

A PARADIGM SHIFT IN INDONESIAN FORESTRY LAW: ANALYZING THE SECURITY APPROACH OF PRESIDENTIAL REGULATION NO. 5 OF 2025

Ida Yulita Susanti

Doctor of Law, Postgraduate Program, Riau Islamic University

Correspondent Email: 251031006@student.uir.ac.id

Abstract

*Forestry law enforcement in Indonesia faces chronic implementation challenges, rendering Law No. 41 of 1999 on Forestry ineffective in curbing the rates of deforestation and forest encroachment. This failure has created a momentum for the state to seek a policy breakthrough, which manifested in the issuance of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 concerning the Orderliness of Forest Areas. This research aims to critically analyze the paradigm shift and the philosophical tension arising between the Forestry Law as *lex generalis* and Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 as a *lex specialis* intervention. Using a juridical-philosophical approach, this study examines the causal relationship between the phenomenon of institutional failure in civil law enforcement and the emergence of a policy response oriented towards a security approach. The main finding reveals that Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 fundamentally alters the landscape of environmental law enforcement by establishing a Task Force predominantly led by the Minister of Defense and involving elements of the military (TNI) and police. Instead of strengthening the mandated civilian institution (Ministry of Environment and Forestry), this policy bypasses it, reflecting a symptom of "environmental securitization." This approach reduces the complex socio-ecological problems of forestry to mere issues of public order and the recovery of state revenue. In conclusion, this Presidential Regulation creates a structural and philosophical anomaly that risks being a symptomatic solution, ignoring root problems such as tenurial conflicts and systemic corruption, and potentially degrading civilian supremacy in natural resource governance.*

Keywords: Legal Philosophy, Forestry Law, Presidential Regulation, Environmental Securitization, Law Enforcement, Forest Governance.

Abstrak

Penegakan hukum kehutanan di Indonesia menghadapi tantangan implementasi yang kronis, mengakibatkan Undang-Undang No. 41 Tahun 1999 tentang Kehutanan belum mampu membendung laju deforestasi dan perambahan kawasan hutan. Kegagalan ini menciptakan sebuah momentum bagi negara untuk mencari terobosan kebijakan, yang termanifestasi dalam penerbitan Peraturan Presiden No. 5 Tahun 2025 tentang Penertiban Kawasan Hutan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menganalisis secara kritis pergeseran paradigma dan tensi filosofis yang muncul antara UU Kehutanan sebagai *lex generalis* dengan Perpres No. 5/2025 sebagai intervensi *lex specialis*. Menggunakan pendekatan yuridis-filosofis, penelitian ini mengkaji hubungan kausalitas antara fenomena kegagalan institusional dalam penegakan hukum sipil dengan lahirnya respons kebijakan yang berorientasi pada pendekatan keamanan (*security approach*). Temuan utama menunjukkan bahwa Perpres No. 5/2025 secara fundamental mengubah lanskap penegakan hukum lingkungan dengan membentuk Satuan Tugas (Satgas) yang dipimpin oleh Menteri Pertahanan dan melibatkan unsur TNI/Polri secara dominan. Alih-alih memperkuat institusi sipil yang berwenang (Kementerian LHK) sebagaimana diamanatkan oleh undang-undang, kebijakan ini justru mem-bypass-nya, merefleksikan gejala "sekuritisasi lingkungan". Pendekatan ini mereduksi permasalahan kehutanan yang bersifat sosio-ekologis kompleks menjadi sekadar isu ketertiban dan penyelamatan penerimaan negara. Kesimpulannya, Perpres ini menciptakan anomali struktural dan filosofis yang berisiko menjadi solusi simptomatik, mengabaikan akar masalah seperti konflik tenurial dan korupsi sistemik, serta berpotensi mendegradasi supremasi sipil dalam tata kelola sumber daya alam.

Kata Kunci: Filsafat Hukum, Undang-Undang Kehutanan, Perpres, Sekuritisasi Lingkungan, Penegakan Hukum, Tata Kelola Hutan.

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia holds one of the largest tropical rainforests in the world, serving as a crucial carbon sink and biodiversity hotspot. However, despite decades of regulation, deforestation and forest degradation remain critical issues. Previous legal frameworks, primarily grounded in Law No. 41 of 1999 on Forestry and subsequent Job Creation Law amendments, heavily relied on administrative sanctions and conventional policing, which often proved insufficient against organized transnational environmental crimes.

The introduction of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 represents a reactive and drastic measure by the state. This regulation redefines forest protection by adopting a "Security Approach" a doctrine often associated with national defense applied to environmental management. This shift is driven by the statistical failure of previous soft-law approaches.

To illustrate the urgency prompting this regulation, the following table presents the trend of forest destruction cases and the low conviction rate under the previous regime (2020–2024), which served as the academic basis for the urgency of Perpres No. 5 of 2025.

1.1. Background of the Study

The constitution of Indonesia, specifically Article 33 Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution, mandates that earth, water, and natural resources contained therein shall be controlled by the State and used for the greatest prosperity of the people. As a country possessing the third-largest tropical rainforest in the world, Indonesia bears a dual responsibility: ensuring national economic sovereignty through forestry resources and fulfilling global obligations as a "carbon sink" to mitigate climate change.

1.1.1. Historical Context: The Pendulum of Indonesian Forestry Law

To understand the gravity of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025, one must examine the historical trajectory of Indonesian forestry law. The legal policy (Politik Hukum) regarding forests in this archipelago has historically oscillated between two poles: Economic Exploitation and Administrative Conservation. The "Security Approach" introduced in 2025 represents a new, third pole in this historical pendulum.

A. The Colonial Era: *Domein Verklaring* (1870–1945) The foundation of state control over forests was laid by the Dutch Colonial Government through the *Agrarische Wet* 1870. This law introduced the principle of *Domein Verklaring* (State Domain), which declared that all land without a proven owner belonged to the State. While ostensibly for legal certainty, the latent function of this regulation was to facilitate the exploitation of teak forests in Java and spices in the outer islands for the benefit of the colonial trade. At this stage, the forest was viewed purely as a commodity. Indigenous rights (*Ulayat*) were structurally ignored to ensure the smooth flow of timber to Europe.

The New Order Era: The Forest as Development Capital (1967–1998) Following independence, the paradigm did not immediately shift towards conservation. Under the New Order regime, the enactment of Law No. 5 of 1967 on Basic Forestry marked the golden age of exploitation. The state used forests as the primary capital for economic development. Through the mechanism of Forest Concession Rights (*Hak Pengusahaan Hutan* or HPH), millions of hectares in Sumatra and Kalimantan were parceled out to conglomerates and military-affiliated businesses. Law No. 5 of 1967 was highly centralistic. The "Security" aspect at

this time was limited to securing the concession areas of private companies, often using the military to evict local residents. The legal character was strictly Commercial-Administrative, where the preservation of ecology was secondary to the pursuit of national revenue.

The Reformation Era: The Illusion of Conservation (1999–2020) The fall of the New Order brought Law No. 41 of 1999 on Forestry. This law attempted to swing the pendulum towards conservation and decentralization. It recognized customary forests (to a limited extent) and imposed stricter criminal sanctions. However, the enforcement remained administrative. The primary weakness of Law No. 41/1999 was its reliance on the Civil Servant Investigators (PPNS) who lacked the distinct coercive power to face armed illegal loggers. Between 1999 and 2024, the law failed to adapt to the changing nature of crime. While the law focused on catching individual loggers (*tebang liar*), the crime evolved into a corporate-backed mafia.

The 2025 Paradigm Shift Against this historical backdrop, Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 is not merely an amendment; it is a reaction to a century of failure. The pendulum has now swung to "Security." The state acknowledges that neither the Commercial Approach (1967) nor the Administrative Approach (1999) could save the remaining rainforests. Thus, the forest is no longer treated just as an asset or a conservation zone, but as a National Vital Object that requires military-grade protection

However, the reality of forestry law enforcement in the last decade (2015–2025) has shown a stark contrast between the normative ideal (*Das Sollen*) and the empirical reality (*Das Sein*). Despite the enactment of Law No. 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation (*Omnibus Law*) which

attempted to simplify licensing to reduce illegal activities, forest crimes have evolved into transnational organized crimes. These crimes are no longer committed by individuals for subsistence but by sophisticated syndicates involving money laundering and paramilitary-style operations.

The urgency of this research is triggered by the recent enactment of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025, which introduces a "Security Approach" to forestry law. This regulation marks a fundamental departure from the previous "Administrative-Criminal" approach. The state no longer views illegal logging merely as a violation of administrative permits but as an act of "Environmental Terrorism" that threatens national security.

1.2. The Failure of the Administrative Approach: Data Analysis

The primary justification for the shift to a security approach is the statistical failure of the previous legal regime to curb state losses. The "Ultimum Remedium" principle (criminal law as a last resort), which was emphasized in the Job Creation Law era, proved ineffective against large-scale corporate crime. Administrative sanctions were often treated by syndicates merely as a "cost of doing business."

1.2.1. Theoretical Framework: Green Criminology

The urgency of the Security Approach is further justified through the lens of Green Criminology. Traditional criminology often views illegal logging as a property crime or an administrative violation. However, this research adopts the "Green Criminology" perspective (Lynch & Stretesky), which redefines forest destruction not as a victimless crime, but as a crime against humanity and intergenerational justice.

Under the previous legal regime, if a syndicate cleared 1,000 hectares of peatland, it was legally processed as a permit violation. However, Green Criminology argues that the impact release of megatons of carbon, destruction of biodiversity, and floods affecting downstream villages constitutes environmental violence. Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 aligns with this theory by elevating the status of the crime. By involving the State Intelligence Agency (BIN) and the Military (TNI), the state acknowledges that environmental harm is a threat comparable to terrorism. The victims

are not just the trees, but the millions of citizens threatened by the climate crisis derived from such destruction.

To demonstrate this critical urgency, the following data presents the escalation of forest destruction and the inefficiency of law enforcement prior to the enactment of Perpres No. 5 of 2025.

Table 1.1 : Comparative Data on Forest Destruction, Enforcement Efficiency, and State Financial Loss (2020–2024)

Year	Deforestation Rate (Hectares)	Illegal Logging Cases Reported	Cases Executed (Inkracht)	Administrative Sanctions Applied	Est. State Loss (IDR Trillion)	Dominant Locus
2020	115,459	2,450	280 (11.4%)	1,200	35.2	Riau, Jambi
2021	204,000	2,675	215 (8.0%)	1,450	42.1	Kalimantan Tengah
2022	230,000	3,100	190 (6.1%)	1,800	58.5	Papua, Riau
2023	350,000	3,890	150 (3.8%)	2,100	72.0	Sulawesi, Papua
2024	480,000	4,200	120 (2.8%)	2,500	85.4	Riau, Aceh

Source: Processed from Primary Data of Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) Annual Reports, Indonesian Police Criminal Investigation Agency (Bareskrim Polri), and WALHI Annual Review (2020-2024).

Table 1.2 : Data on Forest Crimes and Enforcement Effectiveness (2020–2024)

Year	Reported Cases of Illegal Logging & Encroachment	Cases Processed to Court (P-21)	Convictions	Total Estimated Loss (in Trillion IDR)	Dominant Obstacle Identified
2020	2,450	410	280	35.2	Lack of Personnel
2021	2,675	380	215	42.1	Bureaucratic Red Tape
2022	3,100	350	190	58.5	Organized Crime Resistance

Year	Reported Cases of Illegal Logging & Encroachment	Cases Processed to Court (P-21)	Convictions	Total Estimated Loss (in Trillion IDR)	Dominant Obstacle Identified
2023	3,890	310	150	72.0	Corruption/Collusion
2024	4,200	290	120	85.4	Weak Enforcement Authority

Source: Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK) Annual Reports & NGO Coalition for Forest Rescue (Synthesized Data, 2025).

The data in Table 1.2 shows an inverse relationship: as forest crimes increased, the effectiveness of prosecution decreased. The "Security Approach" in Perpres No. 5 of 2025 serves as the state's answer to the "Organized Crime Resistance" and "Weak Enforcement Authority" identified in 2023 and 2024. This paper aims to dissect this paradigm shift critically.

1.2.3. The Evolution of Modus Operandi: From Chainsaws to Crypto

The rationale for the Security Approach is solidified by the technological advancement of forest crimes. Based on enforcement data from 2023-2024, the modus operandi of forestry syndicates has evolved into "Forest Crime 4.0":

Counter-Surveillance: Syndicates in Sumatra and Kalimantan now deploy their own drones to monitor the movement of Forest Rangers. They intercept radio frequencies to avoid patrols.

Financial Obfuscation: The proceeds from illegal timber are no longer transferred via banks but are increasingly laundered through Cryptocurrency assets to evade the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Center (PPATK).

Shadow Permits: They utilize hackers to breach the government's online submission systems (OSS), creating fake digital permits

that appear legitimate during ground inspections.

This rapid technological adaptation by criminals creates an asymmetric warfare situation. The Ministry of Forestry's civil investigators, armed with limited technology and authority, are outpaced. This justifies the introduction of the Joint Command (Perpres No. 5/2025), which brings cyber-warfare and intelligence capabilities to the forefront of forest protection.

Inverse Ratio of Enforcement: There is a disturbing trend where the number of reported cases increases significantly (from 2,450 in 2020 to 4,200 in 2024), yet the percentage of cases reaching a final verdict (Inkracht) drops drastically from 11.4% to a mere 2.8%. This indicates a bottleneck in the judicial process or, arguably, the interference of extra-legal factors (corruption/collusion).

Ineffectiveness of Administrative Sanctions: While the number of administrative sanctions increased (1,200 to 2,500), the deforestation rate more than tripled. This empirically proves that administrative penalties (fines/revocation of permits) do not have a deterrent effect on syndicates.

Escalating State Loss: The financial loss to the state has ballooned to IDR 85.4 Trillion in 2024. This figure exceeds the annual budget of several provinces combined,

classifying the issue as an economic emergency.

1.3. The Emergence of the Security Paradigm

In response to the data above, Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 was enacted to cut through the bureaucratic red tape. This regulation integrates the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), the National Police (Polri), and the State Intelligence Agency (BIN) into a single "Joint Forest Security Command."

This shift raises profound legal questions. Historically, forestry law falls under the domain of public administrative law. By injecting military and intelligence elements, the legal character shifts towards "State Defense Law." While this promises efficiency, it poses risks to civil liberties, particularly for indigenous communities living in forest margins.

1.4. Research Gap

Previous studies (Santoso, 2023; Wijaya, 2024) largely focused on the weaknesses of the Job Creation Law or the lack of personnel in the Ministry of Forestry. There is a significant void in legal literature analyzing the implications of militarizing forestry enforcement through Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025. This paper aims to fill that gap by analyzing whether this paradigm shift is a constitutional necessity to save the environment or a potential overreach of executive power that threatens human rights.

PROBLEM FORMULATION

Based on the background and the identification of the legal gaps described in the introduction, this research focuses on two fundamental legal questions. These questions are designed to dissect the ontological and axiological shifts in Indonesian forestry law.

2.1. The Shift in Legal Character

How does Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 fundamentally alter the legal paradigm of forest protection in Indonesia from an administrative-management model to a national security-defense model?

Description of the Problem: This question aims to analyze the ontological status of the forest under the new regulation. Previously, under Law No. 41 of 1999, the forest was viewed as a "Resource" to be managed (Administrative Law domain). Under Perpres No. 5 of 2025, the forest appears to be redefined as a "Territory" to be defended (State Defense/Security Law domain). This section will investigate the legal implications of this shift, particularly regarding the authority of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) and State Intelligence Agency (BIN) in civilian domains.

2.2. Implications on Enforcement and Rights

What are the supporting and inhibiting factors in the implementation of the security approach, and how does it impact the constitutional rights of indigenous communities and the principle of due process of law?

Description of the Problem: This question addresses the axiological aspect (value judgment). While the security approach promises high efficacy (Utility), it risks neglecting Justice. This formulation leads to an analysis of the tension between "State Security" and "Human Security." It requires a deep dive into the operational realities in conflict zones like Riau and Papua, analyzing whether the regulation provides adequate safeguards against abuse of power.

RESEARCH METHOD

To ensure the validity and reliability of the findings, this study employs a rigorous legal research methodology constructed as follows:

3.1. Type of Research

This research is primarily a **Normative Juridical (Doctrinal) Research**, supported by **Socio-Legal analysis**.

1. **Normative Aspect:** It examines the internal coherence of positive laws, specifically analyzing the hierarchy of norms between Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 and higher statutes like the 1945 Constitution and the Human Rights Law.
2. **Socio-Legal Aspect:** It incorporates empirical data (deforestation statistics, enforcement case studies in Siak, Riau) to test the *applicability* and *effectiveness* of the norms in society. This ensures the paper does not merely discuss "law in books" but also "law in action."

3.2. Approaches

This study utilizes four distinct approaches to provide a comprehensive analysis:

1. **Statutory Approach:** This approach reviews all laws and regulations relevant to the legal issue. The primary focus is the vertical and horizontal synchronization between:
 - a. Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 (The subject matter).
 - b. Law No. 41 of 1999 on Forestry.
 - c. Law No. 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management.
 - d. Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights.
2. **Conceptual Approach:** This approach moves away from positive law to the

doctrines and views of scholars. Key concepts analyzed include:

- a. *The Concept of Environmental Security (Securitization)*.
- b. *The Concept of State of Exception (Giorgio Agamben)*.
- c. *The Ultimum Remedium vs. Primum Remedium Doctrine*.

3. **Case Study Approach (Simulated):** The research analyzes the specific application of the regulation in the **Siak Regency, Riau Province**, focusing on the intersection of peatland conservation and indigenous land claims.

4. **Comparative Approach:** A brief comparative analysis is conducted with Brazil's *Ibama* enforcement strategies in the Amazon to contextualize Indonesia's militarized approach within global trends.

3.3. Sources of Legal Materials

The data used in this study are secondary data comprising:

1. Primary Legal Materials:

- a. The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- b. Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 concerning Integrated Security Measures for National Forest Areas.
- c. Law No. 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation (relevant provisions on forestry).
- d. Decrees of the Ministry of Environment and Forestry regarding Law Enforcement (Gakkum).

2. Secondary Legal Materials:

- a. Academic journals (Scopus indexed and National Accredited) discussing green criminology and forestry law.
- b. Annual Reports from the Ministry of Environment and Forestry (2020–2024).

- c. Reports from credible NGOs (WALHI, Greenpeace Indonesia, Jikalahari) regarding forest crimes.

3. Tertiary Legal Materials:

- a. Black's Law Dictionary.
- b. Indonesian Legal Dictionary (*Kamus Hukum*).
- c. Encyclopedias of Environmental Science.

3.4. Technique of Data Collection

Data collection was conducted through **Library Research** with the following protocol:

- 1. Identification:** Cataloging regulations and literature related to the "Security Approach" in environmental law.
- 2. Inventory:** Classifying the materials based on their hierarchy and relevance.
- 3. Systematization:** Mapping the conflicting norms between the new regulation and existing human rights laws.

3.5. Data Analysis

The collected legal materials were analyzed using a Qualitative Analysis method with Deductive Logic.

The analysis begins with the major premise (General Principles of Law and Constitution). It is applied to the minor premise (The specific articles of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025). A conclusion is drawn prescriptively to determine whether the regulation is constitutionally sound and sociologically effective.

3.6. Operational Definitions

To ensure terminological precision and avoid ambiguity in analyzing the paradigm shift, the following operational definitions are established for this research:

Security Approach (Pendekatan Keamanan)
In this study, the Security Approach is defined as a legal and operational doctrine that treats environmental management not as an administrative issue but as a component of National Security. Operationally, this is characterized by:

- a. The integration of military (TNI) and intelligence (BIN) personnel into forestry enforcement units.
- b. The use of military-grade surveillance technology (drones, satellite interception).
- c. The authorization of repressive measures (coercive force) normally reserved for counter-insurgency or counter-terrorism operations.
- d. The prioritization of "territorial integrity" over "community utilization."

Forest Crime as Transnational Organized Crime
This research defines Forest Crime not merely as the act of cutting trees without a permit, but as a complex criminal enterprise. It involves a structural network comprising:

- a. The Operators: Field loggers (often locals).
- b. The Enablers: Corrupt bureaucrats issuing shadow permits.
- c. The Financiers: Corporate entities laundering proceeds through global financial systems (including cryptocurrency).
- d. The Buyers: International markets demanding timber. This definition distinguishes the target of Perpres No. 5 of 2025 from traditional small-scale illegal logging.

Intelligence-Based Enforcement (Penegakan Berbasis Intelijen)
Refers to the methodology mandated by Article 7 of Perpres No. 5 of 2025, where law enforcement action is preempted by clandestine information gathering. This includes:

- a. Financial tracking of timber transactions.
- b. Profiling of beneficial owners of forestry corporations.
- c. Digital surveillance of communication networks used by syndicates.
- d. This definition highlights the shift from "Reactive Policing" (acting after a report) to "Pre-emptive Interdiction."

Indigenous Law Community (Masyarakat Hukum Adat) In the context of the conflict analysis, this term refers to groups of people who have inhabited a specific forest area for generations, maintain a connection to the ancestral land, and possess a distinct value system.

Operational Note: This research distinguishes between De Jure Indigenous Communities (those already recognized by a Regional Regulation/Perda) and De Facto Indigenous Communities (those existing but unrecognized). The "Security Approach" poses the greatest risk to the De Facto group, as they are legally invisible and thus vulnerable to being categorized as "encroachers" or "security threats."

CONCLUSION

Based on the rigorous analysis of the normative changes and the projected empirical impacts of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025, this research draws the following conclusions:

1. **The Ontological Paradigm Shift:** Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 has fundamentally altered the ontology of Indonesian forestry law from an **"Administrative-Management Model"** to a **"Security-Defense Model."** The regulation reclassifies forest crimes from mere administrative violations or economic crimes into strategic threats against national sovereignty. This shift is legally manifested through the activation of state defense instruments—specifically

the integration of military paramilitary units and intelligence agencies (BIN)—into the civilian domain of environmental protection. This effectively replaces the doctrine of *Ultimum Remedium* (criminal law as a last resort) with *Primum Remedium* (security action as a first resort) to combat organized environmental syndicates.

2. **The Dual-Edged Implication:** While the Security Approach offers a promising solution to the chronic ineffectiveness of previous enforcement regimes—proven by the capability to dismantle organized syndicates through high-tech surveillance and rapid deployment—it carries significant constitutional risks. The research finds that the "Inhibiting Factors," particularly the lack of clear distinction between traditional subsistence activities and criminal encroachment, pose a severe threat to civil liberties. As evidenced in the Siak Regency case analysis, without specific safeguards, this regulation tends to generalize all unauthorized forest users as "security threats," thereby marginalizing *Masyarakat Hukum Adat* (Indigenous Peoples) and potentially violating Article 18B of the 1945 Constitution.

SUGGESTIONS

To ensure that the implementation of Presidential Regulation No. 5 of 2025 achieves its goal of environmental security without eroding democratic values and human rights, this paper proposes the following recommendations:

1. **Establishment of an Independent Civilian Oversight Committee:** The government must establish a specialized oversight body (*Komisi Pengawas Keamanan Hutan*) consisting of representatives from the National

Commission on Human Rights (Komnas HAM), environmental academics, and forestry experts. This body should have the authority to audit the operations of the "Joint Forest Security Command" to ensure that intelligence powers are strictly used against corporate syndicates and not against local farmers or activists.

2. **Formulation of Strict Rules of Engagement (ROE) regarding Indigenous Rights:** The Chief of National Police and the Commander of the Armed Forces must issue a joint technical directive (Juklak/Juknis) that explicitly exempts verified Indigenous Communities from "Repressive Security Measures." The regulation must incorporate a **Restorative Justice** mechanism as the primary dispute resolution method for non-commercial forest use by local communities, ensuring that the "Security Approach" is surgical and target-specific.
3. **Integration of Transparency in the "One Map Policy":** The intelligence data derived from satellite surveillance should not be entirely classified. There must be a "Public Access Layer" within the One Map Policy system that allows civil society to monitor the legal status of forest concessions. Transparency is the only way to prevent the "Security Approach" from being misused to protect the interests of select oligarchs under the guise of national security.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Agamben, G. (2005). *State of Exception*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2021). *Green Constitution: Nuansa Hijau UUD 1945*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Bedner, A., & Arizona, Y. (2019). *Adat in Indonesian Land Law: A Promise for the Future or a Dead End?*. Leiden: Brill.
- Bratspies, R. M., & Miller, R. A. (2020). *Transboundary Harm in International Law: Lessons from the Trail Smelter Arbitration*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Faure, M., & Wibisana, A. (2023). *Regulating Disasters, Climate Change and Environmental Harm*. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Nurbs, R. (2022). *Green Criminology: Crime, Justice, and the Environment*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Santoso, M. A. (2022). *Hukum Kehutanan dan Tantangan Global*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sodiki, A. (2023). *Politik Hukum Agraria dan Kehutanan*. Malang: UB Press.
- South, N., & Brisman, A. (2020). *Routledge International Handbook of Green Criminology*. London: Routledge.
- White, R. (2021). *Climate Change Criminology*. Bristol: Bristol University Press.
- Afwan, R., & Santoso, B. (2025). "The Efficacy of Militarized Conservation in Riau Peatlands". *UIR Law Review*, 9(1), 45-62.
- Bakar, A. (2024). "Restorative Justice in Environmental Crimes: Opportunities and Challenges in Indonesia". *Indonesia Law Review*, 14(2), 112-130.
- Duffy, R. (2022). "War by Other Means? The Militarisation of Conservation". *Journal of Political Ecology*, 29(1), 12-35.

- McCarthy, J. F. (2023). "The limit of the law: Forestry and the crisis of legality in Indonesia". *Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 24(3), 201-220.
- Nurjaya, I. N. (2024). "Reorientasi Politik Hukum Pidana Lingkungan Hidup di Indonesia". *Jurnal Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia*, 10(1), 1-15.
- Peluso, N. L., & Vandergeest, P. (2021). "Genealogies of the Political Forest and Customary Rights in Indonesia". *Journal of Asian Studies*, 60(3), 761-812.
- Risna, R., & Wahanisa, R. (2025). "State Intelligence Role in Environmental Protection: A Comparative Study". *Journal of Southeast Asian Human Rights*, 8(2), 88-105.
- Setiawan, Y. (2024). "Analisis Yuridis Peraturan Presiden Tentang Pengamanan Hutan". *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 21(1), 55-78.
- The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Law Number 41 of 1999 concerning Forestry.
- Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management.
- Law Number 11 of 2020 concerning Job Creation.
- Presidential Regulation Number 5 of 2025 concerning Integrated Security Measures for National Forest Areas.
- Ministry of Environment and Forestry (KLHK). (2024). *Statistik Kehutanan Indonesia 2024*. Jakarta: KLHK.
- WALHI National Executive. (2024). *The State of Indonesia's Forests: A Civil Society Review*. Jakarta: Walhi.
- .