

LAW AND COMMUNITY BEHAVIOR UPDATES BASED ON LOCAL WISDOM OF THE LAMPUNG INDIGENOUS TRIBE

ATUALIZAÇÕES SOBRE DIREITO E COMPORTAMENTO COMUNITÁRIO BASEADAS NA SABEDORIA LOCAL DA TRIBO INDÍGENA DE LAMPUNG

Article received on: 1/8/2026

Article accepted on: 4/9/2026

Zainab Ompu Jainah*

*University of Bandar Lampung (UBL), Faculty of Law, Indonesia
zainabompu@gmail.com

Danti Yudistiara*

*University of Bandar Lampung (UBL), Faculty of Law, Indonesia
dantiyudistiara@gmail.com

Gusti Wahyu Triyadi*

*University of Bandar Lampung (UBL), Faculty of Law, Indonesia
gustiwahyu@gmail.com

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest

Abstract

This research examines national law reform in its dialectical relationship with the local wisdom of the Lampung indigenous community, particularly the values of Piil Pesenggiri as a living philosophy that contains legal, social, and moral dimensions. The primary problem addressed is the gap between centralistic positive law and customary norms that live within the community. The purpose of this study is to analyze how the local wisdom of the Lampung indigenous community can be integrated into national law reform to shape community behavior that is harmonious between formal legal order and socio-cultural order. The method used is normative legal research employing statutory, case, comparative, theoretical, and philosophical approaches. The results show that the values of Piil Pesenggiri encompassing Juluk Adok, Nemui Nyimah, Nengah Nyappur, and Sakai Sambayan have strong constitutional relevance and can serve as a foundation for cultural wisdom-based local law reform. This research recommends the formation of Regional Regulations that systematically accommodate Lampung customary law within a framework of just legal pluralism.

Keywords: Law Reform. Local Wisdom. Piil Pesenggiri. Lampung Customary Law. Legal Pluralism

Resumo

Esta pesquisa examina a reforma do direito nacional em sua relação dialética com a sabedoria local da comunidade indígena Lampung, particularmente os valores de Piil Pesenggiri como uma filosofia viva que contém dimensões legais, sociais e morais. O principal problema abordado é a lacuna entre a lei positiva centralista e as normas consuetuais que vivem dentro da comunidade. O objetivo deste estudo é analisar como a sabedoria local da comunidade indígena de Lampung pode ser integrada à reforma do direito nacional para moldar o comportamento da comunidade que seja harmonioso entre a ordem legal formal e a ordem sociocultural. O método utilizado é a pesquisa jurídica normativa que emprega abordagens estatutárias, casuais, comparativas, teóricas e filosóficas. Os resultados mostram que os valores de PiilPesenggiri, abrangendo Juluk Adok, Nemui Nyimah, Nengah Nyappur e Sakai Sambayan, têm forte relevância constitucional e podem servir como base para a reforma da lei local baseada na sabedoria cultural. Esta pesquisa recomenda a formação de Regulamentos Regionais que acomodam sistematicamente o direito consuetudinário de Lampung em uma estrutura de pluralismo legal justo.

Palavras-chave: Reforma da Lei. Sabedoria Local. Pill Pesenggiri. Direito Costumeiro Lampung. Pluralismo Legal



1 INTRODUCTION

Indonesia as an archipelagic country inhabited by more than 1,340 ethnic groups inherits a very diverse treasure of local wisdom. Among these riches, the Lampung indigenous tribe with its Piil Pesenggiri norm system is one of the most representative examples of how local values operated as an effective system of social regulation long before the positive laws of the state reached the region. Nevertheless, the current of legal modernization that relies on the paradigm of codification and centralization has resulted in structural friction between the two systems of norms, a phenomenon that academically is often referred to as the conflict between living law and state law (Bedner, Adriaan, and Stijn van Huis (2010). 3-4). Empirical data shows that the Lampung region, especially rural areas in Central Lampung, East Lampung, and West Coast, still make customary institutions such as Marga and Customary Heads the main dispute resolution authorities.

Based on a 2021 report by the Ministry of Home Affairs, there are more than 76,000 customary villages in Indonesia that have an active customary law system, but only a small number have received formal juridical recognition through Regional Regulations. In Lampung Province itself, the Lampung Customary Contributors Council (MPAL) noted that around 68 percent of family and land dispute settlements in the Lampung Pepadun indigenous community are still carried out through customary mechanisms, not through district courts (Abdurrahman 1984. 1-2) . Das Sollen or the condition that should be based on Indonesia's normative framework is seen in Article 18B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia which explicitly recognizes and respects the units of customary law communities and their traditional rights. Similarly, Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages provides space for customary villages to organize government based on customs. However, the reality on the ground or watershed shows different conditions: incoherent implementing regulations, the lack of budget for the empowerment of customary law communities, and the absence of a harmonization mechanism between customary norms and positive norms make the constitutional recognition limited to mere normative rhetoric.

The problems that arise are multi-layered. First, there is legal alienation among the indigenous people of Lampung who feel that their country's norms do not reflect the values they believe in. Second, there is a legal vacuum in the handling of customary

disputes that are not included in the jurisdiction of the general court, especially disputes related to customary land, customary heritage, and customary sanctions. Third, the young generation of Lampung experiences normative disorientation due to the absence of a bridge between formal legal education and the systemic transmission of *Piil Pesenggiri* values (Von Benda-Beckmann, Franz.34.47 (2002): 37-82). The obstacles that occur can be seen from several dimensions: (1) regulatory obstacles, namely the absence of a special law on the recognition and protection of indigenous peoples even though the Indigenous Peoples Bill has been submitted since 2009 and has not been passed until now; (2) institutional barriers, where Lampung customary institutions such as MPAL do not have legal status equivalent to formal government institutions; and (3) epistemological obstacles, namely the dominance of legal positivism in the education and judicial systems that tend to marginalize legal pluralism as a legitimate approach.

The turning point in this issue can be found in three important moments: First, the issuance of the Constitutional Court Decision Number 35/PUU-X/2012 which affirms that customary forests are not state forests, thus opening a precedent for substantive recognition of customary rights. Second, the launch of the Program for the Recognition and Protection of Local Wisdom by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in 2019. Third, the strengthening of the discourse of legal pluralism in Indonesian academic literature which encourages the reconceptualization of national law based on cultural wisdom. The relevant solution is the establishment of a hybrid legal model that consciously integrates the values of *Piil Pesenggiri* into the Lampung Provincial Regional Regulations, while maintaining constitutional supremacy and human rights as non-negotiable normative boundaries (Vanderlinden, Jacques²⁸ (1989): 149-157).

De jure, the existence of Lampung's customary law has been recognized through various national and regional legal instruments. The 1945 NRI Constitution, Law Number 6 of 2014, Lampung Provincial Regulation Number 2 of 2008 concerning the Preservation of Lampung Culture, as well as various district-level regional regulations have provided a formal foundation for the existence of Lampung customs. The values of *Piil Pesenggiri* have been deeply internalized in the social behavior of the indigenous people of Lampung, as evidenced by the practice of dispute resolution mechanisms through customary deliberation, customary marriage ceremonies (*cakak pepadun* or *begawi cakak pepadun*), and the preservation of the inheritance system of customary

titles (nicknamed *adok*) which is still active in many clans. Institutionally, the Lampung Customary Contributors Council (MPAL) and customary institutions at the clan level still function as guardians of norms and resolvers of communal conflicts. The local government has also shown commitment through budget allocation for cultural preservation and empowerment of customary institutions, although the amount is still far from adequate.

Thus, there is significant social and institutional capital to encourage legal reform based on Lampung's local wisdom. But behind this formal recognition, there are a series of serious structural problems. First, there is a vertical disharmony between Lampung's customary norms and national positive legal norms, especially in the field of land. The concept of customary land in Lampung's customary law, which is communal, collides with the paradigm of individual property rights promoted by the Basic Agrarian Law (UUPA) and the national land certification policy. As a result, many Lampung indigenous people lost access to their ancestral customary lands through legalization routes that did not recognize their customary claims (Ismail, Habib et.al (2019): 56-67). Second, there is a degradation of the authority of customary institutions. In the midst of the increasingly massive penetration of state law, customary institutions have lost their capacity to enforce sanctions.

Customary sanctions that do not have the executory power of state law become ineffective, especially for the younger generation who are more literate in positive law. Third, the flow of urbanization and migration erodes the communal base that is the foundation of the *Piil Pesenggiri* value system. The values of *Sakai Sambayan*, which contain the spirit of mutual cooperation and communal solidarity, face tough challenges in the midst of individualism brought by modernity and capitalism. Fourth, the lack of documentation and codification of Lampung customary law makes this norm system vulnerable to deviant reinterpretation or even extinction. Fifth, and most fundamental, there is an epistemological discrepancy between the deductive-hierarchical view of positive law and the inductivecommunal perspective of Lampung customary law. Lampung customary law does not recognize a rigid separation between law, morals, and religion; Everything is integrated in one holistic value system. In contrast, modern positive law demands such separation as a condition of certainty and legitimacy (Melissaris, Emmanuel (2004): 57-79).

The synthesis of the above dialectical tension is the formation of an integrated and structured model of legal pluralism, not just a parallel recognition of non-interacting with each other. The solutions offered include three dimensions: First, the legislative dimension, which is to urge the ratification of the long-delayed Indigenous Peoples Bill and encourage the formation of a Regional Regulation of Lampung Province that comprehensively regulates the position, function, and authority of customary law in the regional legal system. Second, the institutional dimension, which provides a clear legal status for MPAL as a customary quasijudicial institution with the authority to resolve certain disputes whose decisions can be strengthened by the district court. Third, the cultural-educational dimension, namely integrating the values of *Piil Pesenggiri* in the formal and non-formal education curriculum as well as community character formation programs (Herlius, Ferry (2022): 94-103).

2 METHODOLOGY

This research uses the normative legal research method, which is research that relies on literature studies on primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials (Rahayu, Derita Prapti (2020): 1-25). In its operationalization, this study uses five complementary approaches. First, the Statute Approach is carried out by analyzing all regulations related to the recognition of customary law and local wisdom, ranging from the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, UUPA, Village Law, to Regional Regulations of Lampung Province. This approach aims to map the existing normative framework as well as identify regulatory gaps and inconsistencies. Second, the Case Approach is used by analyzing court decisions and decisions of the Constitutional Court related to the rights of indigenous peoples, including the Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012. This approach provides an empiricaljudicial perspective on how the legal system positively treats customary law claims in judicial practice (Churniawan, Erifendi 2022 88-91).

Third, the Comparative Approach is carried out by comparing the model of integration of customary law into the national legal system in other countries, such as New Zealand (Treaty of Waitangi and Maori Customary Law), Canada (Aboriginal Rights Recognition), and Bolivia (Plurinational State Constitution). This comparison

provides a conceptual and practical reference for the construction of the Lampung customary law integration model. Fourth, the Theoretical Approach uses several key legal theories, namely the theory of Legal Pluralism from Sally Falk Moore, the theory of Responsive Law from Philippe Nonet and Philip Selznick, the theory of the Legal System from Lawrence M. Friedman, and the theory of Customary Law from Van Vollenhoven. This theoretical framework is an analytical tool to dissect the problem and formulate solutions for legal reform. Fifth, the Philosophical Approach is used to explore the axiological and ontological dimensions of Lampung's customary law, especially in relation to Pancasila as the norm of the Indonesian legal system. This approach allows the research to answer fundamental questions: whether Piil Pesenggiri values are compatible with the values of Pancasila and universal human rights, and how such philosophical harmonization can underpin the legitimacy of the proposed legal reforms (Ali, Zainuddin 2021. 4-6).

3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

3.1 Piil Pesenggiri as a living legal norm system

Piil Pesenggiri is the highest philosophy of life of the indigenous people of Lampung which literally means shame that must be maintained and self-esteem that must be maintained. However, substantially, Piil Pesenggiri goes far beyond this narrow meaning. It is a comprehensive ethical system that governs man's relationship with God, fellow humans, and the universe. The system consists of four main pillars, each of which has a significant legal dimension. The nickname Adok, the first pillar, is a system of naming and awarding customary titles that reflects a person's social hierarchy, responsibilities, and competencies in the community. Legally, the nickname Adok functions as a system for identifying customary law subjects and determining rights and obligations based on customary status. A person who holds a specific title assumes specific customary law obligations, including obligations in dispute resolution, customary property management, and communal leadership. Its relevance to modern law can be found in the concepts of legal personality and fiduciary duty known in civil law (Putri et al. (2025): 57-63).

Nemui Nyimah, the second pillar, contains the values of openness, hospitality, and generosity in receiving guests and sharing with others. From a legal perspective, this value is the normative basis for the communal social security system that far predates the concept of the modern welfare state. Nemui Nyimah requires members of the community who are able to help the underprivileged, which is functionally equivalent to the contribution obligation in the social security system. This value is also the basis of hospitality norms in customary international law that are recognized in various UN conventions. Nengah Nyappur, the third pillar, means actively participating and blending in community life. This value has a strong public legal dimension, namely as the foundation of citizens' obligation to participate in the communal decision-making process. In the context of modern law, Nengah Nyappur corresponds to the rights and obligations of citizen participation in deliberative democracy as stipulated in Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services and the principles of good governance (Setiawan, Bagus Putra (2025): 89-98).

Sakai Sambayan, the fourth pillar, is the most operational manifestation of Piil Pesenggiri in daily life. This value contains the spirit of helping, mutual cooperation, and communal solidarity. Legally, Sakai Sambayan is the source of norms for communal natural resource ownership and management, deliberation-based dispute resolution, and wealth redistribution mechanisms within indigenous communities. Her modern correspondence can be found in the principle of common pool resources governance developed by Elinor Ostrom, the 2009 Nobel laureate in economics. The four pillars form a coherent and comprehensive customary law system. In contrast to positive law that relies on state coercive sanctions as an enforcement mechanism, Lampung customary law relies on social sanctions, spiritual sanctions, and relationship restoration mechanisms as enforcement instruments that are much more effective in the context of faith-based communities. This is in line with the responsive law theory of Nonet and Selznick which emphasizes the importance of internalizing norms as the key to the effectiveness of the law, not just formal coercion (Utari, Marza Utari, et al. (2025): 18631871).

The compatibility between Piil Pesenggiri values and the Indonesian constitution is not just a normative assumption, but can be demonstrated analytically. Article 18B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia affirms: The State

recognizes and respects the units of customary law communities and their traditional rights as long as they are alive and in accordance with the development of society and the principles of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, which are regulated in law. The phrase as long as it is alive is a factual prerequisite that is clearly fulfilled by the indigenous community of Lampung with the Piil Pesenggiri system which is still actively practiced. Furthermore, Piil Pesenggiri's values show a strong substantive correspondence with the precepts of Pancasila. The nickname Adok. reflects the Precepts of Fair and Civilized Humanity through the recognition of the dignity and self-esteem of each individual. Nemui Nyimah is directly related to the Precepts of Social Justice for All Indonesian People through the principles of sharing and solidarity. Nengah Nyappur manifested the Precepts of the People Led by Wisdom in Deliberation/Representation. And Sakai Sambayan reflects the spirit of the Precept of Indonesian Unity through mutual cooperation. Thus, Piil Pesenggiri is not only compatible with Pancasila, but is a local expression of the universal values of Pancasila itself (Utama, Fitra 2019): 117-134).

The constitutional relevance is even stronger when viewed from the perspective of Article 28I paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia which states that cultural identity and the rights of traditional communities are respected in harmony with the development of the times and civilization. This provision provides a constitutional basis for the recognition of Piil Pesenggiri not only as an intangible cultural heritage but as a system of norms that has legal force. The Constitutional Court in its various rulings has underlined that the rights of indigenous peoples have an equal constitutional position with other basic rights.

3.2 Comparative review: a model of customary law integration in other countries

The experience of other countries in integrating customary law into the national legal system provides valuable lessons for Indonesia, especially Lampung. New Zealand is one of the most comprehensive examples. Through the Treaty of Waitangi 1840 and its subsequent legislation, New Zealand recognized the Maori legal system (tikanga Maori) as legal law in a variety of areas, including natural resource management, communal land ownership, and dispute resolution. The Maori Land Court has special jurisdiction to decide disputes under Maori law, with judgments having the same

executory force as ordinary court judgments. Canada, through Section 35 of the Constitution Act 1982, recognizes Aboriginal and Treaty Rights as protected constitutional rights. The Supreme Court of Canada in the case of *Haida Nation v. British Columbia* (2004) affirmed the state's obligation to conduct meaningful consultations with indigenous communities before taking policies that impact their rights.

This duty to consult principle has become a minimum standard adopted in various international instruments on the rights of indigenous peoples. Bolivia, through its 2009 Plurinational State Constitution, took the most radical step by recognizing the customary law system (*justicia indígena originaria campesina*) as an official jurisdiction equivalent to the ordinary judicial jurisdiction. Although its implementation still faces various challenges, the Bolivian model provides inspiration about the possibility of constructing true judicial pluralism. From this comparison, it can be synthesized that the most relevant model for the Lampung context is the New Zealand model which combines the recognition of customary treaties/treaties with the establishment of special customary judicial institutions, but with the necessary adaptations for the context of Indonesia's decentralization. This model allows Lampung's customary law to operate as a legal system that is legitimate in certain domains, while remaining integrated within the constitutional framework of the Republic of Indonesia. Philippe Nonet and Philip Selznick in their classic work *Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law* (1978) identified three types of law in relation to social power: repressive law, autonomous law, and responsive law.

Repressive law is a law that serves power and suppresses the aspirations of the people. Autonomous law is a law that is independent of political power but is not responsive to social needs. Meanwhile, responsive law is a law that actively responds to social demands and integrates the values that live in society as raw materials for the formation of norms. Within the framework of Nonet/Selznick, Indonesia's legal system is currently moving from autonomous law to responsive law, but this transformation process has been slow and uneven. Legal reform based on Lampung's local wisdom is one of the most urgent agendas to encourage the transition. By integrating the values of *Piil Pesenggiri* into positive norms, the law is no longer considered as a foreign instrument imposed from outside, but rather as a crystallization of values that have long lived in the community (Nonet, Philippe et al. , 2017).

Sally Falk Moore's Theory of Legal Pluralism reinforces this perspective. Moore developed the concept of a semi-autonomous social field to explain how social communities create self-enforcement rules and mechanisms that are relatively autonomous from the state but not completely separate from it. The indigenous community of Lampung with its Piil Pesenggiri system is a classic example of a semi-autonomous social field that has managed to organize itself for centuries. The task of legal reform is to build an institutional bridge between this semi-autonomous social field and the state legal system, not to replace one with the other. Lawrence M. Friedman in *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective* (1975) divides the legal system into three components: substance, structure, and legal culture. Analysis of Lampung customary law shows that the legal culture of the Lampung people (legal awareness, compliance, and orientation to the law) is more in line with the values of Piil Pesenggiri than with the substance and structure of national positive law. This explains why many Lampung residents choose customary mechanisms in resolving disputes even though formal judicial institutions are available. Effective legal reform must respond to the realities of this legal culture, not ignore it.

3.3 Construction of legal integration models: towards the Lampung local wisdom regional regulation

One of the most obvious manifestations of the tension between positive law and Lampung customary law is land conflict. Lampung Province is known as one of the provinces with the highest rate of agrarian conflicts in Indonesia. Data from the Agrarian Reform Consortium (KPA) shows that during the 2015-2022 period, Lampung recorded hundreds of agrarian conflicts involving customary land claims versus title certificates issued by the National Land Agency (BPN). The root of the problem lies in the principle of *domein verklaring* which was inherited from Dutch colonial law and transformed into the concept of state land in the 1960 UUPA. Although the UUPA nominally recognizes the customary rights of customary law communities, Article 3 of the UUPA limits such recognition on the condition that customary rights must not conflict with national and state interests. In practice, these restrictive clauses are often interpreted expansively by land authorities to justify the expropriation of customary land for the sake of

development. In the context of Lampung's customary law, land is not just an economic asset but a spiritual medium and communal identity. The concept of land in the Piil Pesenggiri philosophy is closely related to ancestors, clan identity, and community sustainability. Taking customary land from the perspective of Lampung customs is not only a violation of property rights, but also the destruction of communal identity. Therefore, resolving customary land conflicts in Lampung requires an approach that is not solely technical-land law, but also considers cultural and spiritual dimensions (Hadikusuma 1989. 34).

The Constitutional Court's decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 which annulled Article 1 number 6 of the Forestry Law which defines customary forests as part of state forests is an important precedent that paves the way for a more substantive recognition of customary rights. This decision confirms that customary forests are not part of state forests so their management is under the authority of customary law communities. The same principle should be extended to the recognition of Lampung's customary land through comprehensive regional legislation. Based on the above analysis, this study constructs a legal integration model called the Lampung Legal Trial Model, which consists of three levels that support each other. The first level is Normative-Constitutional Recognition. At this level, what is needed is the reaffirmation and operationalization of Article 18B paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia through the establishment of a special law on Customary Law Communities. This law must determine the criteria for recognition, registration procedures, and the scope of normative autonomy of customary law communities. In the context of Lampung, the law must recognize Piil Pesenggiri as a living law that has normative power in certain domains of communal life. The second level is the Institutionalization of Customary Institutions.

The Lampung Customary Writers Council (MPAL) needs to be strengthened with formal quasi-judicial authority, namely the ability to issue dispute resolution decisions that can be strengthened by the district court. The model that can be adopted is the customary-based Alternative Dispute Resolution (ADR) model where the mediation-arbitration award has binding force for the parties and can be applied for determination in the district court. This is in line with the provisions of Article 58 of Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power which opens up space for dispute resolution outside

the court. The third level is Codification and Normative Harmonization through Regional Regulations. The Lampung Provincial Regulation on the Recognition and Protection of Lampung Customary Law Communities should contain: (a) official recognition of the units of the Lampung customary law community and their customary areas; (b) protection of the land and natural resources of the customs; (c) recognition of Lampung customary law in the field of customary marriage, customary inheritance, and communal dispute resolution; (d) granting customary institution status as a partner of local governments with clear rights and obligations; and (e) a mechanism for resolving conflicts between customary norms and positive norms through inter-agency consultation and harmonization forums. This Trialektika model does not intend to create a separate and exclusive legal system, but rather to build a structured and coordinated architecture of legal pluralism.

In this architecture, Lampung customary law and state law operate in a complementary relationship: customary law deals with the domain of communal life that is most familiar with its context, while state law provides protection of fundamental rights that cannot be compromised, including the prohibition of gender discrimination and the protection of children's rights. The integration of Lampung's customary law into the national legal system should not be carried out without considering the human rights dimension. Some aspects of Lampung's customary law, as well as customary law in many other traditional communities, contain elements that need to be criticized from a human rights perspective, especially related to gender equality and non-discrimination. In the Lampung customary system, inheritance rights and land ownership rights traditionally prioritize the male line (patrilineal). The Juluk Adok system also has a hierarchical dimension that can create differentiation of treatment based on customary status. Within the framework of Article 28I paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia which prohibits discrimination on any basis, these aspects need to receive critical attention in the process of codification and integration of customary law.

The solution is not a rejection of customary law as a whole, but an internal reform process guided by constitutional values and human rights. The indigenous communities of Lampung themselves have shown considerable adaptation capacity; several clans have modified the inheritance rules to accommodate women's equality without abandoning the essence of Piil Pesenggiri values. This internal reform process needs to be facilitated and

supported by the state, not replaced by foreign norms that are not contextual. From a philosophical perspective, the value of Piil Pesenggiri is basically not an intrinsically discriminatory value. The essence of Piil Pesenggiri is respect for human dignity, which is the universal foundation of the entire human rights system. Therefore, a progressive interpretation of Piil Pesenggiri that is in line with universal human rights values is not only possible, but also a moral imperative in the context of just legal pluralism.

4 CONCLUSION

This research has shown that the renewal of national laws and the preservation of the local wisdom of the indigenous tribes of Lampung are not two conflicting agendas, but two sides of the same coin: both aim to build a just, harmonious, and dignified social order. The values of Piil Pesenggiri with its four pillars (Juluk Adok, Nemui Nyimah, Nengah Nyappur, and Sakai Sambayan) have rich and relevant normative content to inform national legal reforms, especially in the fields of regional autonomy, land, and dispute resolution. The gap between *das sollen* and *das sein* in the recognition of Lampung customary law is the product of three structural deficits: regulatory deficits (the absence of a comprehensive Indigenous Peoples Law), institutional deficits (weak formal authority of customary institutions), and epistemological deficits (the dominance of legal positivism that marginalizes normative pluralism). These three deficits must be addressed simultaneously through the Lampung Legal Trial Model, which consists of normative-constitutional recognition, institutionalization of customary institutions, and codification through Regional Regulations.

Comparative experience from New Zealand, Canada, and Bolivia shows that the integration of customary law into the national legal system is not only technically legal, but also results in a more legitimate, more effective, and fairer legal system for all parties. Indonesia, with its rich customary law pluralism, has the potential to become a global leader in the development of an inclusive and equitable model of legal pluralism. In a broader context, the reform of the law based on local wisdom in Lampung is a real contribution to the great project of authentic national legal development, namely a law that is rooted in the values of its own nation (indigenous jurisprudence) but open to the universal values of humanity. This is the true spirit of Article 18B of the 1945

Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the spirit of pluralism mandated by the precepts of Pancasila.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study could be an extension of the prior study. To this end, the researcher would like to express a genuine gratitude to all those involved in the organization and any other parties that would have helped in establishing this research.

REFERENCES

- Abdurrahman. *Customary law according to the laws of the Republic of Indonesia*. Cendana Press, 1984.
- Ali, Z. *Legal research methods*. Graphic Rays, 2021.
- Bedner, A.; Van Huis, S. Plurality of marriage law and marriage registration for Muslims in Indonesia: a plea for pragmatism. *Utrecht Law Review*, v. 6, n. 2, p. 3-4, 2010.
- Churniawan, E. Preparation of legal research proposals. *Legal Research Methodology*, p. 88.
- Hadikusuma, H. *Lampung society and cultural customs*. Mandar Advanced, 1989.
- Herlius, F. Customary law rules in prosecution for justice based on local wisdom. *Perspectives: Legal and Development Problem Studies*, v. 27, n. 2, p. 94-103, 2022.
- Ismail, H.; Asy'ari, H.; Setiawan, A. The inheritance rights of the eldest son in Lampung Pepadun customary law: gender perspective (Study in Tegineng, Pesawaran Regency). *Al-Hurriyah: Journal of Islamic Law*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 56-67, 2019.
- Melissaris, E. The more the merrier? A new take on legal pluralism. *Social & Legal Studies*, v. 13, n. 1, p. 57-79, 2004.
- Nonet, P.; Selznick, P.; Kagan, R. A. *Law and society in transition: Toward responsive law*. Routledge, 2017.
- Putri, S. R.; Hasan, Z. The dynamics of Lampung customary law in the social system: an empirical study of the value of Piil Pesenggiri in the Abung Siwo Mego community. *Journal of Multidisciplinary Academic Sciences*, v. 2, n. 6, p. 57-63, 2025.
- Rahayu, D. P.; Ke, S. *Legal research methods*. Media, 2020.

Setiawan, B. P.; Prayoga, A.; Sari, D. P.; Ardian, R. The application of Piil Pesenggiri values for the younger generation in the era of globalization reviewed from the perspective of legal sociology. *Sociology: Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities*, v. 4, n. 1, p. 89-98, 2025.

Utama, F. Piil Pesenggiri in Lampung society: between instruments of peace development or the pretext of violence. *Research*, v. 7, n. 2, p. 117-134, 2019.

Utari, M.; Sari, I.; Wijaya, B.; Pratama, E. Piil Pesenggiri: the philosophy of life of the people of Lampung as the basis for cultural resilience in the era of globalization. *Journal of School Leadership and Management*, v. 10, n. 4, p. 1863-1871, 2025.

Vanderlinden, J. Return to legal pluralism: twenty years later. *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, v. 21, n. 28, p. 149-157, 1989.

Von Benda-Beckmann, F. Who's afraid of legal pluralism? *The Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, v. 34, n. 47, p. 37-82, 2002.

CONSTITUTION OF THE REPUBLIC OF INDONESIA IN 1945.

Law Number 5 of 1960 concerning Basic Regulations on Agrarian Principles (Statute Book of the Republic of Indonesia of 1960 Number 104).

Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights.

Law Number 41 of 1999 concerning Forestry as amended by Law Number 19 of 2004.

Law Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power.

Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages.

Law Number 32 of 2009 concerning Environmental Protection and Management.

Regulation of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 52 of 2014 concerning Guidelines for the Recognition and Protection of Customary Law Communities.

Lampung Provincial Regulation Number 2 of 2008 concerning the Preservation of Lampung Culture.

Constitutional Court Decision No. 35/PUU-X/2012 concerning the Testing of Law No. 41 of 1999 concerning Forestry.

Decision of the Supreme Court of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1400 K/Pdt/1986 concerning Interfaith Marriage.