Siyasah Dusturiyah: State Law Review
Published by Yayasan Cerdas Pedia Indonesia
Volume 1 Issue 4, 2026 ISSN (Online) ***3109-9726***
Journal Homepage: **https://jurnal.smartpedia.co.id/index.php/SDLR**

Analyzing Artificial Intelligence Legal Ethics: Global Justice Perspectives in the Digital Era

Analisis Etika Hukum Kecerdasan Buatan Dalam Perspektif Keadilan Global di Era Digital

Ari Wahyudi
Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Corresponding Author:
Ari Wahyudi
✉ariwahyudi1875@gmail.com

History:
Submitted: 20-11-2025
Revised: 20-01-2026
Accepted: 28-01-2026

Keyword:
Legal Ethics; Artificial Intelligence; Global Justice; Digital Sovereignty; Algorithms.

Kata Kunci:
Etika Hukum; Kecerdasan Buatan; Keadilan Global; Kedaulatan Digital; Algoritme.

https://doi.org/10.65101/mxzsx259

Abstract

The rapid integration of artificial intelligence into global judicial systems presents profound ethical and legal challenges. This research investigates the impact of algorithmic opacity and systemic bias on substantive justice, specifically emphasizing the technological divide between the Global North and South. Utilizing normative legal research with comparative and philosophical approaches, this study synthesizes Rawlsian justice principles, capability frameworks, and local Pancasila values. The analysis reveals that unregulated artificial intelligence deployment directly threatens human rights and exacerbates digital imperialism by marginalizing developing nations. To achieve sustainable global justice, the findings advocate for a crucial paradigm shift toward human centered governance. Strategic solutions include formulating inclusive multilateral policies, mandating strict algorithmic transparency, empowering digital sovereignty, and establishing comprehensive national regulations. Ultimately, rigorous ethical oversight must remain paramount over mere computational efficiency to ensure that artificial intelligence serves as an equitable instrument for empowering humanity instead of widening existing social disparities worldwide today.

Abstrak

Integrasi cepat kecerdasan buatan ke dalam sistem peradilan global menghadirkan tantangan etis dan hukum mendalam. Penelitian ini menyelidiki dampak opasitas algoritmik dan bias sistemik terhadap keadilan substantif, secara khusus menekankan kesenjangan teknologi antara Utara dan Selatan Global. Memanfaatkan metode penelitian hukum normatif dengan pendekatan komparatif serta filosofis, studi ini menyintesis prinsip keadilan Rawlsian, kerangka kapabilitas, dan nilai lokal Pancasila. Analisis mengungkapkan bahwa penerapan kecerdasan buatan tanpa regulasi secara langsung mengancam hak asasi manusia dan memperburuk imperialisme digital dengan memarginalkan negara berkembang. Untuk mencapai keadilan global berkelanjutan, temuan mengadvokasi sebuah pergeseran paradigma krusial menuju tata kelola berpusat pada manusia. Solusi strategis mencakup perumusan kebijakan multilateral inklusif, pewajiban transparansi algoritmik ketat, pemberdayaan kedaulatan digital, dan pembentukan regulasi nasional komprehensif. Pada akhirnya, pengawasan etis ketat harus tetap diutamakan di atas sekadar efisiensi komputasional demi memastikan bahwa kecerdasan buatan berfungsi sebagai instrumen adil untuk memberdayakan umat manusia bukan untuk memperlebar disparitas sosial global sekarang.

A. INTRODUCTION

1. Background

The rapid proliferation of algorithmic governance has catalyzed an exogenous shock to the foundational structures of global legal systems. This structural metamorphosis extends far beyond the realm of administrative expediency; it strikes directly at the core of jurisprudential philosophy—namely, the pursuit of substantive justice amidst algorithms that remain persistently opaque.[1] While the integration of artificial intelligence (AI) into judicial and administrative decision-making promises elevated objectivity through hyper-scale data processing, it simultaneously introduces profound inherent risks. These include the entrenchment of algorithmic bias, the dilution of liability through distributed accountability, and unprecedented threats to fundamental human rights.[2] The normative tension between the utilitarian promise of technological efficiency and the absolute imperative of dignified, human-centric justice forms the crucial analytical baseline for this inquiry.

The necessity for rigorous doctrinal scrutiny of AI's legal ethics is rendered increasingly urgent by the glaring technological inequities dividing the Global North and the Global South.[3] Within the broader discourse of global justice, AI cannot be relegated to the status of a neutral technical instrument. Rather, it must be understood as a potent socio-technical force capable of either fortifying digital sovereignty or exacerbating normative asymmetry among sovereign states.[4] s jurisdictions such as China and Estonia increasingly experiment with mechanized adjudication—colloquially termed "robot judges"—to expedite judicial dockets, profound ontological questions emerge regarding whether justice can be substantively realized absent the empathy, equity, and contextual reasoning unique to the human intellect.[5]

---

[1] Elfindah Princes, Rasji Rasji, and Michael, "The Concept of Justice in AI-Driven Legal Decision Making," *Bit-Tech* 8, no. 1 (August 10, 2025): 78–86, https://doi.org/10.32877/bt.v8i1.2338.
[2] Zico Junius Fernando and Ariesta Wibisono Anditya, "AI on The Bench: The Future of Judicial Systems in The Age of Artificial Intelligence," *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 13, no. 3 (November 30, 2024): 523–50, https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.13.3.2024.523-550.
[3] Nate Edwards, "AI for Justice and Justice for AI: Why Access to Justice Enables Better AI Governance," New York University Center on International Cooperation, 2025, https://cic.nyu.edu/resources/ai-for-justice-and-justice-for-ai-why-access-to-justice-enables-better-ai-governance/.
[4] Michael G. Jacobides et al., "The Political Economy and Geopolitics of AI Regulation," *Management and Business Review* 5, no. 4 (December 4, 2025): 38–51, https://doi.org/10.1177/2694104X251404322.
[5] Fernando and Anditya, "AI on The Bench: The Future of Judicial Systems in The Age of Artificial Intelligence."

The theoretical scaffolding of this research is anchored in the dialectic between John Rawls's Transcendental Institutionalism and Amartya Sen's Realization-Focused Comparative Framework. Rawls's conceptualization of *justice as fairness* demands the absolute protection of basic liberties as an uncompromising priority; translated into the context of AI, this dictates that technological deployment must never encroach upon cognitive liberty or individual privacy. Conversely, Sen's capability approach posits that global justice must be evaluated not by procedural formalism or capital accumulation, but by the extent to which technology practically expands substantive human agency, enabling individuals to lead dignified lives.[6,7,8]

A review of contemporary legal scholarship reveals that literature at the intersection of AI and law has expanded exponentially over the past decade. Foundational studies, such as those by Mittelstadt et al. (2016), have meticulously mapped the contours of algorithmic ethics, while Wachter et al. (2017), have interrogated the limits of the "right to explanation" under the European Union's General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR).[9,10] Nevertheless, a critical normative void persists. As Jacobides et al. observe, contemporary discourse rarely bridges the ethics of AI law with inclusive paradigms of global justice tailored for developing nations like Indonesia.[11] The prevailing literature remains disproportionately tethered to US and EU regulatory architectures, frequently omitting the positive-law implications of digital imperialism and data colonialism.

The epistemological novelty of this study lies in its synthesis of universal global justice philosophies with *Pancasila*—Indonesia's foundational state ideology—to construct a localized yet globally resonant ethical framework for AI. Moving beyond conventional critiques of algorithmic bias, this article advances a "Justice-First Pluralist" framework that elevates procedural legitimacy and ecological sustainability within the global governance of intelligent systems. By triangulating a normative-juridical analysis

[6] Theofransus Litaay, "Theory of Justice's Principles For A Just and Equitable Global Order," *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities* 6, no. 1 (November 4, 2025): 567–77, https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i1.2548.
[7] Salla Westerstrand, "Reconstructing AI Ethics Principles: Rawlsian Ethics of Artificial Intelligence," *Science and Engineering Ethics* 30, no. 5 (October 9, 2024): 46, https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-024-00507-y.
[8] Flavio Comim, P. B. Anand, and Shailaja Fennell, eds., *Social Choice, Agency, Inclusiveness and Capabilities* (Cambridge University Press, 2024), Hal, 40. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009232678.
[9] Brent Daniel Mittelstadt et al., "The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate," *Big Data & Society* 3, no. 2 (December 1, 2016), https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679.
[10] Sandra Wachter, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi, "Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation," *International Data Privacy Law* 7, no. 2 (May 2017): 76–99, https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005.
[11] Jacobides et al., "The Political Economy and Geopolitics of AI Regulation."

of Indonesia's Personal Data Protection Act (UU PDP) and the Electronic Information and Transactions Act (UU ITE) with comparative international benchmarks like the EU AI Act, this research offers a strategic blueprint for cultivating domestic legal frameworks that are both rights-protective and globally competitive.

Ultimately, this research reveals a critical paradox: while AI harbors transformative potential to democratize access to justice, its deployment devoid of rigorous ethical oversight will inevitably widen the global justice gap. This systemic disparity manifests acutely in the Global South through exploitative data-labeling labor practices and the aggressive extraction of natural resources requisite for AI hardware infrastructures. Consequently, navigating this landscape requires a decisive paradigm shift—moving away from market-driven AI proliferation toward a human-centric, rights-based model of algorithmic governance, wherein transparency and distributed accountability serve as the non-negotiable pillars of global justice in the digital epoch.

2. Research Questions

Flowing from the aforementioned doctrinal and contextual baseline, the core legal inquiries animating this research are twofold:

1. How does the systemic integration of artificial intelligence into global adjudicatory architectures disrupt the established precepts of both procedural due process and substantive equity, particularly when confronted with the intractable challenges of algorithmic opacity (the "black box" phenomenon) and systemic bias?
2. How must international regulatory frameworks and domestic jurisprudential paradigms—specifically within the Indonesian jurisdiction—be normatively reconstructed to ensure that the deployment of AI remains inextricably tethered to the imperatives of global justice and the foundational tenets of civilized, equitable human dignity?

3. Research Methods

This article employs a rigorous doctrinal methodology, augmented by comparative institutional analysis and normative-jurisprudential inquiry. To establish a robust empirical and theoretical baseline, the research design operationalizes a systematic literature review (SLR) interrogating a curated dataset of forty-eight peer-reviewed articles, transnational policy instruments, and statutory texts promulgated between 2015

and 2025.[12] The acquisition of this data corpus was executed through exhaustive documentary analysis and targeted digital archival retrieval, utilizing specific taxonomic parameters—namely, "AI Legal Ethics," "Global Justice," and "Digital Sovereignty."

The epistemological foundation of this inquiry is anchored in seminal scholarly treatises, prominently including *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law, Ethics and Policy of Artificial Intelligence*, alongside authoritative normative frameworks and technical reports issued by supranational entities such as the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) and the United Nations.[13] Analytically, the study applies a qualitative doctrinal synthesis. By structurally triangulating existing positive legal architectures (*lex lata*) with the theoretical paradigms of Rawlsian justice and Amartya Sen's capability approach, this methodology facilitates a critical, forward-looking synthesis regarding the trajectory and preservation of human-centric jurisprudence in the digital epoch.

B. DISCUSSION

1. The Epistemology of AI in Adjudication: Navigating the Nexus of Efficiency and Algorithmic Opacity

The structural integration of artificial intelligence into the adjudicatory apparatus represents a paradigmatic shift toward judicial modernization, ostensibly designed to mitigate docket congestion and harmonize the consistency of legal rulings. In jurisdictions such as China, the deployment of "Intelligent Court Systems" has catalyzed the virtualization of legal proceedings, leveraging cloud computing and big data analytics. This ecosystem transcends mere administrative utility; it actively facilitates personnel evaluation and heuristic case resolution.[14] However, this technological leap engenders profound epistemological consequences. The intrinsic nature of judicial logic—historically anchored in moral reasoning, equitable discretion, and contextual statutory interpretation—is increasingly supplanted by the rigid, mechanistic calculus of algorithmic probability.[15]

[12] Princes, Rasji, and Michael, "The Concept of Justice in AI-Driven Legal Decision Making."
[13] Nathalie A. Smuha, ed., *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law, Ethics and Policy of Artificial Intelligence* (Cambridge University Press, 2025), https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009367783.
[14] Fernando and Anditya, "AI on The Bench: The Future of Judicial Systems in The Age of Artificial Intelligence."
[15] Princes, Rasji, and Michael, "The Concept of Justice in AI-Driven Legal Decision Making."

A paramount doctrinal hurdle in this transition is the pervasive opacity, or the "black box" phenomenon, inherent in complex AI systems, particularly deep learning architectures. The algorithmic decision-making matrix often processes billions of interdependent variables, rendering it mathematically and cognitively impossible to distill the rationale into human-comprehensible terms without sacrificing granularity or predictive accuracy. This opacity stands in direct dialectical conflict with the bedrock principle of legal transparency and procedural due process—namely, the immutable right of the individual to comprehend the rationale underpinning adjudicatory outcomes that constrain their civil liberties. In the absence of interpretability, the scaffolding of judicial accountability invariably collapses, precipitating a systemic erosion of public trust in legal institutions.[16]

Table 1. A Typological Comparison of Adjudicatory Paradigms

Dimension of Comparison	Traditional Adjudicatory Model	AI-Driven Adjudicatory Model
Decision-Making Baseline	Judicial reasoning, equitable discretion, and moral interpretation.	Historical data pattern analysis and statistical probability.
Procedural Transparency	Judgments are accompanied by written, reasoned opinions subject to appellate review.	Algorithmic outputs frequently exhibit "black box" opacity, resisting human interpretability.
Velocity and Scalability	Constrained by the cognitive and physiological limits of human jurists.	Capable of processing hyper-scale data streams instantaneously and simultaneously.
Primary Systemic Risks	Human subjectivity, cognitive bias, and doctrinal inconsistency.	Algorithmic bias and the automated replication of systemic socio-legal disparities.

Furthermore, the specter of algorithmic bias poses an existential threat to substantive justice. Machine learning models are trained on historical datasets inherently saturated with latent societal prejudices regarding race, gender, and socioeconomic stratifications. When trained on compromised empirical foundations, AI systems inevitably automate, operationalize, and amplify these historical discriminatory vectors.[17] This normative failure is vividly illustrated by the deployment of algorithmic risk assessment instruments, such as the COMPAS system in the United States, as well as facial recognition technologies that have empirically demonstrated disproportionate error

[16] Smuha, *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law, Ethics and Policy of Artificial Intelligence*. Hal, 110.
[17] Princes, Rasji, and Michael, "The Concept of Justice in AI-Driven Legal Decision Making."

rates when analyzing individuals of color.[18] Consequently, rather than serving as a neutralizing agent of equity, AI risks being weaponized as a novel instrument of digital subjugation.

In constructing a normative ethical architecture for algorithmic governance, John Rawls's theory of justice offers an indispensable analytical compass. Analyzed through a Rawlsian lens, the proliferation of AI must strictly adhere to the lexical ordering of justice principles, wherein the absolute protection of fundamental liberties occupies the apex of the normative hierarchy. Jurisprudentially, this mandates that AI systems must never be deployed for pervasive mass surveillance that vitiates individual privacy, behavioral manipulation (nudging) that subverts cognitive autonomy, or the algorithmic amplification of disinformation that degrades the democratic deliberative process. Furthermore, under Rawls's *difference principle*, any socio-economic asymmetries precipitated by AI—such as the hyper-concentration of capital or informational power—can only be legally and ethically justified if they unequivocally maximize the welfare of the most marginalized strata of society.[19]

Nevertheless, the juridical challenges of the digital epoch transcend Westphalian borders, necessitating a more expansive paradigm of global justice. Amartya Sen critically interrogates Rawls's rigid reliance on *transcendental institutionalism*, advocating instead for a pragmatic, realization-focused approach aimed at rectifying substantive injustices through the enhancement of human capabilities.[20] Applied to the geopolitical economy of AI, global justice cannot be confined to the drafting of institutional regulatory codes; it must affirmatively guarantee that populations within the Global South possess the substantive agency to participate equitably in the digital economy and leverage these technologies for socio-economic actualization.[21] Absent equitable access to the dividends of technological innovation, the international legal order will merely institutionalize a catastrophic "digital divide," structurally bifurcating the globe into hegemonic "norm-shapers" and marginalized "norm-takers."[22]

This dynamic thrusts the phenomena of digital imperialism and data colonialism to the forefront of global justice discourse. Hegemonic technology conglomerates domiciled

[18] Westerstrand, "Reconstructing AI Ethics Principles: Rawlsian Ethics of Artificial Intelligence."
[19] Westerstrand.
[20] Theofransus Litaay, "Theory of Justice's Principles For A Just and Equitable Global Order."
[21] Comim, Anand, and Fennell, *Social Choice, Agency, Inclusiveness and Capabilities*.
[22] Jacobides et al., "The Political Economy and Geopolitics of AI Regulation."

in the Global North systematically extract raw data from populations in the Global South to train proprietary algorithms; however, the downstream economic rents and value-added derivatives are captured almost exclusively by a concentrated cadre of actors in developed jurisdictions.[23] Furthermore, the physical supply chains of AI hardware—spanning the extraction of rare-earth minerals to the extraterritorial dumping of electronic waste—disproportionately externalize severe ecological and socio-economic burdens onto developing nations. Ultimately, realizing global justice in the algorithmic era dictates a systemic redistribution of digital sovereignty, demanding equitable technology transfer protocols and the strict fortification of sovereign data rights.[24]

2. Reconstructing Algorithmic Jurisprudence through the Normative Prism of Pancasila

As one of the world's most populous digital economies, Indonesia faces an acute imperative to promulgate comprehensive artificial intelligence regulations. The extant regulatory architecture remains precariously fragmented. While Law Number 27 of 2022 on Personal Data Protection (UU PDP) establishes a baseline for informational privacy, it conspicuously omits explicit statutory mandates regarding algorithmic transparency, the auditing of automated decision-making systems, or the allocation of liability for machine-generated outcomes. Similarly, the Electronic Information and Transactions Act (UU ITE) governs "electronic agents" through a generalized lens, fundamentally failing to account for the sophisticated autonomy and opaque complexity characteristic of modern algorithmic governance. [25,26]

To remedy this doctrinal void, Indonesia must anchor its AI jurisprudence in *Pancasila*, the state's foundational ideological paradigm. The Second Precept—*Kemanusiaan yang Adil dan Beradab* (Just and Civilized Humanity)—demands that AI be conceptualized not merely as a utilitarian instrument for capital optimization, but as a socio-technical apparatus strictly bound by the imperative to uphold human dignity and

[23] Jacobides et al.
[24] Thomas Pogge, "Rawls and Global Justice," *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 18, no. 2 (June 1, 1988): 227–56, https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1988.10717175.
[25] Kimmy Baby Kirana and Wilma Silalahi, "Tantangan Regulasi Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Perlindungan Data Pribadi Di Indonesia," *Cerdika: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia* 5, no. 6 (June 24, 2025): 1807–17, https://doi.org/10.59141/cerdika.v5i6.2711.
[26] Adnasohn Aqilla Respati, "Reformulasi UU ITE Terhadap Artificial Intelligence Dibandingkan Dengan Uni Eropa Dan China AI Act Regulation," *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW* 7, no. 3 (December 14, 2024): 1737–58, https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i3.10578.

preempt digital subjugation.[27] Concurrently, the Fifth Precept—*Keadilan Sosial bagi Seluruh Rakyat Indonesia* (Social Justice for All Indonesians)—imposes a non-derogable constitutional mandate. It dictates the equitable distribution of AI's dividends across critical sectors such as education, healthcare, and public administration, while instituting robust safeguards to shield historically marginalized demographics from the systemic disparity engendered by algorithmic bias.[28]

A particularly critical lacuna in the Indonesian legal landscape is the absence of targeted statutory mechanisms to combat AI-facilitated criminality, most notably deepfakes and synthetic identity manipulation. The current penal code lacks the doctrinal specificity required to adjudicate these phenomena, thereby structurally paralyzing law enforcement and denying restorative justice to victims.[29] Furthermore, while the Ministry of Communication and Informatics issued Circular Letter Number 9 of 2023 on Artificial Intelligence Ethics—articulating laudable principles such as inclusivity and transparency—its status as non-binding soft law severely neuters its regulatory efficacy over entrenched industry actors.[30] Consequently, Indonesia requires the immediate enactment of a *lex specialis* AI statute: a binding legislative framework equipped with coercive enforcement mechanisms, mandatory algorithmic auditing, and an unambiguous accountability regime.

Beyond structural legislation, a paradigmatic shift in legal culture is essential. The integration of AI into the Indonesian adjudicatory system—currently being piloted in docket and case management architectures—must be strictly governed by the doctrines of proportionality and meaningful human control.[31] The judiciary and legal practitioners must be equipped with advanced digital literacy to ethically interrogate and interpret algorithmic outputs. The dispensation of justice is a profoundly human endeavor that cannot be abdicated to mechanistic probabilistic models; human conscience, equitable

[27] Kirana and Silalahi, "Tantangan Regulasi Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Perlindungan Data Pribadi Di Indonesia."
[28] Adia Rebi et al., *Hukum Pancasila & Globalisasi*, ed. Eddy Rifai (Bandar Lampung: Pusaka Media, 2023).
[29] Kirana and Silalahi, "Tantangan Regulasi Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Perlindungan Data Pribadi Di Indonesia."
[30] Respati, "Reformulasi UU ITE Terhadap Artificial Intelligence Dibandingkan Dengan Uni Eropa Dan China AI Act Regulation."
[31] Amiroel Syarief and Merina Pratiwi, "Legal Review of the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial System in Indonesia," *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin* 4, no. 04 (July 30, 2025): 164–72, https://doi.org/10.56127/jukim.v4i04.2074.

discretion, and societal values must unequivocally remain the ultimate arbiters of legal adjudication.

Looking outward, the trajectory of global justice in the digital epoch hinges upon the international community's capacity to bridge the prevailing "justice gap." Currently, over 1.5 billion individuals globally confront unresolved legal vulnerabilities. Here, AI presents a democratizing potential, offering scalable and economically accessible legal triage and information. Nevertheless, the unregulated proliferation of this technology threatens to recursively deepen global inequities, centralizing epistemic and economic power within a monopolistic oligarchy of Global North tech conglomerates and sovereign hegemons.[32,33]

To operationalize sustainable global justice within AI governance, this research proposes a multifaceted strategic framework:

a. Multilateralism and Institutional Inclusivity: Global AI normative frameworks must be forged through deeply inclusive multilateral forums that actively empower the Global South. This structural inclusion is imperative to preempt digital colonialism and ensure the codification of pluralistic cultural values.
b. Algorithmic Transparency and Independent Auditing: AI systems implicating fundamental human rights must be subject to stringent transparency mandates and periodic, independent algorithmic audits to proactively neutralize discriminatory bias.
c. Data Sovereignty and Equitable Digital Economies: Developing nations must aggressively fortify their data sovereignty architectures. The prevailing extractive models of the AI supply chain must be replaced by an equitable digital economy that guarantees fair compensation for data provenance and localized processing.
d. Capacity Building and Digital Literacy: Digital justice is inherently contingent upon the civic capacity to scrutinize technological architectures. Strategic investments in localized digital ethics education and technological capacity-building are non-negotiable.
e. Human Rights as the Normative Baseline: All AI regulatory regimes, domestic and international, must be inextricably anchored to international human

[32] The Hague Institute for Innovation of Law, "How Can We Leverage AI to Solve Justice Problems for All?," HiiL, 2025, https://www.hiil.org/news/how-do-we-best-leverage-ai-to-solve-justice-problems-for-all/.
[33] Edwards, "AI for Justice and Justice for AI: Why Access to Justice Enables Better AI Governance."

rights law. These protections constitute an absolute, non-derogable baseline that cannot be subordinated to the imperatives of commercial innovation or macroeconomic growth.

Finally, the escalation of autonomous technologies within the military-industrial complex warrants urgent doctrinal intervention. The pursuit of global justice necessitates a categorical prohibition of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems (LAWS) that operate devoid of meaningful human control. The delegation of life-and-death determinations to algorithms fundamentally violates the essence of moral judgment codified in international humanitarian law. Ultimately, AI safety must be conceptualized and governed as a global public good, necessitating collaborative, transnational safety protocols to shield humanity from the existential risks posed by advanced, unconstrained artificial intelligence.

C. CONCLUSION

The structural integration of artificial intelligence into contemporary legal architectures has precipitated a profound ethical and jurisprudential crisis. Within this paradigm, the relentless drive for algorithmic efficiency frequently collides with the fundamental tenets of procedural transparency and substantive justice—a normative friction exacerbated by the intractable opacity of the "black box" phenomenon and the automated replication of systemic bias. Achieving global justice in this epoch demands a radical reconstruction of technological governance into a deeply inclusive framework: one capable of actively dismantling digital imperialism and guaranteeing the equitable distribution of AI's socio-economic dividends across the Global South. Consequently, the Indonesian state must urgently codify a comprehensive, binding AI regulatory regime. By operationalizing the foundational philosophical values of *Pancasila* as its normative compass, Indonesia can ensure that technological advancement remains strictly subordinate to the imperative of just and civilized human dignity. Ultimately, the trajectory of jurisprudence in the digital era hinges upon a collective, transnational resolve to elevate ethical imperatives above algorithmic expediency. The law must proactively intervene to ensure that artificial intelligence functions as a bridge toward emancipatory justice, rather than an unassailable structural barrier that entrenches the systemic disparities afflicting humanity.

REFERENCES

Bengio, Yoshua, Max Tegmark, Stuart Russell, Dawn Song, Sören Mindermann, Lan Xue, Stephen Casper, et al. "The Singapore Consensus on Global AI Safety Research Priorities." *SuperIntelligence - Robotics - Safety & Alignment* 2, no. 5 (August 11, 2025): 1–38. https://doi.org/10.70777/si.v2i5.15503.

Comim, Flavio, P. B. Anand, and Shailaja Fennell, eds. *Social Choice, Agency, Inclusiveness and Capabilities*. Cambridge University Press, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009232678.

Edwards, Nate. "AI for Justice and Justice for AI: Why Access to Justice Enables Better AI Governance." New York University Center on International Cooperation, 2025. https://cic.nyu.edu/resources/ai-for-justice-and-justice-for-ai-why-access-to-justice-enables-better-ai-governance/.

Fernando, Zico Junius, and Ariesta Wibisono Anditya. "AI on The Bench: The Future of Judicial Systems in The Age of Artificial Intelligence." *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 13, no. 3 (November 30, 2024): 523–50. https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.13.3.2024.523-550.

Jacobides, Michael G., Annabelle Gawer, Nikolaus Lang, and David Zuluaga Martínez. "The Political Economy and Geopolitics of AI Regulation." *Management and Business Review* 5, no. 4 (December 4, 2025): 38–51. https://doi.org/10.1177/2694104X251404322.

Khotimah, Amalia Nurul, Zunnuraeni, and Ayu Riska Amalia. "Analisis Yuridis Penggunaan AI-Based Autonomous Weapon System Dalam Konflik Bersenjata Berdasarkan Hukum Humaniter Internasional." *Mataram Journal of International Law* 3, no. 1 (June 18, 2025): 60–77. https://doi.org/10.29303/majil.v3i1.7011.

Kirana, Kimmy Baby, and Wilma Silalahi. "Tantangan Regulasi Kecerdasan Buatan (AI) Dalam Perspektif Hukum Perlindungan Data Pribadi Di Indonesia." *Cerdika: Jurnal Ilmiah Indonesia* 5, no. 6 (June 24, 2025): 1807–17. https://doi.org/10.59141/cerdika.v5i6.2711.

Litschka, Michael. "AI Ethics and the Capability Approach." *Genealogy+Critique* 11, no. 1 (April 5, 2025): 1–16. https://doi.org/10.16995/gc.18499.

Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel, Patrick Allo, Mariarosaria Taddeo, Sandra Wachter, and Luciano Floridi. "The Ethics of Algorithms: Mapping the Debate." *Big Data & Society* 3, no. 2 (December 1, 2016). https://doi.org/10.1177/2053951716679679.

Narter & Partners. "Artificial Intelligence and Law: Ethical and Regulatory Framework." Narter & Partners, 2025. https://www.narterlaw.com/en/artificial-intelligence-and-law-ethical-and-regulatory-framework/.

Pogge, Thomas. "Rawls and Global Justice." *Canadian Journal of Philosophy* 18, no. 2 (June 1, 1988): 227–56. https://doi.org/10.1080/00455091.1988.10717175.

Princes, Elfindah, Rasji Rasji, and Michael. "The Concept of Justice in AI-Driven Legal Decision Making." *Bit-Tech* 8, no. 1 (August 10, 2025): 78–86. https://doi.org/10.32877/bt.v8i1.2338.

Rebi, Adia, Rissa Afni Martinouva, Erlina Gunsu Nurmansyah, Meryon Hariputra, Emilia

Susanti, Andi Metrawijaya, Andriyan Saputra, et al. *Hukum Pancasila & Globalisasi*. Edited by Eddy Rifai. Bandar Lampung: Pusaka Media, 2023.

Respati, Adnasohn Aqilla. "Reformulasi UU ITE Terhadap Artificial Intelligence Dibandingkan Dengan Uni Eropa Dan China AI Act Regulation." *JURNAL USM LAW REVIEW* 7, no. 3 (December 14, 2024): 1737–58. https://doi.org/10.26623/julr.v7i3.10578.

Smuha, Nathalie A., ed. *The Cambridge Handbook of the Law, Ethics and Policy of Artificial Intelligence*. Cambridge University Press, 2025. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009367783.

Socol de la Osa, David Uriel, and Nydia Remolina. "Artificial Intelligence at the Bench: Legal and Ethical Challenges of Informing—or Misinforming—Judicial Decision-Making through Generative AI." *Data & Policy* 6 (December 2, 2024): e59. https://doi.org/10.1017/dap.2024.53.

Syarief, Amiroel, and Merina Pratiwi. "Legal Review of the Policy on the Use of Artificial Intelligence in the Judicial System in Indonesia." *Jurnal Ilmiah Multidisiplin* 4, no. 04 (July 30, 2025): 164–72. https://doi.org/10.56127/jukim.v4i04.2074.

The Hague Institute for Innovation of Law. "How Can We Leverage AI to Solve Justice Problems for All?" HiiL, 2025. https://www.hiil.org/news/how-do-we-best-leverage-ai-to-solve-justice-problems-for-all/.

Theofransus Litaay. "Theory of Justice's Principles For A Just and Equitable Global Order." *Journal of Law, Politic and Humanities* 6, no. 1 (November 4, 2025): 567–77. https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v6i1.2548.

Wachter, Sandra, Brent Mittelstadt, and Luciano Floridi. "Why a Right to Explanation of Automated Decision-Making Does Not Exist in the General Data Protection Regulation." *International Data Privacy Law* 7, no. 2 (May 2017): 76–99. https://doi.org/10.1093/idpl/ipx005.

Westerstrand, Salla. "Reconstructing AI Ethics Principles: Rawlsian Ethics of Artificial Intelligence." *Science and Engineering Ethics* 30, no. 5 (October 9, 2024): 46. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11948-024-00507-y.