



The Paradigm of Anthropocentrism in Indonesia's Environmental Legal Policy

Petra Gilang Ramadan^{1*}, Imam Koeswahyono², Indah Dwi Qurbani³

¹ Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia

² Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Law, Brawijaya University, Malang, Indonesia
pgramadan@student.ub.ac.id

Abstract. Anthropocentrism is a paradigm that has influenced environmental management procedures in Indonesia and even the world. However, the weakness of this paradigm is that it places humans as the center of interaction between humans and other aspects of the environment. In the anthropocentric paradigm, humans are the subject of life, while other aspects of the environment are objects in life, so that aspects of the environment other than humans are nothing more than tools to fulfill human life needs. With this view, it is easy for humans to legitimize their activities in exploring and exploiting the environment by ignoring the interests of the environment so that it can continue to be sustainable. As time goes by, the anthropocentric paradigm is not only an idea but has become a policy in a country, including Indonesia. Legal products that contain an anthropocentric paradigm will gradually cause environmental sustainability to become increasingly degraded. This study aims to analyze which legal products in Indonesia contain the anthropocentric paradigm and their impact on the environment. This research is a doctrinal legal study using a conceptual and legislative approach. The results indicate that some legal products in Indonesia still adopt an anthropocentric paradigm, which has implications for threatening environmental sustainability in Indonesia due to the anthropocentric orientation that emphasizes fulfilling human needs for the environment. These legal products include Article 28H of the 1945 Constitution and Law Number 2 of 2025 concerning Mining, Minerals, and Coal. The implication of legal products embodying an anthropocentric paradigm is that they easily disregard efforts to preserve the environment. This research is expected to contribute to efforts to reform legal products in Indonesia. By identifying legal products that adopt an anthropocentric paradigm, it will be easier for the Indonesian government to adjust these legal products to maintain environmental sustainability in Indonesia.

Keywords: Anthropocentric, Legal Policy, Constitution, Environment.

1 Introduction

It cannot be denied that human life on earth cannot be separated from the universe, along with the resources contained within it. These resources are then used by humans to support their lives, at the very least as sources of clothing, food, and shelter.

However, throughout the history of human civilization, no one has been able to know when all life will come to an end, so with this understanding, the use of natural resources within the earth, especially those that cannot be replaced and cannot be renewed, becomes unlimited and immeasurable.

The Earth, as the dwelling place of all creatures, is facing increasingly serious damage. The decline in the physical quality of planet Earth has been proven to

originate from various interrelated phenomena such as rapid deforestation, desertification, soil salinity, loss of biodiversity, shortage of fresh water, and particularly climate change [1].

The main cause of this earth/environmental crisis is the erroneous pattern of modern human approaches toward nature. Humans do not sufficiently treat nature as a friend and only see it as an object [2]. Nature is viewed as a means, a mine of wealth, a source of energy, a source of riches that must indeed be exploited for the needs of humans. This is what causes environmental damage to become increasingly severe.

Such damage certainly cannot be allowed to continue, considering that environmental destruction is equivalent to destroying the civilization of all humankind. Environmental problems do not appear suddenly, but through a long process. This is because the bad effects or negative excesses of environmental destruction cannot be seen directly, but slowly but surely they will inevitably occur in line with environmental management patterns that are not seriously taken into account, which end up in climate change that can harm the general public [3].

In general, at present, the pattern of environmental management depends on how humans and the environment interact. This interaction between humans and the environment will later influence environmental management policies in a country. Generally, the patterns of interaction between humans and the environment can be traced to two familiar models, namely anthropocentric and ecocentric interaction patterns.

The anthropocentric interaction pattern emphasizes that the center of interaction is in humans as the center of life, while the ecocentric interaction pattern emphasizes the existence of a bond relationship between humans and the environment that is mutually dependent. In short, the anthropocentric pattern places humans at the peak of the hierarchy of life and positions the environment as an object for fulfilling human needs.

In the anthropocentric paradigm, humans are regarded as the center of everything. On the other hand, the universe is considered to have no intrinsic value in itself other than economic instrumental value for economic purposes [4]. Human actions today, which tend to be exploitative toward the environment and set aside environmental sustainability solely to fulfill human needs, are the manifestation of the anthropocentric paradigm itself.

The manifestation of the anthropocentric paradigm can become a boomerang for humankind if it has already become a legal policy within a state. An anthropocentric paradigm embodied in legal politics will certainly become an instrument of legitimacy to conduct exploitation of the environment while sidelining aspects of sustainability for the environment.

Legal politics that adopt the anthropocentric paradigm tend to marginalize environmental sustainability and set aside policies that are oriented toward sustainability. This will be discussed in more detail in this study.

2 Problem Statement

The phenomena outlined in the background indicate the existence of a fundamental issue concerning the State's commitment to providing environmental protection through constitutional instruments that have not yet been fully comprehensive. This condition is attributable to the continued application of an anthropocentric paradigm as the underlying basis of regulation within the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

3 Research Question

Based on the problem statement, a compelling issue arises for further examination, namely:

- How is the practice of legal policy based on the anthropocentric paradigm manifested in Indonesian legislation?
- How does the constitutional legal policy on environmental protection in Indonesia compare with that of other countries?

4 Purpose Of Study

The objectives of this study are:

- To examine the implementation of environmental legal policies that remain grounded in an anthropocentric paradigm, and
- To compare constitutional frameworks that provide comprehensive protection for the environment.

5 Research Methods

This research uses the type of normative juridical research. This research focuses on discussing the application of rules or norms in the positive law of Indonesia. Then it bases the legal materials by examining theories, concepts, legal principles, and statutory regulations that are in accordance with the content of the research. In order to elaborate and discuss the problems in this research, a method of approach will be applied based on legislation, or what is commonly known as the statute approach. In addition, a conceptual approach will also be used, which is commonly referred to as the conceptual approach, which is the process of studying the object of research by paying attention to the conceptual aspects of the object of research.

6 Discussion

6.1 Anthropocentrism as a Paradigm and Its Application in Environmental Legal Policy in Indonesia

Paradigm is defined as a set of beliefs or basic convictions that determine a person's actions in everyday life. There are those who state that a paradigm is a fundamental image of the core problems of a science. Paradigm outlines what must be studied, what statements should be expressed, and what rules should be followed in interpreting the answers obtained. Thus, a paradigm is like a window through which a person observes the outside world, a place from which a person departs to explore the world with their perspective (worldview) [5]. Thus, a paradigm presents a way of looking at an individual in facing an object or phenomenon. This paradigm will then fill human thought and directly determine how humans behave and act toward the object they view.

In another literature, a philosopher named Thomas Kuhn elaborates his view on a paradigm. In defining paradigm, Thomas Kuhn first explains that the existence of classical scientific works such as *Physica* by Aristotle, *Almagest* by Ptolemy, *Principia* and *Opticks* by Newton, *Electricity* by Franklin, *Chemistry* by Lavoisier, as well as *Geology* by Lyell—these works and many other works, for a period of time, implicitly functioned to define the legitimate problems and methods of a field of research for subsequent generations of scientists [6]. According to Kuhn, these figures were able to do so because they had two important characteristics. Their achievements were sufficiently unprecedented that they were able to attract a long-lasting group of followers away from competing ways of scientific activity. At the same time, the achievements were sufficiently open that they left various problems for the newly defined group of scientists to resolve [6]. Achievements with those two characteristics, namely, functioning to define legitimate problems and methods of a field of research for the next generation of scientists, are what Kuhn calls a paradigm.

The presence of a paradigm delivers a framework for every human being in defining an object so that the person can elaborate on the problem and be able to create a method to research and discover renewal regarding that object. Accordingly, in practical life, a paradigm has the potential to govern the way individuals perceive and respond to reality and evolving social conditions, allowing them to draw conclusions and make decisions that inform everyday actions or, in certain cases, determine decisions of significant consequence for society at large.

In any case, the paradigm will indirectly control humans to act and make decisions likewise in daily activities. Such a paradigm, if believed by many people in a community, will become a way of life that is believed to be true and gradually can become a culture and more concretely become a norm of life in a society.

Paradigm as a way of looking continues to spread into all sectors of human life, including the environmental sector. There is a paradigm in the environmental sector, namely, anthropocentrism. Anthropocentrism as a paradigm did not simply exist immediately, but was born from the history of the relationship between humans and God. It began with Western thought that was full of the shackles of mythological things that filled the space of human thinking. The paradigm over time began to be

abandoned in line with the emergence of the Renaissance, which removed those mythological shackles and put forward human reason as a living being [7].

The anthropocentric paradigm emerged as a revolutionary breaker of mythological religious views. The anthropocentric view, also commonly known as humanism, assumes that life does not center on God, but on humans. Humans are the rulers of reality, who determine their own destiny and truth. Therefore, God and the holy books are no longer needed. Anthropocentrism actually appeared with the arrival of rationalism, which no longer believed that the laws of nature were absolute [8].

According to Rasmussen, as quoted by Mary Evelyn and John A. Grim, the root of all environmental problems is thought to originate from anthropocentric philosophy [9]. He defines anthropocentrism as a theory of environmental ethics that views humans as the center of the universe so that human interests are the most decisive in policymaking related to nature, whether directly or indirectly [7].

The reality regarding anthropocentrism is worsened when the actor is not only individuals but larger actors, namely the State, in other words, the state becomes the subject that has the anthropocentric paradigm. Along with the development of civilization, the management of natural resources is increasingly carried out massively by states relying on companies within those states. In the process, those companies generate profits that are sufficient for a state.

With the phenomenon as described above, the practice that often occurs and indirectly strengthens the anthropocentric paradigm is by making policies that give legitimacy to completely extract non-renewable natural resources. In addition, there are policy changes that are nuanced as supporting environmental sustainability, but, in fact, tend to facilitate exploitation.

In anthropocentric ethics, human interests are placed above the interests of other creatures. Therefore, everything that exists in nature is utilized as much as possible to fulfill the needs and interests of humans alone [10]. In the anthropocentric approach, it is often considered that the position of humans is outside and separate from their environment. By considering that the existence of the environment is solely for human interests, we often forget to maintain it [11].

The anthropocentric paradigm that has already become a pattern of human interaction with the environment will make humans subjects who will only carry out exploration and exploitation of the environment and produce environmental crises. This anthropocentric paradigm will increasingly endanger the existence of the environment if it has already transformed into legal politics and is manifested in legislation within a state. Anthropocentrism as a paradigm offers two things in the form of defining legitimate problems and the methodology of a field of research.

Legal politics is a very important matter in the legal system of a country. Legal politics is an official line (policy) regarding the law that will be enforced either through the creation of new laws or the replacement of old laws, in order to achieve the goals of the state [12]. Thus, legal politics is a choice regarding the laws that will be enacted as well as a choice regarding the laws that will be repealed or not enforced,

all of which are intended to achieve the goals of the state as stated in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution [12].

The definition of legal politics above illustrates that every legal product that is made, or a legal product that is renewed or amended, is a tool to achieve the goals of the state. A law or regulation can be created to help achieve the goals of the state, or a regulation can be amended if it is deemed irrelevant to social conditions and burdens the pace of achieving the ideals of a country. Thus, legal products become a vehicle for achieving the goals of the state. With the creation of legal products, of course, they must contain elements that are always beneficial for society and equally important for the environment in a country, so that those legal products bring about public welfare.

If one observes the explanation of legal politics as above, it becomes important for every society to be able to enrich the substance of legal politics with content that supports environmental sustainability and not merely prioritize human interests over the environment. The content of legal politics becomes very important in the formation of laws because legal politics essentially determines the nuance of the legislation and will intersect with the way in which the state will achieve its goals.

In the formation of legislation, legal politics becomes very important at least for two reasons: *first*, as the reason why the formation of a law or regulation is necessary; *second*, to determine what is to be translated into legal sentences and become the formulation of articles. These two aspects are important because the existence of legislation and the formulation of articles are the link between the legal policies that have been established and the implementation of those legal policies at the stage of law enforcement. Bearing in mind that there must be consistency and correlation between what has been established as legal politics and what is to be achieved as objectives [13].

In reviewing the legal politics of Environmental Law in Indonesia, there are several laws related to it that can be used for analysis, especially laws that intersect with natural resources. The first law is Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management (hereinafter referred to as the Environmental Protection and Management Law). This Law was formed based on Article 28H of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and one of the considerations was national economic development.

The Environmental Protection and Management Law, in general, provides an overview that ensures the creation of environmental protection and sustainable environmental management. In this Law, the process of protection and management of the environment must be carried out in several stages, namely the stage of Environmental Inventory at the national level, island/archipelago level, and ecoregion level. This environmental inventory is carried out to obtain data and information regarding natural resources, such as potential and availability, the types utilized, forms of control, management knowledge, forms of damage and conflicts, and the causes of conflicts arising from management. Based on this inventory, the government begins to determine ecoregion areas.

The next step that the government must take to carry out Environmental Protection and Management is to create an Environmental Protection and Management Plan

prepared based on the environmental inventory. Then, in the process of utilizing natural resources, it is carried out based on the Environmental Protection and Management Plan by paying attention to the sustainability of environmental processes and functions, the sustainability of environmental productivity, and the safety, quality of life, and welfare of society.

With the existence of the Environmental Protection and Management Plan system, it is able to answer the importance of having legal policies in the making of a law. If analyzed from the existence of the Environmental Protection and Management Plan system, the reason why the enactment of the Environmental Protection and Management Law is necessary is to provide an integrated and planned system in carrying out the process of environmental protection and control.

In addition, with the existence of the Environmental Protection and Management Plan system, the government attempts to translate its intention to provide certainty regarding the steps that must be taken in environmental protection and management. Thus, the formulation of articles in the Environmental Protection and Management Law is arranged in such a way as to form a document that contains planning for environmental protection and management.

However, until now, the implementation of the Environmental Protection and Management Law has not been completed. Until today, there has not been a single Environmental Protection and Management Plan document. This certainly becomes a challenge in the process of environmental protection and control.

The second piece of legislation related to the environment is Law Number 26 of 2007 concerning Spatial Planning. This Law becomes important in environmental management because it regulates the allocation of space in a region, which includes the allocation of space for protection functions and the allocation of space for cultivation functions.

In relation to the Environmental Protection and Management Law, spatial planning is one of the instruments in the effort to prevent pollution and/or environmental damage. Therefore, it is important for the government to be able to establish spatial planning in accordance with its designation and follow it up with consistent implementation in order to prevent pollution and/or environmental damage.

In principle, the Spatial Planning Law also provides a guarantee for environmental preservation because within the spatial planning system, there is an allocation of areas called Protected Areas, which means areas designated with the main function of protecting environmental sustainability, including natural resources and artificial resources. Protected Areas can be designated for areas with the allocation of space for environmental, social, cultural, economic, defense, and security preservation activities. If examined further, the existence of Protected Areas can become the starting point of sustainable development because within protected areas protection is given not only to the environment but also to social, cultural, and economic aspects, on which human life sometimes depends. For communities whose profession is farming, they will certainly depend greatly on environmental aspects. For such matters, the aspect of spatial planning for protected areas must be determined so that it receives protection guarantees from pollution and environmental damage.

Over time, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia issued policies related to environmental aspects and also related to spatial planning. These policies are contained in Law Number 2 of 2025 concerning the Fourth Amendment to Law Number 4 of 2009 concerning Mineral and Coal Mining (the Mineral and Coal Mining Law).

The Mineral and Coal Mining Law brings significant policy changes to the spatial planning system, which will indirectly influence the way the government protects environmental sustainability from pollution and environmental damage. The Mineral and Coal Mining Law introduces a new way in the preparation of spatial planning as contained in Article 31A paragraph (2) of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law.

Article 31A paragraph (2) of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law brings significant changes in the determination of space and area utilization because, in that article, the determination of Special Mining Business License Areas becomes the basis for determining space and area utilization. Thus, if in a certain space the designation has not yet been determined, then automatically it will be designated as a mining area without considering the environment as stipulated in Article 6 of the Spatial Planning Law which reads: "Spatial Planning is organized by taking into account the potential of natural resources, human resources, and artificial resources; economic, social, cultural, political, legal, defense and security conditions, the environment, as well as science and technology as a unity".

With the determination of Spatial Planning based on mining business licenses, it is feared that the carrying capacity of an area whose spatial planning designation has not yet been determined will be ignored. Considering that one of the indicators that must be considered in making spatial planning designations is the carrying capacity and environmental capacity.

With the determination of spatial planning based on mining business licenses, it is feared that the use and management of space will not take into account the carrying capacity and environmental capacity. Carrying capacity itself means the ability of the environment to support human life, other living beings, and the balance between the two. That means that if the use of areas is not based on spatial planning that first analyzes carrying capacity, then it is feared that it will damage the environmental carrying capacity for the survival of other living beings—considering that environmental carrying capacity means the willingness of the environment to provide balance in the interaction of every living being.

In addition, the determination of spatial planning based on mining business licenses also endangers the environment's capacity, as granting such determination based on mining business licenses amounts to ignoring the process of assessing carrying capacity and environmental capacity for development. In the system of environmental protection and management planning in Indonesia, every regional spatial planning must be based on a Strategic Environmental Assessment, which includes a study of the carrying capacity and environmental capacity for development. Thus, it would greatly enhance environmental protection if, first, a study of the strategic environment were carried out, and then a determination regarding spatial planning were made.

However, by determining spatial planning solely on the basis of mining business licenses, as stipulated in Article 31 of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, it will only undermine the system that has already been neatly established to ensure environmental protection and management. In addition, this norm will become legitimate for mining companies and the government to easily carry out exploitation.

The potential for large-scale environmental damage is also visible because, in Article 31A paragraph (2) of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, the government's side will certainly become legitimate in facilitating the granting of mining licenses. After all, for spaces whose spatial planning has not yet been determined, they will automatically be given to companies applying for mining licenses. Moreover, in paragraph (3), the Central Government and Regional Governments guarantee that there will be no changes in space or area utilization in the designated special mining business license areas, provided they do not conflict with statutory provisions.

The provision of paragraph (3) places the government in the position of protecting company activities in carrying out exploitation rather than as a party responsible for protecting the environment. The article's implementation gives the impression that the government cannot immediately take strategic steps to protect the environment. Still, it rather only guarantees the continuation of activities under the implementation of special mining business licenses. With the formulation of the article which reads "guaranteeing that there will be no changes in the utilization of space and areas in the designated Special Mining Business License Areas as long as it does not conflict with statutory provisions," it makes the government held hostage by the interests of special mining license holders because it must be able to guarantee that there will be no changes in the utilization of space and areas in the Special Mining Business License Areas. This can result in neglect of spaces threatened by environmental damage, yet the government cannot immediately change their use.

Such article formulations make the Government an institution that only legitimizes mining activities and the exploitation of the environment. In summary, environmental management in Indonesia, especially in the mining sector, is given the green light to operate freely while sidelining environmental concerns.

The correlation between the Environmental Protection and Management Law and the Spatial Planning Law is already clearly reflected in efforts to protect the environment, namely, in the Strategic Environmental Assessment serving as the basis for spatial planning in the State of Indonesia, to preserve environmental functions and public safety. In addition, the Strategic Environmental Assessment includes carrying capacity and environmental capacity for development, both of which must be considered in the making of regional spatial planning.

By paying attention to the correlation between the two laws, the spatial planning system in Indonesia integrates the use of space and environmental protection by taking into account spatial functions, carrying capacity, and environmental capacity. However, the revision of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law disrupts the spatial planning system that has already been integrated by making special mining business licenses the basis for spatial planning.

The description of the correlation among the Environmental Protection and Management Law, the Spatial Planning Law, and the Mineral and Coal Mining Law reflects a transition from the ecocentric paradigm, which seeks to protect the environment. It unconsciously shifts toward anthropocentrism, which prioritizes exploitative activities for human interests and, in turn, degrades environmental sustainability. Such a pattern of behavior will only position humans as the pinnacle in this life and place other creatures in this environment as subordinates, serving as objects to satisfy human needs.

With the correlation between the three laws and regulations, which in practice actually negate each other, with the presence of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, it can then be concluded regarding the characteristics of legal norms in legislation that contain the anthropocentric paradigm, whether intentionally made to facilitate exploitation or contain hidden agendas from lawmakers, or unintentionally created by the legislation.

Suppose we return to the concept of anthropocentric interaction, which views nature as having no intrinsic value in itself other than its instrumental economic value for human economic interests. This anthropocentric paradigm gives rise to excessive, exploitative behavior that treats nature as an economic commodity and a tool to satisfy human interests [14]. Thus, the first characteristic is the existence of norms that override other norms intended to protect the environment.

The second characteristic is that, within those norms, the government serves as a representative of "humans" to perpetuate exploitative practices. The government's involvement represents humans who seek to maintain the view that, in interaction with the environment, only humans have intrinsic value. As a result, when making environmental management policies, the government tends to maintain conditions that legitimize exploitation while sidelining aspects of environmental sustainability. In this case, the government has a significant interest in viewing the environment as an object of economic governance, so it tends to safeguard mineral and coal mining business activities.

From an economic value perspective, the Government has a major interest, as business activities in the environmental sector can create employment opportunities, increase the income of surrounding communities, and certainly boost regional and national income. However, there is undoubtedly a high cost to all of this, namely, business activities in the environmental sector, especially coal mining, directly provide negative impacts on the preservation of nature and the environment by altering topographic forms, creating large pits, disrupting hydrology, lowering air quality, and causing the loss of natural ecosystems [15].

With policies that prioritize human interests even as environmental threats are already evident, this clearly shows the existence of an anthropocentric paradigm, as the Government, as the representative of humans, tends to preserve its interests amid threats to environmental sustainability.

The third characteristic of policies grounded in the anthropocentric paradigm is that the nuances of those norms do not address the environment but rather focus on humans and their interests. If we return to the formulation of Article 31A, paragraph

(3), of the Mineral and Coal Mining Law, it clearly shows that the Central Government and Regional Governments must, imperatively, guarantee that there will be no changes in the utilization of space and areas in special mining business license areas. In that norm, it indirectly places the Government not as the guarantor of environmental sustainability, but as the guarantor of the continuation of the activities of special mining business license holders oriented toward exploration and exploitation.

Such conditions also occur not only in the Mineral and Coal Mining Law but also in the Constitution of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, namely the 1945 Constitution, particularly in Article 28H paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution which states: "Every person shall have the right to live in physical and spiritual prosperity, to have a home, and to enjoy a good and healthy living environment and shall have the right to obtain health care."

In the formulation of that article, the provision is often used as the basis for environmental protection, but in essence the article is not discussing the environment but human rights. Under such conditions, a good environment is not a necessity, as an ethic of interaction holds that the environment has the right to be sustainable, but rather a fulfillment of human needs so that humans can live well. In general, when reviewing the 1945 Constitution, Indonesia has not explicitly regulated environmental protection or the rights of the environment.

6.2 Environmental Legal Policy in the Indonesian Constitution and Its Comparison

If the State of Indonesia is committed to implementing the ecocentric paradigm, then, at the very least, it must firmly include environmental rights in its Constitution. The State of Ecuador has taken a progressive step in guaranteeing environmental rights, granting the environment legal rights equal to those of human rights [16].

Unlike Indonesia, Ecuador has a Constitution that includes a specific section on environmental rights. In Chapter 7 of the Constitution of Ecuador, the "Right of Nature" explains various rights of the environment. In Article 71 of the Constitution of Ecuador, it is stated: "Nature, or Pacha Mama, where life reproduces and unfolds, has the right to integral respect for its existence and for the maintenance and regeneration of its life cycles, structure, functions, and evolutionary processes." This article clearly emphasizes that the environment in Ecuador deserves full respect. Aware that everything contained within the earth in the territory of Ecuador will be used for business and economic interests, the Constitution of Estonia, in Article 72, also includes a provision which reads: "Nature has the right to be restored. This restoration is independent of the obligation of the State, as well as of natural persons and legal entities, to provide compensation to individuals and communities that depend on affected natural systems. In cases of severe or permanent environmental impact, including those caused by the exploitation of non-renewable natural resources, the State must establish the most effective mechanisms to achieve

restoration as well as take appropriate measures to eliminate or reduce adverse environmental consequences.”

This article reinforces the rights of the environment that have already been used for exploration and exploitation. It becomes an article that establishes the state, individuals, and/or legal entities' responsibility to restore the environment used. In essence, the activity of utilizing the environment is unavoidable. Therefore a constitutional norm is needed to serve as the basis for more detailed regulations regarding environmental restoration and the imposition of responsibility.

An equally important article in preserving the environment from the Constitution of Ecuador is Article 73 regarding the obligations of the state towards the environment, which reads: “The State shall apply precaution and restriction measures to activities that can lead to the extinction of species, the destruction of ecosystems, and the permanent alteration of natural cycles.” This article places the state as the active party in ensuring that there will be no extinction of species, ecosystem destruction, and permanent changes in natural cycles.

With the formulation of such articles in the Constitution of Ecuador, the state actively protects environmental sustainability because, consciously or unconsciously, protecting the environment is the same as protecting humankind.

Unlike Indonesia and Ecuador, Estonia, in protecting the environment, not only explicitly writes about people's rights but also explicitly about their obligations towards the environment. In Article 53 of the Constitution of Estonia, it is stated: “Everyone has a duty to preserve the human and natural environment and to compensate for damage caused by them to the environment. The procedure for providing compensation shall be prescribed by law.”

From the perspective of the Constitution of Estonia, it emphasizes society's obligation towards the environment, not only the state's. Indirectly, through norms that obligate society to preserve the environment, the state aims to prevent arbitrary treatment of the environment and imposes responsibility on each person for environmental sustainability. In the anthropocentric paradigm, which holds that intrinsic value exists only in humans, such a formulation of an article that obliges every human being to preserve the environment can degrade each person's ego before the environment, because, indirectly, the provision reduces human arrogance in the face of nature.

In addition to substantial matters, it is also necessary to examine the formal arrangement for formulating a Constitution that can reduce manifestations of anthropocentrism. Formally, Switzerland is a country that systematically and in detail includes not only the environment in a broad sense, but also specific environmental elements. In its Constitution, Switzerland has a special Section, entitled *Environment and Spatial Planning*, which explains matters concerning environmental management and spatial planning. In its Constitution, Switzerland provides a regulatory basis for

fundamental matters of the environmental aspect that greatly affect the lives of every person in the territory of Switzerland, namely Environmental Protection, Spatial Planning, Water Resources Protection, Forest Protection, Protection of natural and cultural heritage, Regulation of fisheries and hunting practices, and Animal protection. These matters are regulated and specifically included in the constitution of Switzerland. Formally, these matters are elaborated in their respective articles, so that for each matter it is clear that its legal basis originates in the constitution.

7 Conclusion

It cannot be denied that the anthropocentric paradigm gradually separates humans from the environment and fosters the view that humans are the only beings with inherent value. This, consciously or unconsciously, causes environmental destruction and, indirectly, will destroy humankind itself.

To overcome this, a structured, systematic effort is needed to shift the paradigm in managing the environmental sector, so that the environment becomes a comfortable place to live for all creatures and not a time bomb that brings disaster due to human error in management.

Structured efforts can be carried out by first understanding the laws and regulations that unconsciously perpetuate the anthropocentric paradigm. From studies conducted on several regulations in Indonesia, namely the Law on Environmental Protection and Management, the Law on Spatial Planning, and the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining, it is found that there still exist contradictory and mutually negating norms which tend to lead humans to live with an anthropocentric paradigm, because in the provisions of the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining in Indonesia there is a norm that negates the urgency of conducting Spatial Planning studies as stated in Article 31A paragraph (2) of the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining.

Based on the study of the correlation between the Law on Environmental Protection and Management, the Law on Spatial Planning, and the Law on Mineral and Coal Mining, there are several specific characteristics of legislation that indirectly present legal politics of environmental management with an anthropocentric nuance, namely: First, the existence of a norm that overrides another norm which seeks to protect the environment. Second, in that norm, the government is involved as the representation of “humans” to perpetuate the practice of exploitation. Third, a policy containing an anthropocentric paradigm is characterized by the nuance that the norm essentially does not discuss the environment but rather discusses humans and their interests.

In building real efforts to reduce the anthropocentric paradigm, the State of Indonesia requires reform in the material content of its constitution, which at the very least must include several matters, namely: the existence of a section that explicitly includes environmental rights, the existence of a clear norm affirming the obligation of the state towards environmental preservation, and the existence of a clear

obligation in the constitution regarding the obligation towards the environment for every person or legal entity residing in the territory of Indonesia. In this way, systematically, the State of Indonesia will have a legal instrument that no longer contains the anthropocentric paradigm but instead embodies the ecocentric paradigm.

References

1. Guess, Deborah. (2017). An Ecotheological Exploration of the Thought of Arthur Peacocke, *Journal of Anglican Studies*, Vol. 15, No. 2, 188.
2. Yusup Rogo Yuono. (2019). Melawan Etika Lingkungan Antroposentris Melalui Interpretasi Teologi Penciptaan Sebagai Landasan Bagi Pengelolaan dan Pelestarian Lingkungan, *Jurnal Teologi Sistematis dan Praktika*, Vol. 2, No. 1, 187.
3. Muhammad Syaiful Anwar, Kebijakan Antroposentris Versus Ekosentris Lingkungan Hidup, *Babelpos*, edition: 16 Januari 2020.
- A. Sonny Keraf. (2010). *Etika Lingkungan Hidup*, Jakarta: Kompas.
4. Mohammad Muslih. (2004). *Filsafat Ilmu Kajian atas Asumsi Dasar*, Paradigma dan Kerangka Teori Ilmu, Yogyakarta, Belukar.
5. Thomas S. Kuhn. (1970). *The Structure of Scientific Revolutions*, Chicago, The University of Chicago Press.
6. Junaidi Abdillah. (2014). Dekonstruksi Tafsir Antroposentrisme: Telaah Ayat-Ayat Berwawasan Lingkungan, *Jurnal Kalam: Jurnal Studi Agama dan Pemikiran Islam*, Volume 8, Nomor 1, 68.
7. Kuntowijoyo. (1998). *Paradigma Islam Interpretasi Untuk Aksi*, Bandung, Mizan.
8. Mary Evelyn dan John A. Grim. (2003). *Agama Filsafat dan Lingkungan Hidup*, Yogyakarta, Penerbit Kanisius.
9. M. Yasir Said, dkk. (2020). Paradigma Filsafat Etika Lingkungan dalam Menentukan Arah Politik Hukum Lingkungan, *Al Adl*, Vol. XII No. 1, 41.
10. Erri Magentara, "Pendekatan Pembangunan Antroposentris vs Ecosentris", *Republika Newspaper*, 11 Januari 1997, in Supriadi. (2008). *Hukum Lingkungan Indonesia: Sebuah Pengantar*, Jakarta, Sinar Grafika.
11. Moh. Mahfud MD. (2020). *Politik Hukum di Indonesia*, Jakarta, PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
12. Indah Dwi Qurbani. (2012). Politik Hukum Pengelolaan Minyak dan Gas Bumi di Indonesia, *Jurnal Arena Hukum*, Vol. 6 No. 2, 117.
13. Sonny Keraf. (2014). *Filsafat Lingkungan Hidup: Alam sebagai sebuah Sistem Kehidupan*, Sleman, Penerbit PT. Kanisius.
14. Teuku Ade Fachlevi dkk. (2015). Dampak dan Evaluasi Kebijakan Pertambangan Batubara di Kecamatan Mereubo, *Jurnal Risalah Kebijakan Pertanian dan Lingkungan*, Vol. 2 No. 2, 176.
15. Pan Moh Faiz. (2016). Perlindungan Terhadap Lingkungan dalam Perspektif Konstitusi, *Jurnal Konstitusi*, Vol. 13, No. 4, 775.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

