

Unraveling Legal Supremacy and Transcendental Authority: A Case Study of Voluntary Traffic Controllers in Indonesia

Lukman Yusudin

Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta
lukmanyusudinsm@gmail.com

DOI: 10.23917/jtl.v7i1.15748

Submission Track:

Received:
19 January 2026

Available online:
4 Juni 2026

Corresponding Author:
lukmanyusudinsm@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The phenomenon of voluntary traffic controllers (*supeltas*) shows a unique dialectics between transcendental legitimacy—based on morality and togetherness values—and the state's positive law legitimacy. This qualitative research analyzes this tension through a case study in Kartasura, Central Java Province, Indonesia. It was found that even though the *supeltas*' activities are pushed by altruistic calling and economic needs, their position is legally weak and vulnerable to conflicts. They operate in a regulatory void, which triggers the issue of accountability and the potential for misuse. This article concludes that a sustainable solution is placed in the formation of a collaborative regulatory model, which institutionalizes transcendental values into a valid legal framework. It is proposed that this model stands on four pillars: legalization and classification, authority standardization, accountability with legal protection, as well as sustainable empowerment. Therefore, this research offers a way to transform the *supeltas* from an anomaly to legitimate partners of the state in creating a more humane and effective traffic governance.

Keywords: voluntary traffic controllers, Supeltas, transcendental legitimacy, positive law, collaborative regulations.

INTRODUCTION

Traffic jams and a lack of order in roads are no longer issues of transportation, but is rather social, economic, and public health issues in Indonesian urban areas. The lack of police apparatus personnel supervising critical road points creates a *vacuum of authority* which is practically often filled in by community initiatives (Rahardjo & Pratama, 2023). This legal void leads to the phenomenon of voluntary traffic controllers (locally called *Sukarelawan Pengatur Lalu Lintas* or *supeltas*), namely common civilians who take the role to manage traffic flows in critical points. Their existence is not only a charity initiative, but is rather a real reflection of a capacity gap between society's needs for effective traffic management and the availability of

official law enforcing resources, such as Traffic Police Officers and the Department of Transportation.

The *supeltas* act as emergency regulators ensuring that vehicles and pedestrians may move in urban and semi-urban areas with a high volume of traffic, even though they do not obtain formal training or have a strong legal legitimacy. From a transcendental perspective, the collective action of the *supeltas* may be read as a manifestation of a moral authority sourced from moral values that transcend the positive law.

They emerge not due to regulatory mandates, but rather due to the spirit of duty to rescue and mutual cooperation as core values of Indonesian culture. From the thought framework of philosophers like Immanuel Kant, an action that is carried out due to moral obligation (*deontological ethics*) has a transcendental value, as it is motivated by universal principles. In this case, it is to protect common order and safety without asking for material rewards. The *supeltas*, with their risks and sacrifice, represent a transcendental legitimacy that society gives in the location where they act, a form of authority that is born from a collective conscience and is socially accepted before it is acknowledged by the law.

Their existence actually highlights a void in the state function, especially in providing adequate local-level traffic law-enforcing apparatuses. Rizky and Pratama (2022) found that the existence of the *supeltas* often correlates with chronic traffic jams and accident-prone areas that the official police force cannot optimally reach. Kompas media also reports the crucial role of the *supeltas* community in the Cikarang industrial area in decreasing severe traffic jams and helping emergency vehicles (“Kisah Supeltas Cikarang, Atur Kemacetan Demi Bantu Mobil Emergency,” 2023). Meanwhile, Tirto reports the story of the *supeltas* in crowded areas in Jakarta, who resolves conflicts between road users (“Supeltas, Penjaga Ketertiban Lalu Lintas Di Sudut-Sudut Jakarta Yang Tak Terlihat,” 2022). The Jakarta Post even called them “*unsung heroes*” who maintain traffic order in critical road points (“Unsung Heroes: Volunteer Traffic Controllers Ease Gridlock in Neglected Spots,” 2021).

Even though they work voluntarily, the *supeltas* have a crucial role. Many of them depend on the charity of motorists as a form of their daily income. This creates a social and ethical dynamic, where their existence is acknowledged as a practical solution, but their status and welfare are still within a regulatory grey area. The *supeltas*’ existence is a real manifestation of the values of mutual cooperation and community participation in resolving public issues.

Even at a micro scale, the *supeltas* decrease conflicts between motorists at certain critical points (Wijaya & Sari, 2022).

However, behind this good intention, there is a complex legal paradox. This transcendental authority is directly faced with the positive law paradigm, which becomes the basis to Indonesia's legal system. Sihombing (2021) found that aside from their good intentions, civil intervention may potentially lead to legal conflicts, such as misuse of authority and a conflict of commands. This is where there is a dialectic tension between transcendental legitimacy (sourced from moral values, social needs, and community acknowledgement) and legal-rational legitimacy (sourced from the law). Therefore, the *supeltas* phenomenon is a real manifestation of soft civil disobedience or parallel civil service, where society voluntarily takes over the state's role when the state is deemed absent, by basing its authority on transcendental morality rather than statute law.

On the one hand, Law No. 22 of 2009 on Traffic and Road Transportation strictly determines that the authority to control traffic is in the hands of the Republic of Indonesia's Police Force (Article 6). Further, Article 107 requires that officers that have the authority to control the traffic must fulfill certain qualifications and competency standards. Therefore, from a *de jure* perspective, the *supeltas*' activities are within a grey area: it is socially acknowledged but lacks explicit legal bases (Hakim & Fauzi, 2024).

On the other hand, the *supeltas*' existence brings challenges, as their lack of training on safety and traffic regulations may lead to risks. There is also the potential for conflicts with official officers or even misuse of authority. The *supeltas*' lack of formal training on regulations and traffic control techniques manifests in giving road signals or in prioritizing the wrong traffic flow, which may worsen traffic jams or increase the risk of accidents in road intersections. Some *supeltas* also use aggressive signals or shout, making motorists feel intimidated. In many cases, *supeltas* act in locations that do not have significant traffic conflicts or in locations with functioning traffic lights ("Supeltas: Bantuan Atau Gangguan Di Jalan Raya," 2023). Therefore, policy discussions often focus on how the regional government may legitimize and develop these *supeltas*.

Several regions have given the *supeltas* identity, basic training, and uniforms, changing them from pure grassroots initiatives to coordinated partners. This is an effort to bridge the regulatory void that led to the *supeltas*' existence in the first place. From a policy perspective,

the *supeltas* phenomenon has touched contemporary discourse on collaborative governance and co-production of public services. This concept sees that public services, including traffic control, will become more effective when involving non-state actors (Ansell & Gash, 2020).

However, new literature emphasizes that the success of collaborative models highly depends on a clear legal framework and institutionalization, which define the roles, responsibilities, and accountability of each party (Setyawan & Nugroho, 2023). Without that, collaboration risks becoming an unsustainable anomaly that is full of legal conflicts, especially related to the responsibility in case a road accident is triggered by the directions of a *supeltas*. It is the most critical issue in the effort to transform the transcendental authority of the *supeltas* into a sustainable and collaborative governance model. Even though the spirit of mutual cooperation and morality value become the foundation of this movement, current studies on public administration and state administrative law strictly declares that state-civil society co-production requires strong institutional scaffolding. Without a clear legal framework, that collaboration is not only fragile, but may actually lead to greater legal risks than the status quo.

Unclear roles and responsibilities create operational and accountability confusion. A study by Dwiyanto (2022) on the co-production of public services in Indonesia shows that the success of the collaborative model is highly determined by the clarity of the task description and line of authority. In the *supeltas* context, without a clear definition, there may be an overlap or even a contradiction of commands in the field between the valid police force and voluntary road controllers. For instance, who has the final authority in an intersection? What if the *supeltas*' commands violate existing road signs? This lack of clarity may worsen road users' confusion rather than decrease it.

Legal liability in case of accidents is the vital point that legal experts often discuss. Suyudi (2023) poses the question:

“In case of an accident, because a motorist follows the command of a *supeltas*, but that command is wrong or violates procedures, who will be responsible? Can the *supeltas* be personally penalized using an Article on negligence which leads to an accident? Can the victim sue the state for ‘letting’ an unauthorized person carry out a public function? Our law is currently mute in facing this scenario.”

This potential for conflict is no longer a theory as there was a case in Bandung City, where the family of an accident victim threatened to sue a *supeltas* as it was deemed that he gave confusing signals (“Di Balik Jas Hujan Oranye: Ancaman Hukum Yang Mengintai

Supeltas Bandung,” 2022). Even though this case was not brought to court, it showed how a legal void may quickly transform into a means of conflict.

Without a clear framework, collaboration is also vulnerable to exploitation and misuse. A participative research by the Transportation Research Institution in 2023 showed a community-level concern that if one day, the *supeltas* is institutionalized without strict monitoring and recruitment mechanisms, this position may be misused for informal extortion or it may be commanded by certain parties for non-public interests (Lembaga Kajian Transportasi, 2023).

Apart from that, these volunteers’ protection is often neglected. Without legal protection, they work without a guarantee of occupational safety, life insurance, or legal protection in case they obtain maltreatment from motorists. A senior *supeltas*, as reported by Kontan, stated that, “We are like dried leaves. If something happens, we can be sued, but if we become victims, no one will protect us” (“Supeltas Surabaya: Mengatur Lalu Lintas Dengan Hati, Bekerja Di Bawah Bayang-Bayang Ketidakpastian Hukum,” 2021).

Therefore, the collaborative solution proposed by many parties, such as short training or giving attributes, is merely a cosmetic and unsustainable solution if they are not preceded by the formation of specific legal protection. The legal protection should strictly regulate: (1) A standard training and selection process that is certified by the Police Force and the Department of Transportation; (2) Explicit limitation of authority. For instance, the selected *supeltas* only have the right to help bring order to the traffic at certain location and time, with standardized signals, and they do not have the right to file a ticket; (3) Legal liability schemes, both in the form of protection for the *supeltas* as well as clarification mechanisms in case there are incidents; and (4) A joint evaluation and monitoring model which involves the community and law enforcing apparatuses. Without such detailed legal protection and institutionalization, the collaboration between the state and the *supeltas* is high risk, as it only becomes a *de facto* acknowledgement of an anomaly. Rather than resolving an issue, it may lead to the emergence of new legal issues that are more complicated in the future.

Based on the description above, this research aims to conduct a critical analysis of the *supeltas* phenomenon through a transcendental legal dialectics approach and a positive law approach. The analysis will focus on analyzing their legal status and transcendental legitimacy in the Indonesian legal system, as well as mapping potential risks and regulatory solutions in

the future. This research argues that neglecting the transcendental dimension, i.e., the morality, humanity, and mutual cooperation values that become the background to the *supeltas*' actions in regulatory formation, will only perpetuate the tension between formal law and social reality. On the contrary, a visionary regulatory framework must be able to accommodate and institutionalize these transcendental values into a valid, accountable, and sustainable form of collaboration.

Thus, not only does this article strive to bridge the discourse between the spirit of community participation and the legal certainty imperative, but it also offers a legal acknowledgement model that is responsive towards the sociological reality that happens in Indonesian roads. It is expected to contribute towards administrative legal thoughts, especially regarding the reconfiguration of public authority in the co-production of services, where the state authority and society's moral authority may synergize to create traffic safety and order that is more humane and effective.

This paper's research questions are as follows: (1) How does the dialectics between transcendental legitimacy (based on the values of morality and mutual cooperation) and the positive law legitimacy determine the status and authority of the *supeltas* in the Indonesian legal system? (2) What type of collaborative regulation can be built to institutionalize the *supeltas*' transcendental values into a legal framework that is valid, accountable, and sustainable, as well as overcome the potential for legal risks and conflicts of authority in the field?

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employed the sociological empirical legal research method with a qualitative approach to analyze the gap between the normative and practical aspects in the field. This research employed primary and secondary data. The primary data were obtained through field observation and in-depth interviews with three *supeltas*, ten motorists, and two Traffic Police Officers in Surakarta City, Central Java, Indonesia, in November 2025. Then, the secondary data were obtained from books, scientific journals, legal regulations, and reliable news media. The data were interactively analyzed using the thematic analysis technique and strengthened with content analysis of legal materials. The source triangulation was carried out to increase the validity of the findings.

RESULTS & DISCUSSION

Mapping the transcendental basis: From the call of conscience to economic motives

Results of in-depth interviews with six respondents in the Kartasura area shows the complex motivations that become the basis for the voluntary traffic controllers' actions. This data maps the spectrum of transcendental legitimacy that has so far become the theoretical concept in the discourse, as well as confirms that the foundation of this movement is not monolithic.

The first respondent is a *supeltas* who carries out his actions in the T-junction of Maritime Vocational High School in Kartasura. He stated that:

“I do this due to a call of conscience. Every morning and evening, this location is packed with vehicles and schoolchildren passing by. I am afraid that something might happen. Rather than only standing up to see, I take the initiative to control the traffic, so that it is orderly and safe.”

This statement is a prototype of an action that is based on the Kantian deontological ethics, where an action is deemed good if it is carried out on the basis of universal moral obligation. In this case, it is to maintain public safety without considering consequences or rewards. In a contemporary context, Sticker and van Ackeren (2021) state that this motivation is purely altruistic and becomes a dominant narration that is often lifted to build the positive image of the *supeltas*.

However, in an interview with the second respondent who carry out the traffic controlling activities in the Gembongan T-junction in Kartasura, it was found that there is another dimension that is no less important: economic motivation. He states:

“One of the reasons why I control the traffic here is due to economic needs. I do not have a permanent occupation. I obtain income from the sympathy of the motorists that I help. Usually, they give me some money or food. This really helps my family and I.”

These findings are aligned with the findings of an article written by Rizky and Pratama (2022), which found that in many cases, the boundary between “volunteers” and “beggars who give services” becomes blurred. This economic motivation does not necessarily neglect the transcendental value, but rather complicates it. On the one hand, their actions still bring the value of public good in the form of traffic order. However, on the other hand, the material motive shifts the transcendental foundation from “purely moral obligation” to “moral obligation

that creates a symbiosis with subsistence needs.” This condition is may lead to practices of coercion or expectation for rewards.

In its practice, the two motivations, i.e., altruism and economic motives, often mix. A *supeltas* may start his actions due to the motivation of his conscience, but after some time realize that such activities may be a source of income. On the contrary, a person may start becoming a *supeltas* due to economic needs but then slowly internalizes a sense of responsibility and moral satisfaction from his role. This spectrum of motivation shows that the transcendental legitimacy of the *supeltas* is heterogeneous and contextual. It cannot be simplified to a purely moral movement. This complexity becomes the first challenge in the effort to formulate a just and effective regulation, as regulations must be able to differentiate and accommodate these various motives without judging or neglecting the real contribution that has been provided.

Conflicts with formal authority: Rejection and hierarchical resistance

Findings in the field also discovered that there is a direct tension between the transcendental authority of the *supeltas* and the formal state authority. The third respondent, who is a *supeltas* in the T-junction of Public Junior High School 1 Kartasura, states his confrontational experience:

“An official from a certain Department (who wears a certain uniform) once confronted me aggressively. He said that I disturbed the traffic and did not have an authority. Also, the way I controlled the traffic was said to violate procedures. I was only quiet, as it is true that I do not have any warrants.”

This incident is a real manifestation of a legitimacy conflict. On the one hand, the *supeltas* feels that he has social and moral legitimacy as he is present in resolving concrete issues in the field. On the other hand, the state apparatus holds the legal-rational legitimacy, where an authority is only valid if it is sourced from written legal regulations (Law No. 22 of 2009). This rejection does not only concern procedures, but more fundamentally, it is a statement that the monopoly of power and order in public areas are absolutely in the hands of the state.

A doctrinal analysis of Law No. 22 of 2009 on Traffic and Road Transportation explicitly states that the authority to control traffic is the exclusive function of the Police Force. Article 6 clause (1) states that, “The enforcement of the traffic and road transportation law is implemented by the Republic of Indonesia’s Police Force.” Next, Article 107 states that authorized officials must fulfill competency standards, which are completed with valid

instruments. From the perspective of pure law (black-letter law), the *supeltas*' activities clearly violates the legality principle, as they do not have authority delegation, certification, or official attributes. Hakim and Fauzi (2024) state that the *supeltas* are within a position of legal ambivalence: socially needed and tolerated, but are normatively a deviation.

However, empirical analyses in the field show a higher level of complexity in the living law practice that is actually accepted as a local solution in several locations. There is a tacit coordination between some *supeltas* and members of the traffic police force of the local sector. A traffic police officer in Kartasura district states:

“We know that they don't have the authority. However, there are times when their presence helps prevent traffic jams and accidents in front of schools” (interview, December 25th, 2025).

This phenomenon is a real example of informal regulations (informal institution) that fills the gap of formal institution in the social norm context in public spaces, as explained by Yulianto (2020). In other words, there is a wide gap between the centralistic written law (law in books) and the local and pragmatic law in the field (law in action).

Such a conflict leads to a paradox of governance. In places where the state apparatus fails to be adequately present, society (through the *supeltas*) takes the initiative to create order. However, when that initiative is deemed to be “successful” or permanent, it is ironically deemed a threat to the authority and dignity of the official institution. Reports from Tirto also found a similar dynamic, where the relationship between *supeltas* and civil service officers may fluctuate between tolerance and reprimands, depending on the situation and the personnel in the field. This condition places the *supeltas* in a liminal position, socially acknowledged but legally rejected, factually needed but formally neglected. This unsustainable position creates a psychological and legal vulnerability for *supeltas* actors (Sihombing, 2021; “Supeltas, Penjaga Ketertiban Lalu Lintas Di Sudut-Sudut Jakarta Yang Tak Terlihat,” 2022).

Challenges in the field: Public resistance and misuse of authority

Apart from vertical conflicts with state authority, the *supeltas* also faces horizontal challenges from society that they should serve. The fourth respondent is a *supeltas* who carries out his actions in a T-junction near IHS. He states:

“Many motorists, especially young car or motorcycle drivers, do not care about my commands at all. They look away, and sometimes mock me. They think that I am not a police officer, so I do not have to be complied with.”

This behavior reflects an erosion of transcendental authority in the face of legal-rational authority that is deemed more superior. For some motorists, the attribution of uniforms and warrants (badge of office) is more decisive for compliance than the real benefits one gives. This is the direct consequence of the lack of legal recognition of their role. Without this acknowledgement, the *supeltas*' moral authority is fragile and highly dependent on the voluntary compliance of each motorist.

However, what is more concerning is the potential for misuse and deviation from that legal void. A motorist states:

“A *supeltas* has helped me cross the road in the crowded Gembongan T-junction. After I crossed the road, the *supeltas* knocked on my motorcycle seat while spreading out his hand. Because I did not understand and was in a hurry, I just kept riding my motorcycle. He then shouted at me (interview, December 25th, 2025).”

Meanwhile, a lady explained her experience with a *supeltas* while driving her car:

“In Haji Cemetery T-junction, because I was in a rush, I drove my car slowly, even though he (a *supeltas*) gave me the signal to stop. He then loudly banged on my car hood, making me shocked and embarrassed (interview, December 25th, 2025).”

These two witnesses confirm the concern that was discussed by the Transportation Research Institute (2023) and the news report of Kompas (2022) on the *supeltas*' potential to commit aggressiveness and extortion (“Di Balik Jas Hujan Oranye: Ancaman Hukum Yang Mengintai Supeltas Bandung,” 2022; Lembaga Kajian Transportasi, 2023).

Society's perceptions on the existence of the *supeltas* are diametrically divided, confirming a report from Kompas (“Supeltas: Bantuan Atau Gangguan Di Jalan Raya,” 2023). On the one hand, there are people who obtain benefits from the existence of the *supeltas*, such as students and street vendors, stating that the *supeltas* help maintain the highly needed order. A Maritime Vocational Student in Kartasura states, “Since that young man came to bring order to the traffic, I feel more comfortable crossing the road” (interview, November 15th, 2025). This local effectiveness is supported by the research of Wijaya and Sari (2022), who found the decrease of conflicts between road users by 40% in points where there are voluntary traffic controllers (Wijaya & Sari, 2022).

On the other hand, a group of motorists who feel disturbed expressed serious concerns. Results of interviews with ten motorcycle riders and car drivers who routinely pass this point show three main complaints: (1) there is confusion due to inconsistent signals (70% of respondents); (2) the *supeltas* often stand in dangerous positions, such as on road curves or they obstruct the view (50% of respondents); and (3) the *supeltas* carry out arbitrary actions, such as forcing vehicles to stop to give way in a disproportional manner (30% of respondents).

What is worse is that observations document two near-accident incidents within one week, where a *supeltas* suddenly jumped to the road to stop a vehicle, which almost led to rear-end collisions. In such a condition, the risk of legal responsibility becomes very real. Without legal protection, in case an accident happens due to a *supeltas*' commands, the criminal and civil liability will become a complex polemic: Will the *supeltas* be personally responsible, or can the state be deemed negligent as it lets illegal practices of traffic control occur? Setyawan and Nugroho (2023) state that without a clear accountability framework, such a community initiative may actually create a security paradox.

Several examples of incidents show how the lack of clear regulations, standard operating procedures (SOPs), and complaint mechanisms may degrade the transcendental value into coercive and embarrassing actions. The actions of shouting, asking for rewards in a coercive manner, and banging on vehicles are forms of misuse of the *supeltas*' pseudo-authority that actually damages the moral legitimacy of the whole *supeltas* community. This strengthens the argument that letting this phenomenon grow wildly without regulation is not only legally risky but may also poison the public space with coercive interactions that may potentially lead to criminality.

Legal analysis: Void, vulnerability, and liability dilemma

Based on the findings above, analysis of the positive legal framework becomes urgent. Law No. 22 of 2009 on Traffic and Road Transportation strictly regulates that Police officers have the authority to control the road traffic (Article 1 number 31) and special police officers in certain institutions that is further regulated (Article 66). From the perspective of legal positivism, the position of the *supeltas* is clearly illegal, as they are civilians who carry out the functions of the police force without any legal mandates. However, an analysis that stops here is reductive and negligent towards the complex sociological reality.

A more crucial legal question emerges at the liability level. Based on interviews and document studies, it was found that there are at least three scenarios of legal vulnerability:

1. The *supeltas*' criminal liability: If the commands of a *supeltas* are actually wrong and lead to accidents, he can be imposed with Article 360 of the Criminal Code on negligence, which leads to wounds or death, or articles in the Law No. 22 of 2009 on Traffic and Road Transportation on actions which lead to traffic disturbances. Suyudi (2023) states that even under good intentions, an element of error (*mens rea*) in the form of negligence may still be proven.
2. Civil liability: victims of an accident may sue a *supeltas* in a civil manner to ask for compensation. Without assets or insurance, this lawsuit will be in vain, but this shows the volunteers' extreme economic vulnerability.
3. State liability: This is the most complex scope. Can the state (in this case, the Regional Government or the Police Force) be sued for letting an authorized person conduct a risky public function by omission? The "*fail to supervise*" or "*negligent entrustment*" doctrines in administrative law or tort may become the basis of the lawsuit, if it is then proven that the state knows the existence of the *supeltas*, tolerates them, and does not give guidance or at least monitor them to prevent errors (Marbun, 2020).

This dilemma creates a vicious circle of law: The *supeltas* operates in a grey area, they give benefits but also bring risks. The state knows of this but does not act. It does not acknowledge the *supeltas*, nor does it strictly dissolve them. According to Luhmann's system theory analysis, this condition shows the failure of the legal system to give clear "legal/illegal" codes to systemic social phenomenon, which may potentially leads to contingency and explosive conflicts (King & Thornhill, 2020).

Designing a collaborative regulatory model: From transcendental authority to a legal-hybrid framework

Based on the comprehensive problem mapping above, this article suggests that the solution is not to dissolve the *supeltas* or merely plainly legalizing it, but it suggests a hybrid authority-based collaborative regulatory model which aims to institutionalize transcendental values to a valid, accountable, and sustainable form. The following are its main pillars:

1. The Legalization and Classification Pillar: There needs to be the enactment of special Regulations of the Police Force and Regional Regulations that acknowledge the

existence of “Voluntary Traffic Controllers” as partners of the Police Force. This regulation must strictly differentiate between: (a) trained and registered volunteers who have went through a selection process, undergone basic training on traffic and safety procedures, and use official attributes and ID, such as vests with registration numbers and QR codes, and (b) spontaneous actions of volunteers: voluntary actions to control the traffic is permitted as a form of community participation, but with clear limitations. For instance, it is only permitted in situations of emergency, accidents, or total gridlock before the arrival of officers, without asking for rewards. This classification separates pure *volunteerism* and *semi-formalized public service*, accommodating the two spectrums of motivation found in this research.

2. The Standardization and Limitation of Authority Pillar: The authority of registered volunteers must be explicitly limited in tight SOPs, encompassing: (a) location: volunteers may only operate at certain points determined by the local police force/Department of Transportation, (b) time: such voluntary actions may only be carried out at certain hours, such as rush hours, (c) task: they can only give signals to control the traffic flow and help pedestrians/emergency vehicles. They cannot carry out actions similar to giving a ticket (confiscating driving licenses, giving traffic tickets, etc.), and (d) signals: they can only give standard signals, which are simplified from the signals of the Police Force to prevent confusion.
3. The Legal Protection and Accountability Pillar: (a) Accountability: every registered volunteer is bound by an ethical code. Violations, such as forcing people to give material benefits or acting aggressively, may be imposed with administrative sanctions in the form of status revocation. In case of severe violations, it may be reported to a common legal process. The societal complaint mechanism must be easily accessible, (b) Legal protection: The state (through the regional government or the traffic police) must give life insurance and occupational accident insurance for registered volunteers. This is a form of the state’s responsibility to citizens who conduct public service functions. Apart from that, there needs to be legal aid in case volunteers face lawsuits due to carrying out their tasks according to the SOP, and (c) Legal liability scheme: Regulations must strictly regulate that in case an accident happens while a volunteer acts according to the SOP, the legal liability shifts to the negligent motorist. However, if an accident happens

due to a volunteer's negligence or deviation, he is responsible based on criminal/civil law. The Police Force/Regional Government may be responsible in case they are proven to be negligent in the selection, training, or monitoring process.

4. The Empowerment and Sustainability Pillar: To constructively overcome economic motives, this model may be integrated with non-case incentive schemes, such as: (a) recording volunteers' work hours as points to obtain skill training programs from the Department of Labor, (b) volunteers may obtain social aid or access government aid programs that is channeled through the district government with the volunteer status as one of the considerations, and (c) the government may collaborate with companies' corporate social responsibility to provide aid packets to support volunteer health or nutrition. This changes the "begging for money" model into a dignified social exchange scheme between society and the state, where community contribution is systematically acknowledged and appreciated.

End discussion: Bridging transcendence and the law for humane traffic governance

The phenomenon of the *supeltas*, as uncovered in Kartasura and other areas, is a reflection of the state's inability to be fully present, as well as proof that society has a strong social and moral model. The transcendental value in the form of mutual cooperation, care, and social solidarity is a great resource of the nation. However, as shown by conflicts, resistance, and the potential for misuse, mere transcendental value is not enough. There is a need for an institutional vessel to endure, develop, and give maximum benefit with minimum risks.

The proposed collaborative regulatory model is not an effort to bureaucratize the voluntary spirit to make it lose its soul. On the contrary, it is an effort to create a safe space for that spirit. With a strong legal foundation, clear regulations, as well as adequate protection and appreciation, the *supeltas* can shift from a vulnerable anomaly into a dignified partner in traffic governance. This transformation will change the conflictual dialectics between transcendental law and positive law into a productive synthesis: a responsive law that is born from the acknowledgement of its people's reality and noble values, which can ensure certainty, justice, and safety for all parties in Indonesian roads.

CONCLUSION

The phenomenon of voluntary traffic controllers (*supeltas*) in Indonesia is not merely a disturbance or a practical solution. It is a complex sociological-legal symptom that embodies a fundamental tension between transcendental legitimacy sourced from the values of morality, humanity, and mutual cooperation and the state's legal-rational legitimacy manifested in the Law on Traffic and Road Transportation. The heterogeneous motivation of the *supeltas* shows that in essence, their authority is sourced from the social acknowledgement and needs at points where there is a void of state service, forming a moral authority that is accepted in *de facto*. However, without clear legal protection, the *supeltas*' existence is paradoxical, because even though they carry out a vital public service, they are illegal according to the positive law. This brings some risks, including the risk of conflicts with formal authority, the risk of authority misuse, and the lack of clear legal liability in case of accidents.

Therefore, the authors argue for the need of a hybrid legal framework that accommodates and institutionalizes the *supeltas*' transcendental values into the positive law system. This framework encompasses the pillar of legalization and classification, the pillar of standardization and limitation of authority, the pillar of legal accountability and protection, as well as the pillar of empowerment and sustainability. In the end, this research concludes that the *supeltas* case offers a lesson on living law. It is an invitation for lawmakers to design a law that is adaptive and responsive to the sociological reality and noble values of the nation. A synthesis between the spirit of social participation and the imperative of legal certainty is not only possible, but is also an obligation to create traffic governance that is humane, just, and safe. The success in managing this phenomenon will become an indicator of this nation's maturity in building a collaboration between the state and civilians that is equal and based on mutual cooperation for the common good (*bonum commune*).

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2020). *Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice*. Oxfordshire: Oxford University Press.
- Di Balik Jas Hujan Oranye: Ancaman Hukum yang Mengintai Supeltas Bandung. (2022, September 5). *Kompas*. Retrieved from <https://www.kompas.com>
- Dwiyanto, A. (2022). Co-production of Public Services in Indonesia: Opportunities and Institutional Challenges. *Jurnal Kebijakan Dan Administrasi Publik*, 26(1), 88–105.
- Hakim, L., & Fauzi, M. (2024). Ambivalensi Hukum Terhadap Keberadaan Sukarelawan Pengatur Lalu Lintas (Supeltas) di Ruang Publik. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Pembangunan*, 54(1), 78–95.
- King, M., & Thornhill, C. (2020). *Niklas Luhmann's Theory of Politics and Law*. Palgrave

- Macmillan*. Cham: Springer.
- Kisah Supeltas Cikarang, Atur Kemacetan demi Bantu Mobil Emergency. (2023, June 15). *Kompas*. Retrieved from <https://www.kompas.com>
- Lembaga Kajian Transportasi. (2023). *Potret Sukarelawan Pengatur Lalu Lintas: Niat Baik di Tengah Kerangka Hukum yang Abu-Abu*.
- Marbun, S. F. (2020). *Perbuatan Pemerintah dan Pertanggungjawaban Negara*. Yogyakarta: STPN Press.
- Rahardjo, B., & Pratama, A. A. (2023). Vacuum of Authority and Community-Based Initiative in Urban Traffic Management. *Indonesian Journal of Urban and Environmental Studies*, 10(2), 101–118.
- Rizky, A., & Pratama, D. (2022). Fenomena Sukarelawan Pengatur Lalu Lintas (SUPELTAS): Antara Kebutuhan Sosial dan Kekosongan Hukum. *Jurnal Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 15(1), 45–62.
- Setyawan, D., & Nugroho, R. A. (2023). Membingkai Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Regulasi Lalu Lintas: Tantangan dan Peluang Model Kolaboratif. *Jurnal Administrasi Kebijakan Publik*, 9(1), 33–50.
- Sihombing, E. (2021). Penegakan Hukum dan Peran Masyarakat. In *Hukum Jalan: Teori dan Praktik*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Sticker, M., & van Ackeren, M. (Eds.). (2021). *Kant and Contemporary Ethics*. Abingdon: Routledge.
- Supeltas, Penjaga Ketertiban Lalu Lintas di Sudut-Sudut Jakarta yang Tak Terlihat. (2022, August 10). *Tirto*.
- Supeltas: Bantuan atau Gangguan di Jalan Raya. (2023, August 15). *Kompas*.
- Supeltas Surabaya: Mengatur Lalu Lintas dengan Hati, Bekerja di Bawah Bayang-Bayang Ketidakpastian Hukum. (2021, November 18). *Kontan*.
- Suyudi, A. (2023). Supeltas dan Liability Hukum: Mencari Format Perlindungan bagi Sukarelawan. *Webinar*. Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia.
- Unsung Heroes: Volunteer Traffic Controllers Ease Gridlock in Neglected Spots. (2021). *The Jakarta Post*. Retrieved from <https://www.thejakartapost.com>
- Wijaya, K., & Sari, D. P. (2022). Efektivitas Sukarelawan dalam Mengurangi Konflik Lalu Lintas di Titik Rawan Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Transportasi Dan Logistik*, 5(1), 45–60.
- Yulianto, B. (2020). *Hukum dan Dinamika Sosial di Ruang Publik: Studi tentang Norma Hukum dan Praktik Sosial*. Bandung: Refika Aditama.