

Assessing The Urgency of Recognizing Ecocide in Indonesian Environmental Law

Jelita Kristi Agape

Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This study aims to analyze the concept of ecocide in environmental law and to assess the adequacy of legal regulations and enforcement in Indonesia. The study employs a normative legal methodology using legislative, conceptual, and case-based approaches, with a focus on Law No. 32 of 2009 on the Protection and Management of the Environment. The findings indicate that, from a normative perspective, Indonesia possesses comprehensive legal instruments through administrative, civil, and criminal mechanisms, as well as the principles of precaution, polluter pays, and strict liability. However, this framework is not yet fully adequate from an ecocide perspective. There is a legal gap because ecocide has not been recognized as a specific crime, as well as an enforcement gap reflected in weak law enforcement, particularly against corporations. Cases of forest fires, river pollution, and damage caused by mining demonstrate patterns of widespread, serious, and recurring destruction. Therefore, legal strengthening is required through the recognition of ecocide, the optimization of corporate liability, and the enhancement of law enforcement effectiveness. This study underscores the importance of environmental law reform that is more responsive and oriented toward ecosystem protection.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 4 May 2026
Revised 9 July 2026
Accepted 31 July 2026

KEYWORDS

Corporate Environmental Crime;
Ecocide; Environmental Law;
Green Criminology.

SUBJECTS

Ecology, Environment Law, and
Indonesian Law.

HOW TO CITE:

Agape, Jelita Kristi. 2026.
"Assessing The Urgency of
Recognizing Ecocide in Indonesian
Environmental Law." *Alauddin Law
Development Journal* 8 (2). doi:
10.24252/aldev.v8i2.67594

1. Introduction

Environmental destruction today has developed into a multidimensional crisis that not only impacts ecological aspects but also spreads significantly into social, economic, public health, and even political stability dimensions (Muthmainnah et al., 2020). Phenomena such as massive deforestation, water and air pollution, soil degradation, and the loss of biodiversity are clear indicators that human exploitation of natural resources has exceeded the carrying capacity and assimilative capacity of the environment. This condition cannot be separated from the extractivism-based development model that positions natural resources merely as economic commodities, thereby neglecting ecosystem sustainability.

Theoretically, this issue can be explained through the ecological modernization theory approach (Gibbs 2017) and its critique in green criminology. While ecological modernization theory assumes that technological advancements and regulations can correct environmental

*CORRESPONDING AUTHOR: Jelita Kristi Agape,  agape_jelita@student.uns.ac.id, Sebelas Maret University, Surakarta, Indonesia

damage, the green criminology perspective highlights that environmental destruction is a form of structural crime often legitimized by state policies and corporate interests. Environmental crime is not merely conventional; it also reflects the unequal power relations between the state, corporations, and society (Fadila, 2024).

In the development of international law, large-scale environmental destruction has begun to be viewed as a serious crime that transcends mere administrative or civil violations. The concept of ecocide emerged as a normative response to the need to qualify acts of environmental destruction as extraordinary crimes (Setyawan, 2023). Ecocide is generally understood as an act that causes widespread, severe, and long-term environmental damage, thereby threatening the sustainability of ecosystems and human life.

The idea of recognizing ecocide as an international crime is strengthening in global discourse, particularly with the push to include it within the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court through an amendment to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (Novantia and Sasmini 2024a). This discourse indicates a paradigm shift in law from an anthropocentric approach, which places humans at the center of legal protection, toward an ecocentric approach that recognizes the intrinsic value of the environment as an entity deserving independent protection (Sasmini and Novantia, 2024).

Indonesia faces serious challenges regarding environmental destruction. The high rate of natural resource exploitation, weak supervision, and conflicts of interest between economic development and environmental protection have led to various incidents that can be categorized as large-scale ecological harm (Putro et al., 2024). One example demonstrating a significant level of ecological damage is the case of PT Kallista Alam in the Rawa Tripa area, Aceh. In this case, the company was proven to have burned approximately 1,000 hectares of peatland to clear land for an oil palm plantation. This action resulted in the destruction of the peat ecosystem, which holds strategic functions as a carbon sink, water regulator, and habitat for various endangered species such as the Sumatran orangutan. The resulting damage not only led to biodiversity loss but also triggered an increase in greenhouse gas emissions and degraded the area's ecological functions in the long term. The vastness of the affected area, the magnitude of the ecological loss, and the lengthy time required to restore the peat ecosystem indicate that the event possessed the characteristics of widespread, severe, and long-term damage the very elements generally used to identify an act as ecocide.

Furthermore, the pollution of the Citarum River, once categorized as one of the most polluted rivers in the world, reflects a systemic failure in industrial waste management. Textile industry activities that discharge waste without adequate treatment have significantly degraded water quality and impacted public health. This phenomenon highlights an enforcement gap between applicable legal norms and their implementation on the ground.

In the mining sector, various cases of environmental damage due to extractive activities also exhibit patterns of permanent ecological degradation, such as unreclaimed post-mining lands and water pollution from mining waste. This phenomenon aligns with the corporate environmental crime theory, which positions corporations as the primary actors in environmental crimes characterized by widespread impacts, diffuse victims, and difficulties in legal proof.

Normatively, Indonesia actually possesses a fairly comprehensive legal framework through Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management, which adopts vital principles such as sustainable development, the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and strict liability. However, the existence of these norms has not fully been able to address the complexities of large-scale and systemic environmental crimes. The absence of explicit recognition of the ecocide concept in national law causes limitations in qualifying and prosecuting environmental destruction as a serious crime. Consequently, many cases of environmental damage that should be categorized as extraordinary crimes are treated as ordinary violations.

Based on this elaboration, there is an apparent discrepancy between the conceptual development of ecocide in international law and the construction of environmental law within the Indonesian national legal system. This condition shows that although the environmental regulatory framework has developed normatively, limitations remain in accommodating the characteristics of widespread, serious, and long-term environmental destruction. Therefore, a comprehensive study is needed to examine the concept of ecocide from the perspective of Indonesian law, both in terms of regulation and law enforcement, in order to assess the adequacy of the existing legal system and formulate a direction for environmental law reform that is more adaptive, progressive, and oriented toward sustainable ecosystem protection.

2. Method

This study is a normative (doctrinal) legal research that aims to analyze the regulation and law enforcement against environmental destruction from the perspective of ecocide in Indonesia (Marzuki, 2019). The approaches used include the statute approach, the conceptual approach, and the case approach. The legal materials utilized consist of primary legal materials in the form of legislation, specifically Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management along with relevant sectoral regulations; secondary legal materials in the form of scientific literature, journals, and expert doctrines; and tertiary legal materials as supporting sources. The technique for collecting legal materials is conducted through library research, while the analysis technique used is qualitative analysis with a deductive reasoning method drawing conclusions from general norms to specific problems and employing legal interpretation methods to assess the conformity between applicable norms and the concept of ecocide. The results of the analysis are then systematically structured to provide comprehensive legal argumentation regarding the need for environmental law reconstruction in Indonesia (Rahayu and Djulaeka, 2019).

3. Result and Discussion

3.1. The Concept of Ecocide in the Perspective of Environmental Law

The term ecocide is a conceptual construct in environmental law that indicates a significant development in responding to a global ecological crisis that is increasingly complex and systemic. Etymologically, the word ecocide is derived from a combination of the words *eco* (ecosystem or environment) and *cide* (to kill or destroy), which literally translates to "the killing of the environment" (Zaki and Satriano, 2023). Although this definition seems simple, in the perspective of modern environmental law, the concept of ecocide has undergone a broadening of meaning that is not only descriptive but also normative and prescriptive.

Ecocide is not merely understood as an ordinary form of environmental destruction, but as an act that causes ecological damage with specific characteristics, namely widespread, severe, and long-term. These three parameters serve as vital indicators in identifying a level of damage that exceeds the threshold of ecological tolerance and threatens the sustainability of environmental systems, allowing ecocide to be positioned as a form of aggravated environmental harm or even as the most serious environmental crime. This has implications not only for the ecosystem but also for human rights, particularly the right to a good and healthy environment.

One of the most influential conceptual formulations in the discourse of ecocide was proposed by Polly Higgins. She explicitly formulated that:

"Ecocide is the extensive damage to, destruction of or loss of ecosystems of a given territory, whether by human agency or by other causes, to such an extent that peaceful enjoyment by the inhabitants has been severely diminished."

This formulation demonstrates that ecocide is not only understood as physical ecological damage but as a condition in which the functionality of an ecosystem is degraded to the point that it can no longer adequately sustain life. Higgins implicitly broadened the scope of environmental legal protection by incorporating the dimension of the sustainability of life systems as a primary parameter. Thus, ecocide is not solely concerned with environmental objects but also touches upon the existential rights of humans and other living beings. Within this framework, ecocide transcends the boundaries of administrative offenses or conventional environmental violations because it represents a systemic failure in maintaining ecological balance.

To date, ecocide has not been explicitly codified as an international crime in positive legal instruments, particularly in the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, which governs the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court (Novantia and Sasmini, 2024b). Nevertheless, the progression toward recognizing ecocide as an international crime continues to experience dynamic momentum. A significant milestone is the proposed definition submitted by the Independent Expert Panel in 2021, initiated by the Stop Ecocide Foundation. In that formulation, ecocide is defined as

"unlawful or wanton acts committed with knowledge that there is a substantial likelihood of severe and either widespread or long-term damage to the environment being caused by those acts."

This definition explicitly integrates two fundamental elements in criminal law: *actus reus* (the act) and *mens rea* (the guilty mind/fault element), emphasizing the awareness or at least gross negligence of the perpetrator regarding the ecological consequences caused. Nonetheless, efforts to codify ecocide as an international crime continue to evolve (Atılğan, 2020).

The concept of ecocide cannot be separated from the paradigm shifts in environmental law, specifically the transition from an anthropocentric approach to an ecocentric approach (Aida et al., 2023). The anthropocentric approach places humans at the center of legal protection, meaning the environment is protected insofar as it relates to human interests. Conversely, the ecocentric approach acknowledges that the environment has an intrinsic value that must be protected, regardless of its utility to humans. According to the perspective of green criminology, ecocide can be understood as a form of structural crime often beyond the reach of

conventional legal systems. Large-scale environmental crimes generally involve corporate or even state actors, featuring widespread impacts, diffuse victims, and difficulties in proving causality. Therefore, ecocide often lies in a grey area between formal legality and moral legitimacy, where an action might be legally permissible but ecologically devastating.

Furthermore, the concept of ecocide is closely related to the theory of corporate crime or white-collar crime, where corporations become the primary actors in environmental destruction (Lynn Langton, 2025). In many cases, large-scale environmental destruction is the result of formally legal economic activities that have highly destructive ecological impacts (Purnawati, 2024). This highlights the limitations within the existing legal system in anticipating and mitigating complex environmental crimes. Although the term ecocide has not been explicitly recognized in Indonesian national law, the substance of this concept is actually reflected in various environmental law provisions, particularly in Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management. This law regulates prohibitions against acts that cause environmental pollution and destruction and provides a basis for law enforcement against perpetrators of environmental crimes.

However, the approach used in Indonesian law tends to be sectoral and has not been able to accommodate the complexity of ecocide as a large-scale environmental crime. The absence of specific categorization for ecocide creates difficulties in qualifying environmental destruction as an extraordinary crime, resulting in a weak deterrent effect on perpetrators (Ausath, 2022). Conceptually, ecocide can be viewed as an evolutionary form of environmental law toward a more progressive and responsive legal regime regarding the ecological crisis. Recognizing ecocide as a crime has not only legal implications but also ethical and philosophical implications namely, the recognition that the environment is an entity with value and the right to be protected (Gazali 2026).

It can be seen that ecocide is not merely a descriptive concept of environmental destruction but is also a normative construct aimed at strengthening accountability mechanisms for large-scale environmental destruction (Gillet, 2025). This concept becomes highly relevant in the effort to build a legal system that is more adaptive to the increasingly complex challenges of the global environmental crisis.

3.2. Regulation and Law Enforcement against Environmental Destruction in the Perspective of Ecocide in Indonesia

Regulation and law enforcement concerning environmental destruction in Indonesia fundamentally possess a fairly comprehensive normative foundation. However, when analyzed from the perspective of ecocide as a large-scale environmental crime, various structural and substantive limitations still exist (Triantono et al., 2022).

Normatively, environmental protection in Indonesia is governed by Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management, which adopts fundamental principles of modern environmental law such as sustainable development, the precautionary principle, the polluter pays principle, and strict liability. This law provides legal instruments covering preventive aspects (AMDAL/Environmental Impact Assessments and licensing), repressive aspects (administrative, civil, and criminal sanctions), and environmental restoration mechanisms. Furthermore, sectoral regulations such as Law Number 41 of 1999 on Forestry and Law Number 4 of 2009 on Mineral and Coal Mining help strengthen this regulatory framework.

Currently, the available mechanisms are fundamentally executed through three main avenues. First, administrative law enforcement, which is carried out by the government through supervision and the imposition of sanctions in the form of warnings, government coercion, and the suspension or revocation of environmental permits. Second, civil law enforcement, which allows the government or the public to file lawsuits for compensation and/or environmental restoration measures, including through class action mechanisms and legal standing by environmental organizations (Adha and Syahrudin, 2022). Third, criminal law enforcement, which is applied against perpetrators of environmental pollution or destruction with the threat of imprisonment and fines, including regulations concerning corporate criminal liability. Environmental criminal law functions as an *ultimum remedium* (last resort), although in certain developments, it is beginning to be directed as a *primum remedium* (primary remedy) for cases with serious impacts (Adha and Syahrudin, 2022).

Based on the existing legal avenues, applicable sanctions encompass administrative sanctions (e.g., halting business operations), civil sanctions (compensation and environmental restoration), and criminal sanctions (imprisonment, fines, and additional criminal penalties such as confiscation of profits or business closure) (Alfahrizi and Alauddin, 2024). Normatively, these regulations are actually quite complete and progressive, particularly with the inclusion of the strict liability principle, which simplifies the burden of proof in certain cases without needing to prove the element of fault (Eryarifa, 2022).

Nevertheless, from the perspective of ecocide, this legal framework still exhibits a legal gap: the absence of explicit recognition of ecocide as a special crime category (extraordinary crime). Consequently, environmental destruction that is widespread, severe, and long-term is often qualified merely as an ordinary violation, failing to reflect the severity of the ecological impact caused. Moreover, environmental law enforcement in Indonesia also faces an enforcement gap a discrepancy between regulated legal norms and their implementation in the field. This is reflected in the continuing weakness of the application of criminal sanctions against perpetrators, particularly corporations, and the dominant use of administrative sanctions that do not always provide a deterrent effect (Arioseto, 2022).

Various cases indicate signs of environmental destruction that meet the characteristics of ecocide. Forest and land fires that repeatedly occur in Sumatra and Kalimantan, for example, have caused widespread destruction of tropical forest ecosystems, public health disturbances, and transboundary air pollution. A prominent case in Indonesia is that of PT Kallista Alam in the Rawa Tripa area, Aceh. This case began when the company cleared land for an oil palm plantation by burning peatlands that were part of the Leuser Ecosystem. Rawa Tripa has a highly vital ecological function as a habitat for various endangered animals, such as the Sumatran orangutan, Sumatran tiger, and numerous other endemic species. Additionally, the peatland functions as a massive natural carbon sink and plays a role in maintaining the hydrological balance of the surrounding region.

As a result of the burning activities, thousands of hectares of peatland suffered severe damage and lost their ecological functions. This destruction not only caused the loss of vegetative cover but also destroyed wildlife habitats, reduced the peat's ability to absorb carbon, and increased greenhouse gas emissions that contribute to climate change. Unlike ordinary environmental damage that is relatively recoverable in a short time, the destruction of a peat ecosystem has a long-term nature because its formation process takes hundreds to thousands of years. Therefore, the destruction that occurred in Rawa Tripa not only impacts the current

environment but also threatens the sustainability of the area's ecological functions for future generations.

The case of PT Kallista Alam can be categorized as a form closely resembling ecocide because it fulfills the core elements evolving within the concept, namely damage that is widespread, severe, and long-term. The damage that occurred was not limited to a single specific location but affected the entire ecological system of the peatland area. Its impact was also not only felt by the physical environment but also threatened biodiversity, climate stability, and the quality of life of communities dependent on the area's ecological functions. Furthermore, the restoration of the burned peat ecosystem cannot be done instantly and requires an extremely long time with success rates that are not always optimal. It is these characteristics that distinguish the case from ordinary environmental pollution or destruction. Through the Meulaboh District Court Decision Number 12/PDT.G/2012/PN.MBO, PT Kallista Alam was held liable for the environmental damage caused and was ordered to pay compensation and environmental restoration costs. However, when analyzed from the perspective of ecocide, this case demonstrates that the destruction that occurred actually exceeded the limits of conventional environmental violations because it involved the significant destruction of an ecosystem's functions.

The case indicates that practices substantively approaching ecocide have occurred in Indonesia, despite not being formally recognized in the legal system. This condition can be explained through the approach of green criminology and the theory of corporate environmental crime, which highlight that environmental crimes are often structural, involve corporate actors, and are supported by power asymmetries (Fadila, 2024). The complexity of scientific proof and causal relationships in environmental cases also remains a significant obstacle in the law enforcement process.

The reconstruction of environmental law in Indonesia cannot stop merely at the conceptual level but must be directed toward concrete normative steps. First, explicit regulation regarding ecocide in legislation is needed, either through the revision of Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management or through integration into national criminal law, by formulating a definition of ecocide that includes the elements of "widespread, severe, and long-term damage" and including it as a special category of environmental crime (extraordinary crime) (Fachuda and Risma, 2025).

Second, it is necessary to affirm corporate criminal liability mechanisms, including through more detailed regulations on strict liability (Mansyur, 2021), the shifting of the burden of proof in certain cases, and the application of progressive sanctions such as permanent permit revocation, asset recovery, and measurable, strictly supervised environmental restoration obligations.

Third, the law enforcement system needs to be strengthened through the establishment or optimization of special units for handling environmental crimes based on multidisciplinary approaches (law, environmental science, and economics), and increasing the capacity of law enforcement officers in scientific proof and assessing ecological damage. Additionally, the multi-door enforcement approach must be optimized by positioning criminal law as an instrument that is more responsive to cases with massive impacts (Kharisma, 2019).

Fourth, there is a need for the standardization of environmental damage and loss assessments based on scientific methods, ensuring that the process of proof and the imposition

of sanctions can be carried out more objectively and consistently. This is also important to ensure that environmental restoration is not merely symbolic but truly restores ecological functions.

Fifth, in the long term, Indonesia needs to harmonize with the developments in international law, including adopting the principles developing within the discourse of recognizing ecocide as an international crime, in order to strengthen the legitimacy and effectiveness of the national legal system in confronting cross-border environmental crimes.

Based on this, the strengthening of environmental law in Indonesia cannot be achieved merely through the renewal of norms alone; it must be followed by integrated transformation in institutional aspects and law enforcement practices. This step is necessary so that the national legal system has not only normative legitimacy but also implementative effectiveness in responding to large-scale environmental crimes featuring ecocide characteristics accurately, proportionally, and sustainably

3.3. Internalization of the Ecocide Concept in the Perspective of Progressive Law in Indonesia

The fundamental issue does not lie in the absence of norms, but in the limited reach of the law in constructing environmental destruction as a systemic crime with intergenerational impacts. Although Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management has established a relatively comprehensive regulatory framework, the adopted approach still relies on a legal-formal logic that fragments environmental destruction into administrative, civil, and criminal offense categories partially. This fragmentation results in the law's inability to interpret environmental destruction as a cohesive, cumulative, systemic, and widely impactful event. As a result, the law has not been able to provide proportional classification for actions that result in ecological damage on a widespread, severe, and long-term scale as per the characteristics of ecocide.

This limitation can be seen clearly in the case of PT Kallista Alam, which burned peatlands in the Rawa Tripa area, Aceh. This area is a vital part of the Leuser Ecosystem, possessing strategic ecological functions as a habitat for various endangered species and a natural carbon sink. Based on the Meulaboh District Court Decision Number 12/PDT.G/2012/PN.MBO, PT Kallista Alam was found guilty of an unlawful act resulting in environmental destruction. In that decision, the company was ordered to pay environmental compensation of approximately IDR 114 billion and environmental restoration costs of around IDR 251 billion, bringing the total imposed obligations to over IDR 365 billion. The legal basis used included provisions within Law Number 32 of 2009, specifically regarding the prohibition of environmental destruction, the principle of strict liability, and the obligation for environmental restoration.

At first glance, the decision demonstrates the state's success in enforcing environmental law and holding the corporation accountable for the damage caused. However, upon deeper analysis, the PT Kallista Alam case actually reveals the limitations of the Indonesian environmental law paradigm. The damage incurred was not merely the loss of peatland cover, but also caused the destruction of the area's hydrological functions, an increase in carbon emissions, the loss of wildlife habitats, and the disruption of an ecological balance whose restoration requires decades or even centuries. In other words, the resulting impact far exceeds the economic loss calculable through compensation mechanisms.

The event essentially fulfilled the core elements that have been developing in international discourse, namely widespread, severe, and long-term damage. However, the Indonesian legal system did not qualify the event as an extraordinary environmental crime. The case was still positioned as a standard environmental dispute and violation resolved through existing legal instruments. As a result, even though the perpetrator was obliged to pay compensation and restoration costs, the law has not granted recognition that what was destroyed was not merely land or natural resources, but the integrity of an ecosystem that sustains life.

This condition highlights a gap between the degree of ecological damage that occurred and the legal construction used to address it. The law remains oriented toward compensation and restoration approaches, while the dimension of crimes against ecosystems as entities possessing intrinsic value has not received adequate placement. Through the lens of progressive law developed by Satjipto Rahardjo, the law must not be positioned as a rigid institution trapped in normative texts, but must serve as a tool to actualize substantive justice. Justice is not only interpreted as justice for humans but also encompasses ecological justice, namely the protection of the sustainability of the environmental system itself. Thus, when positive norms have not explicitly regulated ecocide, the law should not stop at that void; instead, it must make an interpretative leap by interpreting existing norms extensively and contextually. This approach demands the courage of law enforcement officers to not merely act as the "mouthpieces of the law," but to be active actors in constructing legal meaning in accordance with the needs of environmental protection (Harini and Rahmat, 2025).

However, reality indicates that the practice of environmental law enforcement in Indonesia is still dominated by a positivistic approach that emphasizes legal certainty in a narrow sense, thereby neglecting the dimension of substantive justice. Widespread environmental destruction is often reduced to administrative violations resolved through formal sanction mechanisms without touching the root of the problem. Even in cases with massive ecological impacts, criminal instruments that should serve as a deterrent are rarely optimized. This reflects a dysfunction of the law as a tool of social engineering, where the law fails to steer the behavior of business actors and economic players to align with sustainability principles (Al Alawi, 2024).

The internalization of the ecocide concept is not only related to the renewal of norms but also involves a change in the fundamental orientation of the law itself (Triantono et al., 2022). Environmental law must shift from a reactive approach toward an anticipatory and transformative approach. This means the law must not merely step in after damage has occurred but must also be capable of preventing and controlling potential damage early on (Maksimilianus and Taufiq, 2025). In this context, the ecocide concept can function as both a normative and moral instrument that places strict boundaries against activities with the potential to cause large-scale environmental destruction.

Furthermore, a progressive legal approach also demands the law's alignment with broader interests, including future generations and ecosystem sustainability (Aulia, 2018). Recognizing ecocide becomes crucial as an affirmation that environmental destruction is not merely a technical or administrative issue, but an issue of justice possessing an intergenerational dimension. Without such recognition, the law risks remaining in a subordinate position to short-term economic interests, which are ironically one of the primary drivers of environmental destruction (Maksimilianus and Taufiq, 2025).

Therefore, the internalization of the ecocide concept within the Indonesian legal system must be understood as part of a broader agenda for legal transformation toward a model that is

more progressive and oriented toward ecological justice. This transformation requires changes not only at the regulatory level but also in the mindset of law enforcement officers and policymakers in interpreting the function of the law itself. Without such a paradigm shift, environmental law will remain trapped in a formalistic approach incapable of addressing the complexities of an increasingly alarming ecological crisis.

4. Conclusion

This study affirms that ecocide is a conceptual construction marking a fundamental shift in environmental law, from an approach oriented toward human interests to the recognition of the intrinsic value of the environment itself. Environmental destruction that is widespread, severe, and long-term can no longer be positioned as an ordinary violation, but rather as a form of crime with an extraordinary dimension. The existence of Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management, along with other sectoral regulations, indicates that normatively, the legal system possesses a relatively adequate foundation through administrative, civil, and criminal instruments. However, the lack of explicit recognition of ecocide as a special crime category indicates a normative gap, which leads to limitations in qualifying and handling large-scale environmental destruction proportionally.

The effectiveness of environmental law enforcement still faces various structural and implementative obstacles, including the weak application of criminal sanctions, limitations in ensnaring corporate liability, and the complexity of proof involving scientific dimensions and extensive causal relationships. Empirical phenomena such as forest and land fires, river pollution, and damage caused by mining activities exhibit systemic and recurring patterns of destruction that substantively approach the characteristics of ecocide, yet they have not been fully and optimally addressed within the existing legal framework.

Strengthening environmental law in Indonesia demands not only the renewal of norms but also integrated transformation in institutional aspects and law enforcement practices. Concrete steps that can be taken include recognizing ecocide as a special crime in the national legal system, strengthening corporate criminal liability through more progressive sanction mechanisms oriented toward ecological restoration, and increasing the capacity and coordination among law enforcement institutions. Harmonization with international legal developments and increasing public participation in environmental oversight are vital elements in building a responsive and adaptive legal system, so that the future direction of environmental law reform focuses not only on the effectiveness of law enforcement but also on the creation of sustainable ecological justice.

Disclosure statement

There is no conflict of interest on this article.

References

- Adha, Bestian, and Erwin Syahrudin. 2022. "TUNTUTAN HAK DALAM PENEGAKAN HAK LINGKUNGAN (ENVIRONMENTAL RIGHT)." *The Juris* 6 (2): 397–408. <https://doi.org/10.56301/juris.v6i2.607>.
- Aida, M., A. M. Tahar, and O. Davey. 2023. "Ecocide in the International Law: Integration Between Environmental Rights and International Crime and Its Implementation in Indonesia." In

- Proceedings of the 3rd Universitas Lampung International Conference on Social Sciences (ULICoSS 2022)*, edited by R. Perdana, G. E. Putrawan, B. Saputra, and T. Y. Septiawan, vol. 740. Atlantis Press SARL. https://doi.org/10.2991/978-2-38476-046-6_57.
- Al Alawi, M. N. K. 2024. "Implementasi Teori Law as a Tools of Social Engineering Mahkamah Konstitusi Sebagai Instrumen Kontrol Sosial Dalam Sistem Hukum Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Law and Justice* 2 (2). <https://doi.org/10.47134/ijlj.v2i2.3393>.
- Alfahrizi, D., and M. H. Alauddin. 2024. "Pelanggaran Pemanfaatan Ruang Dan Risiko Longsor Di Simpang Jalan Kawasan Stasiun Batutulis, Bogor." *LITRA: Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Tata Ruang Dan Agrari* 4 (1). <https://doi.org/10.23920/litra.v4i1.2289>.
- Arioseto, A. 2022. "Bekal Menuju Telaah Kritis Atas Ekosida." *BALAIRUNG: Jurnal Multidisipliner* 3 (2).
- Atilgan, Cansu. 2020. "Ecocide as a Separate Crime under the Rome Statute: A Legal Analysis of the Discourse." *Environmental Policy and Law* 55 (2). <https://doi.org/10.1177/18785395251351171>.
- Aulia, M. Z. 2018. "Hukum Progresif Dari Satjipto Rahardjo." *Undang: Jurnal Hukum* 1 (1): 159–85. <https://doi.org/10.22437/ujh.1.1.159-185>.
- Ausath, Muhammad Ali. 2022. "UPAYA PENERAPAN EKOSIDA SEBAGAI KEJAHATAN LUAR BIASA DI INDONESIA: EFFORTS TO IMPLEMENT ECOCIDE AS AN EXTRAORDINARY CRIME." *LITRA: Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan, Tata Ruang, Dan Agraria* 2 (1): 115–28. <https://doi.org/10.23920/litra.v2i1.1091>.
- Eryarifa, S. 2022. "Asas Strict Liability Dalam Pertanggungjawaban Tindak Pidana Korporasi Pada Tindak Pidana Lingkungan Hidup." *Jurnal MAHUPAS: Mahasiswa Hukum Unpas* 1 (2).
- Fachuda, F. A., and S. S. A. Risma. 2025. "Formulasi Tindak Pidana Ekosida Dalam Hukum Pidana Nasional Urgensi Pembaruan Hukum Di Era Krisis Lingkungan Global." *Jaksa : Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum Dan Politik* 3 (4): 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.51903/72g3vs46>.
- Fadila, N. I. 2024. "Pencemaran Laut Dan Kejahatan Lingkungan Akibat Tumpahan Minyak: Kajian Green Criminology Dan Prisma Kejahatan." *JSSH (Jurnal Sains Sosial Dan Humaniora)* 8 (1): 7. <https://doi.org/10.30595/jssh.v8i1.20007>.
- Gazali, R. A. 2026. "PENGATURAN HUKUM TERHADAP TINDAK PIDANA EKOSIDA: KAJIAN PERBANDINGAN ANTARA INDONESIA DAN UKRAINA." *Indonesian Journal of Contemporary Law* 1 (2).
- Gibbs, D. 2017. "Ecological Modernisation." In *The International Encyclopedia of Geography*. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118786352.wbieg0434>.
- Gillet, M. 2025. "THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMAN RIGHTS." *The International Journal of Human Rights* 29 (6). <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2024.2433660>.
- Harini, M., and D. Rahmat. 2025. "Peran Hakim Pada Proses Penemuan Hukum Sebagai Upaya Penegakan Keadilan Berdasarkan Kode Etik Hakim." *Journal Evidence Of Law* 4 (1).
- Kharisma, H. 2019. "PENDEKATAN MULTI REZIM HUKUM (MULTI DOOR SYSTEM) PADA TINDAK PIDANA PERIKANAN." *Borneo Law Review* 3 (1).
- Maksimilianus, A., and M. Taufiq. 2025. *HUKUM LINGKUNGAN PRINSIP, REGULASI, DAN IMPLEMENTASI DALAM PERLINDUNGAN ALAM*. PT Media Penerbit Indonesia.
- Mansyur. 2021. "PENGATURAN PERTANGGUNGJAWABAN PIDANA KORPORASI DI INDONESIA." *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial MAHAKAM* 10 (1).

- Marzuki, P. M. 2019. *Penulisan Hukum Edisi Revisi*. Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Muthmainnah, L., R. Mustansyir, and S. Tjahyadi. 2020. "KAPITALISME, KRISIS EKOLOGI, DAN KEADILAN INTER-GENERASI: Analisis Kritis Atas Problem Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup Di Indonesia." *MOZAIK HUMANIORA* 20 (1): 57. <https://doi.org/10.20473/mozaiik.v20i1.15754>.
- Novantia, T. Y., and S. Sasmini. 2024a. "Signifikansi Ekosida Sebagai Kejahatan Internasional Di Bawah Yurisdiksi Mahkamah Pidana Internasional." *Simbur Cahaya*, 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.28946/sc.v31i1.2915>.
- Novantia, T. Y., and S. Sasmini. 2024b. "Signifikansi Ekosida Sebagai Kejahatan Internasional Di Bawah Yurisdiksi Mahkamah Pidana Internasional." *Simbur Cahaya*, 188–207. <https://doi.org/10.28946/sc.v31i1.2915>.
- Purnawati, A. 2024. *KORPORASI DALAM KEJAHATAN EKOSIDA DI INDONESIA*. CV. EUREKA MEDIA AKSARA.
- Putro, H., D. I. Rosadi, R. Pebriananta, and R. K. Rajib. 2024. "Melangkah Menuju Lingkungan Yang Berkelanjutan: Tantangan Dan Solusi Untuk Masa Depan Bumi." *Jurnal Multidisiplin Ilmu Akademik* 1 (3). <https://doi.org/10.61722/jmia.v1i3.1368>.
- Rahayu, D. and Djulaeka. 2019. *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. SCOPINDO Media Pustaka.
- Sasmini, S., and T. Y. Novantia. 2024. "Ekosida Sebagai Kejahatan Internasional Dibawah Yurisdiksi International Criminal Court: Dialektika Antara Ekosentrisme Dan Antroposentrisme." *Bina Hukum Lingkungan* 9 (1): 104–19. <https://doi.org/10.24970/bhl.v9i1.138>.
- Setyawan, V. P. 2023. "Urgensi Kriminalisasi Ekosida Dalam Penegakan Hukum Di Bidang Lingkungan Hidup." *LAREH LAW REVIEW* 3 (2). <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10.24905/llr.fhuk.unand.ac.id>.
- Triantono, T., A. Purwanti, and N. Rochaety. 2022. "Ekosida: Studi Atas Pendekatan Loss Of Ecological Service Dan Environmental Crime Serta Prospek Pengaturan Di Indonesia." *Jurnal Hukum & Pembangunan* 22 (2).
- Zaki, Muhammad Reza Syariffudin, and Dion Kasmino Satriano. 2023. "ECOCIDE DALAM PANDANGAN KRIMINALISASI INTERNASIONAL DENGAN MENGUATNYA IMPUNITAS KORPORASI BERDASARKAN HUKUM PIDANA INTERNASIONAL." *Mimbar Hukum* 35: 218–56. <https://doi.org/10.22146/mh.v35i0.11457>.