



Legal Reform of Legal Profession Amidst the Development of Artificial Intelligence in Indonesia: The Perspective of Mesu Budi's Philosophy of Law

Muh. Ali Masnun^{1*}, Dicky Eko Prasetyo², Denial Ikram³,
Puja Aqdamuyasyaro P⁴

¹ Faculty of Law, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

² Faculty of Law, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

³ Faculty of Law, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

⁴ Faculty of Law, State University of Surabaya, Indonesia

* email: alimasnun@unesa.ac.id

Article	Abstract
<p>Keywords: Artificial Intelligence; Mesu Budi; Legal Profession</p>	<p><i>The use of Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the legal profession raises significant concerns about whether the extensive application of AI could potentially replace human roles in this field. This study aims to analyze the challenges and dynamics associated with the implementation of implementing AI in the legal profession, and to compare AI regulations across Indonesia, Malaysia, and the European Union. This research is a normative legal study employing normative legal study employs conceptual, case-based, and legislative approaches. The findings affirm that AI will not replace the role of humans in the legal profession. As an officium nobile, the legal profession inherently requires moral, humanitarian, and value-based considerations that can only be performed by humanshumans can only perform. The presence of "mesu budi"—a concept reflecting comprehensive utilization of IQ, EQ, and SQ—underscores that these facets are uniquely human and cannot be substituted by AI. The comparative analysis of AI regulations between Indonesia, Malaysia, and the European Union reveals that Indonesia's regulatory framework is lagging and lacks specific provisions regarding the use of AI in the legal profession. This study recommends the establishment of dedicated regulations for AI, particularly concerning its application in legal professions and associated accountability measures.</i></p>

INTRODUCTION

The rapid and significant advancement of technology and information fundamentally impacts various aspects of human life. This sophisticated progression necessitates the evolution of the Industrial Revolution concept to Industry 4.0 and, alternatively, to Society 5.0, which fundamentally prioritizes digitalization as an integral part of human existence. (Prasetyo, 2024) The expanding reach of digitalization in society

also affects various occupational fields, particularly those requiring specialized skills and expertise, commonly referred to as professions. These professional fields demand specific education and training processes for individuals oriented towards particular professions. (Caserta, 2021)

The implications of digitalization extend to various professions, notably the legal profession. As one of the oldest professions alongside medicine, the legal profession, often termed *officium nobile*, is considered noble due to its reliance on specialized skills and a deep understanding of morality and ethical values essential for administering justice. (Putro, 2023) This highlights that the legal profession is intrinsically linked to human essence and "soul," with the pursuit of justice best achieved through human conscience.

Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into legal professions in the digital age introduces potential issues. (Shivani, 2019) While AI can enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of legal processes by addressing sophisticated and evolving criminal activities, it also presents challenges. Despite AI's high intelligence quotient (IQ), it lacks emotional and spiritual quotients (EQ and SQ), which are crucial in legal professions. The legal profession, characterized as a "complete profession," requires logical and machine-based thinking and emotional sensitivity to discern societal justice. This comprehensive use of IQ, EQ, and SQ, referred to as *mesu budi*, is mandated by Article 5(1) of Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Power (Judicial Power Law), which obliges judges and legal professionals to explore justice values prevalent in society. Thus, despite AI's assistance, the human element in legal professions remains vital for achieving justice.

The advancement of Artificial Intelligence (AI) across various countries has prompted individual nations to regulate and harness AI within legal processes. For instance, Malaysia is developing AI for traffic management and has prepared an ethical code and governance framework to ensure AI applications are targeted and protect individual human rights. (Teoh, Yen, Hong, & Yen, 2024) Malaysia's National AI Roadmap 2021-2025 aims to align AI usage with national objectives to protect its citizens and ensure fair law enforcement. In the European Union, the European Parliament enacted the AI Act in 2024 to regulate and optimally manage AI risks, enhancing AI's societal benefits. (Gallese Nobile, 2022) This study seeks to employ a comparative legal perspective to examine the regulation of AI in Indonesia relative to Malaysia and the European Union. Malaysia is chosen due to its geographical and legal similarities with Indonesia, including similar legal, cultural, and situational contexts. The European Union is selected to represent progressive approaches to AI regulation in Europe, reflecting broader trends in leveraging AI for societal benefits.

Several scholars have previously researched and analyzed the intersection between artificial intelligence (AI) and the legal profession. For instance, Noerman and Agustanti (2023) explored the legal construction of AI as a legal subject in the context of

corruption offenses.(Noerman & Agustanti, 2023) Jumantoro et al. (2024) also focused their analysis on the pros and cons of utilizing AI in law enforcement.(Raffi, Jumantoro, Rahmansyah, & Hayfa, 2024) Further research by Darmawan and Triadi (2024) examined the application of AI in the constitutional amendment process.(Darmawan & Triadi, 2024) These prior studies underscore the significance of AI in the legal profession, but they generally address only the urgency of employing AI to assist in legal tasks. They have not provided an in-depth analysis of the moral, humanitarian, and ethical dimensions, which are fundamental to the legal profession and have not yet been adequately addressed by AI. This gap in literature highlights the originality of the present research, which aims to explore the concept of "*mesu budi*" (a local philosophical term reflecting ethical considerations and virtues) as a core aspect of the legal profession that remains unaddressed by advancements in digital technology, particularly the application of AI in legal practice.

The research aims to analyze (i) the dynamics and challenges of AI in the legal profession in Indonesia, (ii) legal comparisons between Indonesia, Malaysia, and the European Union concerning AI regulation and utilization in the legal field, and (iii) the role of *mesu budi* in integrating AI within the legal profession while maintaining human moral dimensions.

METHOD

This study, which focuses on the ethical dimensions of the legal profession concerning the use of artificial intelligence (AI), constitutes doctrinal or normative legal research. The principal characteristic of doctrinal legal research is using legal principles, theories, and concepts as the primary means of analyzing legal materials to derive a prescriptive or normative solution to the legal issues presented.(Negara, 2023) The primary legal materials utilized in this research include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945), Constitutional Court Decision No. 147/PUU-VII/2009 (E-Voting Decision 2009), and Law No. 48 of 2009 on Judicial Authority (Judicial Authority Law), as well as regulations from Malaysia and the European Union on AI. Secondary legal materials include literature on artificial intelligence (AI) and the legal profession, such as books, journal articles, and other scholarly works in physical and digital formats, specifically accessed and downloaded via Google Scholar and relevant journal websites. Non-legal materials used in this study include legal dictionaries, notably Black's Law Dictionary. The research employs a conceptual, legislative, and comparative approach. Legal materials, especially digital files, are specifically accessed and downloaded via Google Scholar and relevant journal websites, then categorized and inventoried according to the needs of the legal issues discussed. The analysis of legal materials is conducted qualitatively and prescriptively, involving the examination of existing legal doctrines, principles, concepts, and theories

to formulate prescriptive solutions to the legal problems outlined in this research.(Soren, 2021)

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Dynamics and Challenges of AI in The Legal Profession In Indonesia

Artificial Intelligence (AI) represents a technological advancement that accelerates and simplifies various human endeavors. The development of AI can be traced back to the 1950s, when a group of scientists at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) initiated research to create a computer program capable of replicating human cognitive functions such as thinking, reasoning, and predicting.(Atabekov, 2023) The initial experimentation with AI involved programming it to play chess, mimicking human capabilities. AI's success in these chess-playing experiments, where it devised strategies akin to those of human players, signaled its potential to perform and enhance various human tasks.

AI's academic and practical advancement gained significant momentum in 1956 with the Dartmouth Conference organized by John McCarthy. The conference emphasized the need for a deeper understanding and study of AI's benefits and advocated for AI as an independent field of study.(Yamane, 2020) The proliferation of AI technology continued with the advent of the internet, notably when IBM's Deep Blue, developed in 1997, defeated the reigning world chess champion, Garry Kasparov.(Singh, 2024) AI's sophistication further accelerated with the onset of the Fourth Industrial Revolution and Society 5.0, periods characterized by AI's pervasive role in human activities.(Kulumbetov, 2023) AI's integration extends across sectors such as education, employment, national defense, and security, impacting various professions including engineering, medicine, accounting, and law.

The legal profession is notably advancing in using AI across different aspects of its practice. A 2017 survey by Altman Weil in the United States, involving approximately 386 law firms, revealed that 7.5% of these firms employed AI.(Kluttz & Mulligan, 2019) This integration of AI has led McKinsey Global Institute to forecast that AI could potentially handle 23% of a lawyer's tasks. In Indonesia, AI has been utilized in legal practice, exemplified by Hukumonline's launch of the Legal Intelligence Assistant (LIA), an AI-driven platform designed to provide legal information and consultations.(Fachri, 2024) Similarly, AI has been employed in electronic ticketing (e-tilang) and the prevention and enforcement of cybercrime.

Despite AI's evident benefits to the legal profession—enhancing efficiency and reducing errors, there are concerns regarding its impact. The positive effects include improved operational efficiency and more precise legal prescriptions. However, AI poses potential risks, such as replacing various legal professions. Three main points challenge the argument that AI could fully replace legal professionals: first, AI's historical and practical limits. AI's capabilities, exemplified by its success in chess and

its application in law firms like Baker Hostetler for tasks such as legal consulting and drafting, are fundamentally technical and "logically-systematic." (GH Kasap, 2021) Legal practice involves more than technical skills and logical reasoning; it includes moral and ethical considerations. For instance, mediation in family courts, particularly in divorce cases, requires human sensitivity and empathy—qualities AI lacks. Similarly, judicial functions such as awarding restitution to victims of sexual violence involve moral judgments and considerations of fairness, which are beyond AI's current capabilities. (Abbott, 2020)

Second, challenges in legal interpretation. AI struggles with legal interpretation (*rechtsfindung*) involving moral deliberations and intellectual capacities. Paul Scholten and Ronald Dworkin argue that understanding legal principles involves integrating moral reasoning, which AI cannot replicate. Scholten emphasizes the importance of legal principles in legal discovery, while Dworkin highlights the centrality of moral values in interpreting legal principles. (Badriyah, 2022) Third, professional and ethical standards. Black's Law Dictionary states that a profession requires in-depth expertise, education, and skills. The essence of a profession, including law, involves a commitment to moral values. (Bryan A. Garner, 2019) The primary goal of the legal profession is to administer justice, which involves moral and ethical dimensions that AI cannot fully address. Anthon F. Susanto supports the view that legal practice must be holistic, incorporating compassion and integrity, qualities intrinsic to human practitioners. (Susanto & Rahayu, 2021)

In summary, despite the growing use of AI, human judgment remains crucial in the legal profession due to its reliance on compassion, morality, and humanistic considerations. AI can serve as a supportive tool but cannot replace the human element essential for legal practice. Regarding the regulatory framework, while specific legal provisions or court decisions on AI in the legal profession are lacking, Constitutional Court Decision No. 147/PUU-VII/2009 (E-Voting Decision 2009) provides some guidance. Although not directly addressing AI, this decision highlights the constitutional allowance for technological advancements in legal practice, emphasizing that technology should be a supportive component, not a replacement for human involvement. (B, 2022) The decision outlines three key aspects: the functional equivalence of technology, the necessity for technology to meet legal principles, and the irreplaceable role of human judgment in legal practices. This suggests that AI should assist, rather than supplant, human legal practitioners, ensuring that essential human values and moral considerations remain central to the legal profession.

Legal Comparisons Between Indonesia, Malaysia, And the European Union Concerning AI Regulation and Utilization in the Legal Field

Artificial Intelligence (AI) regulations have been enacted across various countries in response to technological and informational advancements that have integrated AI into

societal norms. In Indonesia, AI usage is specifically governed by the Minister of Communication and Informatics Circular No. 9 of 2023 on AI Ethics (SE No. 9 on AI). These circulars faces two primary issues. First, AI regulations in Indonesia are embodied in a Circular, which is not classified as formal legislation. A Circular is binding only internally and pertains to administrative aspects within the Ministry of Communication and Informatics. This regulatory framework fails to address the legal needs of society, underscoring the necessity for formal legislative measures to regulate AI in Indonesia.(Wijaya, Dewantara, & Ruslijanto, 2022) The second issue is that SE No. 9 on AI applies solely to electronic system operators, both private and public, particularly those involved in business and economic aspects, requiring compliance with existing legislation. For example, SE No. 9 does not explicitly address the regulation of AI usage in law enforcement processes. This highlights the suboptimal nature of AI regulation in Indonesia, necessitating a formal legislative framework.

In contrast, Malaysia has also advanced in AI regulation, paralleling developments in other countries. The Malaysian government has initiated regulations covering AI applications in various societal contexts, including traffic management and policing, to establish comprehensive ethical guidelines and governance frameworks for AI.(Hossain, Miraz, & Abba Ya'u, 2024) Malaysia's unique approach includes applying these ethical and governance codes across all societal sectors, including business, education, and legal professions. This indicates a more comprehensive regulatory approach in Malaysia than Indonesia, where ethical guidelines for AI are restricted to electronic information system operators and do not extend to legal professions.

Similarly, the European Union has developed a comprehensive regulatory framework for AI through the European Union AI Act (EU AI Act). This legislation provides a general guideline for AI usage and addresses potential risks associated with AI applications across various sectors. Key provisions of the EU AI Act include prohibitions on AI applications that may infringe upon public rights, the use of Remote Biometric Identification (RBI) in law enforcement, transparency requirements in AI processes, and regular testing of AI systems before public deployment.(Butt, 2024) Comparing the AI regulatory frameworks of Indonesia, Malaysia, and the European Union reveals that Indonesia's regulations are comparatively weaker and lack specific provisions for AI in legal professions. In contrast, while still general, Malaysia has extended its ethical guidelines to all societal domains, including legal professions. The EU's approach addresses the use of RBI in law enforcement and other legal professions and serves as a potential model for Indonesia. In conclusion, the analysis suggests that Indonesia's AI regulations lag those of Malaysia and the European Union, particularly regarding comprehensive regulation within legal professions.

The Role of *Mesu Budi* in Integrating AI Within the Legal Profession While Maintaining Human Moral Dimensions

Integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) within the legal profession primarily serves as an auxiliary tool, aiding legal practitioners rather than replacing them. The essence of legal duties remains fundamentally human and cannot be supplanted by AI or other non-human entities. (Gordon & Gunkel, 2024) The proliferation of AI, intertwined with the extensive development of technology and information, does not inherently marginalize human roles within the legal profession. Law is intrinsically a human-centric endeavor aimed at achieving humane outcomes, and the legal profession is uniquely suited to be performed by humans due to the nature of law, which emphasizes humaneness. (Arif, 2020)

Satjipto Rahardjo posits that technological advancement, regardless of sophistication, cannot replace the human element in the legal profession. (Dicky Eko Prasetyo Adam Ilyas Felix Ferdin Bakker, 2021) According to Rahardjo, the legal profession is not merely a mechanical application of laws based on statutory texts but is a noble endeavor striving to concretize abstract notions of justice. Legal professionals perform this process of concretizing abstract justice through a "substantive" and "holistic" understanding of the law, considering the logical framework of legal norms and societal values, morality, and evolving legal cultures. Rahardjo emphasizes that a key characteristic of the legal profession is "*mesu budi*," a concept from Javanese philosophy and culture signifying an understanding and depth of one's own moral and intellectual essence. (Rahardjo, 2010)

"*Mesu budi*" serves as the core spirit of legal practice and enforcement, grounded in two critical aspects: personal quality and capacity, and the courage to innovate in the pursuit of justice. (Aulia, Hantoro, Sanjaya, & Ali, 2023) This courage to achieve substantive justice, even in the absence of explicit regulations, underscores the progressive nature of law enforcement, where legal professionals are expected to go "beyond the call of duty" to realize substantive justice. This characteristic aligns with Suteki's perspective, which suggests that legal professionals might engage in "non-enforcement of law" to uphold the essence of substantive justice. (Suteki, 2010)

The core dimension of the legal profession, as characterized by "*mesu budi*," involves an in-depth engagement with values and morality—an aspect that AI, regardless of its sophistication, cannot replicate or replace. Esmi Warassih further reinforces this by asserting that the essence of legal knowledge and profession is rooted in a spiritual-pluralistic attitude, which integrates intelligence quotient (IQ), emotional quotient (EQ), and spiritual quotient (SQ). The importance of EQ and SQ in the legal profession highlights that it is not solely based on logical and mechanical thinking but also on emotional and moral sensitivity, which are essential in discerning justice within a religious and culturally grounded legal system.

The significance of comprehensively employing IQ, EQ, and SQ in legal practice is reinforced by various legal provisions, such as Article 24(1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which emphasizes the primary duty of judicial bodies to

uphold law and justice. The phrase "upholding law and justice" in this context should be interpreted as an integrated effort where legal enforcement aligns with the values of justice. This interpretation resonates with the "mesu budi" concept, where legal professionals must prioritize morality, spirituality, and societal values to achieve optimal justice. Additionally, Article 5(1) of the Judicial Power Act mandates judges and legal professionals to explore societal values of justice, aligning with the principle of *ius curia novit*, which obligates judges to address legal issues even in the absence of specific regulations.

In essence, the characteristics of "*mesu budi*" in the legal profession illustrate why AI cannot fully replace human roles. While AI can assist with technical aspects of legal work, such as document analysis, predictions, and legal drafting, it cannot replace the human element essential for achieving substantive justice. The role of AI in the legal profession should be seen as a supportive tool, with the primary focus remaining on human practitioners who utilize their IQ, EQ, and SQ to ensure justice. Thus, AI's contributions in legal practice must be critically evaluated and complemented by human judgment to achieve substantive justice for society.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that integrating Artificial Intelligence (AI) into the legal profession, while common and beneficial in terms of enhancing efficiency and accelerating performance, does not replace the indispensable role of human practitioners. Despite AI's capabilities, the legal profession, as an *officium nobile*, requires moral, humanitarian, and value-based considerations that AI and other technologies cannot provide.

Globally, AI regulation is an emerging phenomenon, with Malaysia initiating the development of ethical guidelines and proposing specific legislation on AI. The European Union has established a comprehensive regulatory framework for AI, including its application within the legal profession. This comparative analysis highlights the need for Indonesia to develop specific regulations governing AI, including its use in legal practice.

The legal profession, which fundamentally relies on the principles of "*mesu budi*" and the comprehensive application of intellectual, emotional, and spiritual intelligence (IQ, EQ, and SQ), cannot be wholly replaced by AI. AI serves as a tool and auxiliary support within legal practice, but it cannot substitute the essential human element required for achieving substantive justice. The core of legal practice remains the human capacity to integrate these dimensions into one's work.

Therefore, this study recommends a deeper exploration of the "*mesu budi*" concept within the legal profession, emphasizing the comprehensive use of IQ, EQ, and SQ. Such an approach underscores that human practitioners remain central to the legal profession regardless of advancements in AI or other technologies. The

recommendation includes the necessity for specific regulations regarding AI in legal practice, affirming that AI and other technologies cannot replace the crucial role of human practitioners in ensuring the delivery of substantive justice.

REFERENCES

- Abbott, R. (2020). *The Reasonable Robot: Artificial Intelligence and the Law*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Arif, M. (2020). Violation of the Professional Code of Ethics for Judges and its Consequences for Judicial Administration. *Pancasila And Law Review*, 1(2), 127–136.
- Atabekov, A. (2023). Artificial Intelligence in Contemporary Societies: Legal Status and Definition, Implementation in Public Sector across Various Countries. *Social Sciences*, 12(3), 1–21. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci12030178>
- Aulia, M. Z., Hantoro, B. F., Sanjaya, W., & Ali, M. (2023). The Use of Progressive Law Phrase in Constitutional Court Decisions: Context, Meaning, and Implication. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 20(3), 423–450. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk3034>
- B, A. P. (2022). *Effectiveness of Criminal Law in Tackling Cybercrime: A Critical Analysis* (Vol. 5, pp. 74–79). Vol. 5, pp. 74–79. <https://doi.org/10.36348/sijlcj.2022.v05i02.005>
- Badriyah, S. M. (2022). *Sistem Penemuan Hukum dalam Masyarakat Prismatik*. Jakarta: Sinar Grafika.
- Bryan A. Garner, H. C. B. (2019). *Black's Law Dictionary* (11th ed.). Minnesota: West Publishing Co, St. Paull.
- Butt, J. S. (2024). Analytical Study of the World's First EU Artificial Intelligence (AI) Act, 2024. *International Journal of Research Publication and Reviews*, 5(3), 7343–7364.
- Caserta, S. (2021). The Legal Profession in the Digital Age. *Sydney Law Review*, 43(3), 411. <https://doi.org/10.1163/25895745-00201002>
- Darmawan, A. F., & Triadi, I. (2024). Implementasi Artificial Intelligence (AI) Dalam Proses Perubahan Konstitusi dan Implikasinya. *Jurnal Media Hukum Indonesia*, 2(2), 621–632. Retrieved from <https://ojs.daarulhuda.or.id/index.php/MHI/article/view/584/605>
- Dicky Eko Prasetyo Adam Ilyas Felix Ferdin Bakker. (2021). Membangun Moralitas dan Hukum Sebagai Integrative Mechanism di Masyarakat Dalam Perspektif Hukum Progresif. *Mimbar Keadilan*, 14(2), 128–138.
- Fachri, F. K. (2024). *Posisi Hukum dalam Pengembangan Artificial Intelligence*.
- Gallese Nobile, C. (2022). Regulating Smart Robots and Artificial Intelligence in the European Union. *Journal of Digital Technologies and Law*, 1(1), 33–61. <https://doi.org/10.21202/jdtl.2023.2>
- GH Kasap. (2021). Can Artificial Intelligence (“AI”) Replace Human Arbitrators? Technological Concerns and Legal Implications. *Journal of Dispute Resolution*, 5(2), 209–253.

- Gordon, J. S., & Gunkel, D. J. (2024). Artificial Intelligence and the future of work. *AI and Society*, 1(2), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00146-024-01960-w>
- Hossain, M. B., Miraz, M. H., & Abba Ya'u. (2024). From Legality To Responsibility: Charting the Course for Ai Regulation in Malaysia. In *IUM Law Journal* (Vol. 32). <https://doi.org/10.31436/iiumlj.v32i1.927>
- Kluttz, D. N., & Mulligan, D. K. (2019). Automated Decision Support Technologies And The Legal Profession. *Berkeley Technology Law Journal*, 34(853), 853–889.
- Kulumbetov, T. (2023). Ahow Artificial Intelligence Can Help To Reshape Legal Profession Throughout The World. *International Multidisciplinary Research in Academic Science*, 6(8), 467–473.
- Negara, T. A. S. (2023). Normative Legal Research In Indonesia: Its Origins And Approaches. *ACLJ*, 4(1), 5.
- Noerman, C. T., & Agustanti, R. D. (2023). Pertanggungjawaban Artificial Intelligence Sebagai Subjek Hukum Yang Melakukan Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan*, 18(2), 388–405. <https://doi.org/10.33059/jhsk.v18i2.8722>
- Prasetyo, D. E. (2024). Politik Hukum Omnibus Law Terkait Cybercrime di Indonesia dalam Perspektif Hukum Progresif. *Indonesian Journal Of Law Studies*, 3(1), 27–41.
- Putro, W. D. (2023). *Etika Profesi Hukum*. Jakarta: Kencana.
- Raffi, T., Jumantoro, P., Rahmansyah, N. N., & Hayfa, J. (2024). Menilik Pro Dan Kontra Pemanfaatan Dan Penetapan Status Hukum Artificial Intelligence Dalam Hukum Positif Indonesia. *Journal of Analytical Research, Statistics and Computation*, 3(1), 51–70.
- Rahardjo, S. (2010). *Penegakan Hukum Progresif*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- Shivani. (2019). Artificial Intelligence In Legal Profession. *Supremo Amicus*, 18(1), 1–7.
- Singh, M. (2024). Review on Role of Artificial Intelligence in The Life of Legal Profession. *International Journal of Legal Science and Innovation*, 6(3), 1087–1096.
- Soren, C. (2021). Legal Research Methodology: An Overview. *Journal of Emerging Technologies and Innovative Research (JETIR)*, 8(10), 1–44.
- Susanto, A. F., & Rahayu, M. I. F. (2021). Religiusitas Ilmu Hukum Indonesia: (Menyoal Ontologi Spiritualistik Sebagai Identitas Ilmu Hukum Indonesia). In *Konstruksi Hukum dalam Perspektif Spiritual Pluralistik* (pp. 37–39).
- Suteki. (2010). *Kebijakan Tidak Menegakkan Hukum (Non Enforcement of Law) Demi Pemuliaan Keadilan Substantif* (p. 3). p. 3. Semarang: Badan Penerbit Undip.
- Teoh, W., Yen, M., Hong, T. L., & Yen, Y. Y. (2024). A Proposed Framework for Assessing the Readiness of AI in Small and Medium Enterprises (SMEs) in Malaysia. *Ecobumanism*, 3(5), 254–260.
- Wijaya, B. P. A., Dewantara, R., & Ruslijanto, P. A. (2022). Legal Aspects of Artificial Intelligence based on Legislation Regulations in Indonesia. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*, 9(10), 372–380.
- Yamane, N. (2020). Artificial Intelligence in the Legal Field and the Indispensable

Human Element Legal Ethics Demands. *The Georgetown Journal of Legal Ethics*, 33(877), 877–890.