



ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE IN INDONESIAN JUDICIAL DECISIONS: A PANCASILA-BASED NORMATIVE MODEL WITH A COMPARATIVE APPROACH

Erwin Susilo¹

Universitas Syiah Kuala, Indonesia
E mail: erwinowam@gmail.com

Received: 9 July 2025; accepted: 8 December 2025

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.13165/i.cj.2025.11.02.002>

Abstract. This paper examines the urgency of integrating artificial intelligence (AI) into the process of judicial decision-making while remaining rooted in the moral values of Pancasila as the philosophical foundation of the Indonesian nation. On one hand, AI offers transformational potential in enhancing efficiency, consistency, and legal analysis capacity; however, on the other hand, AI also poses ethical and normative challenges related to the absence of moral awareness, ethical responsibility, and the risk of algorithmic bias. Through a juridical-normative research method with statutory, conceptual, and comparative legal approaches, this article explores how AI can function as a decision support system that enhances the objectivity of judges without replacing their deliberative and moral roles. A comparative study of practices in Brazil, the United States, and the European Union shows that the use of AI in the judiciary can be transformative if guided by legal principles and social values that are deeply rooted in society. By referring to the ethical thoughts of Kant, Bentham, Mill, and MacIntyre, and based on the five principles of Pancasila, this paper offers a conceptual model for the utilization of AI in the Indonesian judicial system that upholds human dignity, social justice, and the integrity of the national legal system.

Keywords: Artificial Intelligence, Judicial Decisions, Moral Values, Pancasila, Objectivity.

Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is a technology based on computer science and data utilization designed to solve problems through algorithms that are capable of classifying, analyzing, and making predictions automatically and efficiently (Fine et al., 2023). Related to the field of justice, there is a finding that has long captured public attention, namely the phenomenon of "hungry judges," which describes the tendency of judges to impose harsher sentences as lunchtime approaches. A famous study in 2011 supported this suspicion, showing fluctuations in the severity of judges' rulings influenced by physiological and psychological conditions, particularly hunger (Chatziathanasiou, 2022). These findings reinforce the premise of legal realism theory, which emphasizes that legal decisions are not always purely the result of normative rationality, but are also influenced by non-legal factors, such as emotional conditions. In this case, AI is seen as promising as a law enforcement tool because it is free from human weaknesses such as hunger and fatigue.

However, a fundamental question arises: can AI, which lacks consciousness, intent, or free will, fully perform judicial functions? Because, in judicial practice, a judge's decision not only evaluates factual and normative aspects, but also must consider the dimension of morality, which is an inseparable part of justice (Wilson et al., 2022). In Indonesia, moral values are even emphasized as a constitutional mandate. Article 24, paragraph (1), of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (Indonesian Constitution) states that "judicial power is an independent power to administer justice in order to uphold law and justice" (Firmantoro, 2021). Furthermore, Article 5 paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 48 of 2009 concerning Judicial Power (Judicial Power Law) mandates judges to "explore, follow, and understand the legal values and sense of justice that are active in society" (Kuntadi,

¹Doctoral Candidate in Law, Universitas Syiah Kuala, Banda Aceh, Indonesia; Judge at the Pangkalan Balai District Court, South Sumatra, Indonesia. ORCID ID: 0009-0000-9990-8112.

2023). Even in Article 53, paragraph (1) of the Republic of Indonesia Law Number 1 of 2023 concerning the Criminal Code, it is stated that judges must prioritize justice when there is a conflict between legal certainty and justice. This provision is in line with the national philosophy based on Pancasila, especially the second and fifth principles, which emphasize the principles of just and civilized humanity as well as social justice for all Indonesian people (Andriawan, 2022). Therefore, every decision must include the motto "For Justice Based on the One and Only God" as a marker that morality and spirituality are the foundation of judicial practice (Yamin et al., 2022).

Various previous studies have shown that although AI has advantages in terms of speed, efficiency, and an ability to manage large amounts of data, AI has not yet been able to fully replace the role of human judges. This is due to AI's limitations in understanding the complexity of the social contexts, emotional nuances, and ethical judgments required in judicial practice (Sharma, 2023). In Brazil, the use of AI in the resolution of simple cases has proven to reduce costs and speed up the judicial process. However, the final responsibility remains with the judge because AI does not yet have the capacity to adaptively correct itself to the complexities of law and the need for human correction (Limberger et al., 2022). On the other hand, judicial system reforms such as online courts and digital case management systems have demonstrated the role of AI as a structural support for judges' work, although they still pose new challenges related to legitimacy and integrity (Sourdin, 2021). Concerns over the legitimacy of algorithm-based decisions have become an important discourse in various countries. In Europe, the question of the possibility of AI replacing judges remains an ongoing debate, especially due to the lack of a uniform definition of courts within the framework of European Union law, while technological advancements demand responsive and adaptive regulations (Bodul, 2024). In Indonesia, studies on AI in resolving polygamy cases show that AI is capable of providing analysis based on legal parameters and gender justice, but the involvement of judges in assessing expressions, motives, and the relationships of the parties remains irreplaceable (Maliki et al., 2023). In relation to a fair trial, the most proportional approach is to make AI an assistant or tool in the drafting of decisions, rather than as a replacement for judges, because the judicial process is a social process that requires human interaction (Ullenaers, 2020). This is in line with practices in the United States, where AI is used for scheduling, case classification, and supporting online dispute resolution systems, but not for fully taking over judicial tasks (Lederer, 2020).

Normatively (Article 25, paragraphs (2) to (5) of the Judicial Power Law), judges have three main functions, namely "to examine, to adjudicate, and to decide cases." The examination is conducted to gather facts and assess evidence; the trial is carried out by weighing facts and law objectively and fairly; while the verdict is the culmination of the exercise of judicial power. In this context, this research focuses on how judges can compose decisions objectively with the help of AI, while still being able to filter the moral aspects inherent in justice. This research does not aim to replace judges in the trial process, but rather to explore how AI can serve as a behind-the-scenes decision support system while still respecting moral values.

This research aims to address two problem formulations: first, how relevant is the development of AI technology in supporting judges' roles in drafting decisions; and second, how to build a model for utilizing AI in decision-making that aligns with the moral values of Pancasila. Thus, this research is expected to formulate a new paradigm regarding the use of AI in the decision-making process by judges, which incorporates the deeply rooted moral aspects in Indonesian society.

The research method used in this paper is a juridical-normative study that employs three approaches: statutory, conceptual, and comparative (Ali, 2022). The statutory approach is used to examine positive legal provisions related to judicial power and the principle of morality in law enforcement in Indonesia, as stipulated in the Indonesian Constitution and Law Number 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power, as well as several other legislative regulations. The conceptual approach is used to analyse the legal and ethical thoughts of philosophers such as Immanuel Kant, Jeremy Bentham, John Stuart Mill, and Alasdair MacIntyre that are relevant to the application of AI in the formulation of decisions with moral content. Meanwhile, a comparative legal approach is undertaken by examining the use of AI in the judicial systems of several countries, particularly Brazil, the United States, and the European Union. Brazil was

chosen because it has effectively implemented AI in simple cases without eliminating the authority of judges; the United States serves as a reference for the use of AI in risk assessment systems, scheduling, and online dispute resolution; while the European Union demonstrates a precautionary approach through regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act and ethical discourse on the legal status of AI in the judiciary. Data in this research was obtained through a literature study of regulations, scientific journals, and international policy documents, and then qualitatively analysed to ascertain the connection between technological rationality and the moral values of Pancasila within the framework of the Indonesian legal system.

1. Measuring the Relevance of Artificial Intelligence in Supporting Judges' Role in Formulating Objective Decisions

Demands for a fast, accurate, and impartial judicial system continue to increase with the complexity of cases and the dynamic development of legal norms. In that reality, the objectivity of judges becomes an increasingly difficult challenge to maintain since they not only face complex legal facts, but also a high workload and societal expectations for decisions that are both legally and morally accountable. This is where AI offers a significant contribution. AI is not only present as a new technology, but also as an instrument of rationalization that can help judges formulate decisions more objectively and consistently. The analogy given by Henry Ford perfectly describes the presence of AI: innovation is not merely about speeding up the horse, but about creating a car that entirely changes the way humans work (Chen et al., 2020).

However, comprehending AI is not a straightforward task. This is because AI attempts to mimic human intelligence, while the concept of human intelligence itself is not yet fully understood by science. Therefore, AI should be understood as a system that can behave intelligently, analyse its environment, and act autonomously to achieve specific goals (Sheikh et al., 2023).

In the context of the judiciary, the role of AI becomes important insofar as it can support judges in achieving the primary goal of the judicial process: producing rational, accountable decisions that meet the public's sense of justice (Abbass, 2021). Stuart Russell's conceptualization of AI as a rational agent further strengthens its relevance for judicial tasks. He believes that intelligence should be judged by how well it can act on the best information and circumstances (Kühl et al., 2022). Thus, the focus of AI is no longer on mimicking how judges think, but on helping judges objectively achieve the best possible outcomes. The important question isn't whether AI can replace judges, but rather to what extent AI can be integrated as a rational partner for judges in maintaining objectivity in decision-making.

Brazil's experience shows that implementing AI in the judicial system can increase objectivity without eliminating the central role of judges. In various projects, such as simple case management and repetitive claims, AI is used to classify cases, detect connections to jurisprudence, and identify potential for faster and more efficient resolution (Limberger et al., 2022). However, the final decision-making authority remains with the judge, who is obligated to re-evaluate the AI's classification, test the proportionality of legal considerations, and correct any potential analytical errors. Such evidence indicates that, although AI provides rational support for legal analysis, the principles of judicial accountability and discretion are maintained as guardians of decision legitimacy.

Meanwhile, in the United States and the European Union, the development of AI technology is driving discourse on human rights protection and the principle of fair trial. AI is widely used in the US for case scheduling, online dispute resolution, and even risk-assessment tools in bail and sentencing decisions. However, it has come under fire for possible bias and the lack of transparency in algorithms (Lederer, 2020) (Ulenaers, 2020). In the European Union, the implementation of AI is currently accompanied by a cautious approach through regulatory frameworks such as the EU AI Act, which classifies AI in the field of justice as a high-risk system that requires strict human oversight and guarantees of protection for constitutional rights (Kim et al., 2025). Both jurisdictions demonstrate that AI integration cannot eliminate the moral and deliberative role of judges, and must always remain within the framework of

human values and constitutional principles—an approach that aligns with the Pancasila-based AI utilization model in the Indonesian judiciary.

1.1. AI as a Rational Instrument to Strengthen Judicial Objectivity

Objectivity is at the heart of judicial legitimacy. An objective decision indicates that the judge ruled based on legal principles and rational reasoning, and was free from personal preferences or external pressure (Aronson et al., 2023). Until now, objectivity has been maintained through the methods of legal generalization and legal abstraction. However, in modern practice, cognitive biases, the complexity of facts, and the high volume of data can still interfere with judicial neutrality (Kirillova et al., 2020).

AI is here to strengthen that neutrality. Through machine learning, AI can identify legal patterns, map relationships between facts and norms, and suggest relevance between previous jurisprudence and the case under review (Blasch et al., 2021) (Vasconcelos et al., 2023). Natural Language Processing (NLP) allows AI to extract norms from legal documents and detect inconsistencies in arguments within trial documents. This ability helps judges assess the consistency between the legal reasoning constructed and the applicable legal foundation. The development of neuro-symbolic AI, which combines symbolic logic and the power of statistical analysis, is bringing AI capabilities increasingly closer to human legal reasoning patterns (Hamilton et al., 2022). AI like this doesn't just read text, but also understands the normative relationships and underlying principles. Thus, AI contributes to strengthening the rational legitimacy of decisions.

Nevertheless, vigilance must still be maintained. The resolution of AI-related criminal acts in various countries currently still relies on conventional criminal law instruments. This expands the scope of interpretation that judges must still exercise independently (Al Qatawneh et al., 2023). Thus, AI should not be placed as a decision-maker but as a digital assistant that supports judges while maintaining their independence as holders of judicial power.

1.2. The Limits of AI and Judicial Moral Responsibility

AI support in the judicial process can improve effectiveness, accuracy, and consistency, but AI will never replace the moral responsibility of judges. A legitimate and valid legal decision is not only measured by the accuracy of legal logic, but also by moral sensitivity toward human dignity and the community's sense of justice. AI lacks the empathy, conscience, and moral wisdom that are the spirit of every judicial decision.

The principle of "justice delayed is justice denied" put forward by William E. Gladstone (Susilo et al., 2024) emphasizes the urgency of expediting case resolution. In this context, AI significantly contributes to accelerating the process without reducing the accuracy of legal analysis. This is in line with Article 2 (4) of the Judiciary Act, which says that justice should be simple, quick, and low-cost. However, acceleration should not come at the expense of accuracy, integrity, and diligence in upholding truth and justice.

Thus, the ideal relationship between AI and judges is built upon the following principles: AI enhances objectivity, while judges maintain humanity in justice. AI improves the rationality of decisions, but moral legitimacy remains in the hands of judges as the bearers of judicial power and the guardians of the legal conscience.

In Indonesia, the judiciary uses AI in accordance with Pancasila's philosophical foundation and values, which serve as the foundation for all legal sources. Instead of taking over morality, technology should focus on enhancing human values, promoting social justice, and upholding human dignity. Therefore, it is necessary to formulate a normative model for the utilization of AI that aligns with Pancasila morality, so that the use of technological innovation in the judiciary is not only rationally effective but also morally and constitutionally legitimate. This will be the focus of discussion in the next subsection.

2. Designing an AI Utilization Model in Judicial Decision-Making Aligned with Pancasila Morality

2.1. Pancasila as the Ethical Foundation of AI in the Judiciary

Pancasila is the philosophical and moral foundation of the Indonesian nation, whose status is affirmed in the Preamble of the Indonesian Constitution and serves as the source of all national laws (Susilo, 2024). In the context of the judiciary, Article 5 (1) of the Law on Judicial Power mandates judges to explore, follow, and understand the values of justice that exist within society (Fikriawan et al., 2021). Therefore, the Indonesian judiciary cannot separate any use of AI in decision-making from Pancasila, which serves as its ethical compass and moral legitimacy foundation. AI can help with the efficiency of legal analysis, but the moral judgment that determines the upholding of justice remains in the hands of judges as ethical conscious subjects.

Therefore, before adopting an ethical framework from Western moral thought, it is important to first affirm Pancasila's position as the primary normative framework governing how AI should be used in the Indonesian judicial environment. This aligns with global concerns that the presence of AI could potentially shift the role of judges, thus threatening democracy and freedom, which rely on the independence of the judiciary.

2.2. Western Ethical Frameworks as Supporting Parameters

The deontological ethics developed by Immanuel Kant emphasizes that moral actions must be based on reason and duty, not merely on the consequences of those actions. Kant's categorical imperative principle requires that every action be tested through the principle of universality: "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" (Kant et al., 2021). Regarding the drafting of judicial decisions with the help of AI, this principle reminds us that the resulting decisions must be morally acceptable to broader society and should not merely prioritize rational and objective preferences. Furthermore, through "Idea for a Universal History with a Cosmopolitan Aim," Kant emphasizes that the history of humanity is a journey towards freedom through collective reason (Kant, 2022). Therefore, the use of AI must not separate itself from the moral and historical framework of humanity.

Jeremy Bentham viewed morality as a system of behaviour regulation based on the principle of utility: the right action is the one that maximizes happiness for as many people as possible. Moral sanctions, including sympathetic and retributive sanctions, are instruments to instil internal awareness in individuals to act according to the principle of utility, not merely due to social pressure (Prokofyev, 2023). Bentham's approach is relevant in designing AI systems oriented towards social utility by considering the intensity, duration, and impact of happiness through felicific calculus (Akomolafe, 2019). John Stuart Mill continued the principles of utilitarianism by emphasizing the importance of the quality of happiness. Higher happiness is related to moral development, social empathy, and intellectuality (Komu, 2020) (Hansson, 2022). Regarding AI-based decisions, Mill's principle demands that the system not only measure the practical impact of the decisions, but also uphold human values and the moral progress of society.

The virtue ethics of Alasdair MacIntyre focus on character formation through social practices and life narratives. Virtue cannot be separated from the context of moral society and individual history (Darr, 2020). In the application of AI, the system must consider that decisions are not only about normative right or wrong, but also about how the decision reflects the virtues, social responsibility, and narrative integrity of a judge (Bretherton, 2021).

These Western ethical thoughts can serve as an additional parameter for testing the morality of AI-based decisions. However, in the Indonesian context, all these approaches cannot stand alone; rather, they must be synergized and subordinated under Pancasila as the constitutional ideology and morality that provides identity and legitimacy to Indonesian law.

2.3. Moral Responsibility and Ontological Challenges in AI-Assisted Judging

The use of AI in drafting judicial decisions faces ontological and normative challenges, particularly concerning the concept of personhood. The idea of an "electronic person" developed in the European Parliament resolution aims to grant limited legal status to AI entities in order to impose legal responsibility for the damages they cause (BERTOLINI, 2020) (Avila Negri, 2021). However, this approach poses anthropomorphic risks and moral responsibility confusion, as AI is not an autonomous moral agent (Stancati & Gallo, 2020) (Chesterman, 2020).

The presence of AI in the drafting of court decisions does not automatically guarantee the inclusion of moral dimensions in the resulting legal constructs. It is precisely at this point that the role of the judge becomes important in ensuring that their decision encompasses aspects of morality. Although AI systems can design decisions that are structured and logical, the moral dimension that forms the foundation of justice cannot be reduced to mere algorithmic output. Legal positivism, as formulated by Jeremy Bentham, John Austin, and Hans Kelsen, views law solely as a product of state authority that is autonomous from moral values (Kawałek, 2024) (Nurkic, 2021). While this view prioritizes formal legality, it also dismisses the substantial legitimacy derived from moral values.

Sharp criticism of this view comes from Hans J. Morgenthau, who emphasizes that law stripped of moral and political dimensions is at risk of losing essential social legitimacy in a rule of law state (Chas, 2023). In the use of AI, this reinforces the argument that legal positivism is insufficient as the sole frame of reference. An approach that can bridge law and morality is needed, as developed by Ronald Dworkin through his interpretive theory. According to Dworkin, law is not merely a set of rules but an interpretive practice that demands consistency with moral principles such as justice and human dignity (Hiebaum, 2023) (Queloz, 2024). Thus, the use of AI by judges must adhere to these normative principles to avoid becoming a technocratic tool devoid of value.

Furthermore, Cathy O'Neil has warned about the threat of discriminatory algorithms, which she calls Weapons of Math Destruction, namely predictive models that deepen social inequalities and institutionalize systemic biases if used without adequate ethical oversight (Berry, 2020). In this case, the ethical responsibility lies with the judges as the users and final controllers of the system. Judges are required to synchronize the application of AI with the moral values that exist in society, and to act as a filter against potential algorithmic deviations that are not in line with justice (Coeckelbergh, 2021). Moreover, AI is not a moral entity that can be held accountable. As emphasized by Coeckelbergh, the moral responsibility for a judge's decision cannot be transferred to a machine but remains an ethical burden on humans—namely, the judge as the subject of interpretation and bearer of the meaning of the law (Coeckelbergh, 2023). Therefore, AI models developed to support the drafting of decisions must be designed within the framework of legal hermeneutics, and uphold the principles of non-discrimination and the protection of human dignity. The design of systems that disregard these values risks perpetuating structural bias and undermining justice as the core value of the judiciary (Stettinger et al., 2024). In this case, judges are not merely users of AI but moral enforcers who encompass their decisions.

2.4. A Pancasila-Driven Normative Architecture for Judicial AI Systems

The first principle, the One and Only God, asserts that all policies, including those in the realm of technology, must adhere to spiritual values and an awareness of the human transcendental dimension. Thus, the use of AI cannot be separated from the religious ethics that embody the spirit of justice in the Indonesian legal system. Justice that is mechanistic in nature, devoid of divine moral touch, risks producing verdicts that are devoid of meaning and detached from true justice. Therefore, judges as users of AI are responsible for aligning its use with the noble values of the nation that are rich in spiritual ethics and profound moral awareness. According to Notonagoro, the principle of the Almighty God occupies the highest position in the hierarchical structure of Pancasila as the fundamental norm of the state and the legal idea that serves as the basis and direction for lawmaking (Sudirta et al., 2025). Therefore, the use of AI in judicial decision-making must be based on divine values that uphold human

dignity and ensure that justice does not lose its ethical and human meaning. Such an approach ensures that technology enhances rather than diminishes the human element of judicial decision-making.

The second principle, Just and Civilized Humanity, mandates that AI must be developed and used while always upholding human dignity and worth. In the context of decision-making, the technology used by judges must humanize people, not the other way around. AI-assisted decisions must reflect anti-discrimination principles, ensure procedural justice, and provide maximum protection for vulnerable groups. Thus, the judicial system not only becomes efficient but also upholds the values of fair and civilized humanity. In line with Teguh Prasetyo's theory of Dignified Justice (Keadilan Bermartabat) (Teguh Prasetyo, 2019), human dignity constitutes the core telos of Indonesian law, meaning that AI development must be oriented toward safeguarding the inherent worth of every individual and preventing the reproduction of structural biases or injustices that could harm marginalized communities.

The third principle, Unity in Diversity, encourages that AI in the legal field be developed with consideration for social integrity and the plurality of society. This technology must not contain algorithmic bias that could potentially lead to digital exclusion, social inequality, or even national disintegration. On the contrary, AI must be designed to strengthen social cohesion, promote the spirit of diversity, and maintain harmony within Indonesia's multicultural society. In this framework, judges are required to actively review and correct the content of AI-assisted decisions to ensure that they are fully in line with the spirit of national unity and integrity. As emphasized by Kaelan, unity in Pancasila does not imply homogenization but rather a harmonious integration of differences within a shared moral identity of the nation (Adrian et al., 2025); therefore, AI must be designed inclusively to embrace every segment of Indonesian society and prevent the marginalization of minority groups, ensuring that technological advancement reinforces—not erodes—the fabric of national solidarity.

The fourth principle, Democracy Guided by the Wisdom of Deliberation/Representation, emphasizes the importance of the deliberative principle in every legal decision-making process. AI, in this case, cannot and should not replace the role of humans in considering the social, ethical, and constitutional dimensions of a case. AI only functions as a supporting instrument—especially in compiling legal facts and structuring legal analysis frameworks—however, deliberation and final judgment remain in the hands of judges as the main actors in legal deliberation who are responsible for the decisions rendered. Drawing from Satjipto Rahardjo's concept of progressive law (Neta et al., 2021), judicial decision-making is fundamentally a humanistic endeavour requiring moral wisdom and empathy beyond the mechanical application of rules; thus, algorithmic systems may enhance rational analysis but can never replace the judge's contextual judgment and ethical discernment in realizing justice for the people.

The fifth principle, Social Justice for All Indonesian People, serves as the main normative direction in the design, data training, and AI algorithms used in the judicial system. AI must contribute to the realization of distributive, procedural, and substantive justice and have a high sensitivity to the diversity of social conditions in Indonesian society. Especially in protecting marginalized and vulnerable groups, AI must not be blindly neutral towards the imbalanced social structure. If the AI system is unable to accommodate this diversity of contexts, it becomes the moral and professional duty of judges to align and correct the rulings to remain in line with the principles of comprehensive social justice. According to Notonagoro, the principle of social justice represents the *causa finalis*—the ultimate purpose—of the entire Pancasila value system (Hastangka & Ediyono, 2023); therefore, AI assistance in the judiciary must not remain passively neutral toward structural inequalities but must actively function as a corrective force that strengthens substantive justice and ensures that every citizen, particularly those who are marginalized, receives fair and equitable treatment before the law.

This normative architecture is operationalized in this study as a conceptual model for judicial AI governance, serving as both an evaluative standard and a design principle for ensuring that AI remains constitutionally and morally accountable.

Thus, the implementation of artificial intelligence in the judiciary system based on Pancasila values is not only aimed at enhancing efficiency and accuracy in decision-making, but also at reinforcing ethical

foundations, ensuring respect for human dignity, and strengthening the social legitimacy of every decision rendered. The integration of the values of Godhead, Humanity, Unity, Democracy, and Social Justice in the design and use of AI ensures that technology remains a tool that supports justice, and is not devoid of moral dimensions. Rooted in Pancasila, AI in the Indonesian judiciary can serve as a catalyst for legal transformation that aligns with the nation's cultural identity and aspirations for universal justice.

Conclusions

In facing the complexity of cases, the abundance of data or evidence, and the continuously evolving norms, the utilization of AI in drafting judicial decisions becomes increasingly relevant, not merely as a symbol of technological advancement, but as a rational instrument that supports the emergence of objective, efficient, and logically testable rulings. With its ability to process large data sets, extract norms from jurisprudence, and construct legal argumentation patterns through machine learning, natural language processing, and neuro-symbolic systems, AI can alleviate the cognitive burden on judges, filter out biases, and enhance the consistency of rulings. However, AI is not an autonomous entity with conscience, empathy, or moral responsibility—which are fundamental elements in the function of the judiciary. Therefore, within the philosophical framework, law still demands enlightened subjectivity: the wisdom of judges as bearers of ethical responsibility and guardians of the value of justice. True objectivity does not arise solely from algorithms, but rather from the synergy between artificial intelligence and human integrity, which understands that a decision is both a product of normative logic and a reflection of public morality. In this case, AI is relevant as an auxiliary tool that simplifies processes, accelerates case resolution, and enhances the accuracy of considerations, in line with the principles of simple, swift, and low-cost justice as stipulated in Article 2 paragraph (4) of the Judicial Power Law. However, the effectiveness of AI entirely depends on the judges' ability to use it wisely within the framework of Indonesian national values. Designing an AI utilization model that aligns with the morality of Pancasila requires the integration of philosophical and ethical values in every aspect of the design and operationalization of the technology. The principles of divinity, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice must be an uncompromisable normative foundation. AI should not replace human consideration, but rather function within the framework of the judge's moral responsibility as an interpreter and enforcer of justice. Although AI is capable of systematically composing legal analyses and deriving norms from precedents, it lacks the ethical capacity required in decision-making. Kant's deontological ethics teaches that every legal action must adhere to the principle of universality; Bentham and Mill's utilitarianism emphasises the importance of utility and the quality of happiness; while MacIntyre's virtue ethics highlights the integrity of character and social narrative as part of just public policy. These values must be internalized within the AI system to align with the spirit of justice, respect for human dignity, strengthening social cohesion, and protecting vulnerable groups. Thus, judges are not merely users of technology, but guardians of the nation's moral and cultural values in every decision they make. The utilization of AI rooted in Pancasila values can accelerate and simplify decision-making considerations, while also aligning with the moral values upheld by the Indonesian nation.

References:

Abbass, H. (2021). Editorial: What is Artificial Intelligence? In *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence* (Vol. 2, Issue 2). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TAI.2021.3096243>

Adrian, K., Sapriya, S., & Bestari, P. (2025). Embedding Pancasila Values: Towards Culture-Based Education. *The Eurasia Proceedings of Educational and Social Sciences*, 42, 38–54. <http://www.isres.org/>

Akomolafe, M. A. (2019). Jeremy Bentham on Equal Rights and Justice: An Overview. *Philosophia*, 24, 16–25. https://www.academia.edu/download/80313600/16-25_philosophia-24-2019_akomolafe.pdf

Al Qatawneh, I. S., Moussa, A. F., Haswa, M., Jaffal, Z., & Barafi, J. (2023). Artificial Intelligence Crimes. *Academic Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 12(1). <https://doi.org/10.36941/ajis-2023-0012>

Ali, Z. (2022). Metode Penelitian Hukum, Jakarta. In *Sinar Grafika* (Issue August).

Andriawan, W. (2022). Pancasila Perspective on the Development of Legal Philosophy: Relation of Justice and Progressive Law. *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum Dan Konstitusi*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.24090/VOLKSGEIST.V5I1.6361>

Aronson, O., Elad-Strenger, J., Kessler, T., & Feldman, Y. (2023). Does personalization of officeholders undermine the legitimacy of the office? On perceptions of objectivity in legal decision making. *Regulation and Governance*, 17(3). <https://doi.org/10.1111/rego.12495>

Avila Negri, S. M. C. (2021). Robot as Legal Person: Electronic Personhood in Robotics and Artificial Intelligence. *Frontiers in Robotics and AI*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.3389/frobt.2021.789327>

Berry, P. (2020). Troubleshooting algorithms: A book review of Weapons of Math Destruction by Cathy O'Neil. *The McMaster Journal of Communication*, 12(2). <https://doi.org/10.15173/mjc.v12i2.2450>

BERTOLINI, A. (2020). Artificial Intelligence and Civil Liability: Legal Affairs. European Parliament's. <http://www.europarl.europa.eu/supporting-analyses>

Blasch, E., Pham, T., Chong, C. Y., Koch, W., Leung, H., Braines, D., & Abdelzaher, T. (2021). Machine Learning/Artificial Intelligence for Sensor Data Fusion-Opportunities and Challenges. *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine*, 36(7). <https://doi.org/10.1109/MAES.2020.3049030>

Bodul, D. (2024). Can Artificial Intelligence (AI) replace the judge? *Harmonius Journal of Legal and Social Studies in South East Europe*, 12(1). https://doi.org/10.51204/harmonius_23101a

Bretherton, L. (2021). Political Theology, Radical Democracy, and Virtue Ethics; or Alasdair MacIntyre and the Paradoxes of a Revolutionary Consciousness. *Political Theology*, 22(7). <https://doi.org/10.1080/1462317X.2020.1867406>

Chas, C. (2023). Hans J. Morgenthau's Critique of Legal Positivism: Politics, Justice, and Ethics in International Law. *Jus Cogens*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42439-023-00076-x>

Chatziathanasiou, K. (2022). Beware the Lure of Narratives: Hungry Judges Should Not Motivate the Use of Artificial Intelligence in Law. *German Law Journal*, 23(4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/glj.2022.32>

Chen, L., Chen, P., & Lin, Z. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in Education: A Review. *IEEE Access*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2020.2988510>

Chesterman, S. (2020). Artificial intelligence and the limits of legal personality. *International and Comparative Law Quarterly*, 69(4). <https://doi.org/10.1017/S0020589320000366>

Coeckelbergh, M. (2021). How to Use Virtue Ethics for Thinking About the Moral Standing of Social Robots: A Relational Interpretation in Terms of Practices, Habits, and Performance. *International Journal of Social Robotics*, 13(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12369-020-00707-z>

Coeckelbergh, M. (2023). Narrative responsibility and artificial intelligence: How AI challenges human responsibility and sense-making. *AI and Society*, 38(6). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-021-01375-x>

Darr, R. (2020). Virtues as Qualities of Character: Alasdair MacIntyre and the Situationist Critique of Virtue Ethics. *Journal of Religious Ethics*, 48(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/jore.12297>

Fikriawan, S., Anwar, S., & Ardiansyah, M. (2021). The Paradigm of Progressive Judge's Decision and Its Contribution to Islamic Legal Reform in Indonesia. *Al-Manahij: Jurnal Kajian Hukum Islam*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.24090/mnh.v15i2.4730>

Fine, A., Le, S., & Miller, M. K. (2023). Content Analysis of Judges' Sentiments Toward Artificial Intelligence Risk Assessment Tools. *Criminology, Criminal Justice, Law and Society*, 24(2). <https://doi.org/10.54555/CCJLS.8169.84869>

Firmantoro, Z. A. (2021). Menimbang Kedudukan Majelis Kehormatan Mahkamah Konstitusi Setelah Terbitnya Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 2020. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 17(4). <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1749>

Hamilton, K., Nayak, A., Božić, B., & Longo, L. (2022). Is neuro-symbolic AI meeting its promises in natural language processing? A structured review. *Semantic Web*, 15(4). <https://doi.org/10.3233/sw-223228>

Hansson, S. O. (2022). John Stuart Mill and the Conflicts of Equality. *Journal of Ethics*, 26(3). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10892-022-09393-7>

Hastangka, H., & Ediyono, S. (2023). Pancasila Education in Indonesia: The debate on Pancasila in the post reform era between legitimization, recognition, and institutionalization during 2000-2021. *Jurnal Civics: Media Kajian Kewarganegaraan*, 20(1). <https://doi.org/10.21831/jc.v20i1.59673>

Hiebaum, C. (2023). Law as Weak Integrity. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.4441791>

Kant, I. (2022). Idea for a Universal History from a Cosmopolitan Perspective. In *Toward Perpetual Peace and Other Writings on Politics, Peace, and History*. <https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300128109-007>

Kant, I., Hegel, G. W. F., Green, T. H., Collingwood, R. G., Nishida, K., Tanabe, H., & Nishitani, K. (2021). Philosophical World Histories And Deontological Ethics. In *Big and Little Histories: Sizing Up Ethics in Historiography*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/978042939992-4>

Kawałek, A. (2024). Strengthening the Theoretical Commitments Underpinning Therapeutic Jurisprudence Research: Ontology and Epistemology. *Liverpool Law Review*, 45(1). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10991-023-09329-7>

Kim, B.-J., Jeong, S., Cho, B.-K., & Chung, J.-B. (2025). AI Governance in the Context of the EU AI Act. *IEEE Access*, 13, 144126–144142. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2025.3598023>

Kirillova, E. A., Blinkov, O. E., Zulfugarzade, T., Bocharov, A. V., & Avdalyan, A. Y. (2020). The legal status of tokens and their inheritance. *Juridicas CUC*, 16(1). <https://doi.org/10.17981/juridcuc.16.1.2020.12>

Komu, S. S. C. (2020). Pleasure versus Virtue Ethics in The Light of Aristotelians and the Utilitarianism of John Stuart Mills and Jeremy Bentham. *Al-Milal: Journal of Religion and Thought*, 2(1). <https://doi.org/10.46600/almilal.v2i1.57>

Kühl, N., Schemmer, M., Goutier, M., & Satzger, G. (2022). Artificial intelligence and machine learning. *Electronic Markets*, 32(4). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12525-022-00598-0>

Kuntadi. (2023). The Existence of Decisions of Customary Institutions in the Settlement of Criminal Cases in Indonesia. *KnE Social Sciences*. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v8i3.12838>

Lederer, F. I. (2020). Here There Be Dragons: The Likely Interaction of Judges with the Artificial Intelligence Ecosystem. *Judges' Journal*, 59(1).

Limberger, T., Da Silva Giannakos, D. B., & Szinvelski, M. M. (2022). Can judges be replaced by machines? The Brazilian case. *Mexican Law Review*, 14(2). <https://doi.org/10.22201/ijj.24485306e.2022.2.16568>

Maliki, I. A., Ali, Z. Z., & Khusaini, M. (2023). Artificial Intelligence and the Law: The Use of Artificial Intelligence as a Tool to Assist Judges in Deciding Polygamy Cases. *Nurani*, 23(2). <https://doi.org/10.19109/nurani.v23i2.20152>

Neta, Y., Budiyono, & Firmansyah, A. A. (2021). The Model of Local Regulation of the Human Rights Fulfillment Based on Progressive Law. *Jambura Law Review*, 3(Special issue). <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v3i0.7301>

Nurkic, B. (2021). Legal positivism: An obstacle in the process of strengthening the rule of law in Bosnia and Herzegovina. In *Journal of Liberty and International Affairs* (Vol. 7, Issue 1). <https://doi.org/10.47305/JLIA21170094N>

Prokofyev, A. V. (2023). Jeremy Bentham's Theory of Moral Sanctions. *RUDN Journal of Philosophy*, 27(3). <https://doi.org/10.22363/2313-2302-2023-27-3-757-773>

Queloz, M. (2024). The Dworkin–Williams debate: Liberty, conceptual integrity, and tragic conflict in politics. *Philosophy and Phenomenological Research*, 109(1). <https://doi.org/10.1111/phpr.13002>

Sharma, M. (2023). India's Courts and Artificial Intelligence: A Future Outlook. *LeXonomica*, 15(1). <https://doi.org/10.18690/lexonomica.15.1.99-120.2023>

Sheikh, H., Prins, C., & Schrijvers, E. (2023). Artificial Intelligence: Definition and Background. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-21448-6_2

Sourdin, T. (2021). Judges, Technology and Artificial Intelligence: The Artificial Judge. In *Judges, Technology and Artificial Intelligence: The Artificial Judge*. <https://doi.org/10.4337/978178897826>

Stancati, C., & Gallo, G. (2020). Could an Electronic Person Exist? Robots and Personal Responsibility. In *Studies in Applied Philosophy, Epistemology and Rational Ethics* (Vol. 52). https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-37305-4_8

Stettinger, G., Weissensteiner, P., & Khastgir, S. (2024). Trustworthiness Assurance Assessment for High-Risk AI-Based Systems. *IEEE Access*, 12. <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2024.3364387>

Sudirta, I. W., Pieris, J., Nugroho, W., & Ryantoni, H. (2025). Explore the Values of Pancasila as the Basic Philosophy of the Indonesian Nation. *Arena Hukum*, 18(1), 127–158. <https://arenahukum.ub.ac.id/index.php/arena>

Susilo, E. (2024). Integrating Spinoza's Philosophy of Civil Law into Indonesian Judicial Reasoning: Toward a Justice-Oriented Legal Framework. *Supremasi Hukum: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum*, 13(2), 173–190. <https://doi.org/10.14421/c4016524>

Susilo, E., Din, M., Suhaimi, & Mansur, T. M. (2024). Justice Delayed, Justice Denied: A Critical Examination of Repeated Suspect Status in Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Review*, 3(3), 342–357. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v10i3.6088>

Teguh Prasetyo. (2019). *Keadilan Bermartabat Perspektif Teori hukum*. Nusamedia.

Ulenaers, J. (2020). The Impact of Artificial Intelligence on the Right to a Fair Trial: Towards a Robot Judge? *Asian Journal of Law and Economics*, 11(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/ajle-2020-0008>

Vasconcelos, H., Jörke, M., Grunde-McLaughlin, M., Gerstenberg, T., Bernstein, M. S., & Krishna, R. (2023). Explanations Can Reduce Overreliance on AI Systems During Decision-Making. *Proceedings of the ACM on Human-Computer Interaction*, 7(CSCW1). <https://doi.org/10.1145/3579605>

Wilson, A., Stefanik, C., & Shank, D. B. (2022). How do people judge the immorality of artificial intelligence versus humans committing moral wrongs in real-world situations? *Computers in Human Behavior Reports*, 8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chbr.2022.100229>

Yamin, B., Supryadi, A., & Fahrurrozi, F. (2022). "Mempertanyakan" Irah-Irah Demi Keadilan Berdasarkan Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa Dalam Putusan Perkara Pidana. *Unizar Law Review*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.36679/ulr.v5i2.8>