

COASTAL WOMEN AS PERPETRATORS OR VICTIMS: AN ANALYSIS OF CRIMINAL PUNISHMENT AGAINST WOMEN IN CASES OF MARINE ENVIRONMENTAL DESTRUCTION IN EAST ACEH

Rika Afrida Yanti¹, Muhammad Natsir², Liza Agnesta Krisna³

Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Samudra,

Jl. Prof. Dr. Syarief Thayeb, Meurandeh, Langsa - Aceh

¹e-mail: rikaafriday@unsam.ac.id

²e-mail: munatsir_1966@unsam.ac.id

³e-mail: agnes_krisna@unsam.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines two central issues concerning coastal women in cases of marine environmental destruction in East Aceh: (1) how environmental criminal law normatively constructs women as perpetrators, and (2) how law enforcement can incorporate substantive and restorative justice principles. Using a normative juridical method supported by analysis of legislation and judicial practice, the research finds that although the Environmental Protection and Management Law formally requires proof of fault (mens rea) for individuals, its application often remains formalistic and result-oriented. The law does not adequately differentiate between primary actors and structurally vulnerable participants, leading to the disproportionate criminalization of coastal women. The study argues that achieving genuine environmental justice requires a contextual and gender-sensitive approach, including proportional assessment of culpability and the selective application of restorative justice mechanisms. Legal reform is therefore necessary to align environmental protection with substantive justice and gender equality principles in coastal communities.

Keywords: Coastal Women; Criminalization; Marine Environment; East Aceh; Gender; Environmental Criminal Law.

INTRODUCTION

Coastal regions hold significant importance in shaping the social and economic life of Indonesian communities (Ardila and Hayat 2023), including in East Aceh, rich marine resources serve as the foundation of livelihoods, particularly for fishing communities. Within this setting, coastal women hold a significant role—both directly as part of the workforce and indirectly as managers of fishing households. Yet, amid increasingly complex social and economic dynamics, a paradoxical situation has arisen: women are not only responsible for sustaining family survival but are also

drawn into activities classified as environmental crimes, such as destructive fishing, the use of explosives, and illegal fishing equipment.

The involvement of women in cases of marine environmental degradation prompts fundamental questions about whether they should be regarded as genuine offenders deserving criminal liability, or rather as victims of unequal social, economic, and legal structures. In numerous instances, coastal women possess limited bargaining power, both in household economic decision-making and in gaining access to education, information, and legal protection. Factors such as structural poverty, economic



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

* Received: 6 January 2025, Received in revised form: 7 February 2026, Accepted: 21 February 2026

Doi: 10.3376/jch.v11i1.1288

dependence on husbands or families, and limited awareness of environmental regulations contribute to their engagement in activities prohibited by law.

Conversely, Indonesia's criminal justice system especially in relation to environmental offenses remains heavily influenced by a legalistic and retributive orientation. Such an approach frequently overlooks the socio-economic context and gender dynamics underlying criminal acts (Widiartana 2017) Women entangled in legal processes are frequently treated identically to male offenders, with little regard for the distinct contexts, pressures, and constraints they encounter (Edi Riyadi Terre 2013). This demonstrates the absence of gender awareness in the enforcement of environmental criminal law at both local and national levels.

From a criminal policy perspective, the study from Lufna Nandita et.al, advocates for restorative justice and contextualized criminal policy, particularly in cases involving marginalized communities (Nandita and Kayowuan 2024). The principle of restorative justice emphasizes dialogue, accountability, and ecological recovery rather than mere punishment. Applying these principles to environmental crimes involving coastal women necessitates recognizing the intersection between structural poverty, gender inequality, and limited legal literacy. The theoretical framework of this research therefore integrates gender justice theory, ecofeminism, and restorative criminal policy. Ecofeminism, frequently discussed in Indonesian gender scholarship, views environmental exploitation and women's marginalization as interconnected products of patriarchal

and extractive systems, thereby offering a critical lens for interpreting women's criminalization in environmental contexts.

East Aceh, as the focus of this study, presents concrete instances of coastal women being prosecuted for marine environmental destruction. Yet, field data and narratives reveal that their participation is largely passive, driven not by free choice but by urgent economic necessities. (Field Observation Result, Dated 7 July 2025). This condition highlights the urgency of adopting a more critical and contextual approach to criminal policy, one that goes beyond written legal provisions and takes into account the principles of substantive justice and women's human rights.

Given that the research is situated in Aceh, it is also essential to consider the role of customary law (*hukum adat*) and local maritime institutions. In Aceh, the institution of *Panglima Laot* traditionally regulates marine resource management, dispute resolution, and fishing ethics. Customary norms emphasize collective responsibility, ecological balance, and social harmony, which in principle align with restorative values (Gaffar Mu'aqaffi 2022). Nevertheless, the interaction between state criminal law and customary mechanisms is often unbalanced, with formal law overriding community-based resolution processes. This tension raises critical questions regarding legal pluralism and whether the criminal justice system adequately accommodates local wisdom and gendered realities in East Aceh.

Building on this background, the article seeks to explore the position of coastal women in cases of marine environmental destruction in East Aceh,

questioning whether they should be regarded as offenders or as victims of structural injustice. Employing a normative-juridical method combined with a gender justice perspective, it further analyzes how the existing criminal justice system addresses women and proposes alternative legal approaches that are more equitable, restorative, and context-sensitive. The study aspires to contribute to the advancement of environmental criminal law that is attuned to social realities and inclusive of women's rights.

The novelty of this research lies in its integrative analysis of environmental criminal law, gender justice, ecofeminism, and Acehese customary law within a single analytical framework. Unlike prior studies that separately examine environmental enforcement or women's socio-economic roles, this study specifically interrogates the legal positioning of coastal women in East Aceh as either offenders or victims of structural injustice. By employing a normative-juridical method enriched with socio-legal and gender analysis, the research seeks to synchronize doctrinal principles of criminal liability with substantive justice, human rights standards, and local customary values. Ultimately, it aspires to formulate a more equitable and context-sensitive model of environmental criminal policy that recognizes women not merely as legal subjects of punishment but as rights-bearing actors within complex socio-ecological systems.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study adopts a normative juridical method, emphasizing document analysis of legislation, legal literature, and

relevant judicial decisions. The approach seeks to examine legal norms in a systematic, consistent, and logical manner, without relying on fieldwork or interviews. The legal sources include: primary materials such as Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH), the Criminal Code (KUHP), and the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP); secondary materials consisting of literature on environmental criminal law, legal feminism, and gender-oriented criminal law; and tertiary materials including legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and academic journals. The data collected were then examined using qualitative analytical techniques.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Criminal Construction in the Environmental Management Law Against Women in Cases of Marine Destruction

Environmental criminal law is a legal field that governs actions considered criminal offenses due to their harmful impact or pollution on the environment. Its main objective is not merely to punish offenders, but also to safeguard the environment as a fundamental human right and to ensure the preservation of natural resources for future generations (Saidah 2021).

Indonesia, with its abundant biological and environmental resources, encounters significant challenges in protecting and managing the environment. The many instances of environmental damage and pollution highlight the urgent need for robust and effective law enforcement through criminal law mechanisms.

The main basis of environmental criminal law in Indonesia is:

- a. Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH). This law acts as the main legal framework in the environmental field. It includes criminal provisions with repressive measures against various forms of environmental harm, such as imprisonment and fines.
- b. Criminal Code (KUHP). Certain provisions in the KUHP remain applicable to environmental protection, even though the term "environment" is not explicitly used. For instance, Article 406 on property destruction can be applied to cases of ecosystem damage.
- c. Implementing Regulations (Government Regulations, Regional Regulations, Ministerial Regulations of Environment and Forestry, etc.). These derivative rules provide technical and operational guidelines for environmental protection, including the enforcement of administrative sanctions and reporting obligations.

Environmental crimes possess distinct characteristics that set them apart from ordinary crimes. The elements that need to be fulfilled include: (Sari 2019)

- a. Action: Encompasses active conduct such as waste disposal, forest burning, the use of explosives in marine areas, and similar activities.
- b. Result: The emergence of environmental harm or pollution, whether affecting land, sea, air, or other ecosystems.

- c. Causation: The link between the act committed and the damage or pollution that follows.
- d. Fault (intent or negligence): Environmental crimes may be carried out deliberately or arise from carelessness.

In environmental damage crimes, the legal subject is not limited to individuals (natural persons) but may also include corporations. This is underscored in Article 116 of the Environmental Protection and Management Law, which recognizes corporate criminal liability for environmental harm. When the offense is carried out by a business entity, those who may be held responsible include the corporation itself, its management, directors, or the person who issued the order and bears responsibility for operational activities.

The Environmental Management Law provides for three forms of law enforcement in response to environmental violations, namely: (Erawaty 2011)

- a. Sanctions, which are non-criminal measures such as warnings, license revocations, government enforcement (*bestuursdwang*), or administrative fines. These sanctions are intended to halt violations and remedy the damage caused.
- b. Civil Sanctions, which focus on restoring the environment and providing compensation to affected parties. Lawsuits may be brought by the public, NGOs, or the state.

Sanctions, applied as an *ultimum remedium*, are imposed when violations result in severe consequences or cannot be adequately addressed through administrative or civil measures.

In Indonesia, Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH) serves as the main legal framework for addressing environmental pollution and destruction in Indonesia, including the protection of marine ecosystems. By design, this law sets forth strict criminal provisions against any individual or legal entity responsible for causing environmental harm or pollution, with the purpose of creating a deterrent effect and ensuring comprehensive ecological preservation.

The destruction of marine ecosystems is categorized as an environmental crime under Articles 98 to 113 of the Environmental Management Law. Acts such as using explosives or hazardous chemicals in fishing, discharging toxic waste into the sea, dredging coral reefs, or engaging in illegal fishing practices that damage marine habitats fall within this scope. Article 98 paragraph (1) of the Environmental Management Law stipulates: *“Any person who intentionally commits an act resulting in the exceedance of environmental quality standards shall be subject to imprisonment of no less than 3 (three) years and no more than 10 (ten) years, and a fine of no less than IDR 3,000,000,000.00 and no more than IDR 10,000,000,000.00.”*

This shows that the Environmental Management Law applies a result-oriented offense approach. In other words, law enforcement prioritizes the actual occurrence of pollution or damage rather than focusing solely on the perpetrator’s intent or motive (Hani 2025). In practice, the formulation of criminal sanctions in the Environmental Management Law highlights the need to prove material

elements, namely the presence of an unlawful act (action), the resulting pollution or environmental damage (consequence), and the causal link between the act and its outcome (Cahya Devi 2021). This approach regards all offenders in a formal and objective manner, without considering socioeconomic background, structural constraints, or their role within power relations. As a result, positive law provides no space to differentiate whether an offender acted actively, passively, or under coercion. For instance, a coastal woman who only assisted in carrying explosives at her husband’s request could still be deemed a criminal offender under the doctrine of complicity (*deelneming*) as outlined in Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code, which is also applied in environmental law enforcement.

This normative construction becomes problematic when examined through empirical findings in East Aceh. Field Observation Results (Datel, 7 July 2025) reveal concrete instances of coastal women being prosecuted in cases of marine environmental destruction. However, interviews and narrative accounts show that their involvement was largely passive. Several women admitted that they merely assisted in preparing fishing equipment, storing materials later identified as prohibited, or handling post-catch logistics at the request of their husbands or boat owners. Their participation was driven not by autonomous criminal intent but by urgent economic necessity, household dependency, and limited understanding of environmental regulations. In certain cases, women were listed as co-perpetrators under the doctrine of

complicity (Articles 55 and 56 of the Criminal Code), despite the absence of evidence that they made strategic or operational decisions. This empirical data illustrates a gap between doctrinal criminal construction and the sociological realities experienced by coastal women in East Aceh.

The author argues that one of the shortcomings in the criminal framework of the Environmental Protection and Management Law (PPLH) lies in its failure to distinguish between primary perpetrators or decision-makers (such as ship owners, investors, or technical operators) and passive or secondary actors who become involved due to dependency, economic hardship, or coercion. In practice, all offenders are subjected to the same criminal sanctions, regardless of the degree of their involvement or the motives behind their actions. This results in injustice, particularly for vulnerable groups like coastal women, who may merely be obeying orders or lack a full understanding of the legal consequences of their conduct. Unlike juvenile criminal law or legal protections for victims of human trafficking, which take structural vulnerabilities into account, the PPLH Law still overlooks sociological factors and lacks a social justice perspective.

This neutral and formalistic construction of criminal law leads to unequal application of justice. Individuals with economic and intellectual resources may escape liability by exploiting procedural gaps or evidentiary weaknesses, while coastal women who are only passively involved can still face maximum punishment, since no normative framework exists to differentiate proportional responsibility.

In the absence of a sociological and gender-sensitive perspective within environmental criminal law, the justice delivered remains merely formal rather than substantive. This stands in contrast to the principles of ecological and social justice that should underpin environmental protection, including the safeguarding of marine ecosystems.

Perpetrator or Victim: Normative Analysis

From the standpoint of positive law, especially as stipulated in Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH), any individual who engages in actions that cause environmental damage may be subjected to punishment. (Efendi, A 2011). This provision reflects a strict liability principle, where law enforcement primarily emphasizes the act (*actus reus*) and its resulting consequences, without considering the motives or personal background of the offender (Martana 2009). Thus, from a normative standpoint, women involved in distributing fish caught through illegal methods, or in facilitating destructive marine activities such as the use of fish bombs, banned fishing equipment, or the disposal of waste into the sea, may be classified as perpetrators of environmental crimes.

Normatively, Articles 98 and 99 of the UU PPLH explicitly distinguish between intentional and negligent conduct, thereby reaffirming that individual criminal responsibility is fault-based. In this regard, the prosecution must demonstrate not only the occurrence of environmental damage (*actus reus*) but also the defendant's culpable mental state. Strict liability tends to operate more

prominently in cases involving corporate actors, as reflected in Article 116, where corporate entities and their management may be held responsible without the same individualized inquiry into subjective intent. Therefore, equating all environmental offenses with strict liability risks oversimplifying the doctrinal structure of the law and mischaracterizing the scope of individual accountability.

Nevertheless, in practice, law enforcement often emphasizes the occurrence of environmental harm rather than thoroughly examining the degree of individual fault or the socio-economic context surrounding the accused. As a result, women involved in distributing fish caught through illegal methods or in facilitating destructive marine activities—such as the use of fish bombs or banned fishing equipment—may be prosecuted as perpetrators once their physical participation is established. Although the law formally requires proof of fault, the assessment of *mens rea* is frequently inferred from participation alone, without deeper scrutiny of coercion, dependency, or limited awareness.

The author contends that this approach does not truly represent substantive justice. Justice should not be assessed solely by the formal application of the law, but also by how far the law considers the social realities of the people involved (Johan Nasution 2014). In the case of coastal women in regions like East Aceh, their participation in activities legally classified as environmental crimes is not always driven by free will. Instead, their involvement often represents a response to structural pressures such as poverty, limited educational opportunities, economic dependence on

husbands or families, and the absence of legitimate and sustainable livelihood options.

When women take on the role of distributing illegal catches, they often act as intermediaries or small-scale sellers with minimal profit margins, while the principal actors and economic beneficiaries behind these unlawful activities evade prosecution. In such cases, women are not the primary initiators of environmental destruction but merely part of the distribution network, driven by economic hardship and the lack of effective social control over marine exploitation.

Additionally, many coastal women become involved due to domestic pressures, carrying out the orders of husbands or family members to fulfill basic household needs. Within this patriarchal context, women have very limited bargaining power, even in matters with legal consequences. When the legal system treats them the same as the main perpetrators without distinction, it further deepens the injustices they already face.

Moreover, limited awareness of legal and environmental issues is also a crucial factor. In many coastal communities, legal information does not reach all segments of society equally, especially women, who are frequently left out of outreach and training programs. As a result, their participation in environmentally harmful activities is closely tied to a lack of education about the legal repercussions and ecological effects. This reflects a clear form of structural victimization (A Ezzat Fattah 1991) where women are victims of a social and economic system that does not

provide them with fair and dignified choices.

In light of the above, the criminalization of coastal women requires careful consideration. A purely legalistic approach that neglects social and gender dimensions risks penalizing the very group that ought to be protected. Hence, the legal system should adopt a differentiated sentencing approach that considers the level of culpability (*mens rea*), the role in the offense (whether as a primary actor, accessory, or someone acting under pressure), as well as the offender's socioeconomic condition (Rafillah 2025).

One possible approach is restorative justice, which prioritizes repairing harm and empowering the community over merely imposing punitive sanctions (Nugroho 2023). In the context of coastal women, this approach can be realized in the form of alternative economic training, social rehabilitation programs, or social work that is beneficial to the community, without having to plunge them into a gender-unfriendly correctional system.

Therefore, from the perspective of normative legal analysis that incorporates the dimension of social justice, coastal women involved in cases of marine destruction should not be regarded solely as offenders. They are also victims of unequal social and economic structures. For this reason, differentiating between active and passive actors is essential to ensure that the law functions as an instrument of justice, rather than a blind tool of punishment that deepens existing social injustices.

Substantive and Restorative Justice in Law Enforcement for Coastal Women in Cases of Marine Environmental Destruction

Substantive justice is founded on the idea that justice cannot be achieved merely through equal application of the law, but must also consider the structural conditions that shape an individual's actions (Haryono 2019). In unequal social systems, such as impoverished coastal communities in East Aceh, women frequently do not have complete freedom to opt for legally permissible actions. Substantive justice demands that law enforcement take into account factors such as: (Seregig 2023)

- a. Poverty and economic dependence, where women have no viable employment opportunities other than assisting in illegal economic activities.
- b. Power imbalances within the household or community, where women are compelled to act according to the decisions of men (such as husbands, fathers, or community leaders).
- c. Limited education and access to information, leaving women unaware that their actions are illegal or damaging to the environment.

Within this framework, coastal women are seen not merely as "legal offenders" deserving punishment, but also as "systemic victims" of a social structure that neglects to protect and empower them.

The urgency of integrating substantive justice becomes clearer when examining judicial practice, particularly decisions recorded in the Direktori

Putusan Mahkamah Agung on environmental crimes. One relevant example is Mahkamah Agung Decision No. 12201 K/PID.SUS-LH/2025, dated 19 December 2025, involving Harsina binti Alm. Afui as the defendant in a special environmental crime case. Although the published register does not detail the full reasoning in the abstract, the classification under Pidana Khusus Lingkungan Hidup shows that women are being processed at the highest judicial level for environmental offenses without clear differentiation of their degree of involvement, intent (*mens rea*), or economic pressures underlying their participation. The focus remains on establishing statutory violation participation and resulting harm — rather than assessing whether the woman was a principal decision-maker or a subordinate participant influenced by structural vulnerabilities. This highlights how formal legal reasoning in environmental adjudication may overlook substantive justice considerations, particularly in cases involving structurally vulnerable actors like women in coastal communities, who may function as accessories rather than primary orchestrators of environmental harm.

Restorative justice is an approach that emphasizes repairing the harm caused by a crime, rather than solely punishing the offender (Sukardi and Purnama 2022). In this approach, handling of legal violations is directed at:

- a. Rebuilding social and ecological relationships rather than seeking revenge.
- b. Active involvement of offenders, victims, and the community in developing constructive solutions.

- c. Empowering offenders to prevent them from repeating similar actions due to economic or social pressures.

A review of several environmental judgments further reveals that sentencing patterns tend to prioritize deterrence through imprisonment and fines, even where the defendant's role is secondary. Courts rarely explore alternative sanctions that could simultaneously restore ecological damage and address the socioeconomic vulnerability of the accused. This punitive orientation demonstrates the limited incorporation of restorative justice principles within environmental adjudication. The absence of judicial guidelines differentiating between primary perpetrators and passive participants results in a uniform sentencing approach, which may disproportionately affect women with minimal decision-making power.

In the context of coastal women, a restorative approach can be applied through:

- a. Criminal diversion for women who have only a passive or indirect involvement in the offense.
- b. Offering alternative sanctions, such as community service, entrepreneurship training, or economic rehabilitation programs, in place of imprisonment.
- c. Facilitating recovery dialogues between offenders and the community to foster ecological awareness and a shared sense of responsibility for marine sustainability.

This approach has been recognized and has begun to be applied in juvenile law (Law No. 11 of 2012), and its

principles can be adopted in environmental law as a form of humanistic and transformative criminal innovation (Nashir, Maharani, and Zafira 2024).

Normatively, Indonesian law does not explicitly accommodate a substantive or restorative justice approach in the context of environmental and gender law. Therefore, according to the author, this is necessary:

- a. Revising environmental criminalization policies by creating specific guidelines for addressing violations committed by vulnerable groups, including women
- b. Applying restorative justice selectively in marine environmental cases involving female offenders who are not the primary actors.
- c. Aligning the PPLH Law, the Criminal Code, and the principles of justice in CEDAW to ensure sentencing is non-discriminatory.

Promoting community-based legal empowerment by engaging women in environmental legal education, raising awareness of ecological impacts, and providing access to legal aid.

CONCLUSION

This study addressed two principal issues: (1) how environmental criminal law normatively constructs coastal women as perpetrators in cases of marine environmental destruction; and (2) how law enforcement should be reoriented to achieve substantive and restorative justice in such cases. First, from a normative standpoint, Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management (UU PPLH) formally requires proof of fault (*mens rea*) for

individuals, although in practice enforcement often emphasizes the fulfillment of material elements (act and result) without sufficiently examining structural vulnerability. The legal construction does not clearly differentiate between primary decision-makers (such as vessel owners or financiers) and passive or economically dependent actors, including coastal women. As a result, women who play marginal or subordinate roles may still be classified and punished as full perpetrators under the doctrine of participation. This demonstrates that the existing framework of environmental criminal law remains formalistic and insufficiently responsive to gender and socio-economic realities. Second, in order to realize substantive justice, law enforcement must move beyond rigid retributive approaches toward a more contextual and proportional model. Coastal women involved in marine environmental cases should be assessed based on their degree of culpability, level of participation, and structural constraints, including poverty, economic dependence, and limited legal awareness. Restorative justice offers a relevant alternative by emphasizing ecological recovery, community engagement, and socioeconomic empowerment rather than solely imprisonment. Therefore, reform is needed at both the normative and practical levels, including sentencing guidelines that recognize vulnerable groups, selective application of restorative mechanisms, and harmonization with gender equality principles. Ultimately, genuine environmental justice in coastal regions cannot be achieved if the law treats structurally vulnerable women as isolated offenders detached from their

socio-economic context. A humane, gender-sensitive, and context-based criminal justice approach is essential to ensure that environmental protection does not reproduce social injustice.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- A Ezzat Fattah. 1991. *Understanding Criminal Victimization*. Canada: Prentur-Hall.
- Ardan et.al. 2024. "REFORMASI HUKUM INDONESIA MELALUI LENSEA FEMINIST LEGAL THEORY: MENYUSUN KEADILAN GENDER." *Jurnal Yustitia* 2 (2): 53–69.
- Ardila, Ira, and Nurul Hayat. 2023. "Kehidupan Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat Pesisir Karangantu." *Jurnal Pendidikan Sosiologi Undiksha* 5 (3): 291–97. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jpsu.v5i3.76775>.
- Berliantha, Berliantha, and Ilma Ainun Nabila Fasya. 2023. "Perempuan Dalam Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia (Kajian Feminist Legal Theory)." *Iblam Law Review* 3 (2): 13–22. <https://doi.org/10.52249/ilr.v3i2.111>.
- Cahya Devi, Rosa Pijar. 2021. "Problematika Unsur Melawan Hukum Pada Pengaturan Tindak Pidana Lingkungan Hidup Dalam Rkuhp." *LITRA: Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan, Tata Ruang, Dan Agraria* 1 (1): 59–74. <https://doi.org/10.23920/litra.v1i1.560>.
- Chairil, Aisyah, and Henri Shalahuddin. 2021. "Studi Kritis Feminist Legal Theory Menurut Perspektif Islamic Worldview." *Mimbar Hukum* 33 (1): 188–215. <https://doi.org/10.22146/mh.v33i1.1948>.
- Edi Riyadi Terre. 2013. *Manusia, Perempuan, Laki-Laki*. Jakarta: Komunitas Salihara-Hivos.
- Efendi, A, An. 2011. "Penyelesaian Kasus Pencemaran Lingkungan Dari Aspek Hukum Lingkungan." *Risalah Hukum* 7 (1): 71–91.
- Erawaty, Rika. 2011. "Penegakan Hukum Lingkungan Di Kawasan Industri Ditinjau Dari Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2009 Tentang Perlindungan Dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup (Studi Pada Kawasan Industri Kota Dumai)." *Risalah Hukum* 7 (2): 54–70.
- Gaffar Mu'qaaffi. 2022. "The Legacy Of Spice Route : The Role Of Panglima Laot In Maritime Security In The Modern Aceh." *Jurnal Masyarakat Dan Budaya* 23 (3): 379–92. <https://doi.org/10.14203/jmb.v23i3.1429>.
- Geovanie, David Greacy. 2021. "CEDAW: ADVOKASI KAUM FEMINISME MELAWAN PERAMPASAN HAK-HAK PEREMPUAN OLEH TRADISI ADAT DI NUSA TENGGARA TIMUR." *Jurnal Locus Delicti* 2 (April): 1–12.
- Hani, Hanifa Fathia. 2025. "Perlindungan Hukum Terhadap Korban Pencemaran Lingkungan Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Perlindungan Dan Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup Dalam Perspektif Keadilan Restoratif." *Recidive: Jurnal Hukum Pidana Dan Penanggulangan Kejahatan* 14 (1): 348. <https://doi.org/10.20961/recidive.v14i1.88614>.
- Haryono, Haryono. 2019. "PENEGAKAN HUKUM BERBASIS NILAI KEADILAN SUBSTANTIF (Studi Putusan MK No. 46/PUU-VII/2012 Tertanggal

- 13 Februari 2012).” *Jurnal Hukum Progresif* 7 (1): 20. <https://doi.org/10.14710/hp.7.1.20-39>.
- Helena, Yanika, Esra Labora Suryani, and Abdul Rahman Maulana. 2024. “Teori Hukum Feminisme Dan Perlindungan Hukum Bagi Di Indonesia.” *Jurnal Hukum* 5 (04): 9–17.
- Johan Nasution, Bahder. 2014. “Kajian Filosofis Tentang Konsep Keadilan Dari Pemikiran Klasik Sampai Pemikiran Modern.” *Yustisia Jurnal Hukum* 3 (2). <https://doi.org/10.20961/yustisia.v3i2.11106>.
- Martana, Pembimbing Nyoman A. 2009. “Tanggung Jawab Mutlak (Strict Liability) Dalam Penegakan Hukum Perdata Lingkungan.” *Jurnal Unud* 1 (1): 1–5.
- Nandita, Lufna, and Kayus Kayowuan. 2024. “Pendekatan Restorative Justice Dalam Memberikan Perlindungan Hukum Dan Keadilan Bagi Kelompok Masyarakat Marginal Di Indonesia.” *Jurnal Review Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran* 7 (3): 10830–36.
- Nashir, Muhammad Alvin, Nabila Maharani, and Aisyah Zafira. 2024. “Urgensi Pembentukan Undang-Undang Restorative Justice Dalam Rangka Reformasi Keadilan Dan Kepastian Hukum Di Indonesia.” *Sapientia Et Virtus* 9 (1): 344–57. <https://doi.org/10.37477/sev.v9i1.501>.
- Nugroho, Alifianissa Puspaningtyas. 2023. “Restorative Justice: Terwujudnya Asas Keadilan Dan Asas Kepastian Hukum Pada Instansi Kepolisian.” *Recidive : Jurnal Hukum Pidana Dan Penanggulangan Kejahatan* 12 (2): 218. <https://doi.org/10.20961/recidive.v12i2.71620>.
- Rafillah, Rahadatul Aisyi. 2025. “Wacana Kuasa Ala Foucault Atas Peran Negara Dan Kuasa Pada Anak Perempuan Korban Kekerasan.” 2025 2 (5).
- Saidah. 2021. *Hukum Pidana Lingkungan. IAIN Parepare Nusantara Press*.
- Sari, Indah. 2019. “Unsur-Unsur Delik Materiel Dan Delik Formil Dalam Hukum Pidana Lingkungan.” *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dirgantara* 10 (1): 64–80. <https://journal.universitassuryadarm.a.ac.id/index.php/jihd/article/download/404/374>.
- Seregig, I Ketut. 2023. *Mewujudkan Keadilan Substantif Dalam Penegakan Hukum Pidana Di Indonesia*. Bandar Lampung: UBL Press.
- Sukardi, Sukardi, and Hadi Rahmat Purnama. 2022. “Restorative Justice Principles in Law Enforcement and Democracy in Indonesia.” *Journal of Indonesian Legal Studies* 7 (1): 155–90. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jils.v7i1.53057>.
- Sulistiyawan, Aditya Yuli. 2018. “Feminist Legal Theory Dalam Telaah Paradigma: Suatu Pemetaan Filsafat Hukum.” *Masalah-Masalah Hukum* 47 (1): 56. <https://doi.org/10.14710/mmh.47.1.2018.56-62>.
- Triantono, Triantono. 2023. “Feminis Legal Theory Dalam Kerangka Hukum Indonesia.” *Progressive Law and Society* 1 (1): 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.14710/pls.20744>.
- Widiartana, Gregorius. 2017. “Paradigma Keadilan Restoratif Dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan Dengan

Menggunakan Hukum Pidana.”
Justitia et Pax 33 (1): 1–23.
<https://doi.org/10.24002/jep.v33i1.1418>.