

FAIR LAW ENFORCEMENT IS THE KEY TO ACHIEVING SOCIAL JUSTICE IN INDONESIA

Syalometa

Universitas Negeri Semarang

dejoysyalometa452@students.unnes.ac.id

Article Info

Article history:

Received Apr 18th, 2026

Revised Jul 10th, 2026

Accepted Aug 22th, 2026

Keyword:

Law enforcement;

Pancasila;

Reform.

ABSTRACT

Fair and equitable law enforcement is the most effective way to achieve social justice for all Indonesians, in accordance with the fifth principle of Pancasila and the principle of equality enshrined in the 1945 Constitution. Unfortunately, the reality on the ground reveals serious misconduct by law enforcement officials, such as the rampant bribery in courts that harms ordinary citizens or the controversy surrounding the Omnibus Law, which sparked protests because the law feels unfair. For example, influential individuals can get away with traffic violations without consequences, while ordinary citizens are burdened with hefty fines. The negative impacts are highly damaging, as poverty rates surge, public compliance with the law plummets, national sovereignty weakens, and citizens' rights are frequently violated. A simple yet powerful reform solution involves strengthening the KPK as an independent anti-corruption agency and integrating blockchain technology into digital applications to monitor illegal transactions in real-time. Civics education can also equip students to serve as critical community watchdogs, and legislative amendments are needed to eradicate nepotism at its roots. This legal reform is not only the duty of state institutions but also the responsibility of all citizens, including the younger generation who are educated through Civic Education (PKN). With the full support and active involvement of the public, Indonesia can move toward becoming a more just, democratic, and prosperous nation, so that Pancasila is not merely a symbol but a tangible guiding principle in every policy and practice of law enforcement across the country. In essence, fair laws will elevate Indonesia to the ranks of developed and prosperous nations, so every citizen must actively strive for this to ensure the continuity of Pancasila as the nation's ideology.



© 2026 The Authors. Published by Edukarya. This is an open access article under the CC BY license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Social justice is one of the noble ideals of the Indonesian nation, explicitly enshrined in the fifth principle of Pancasila: "Social Justice for All Indonesian People." This mandate is not merely a slogan, but a constitutional responsibility that must be realized in every aspect of national and state life. However, achieving social justice is no simple matter. It requires a solid foundation, and the most fundamental foundation of a just society is the firm, consistent, and fair enforcement of the law for all parties without exception. The law is, in essence, the state's instrument to protect citizens' rights, ensure legal certainty, and create social order. However, a good law on paper will mean nothing if its enforcement is uneven.

On-the-ground realities underscore these concerns. Throughout 2024, law enforcement in Indonesia has been increasingly co-opted by political interests, with the handling of numerous cases appearing to be selective: those with close ties to those in power tend to receive preferential treatment, while their opponents are targeted for criminalization. This situation is exacerbated by the fact that corruption has not only infected the executive and legislative branches but has also permeated the very institution that should serve as the last bastion of justice: the judiciary itself. When the institution tasked with upholding justice loses its integrity, public trust erodes further.

This inequality is felt most acutely by the most vulnerable segments of society. Corruption cases involving high-ranking officials often drag on, resulting in lenient sentences or even pardons,

while ordinary people who steal out of necessity can face severe punishment immediately. This phenomenon is what legal experts refer to as “the law is sharp against the lowly, but blunt against the powerful.” Law professor Bivitri Susanti vividly illustrates this structural inequality, noting that a member of the House of Representatives facing the police need only show their official badge to receive preferential treatment, whereas a street vendor or a bajaj driver has no such privilege.

Amid these challenges, the commitment to improving the situation continues to be voiced. President Prabowo Subianto emphasized that law enforcement must be fair, uphold integrity, and be guided by conscience, and must not be selective a message directed directly at all law enforcement officials, from prosecutors and police officers to judges. Bareskrim Polri This statement serves as the state’s official acknowledgment that the issue of injustice in law enforcement is real and urgently needs to be resolved. Reform of law enforcement institutions is necessary to strengthen the independence of officials from political interference, making legal processes more transparent, and prioritizing the eradication of corruption and the enhancement of officials’ professionalism.

Based on the above discussion, this article aims to emphasize that fair law enforcement is the key to achieving social justice in Indonesia. The fifth principle of Pancasila, “Social Justice for All Indonesian People,” unequivocally rejects inequality in any form, including in the legal treatment of all citizens regardless of social status or wealth. Without a genuine commitment to the rule of law grounded in the values of Pancasila and the spirit of reform, all the ideals of social justice enshrined in the constitution will remain nothing more than a distant dream for the people.

RESEARCH METHODS

A. Type of Research

This study employs a normative legal research approach (doctrinal legal research) that examines law as a system of norms, principles, doctrines, and values embedded in legislation, court decisions, and legal literature. Normative legal research is fundamentally a desk-based study, focusing on the analysis of legal materials rather than empirical data collected in the field. This approach is considered most appropriate given that the central issue under investigation is conceptual and philosophical in nature, specifically examining the structural relationship between the enforcement of just law and the realization of social justice in Indonesia, as grounded in the values of Pancasila and the spirit of the Reform Era.

The normative approach is further justified by the fact that the issues identified in this study such as the inequality in law enforcement between those in power and marginalized groups, the gap between *das sollen* (law as it ought to be) and *das sein* (law as it actually is in practice), as well as the inadequacy of the existing legal framework in realizing substantive justice are fundamentally normative issues that require normative analysis. Rather than attempting to describe social behavior, this study seeks to evaluate the coherence, consistency, and moral legitimacy of Indonesia’s law enforcement system against ideal legal standards derived from Pancasila, constitutional provisions, and established theories of justice.

B. Research Approaches

To conduct a comprehensive and multidimensional normative analysis, this study employs a combined methodological approach that integrates three distinct yet complementary legal research methodologies:

1. Statutory Approach

The statutory approach is used to examine and interpret the positive legal norms currently in force in Indonesia. This includes a systematic review of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI 1945), particularly the provisions relating to the supremacy of law (Article 1, paragraph 3), human rights (Chapter XA), and judicial power (Chapter IX). Additionally, this approach encompasses laws governing the judicial system, prosecution, police functions, and the framework for combating corruption. By examining these legal instruments, this study identifies normative gaps, inconsistencies, and areas where the existing legal architecture fails to reflect the substantive justice mandated by Pancasila. Thus, the legislative approach provides a foundational legal framework that serves as the basis for subsequent layers of analysis.

2. Conceptual Approach

The conceptual approach is used to explore and synthesize theoretical frameworks and doctrinal ideas drawn from leading legal scholars and philosophers. This study critically examines several key theoretical constructs:

- Soerjono Soekanto's Theory of the Legal System, which identifies three core components of effective law enforcement: legal substance, legal structure, and legal culture. This framework is used to diagnose structural failures within Indonesia's law enforcement apparatus.
- Lawrence M. Friedman's Legal System Framework, which also emphasizes the interdependence of legal substance, structure, and culture as determinants of the effectiveness of law in society. Friedman's concept of legal culture is particularly relevant in explaining how public attitudes and institutional behavior shape unequal application of the law.
- Satjipto Rahardjo's Theory of Progressive Law argues that the law must serve humanity and justice, not bureaucratic rigidity. Progressive law calls on judges, legal practitioners, and institutions to go beyond the literal limits of formal rules when justice demands it. This theory provides a normative ideal that serves as a benchmark for evaluating current law enforcement practices in Indonesia.
- John Rawls' Theory of Justice as Fairness, particularly the principles of the veil of ignorance, equal basic liberties, and the difference principle which states that social and economic inequalities are only justifiable if they benefit the least advantaged members of society. Rawls' framework offers a universal moral benchmark for evaluating whether Indonesia's law enforcement system produces outcomes that are truly fair and equitable.

This conceptual approach enables this study to move beyond descriptive analysis and shift toward a critical normative evaluation of the extent to which law enforcement in Indonesia aligns with these theoretical ideals.

3. Historical Approach

The historical approach is used to trace the course of legal reform in Indonesia from the beginning of the Reform Era in 1998 to the present. This includes an examination of constitutional amendments (1999-2002), the establishment of independent judicial and anti-corruption institutions such as the Constitutional Court, the Judicial Commission, and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), as well as the legislative and institutional reforms that followed. Understanding this historical evolution is crucial for placing the current state of law enforcement in the proper context, identifying recurring patterns of reform and regression, and understanding the political and structural obstacles that continue to hinder the achievement of social justice. This historical approach situates the normative analysis of this study within a dynamic and evolving legal landscape, rather than merely a static snapshot.

C. Sources of Legal Material

In accordance with the methodology of normative legal research, this study utilizes three hierarchically organized categories of legal materials:

1. **Primary Legal Materials (Bahan Hukum Primer)**
Primary legal materials are authoritative and binding sources of law that constitute the main substance of normative legal analysis. For the purposes of this study, primary legal materials include:
 - The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, particularly the Preamble, Article 1 paragraph (3) concerning the rule of law, Article 27 regarding equality before the law, Article 28D regarding the right to obtain equal recognition under the law, and provisions concerning judicial power;
 - Pancasila as the philosophical foundation (Grundnorm) of the state and the Indonesian legal system, with special attention to the Fifth Principle (Fifth Sila): Social Justice for All Indonesians; Laws governing the judiciary, the attorney general, the national police,

anti-corruption measures, and other law enforcement mechanisms; Government regulations, presidential regulations, and other subordinate regulations relevant to the administration of justice.

D. Techniques for Collecting and Analyzing Legal Materials

1. Collection Technique

The collection of legal materials is carried out through systematic literature research, covering both conventional and digital sources. Conventional sources include physical books, monographs, and academic journals available in university libraries. Digital sources include online academic databases such as Google Scholar, JSTOR, HeinOnline, and institutional repositories of universities in Indonesia (for example, the UGM Repository, UI Repository), as well as authorized legal information platforms such as Hukumonline and official websites of government and judicial institutions. All sources selected to be included in this research meet established academic reliability criteria, relevance to the research problem, and are up-to-date in terms of publication. Priority is given to sources published within the last ten years, with exceptions for fundamental theoretical works that have enduring scientific significance, such as the works of John Rawls and Satjipto Rahardjo.

2. Analytical Technique Analysis of legal materials is carried out using a prescriptive-analytical qualitative method. This method is characterized by two interrelated dimensions: Descriptive-analytical, namely a systematic study that explains and maps the existing normative landscape within the Indonesian law enforcement system, including relevant constitutional provisions, the legislative framework, institutional arrangements, and theoretical doctrines; Prescriptive-normative, namely a study that not only describes but also critically evaluates the extent to which the existing system aligns with normative ideas derived from Pancasila, constitutional principles, and the theoretical framework of progressive law and Rawlsian justice and, importantly, formulates concrete normative recommendations on how law enforcement in Indonesia should be reformed to achieve real social justice for all layers of society.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. The Relationship Between Fair Law Enforcement and the Realization of Social Justice in Indonesia

1. The Conceptual Link Between Law Enforcement and Social Justice

Law enforcement and social justice are two sides of the same coin that cannot be separated because they exist in a deep interdependent relationship and reinforce each other. Social justice will never truly be achieved if the law exists only on paper but is paralyzed in practice, empty due to institutional dysfunction, selective application, or the corrupting influence of power and privilege. Conversely, law enforcement that is not grounded in social justice will degrade into mere procedural routine a bureaucratic activity devoid of moral purpose, human sensitivity, and transformative spirit. When law enforcement loses its foundation in justice, it becomes a tool of domination rather than liberation, serving the interests of a few at the expense of many.

This conceptual relationship has been clearly explained by Satjipto Rahardjo, who argued that law is essentially 'for humans, not humans for the law.' In his progressive legal theory, Rahardjo emphasized that the main goal of any legal system is to serve humanity and produce outcomes that are truly just, humane, and beneficial for society as a whole. A law enforcement system that mechanically applies rules without considering the human consequences, or that allows procedural technicalities to override substantial justice, essentially betrays the primary purpose of the existence of law itself.

The relationship between law enforcement and social justice can be better understood through the lens of John Rawls's theory of justice as fairness. Rawls argued that a just society is one organized around two fundamental principles: first, that everyone has an inviolable right to the broadest and most equal system of basic liberties compatible with a similar system for all; and second, that social and economic inequalities must be arranged in such a way as to benefit the least advantaged members of society the difference principle. Applied to law enforcement, Rawls's framework requires that the legal system not merely treat formally identical cases identically, but actively compensate structural disadvantages that prevent the poor, marginalized, and powerless from enjoying equal access to justice.

2.The Foundation of Pancasila: Justice as a Constitutional Imperative

For the Indonesian people, the issue of justice is not merely a philosophical abstraction but a constitutional imperative rooted in the core of the nation's basic ideology. Aspirations for justice are directly regulated in the Second and Fifth Principles of Pancasila, each providing a different but complementary dimension for the national understanding of justice. The Second Principle Just and Civilized Humanity establishes justice as an attribute inherent in humanity itself. This principle requires respect for the dignity and rights of every person, prohibits arbitrary and discriminatory treatment, and recognizes that every citizen, regardless of social status, economic condition, ethnicity, or political affiliation, has the right to receive equal treatment under the law.

Fifth Principle Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia elevates justice from the interpersonal level to the structural and societal level. The word "just" in this principle carries a concrete and demanding meaning: it signifies justice towards fellow humans, based on and inspired by divine and humanitarian values, as explained by the previous principles of Pancasila. This means that social justice in Indonesia is not merely a secular utilitarian concept, but is imbued with moral and spiritual significance, requiring state institutions to actively work to eliminate structural inequalities and ensure that the outcomes of national life including equal protection and enforcement of the law are accessible to all citizens without discrimination.

The aspiration to achieve social justice for all Indonesian people is therefore not merely a programmatic goal, but an enduring moral obligation that must continuously be fought for and realized through every aspect of national governance, including and especially through the legal enforcement system. The implementation of Pancasila values, particularly the Fifth Principle, is the key to achieving this goal. This means that as long as law enforcement remains discriminatory and unjust as the phrase embedded in Indonesian legal discourse goes, sharp downward, blunt upward social justice as mandated by Pancasila will continue to be merely a utopian aspiration, a noble text written in the nation's founding documents but betrayed every day by the reality of legal practice.

The constitutional shallowness of social justice in Pancasila also implies that legal enforcement reform in Indonesia is not merely a matter of policy preference or administrative efficiency. It is a matter of constitutional fidelity and national identity. A country that claims Pancasila as its Grundnorm the highest normative foundation but allows its law enforcement institutions to systematically discriminate against the poor and protect the privileged, is in fundamental contradiction with its own constitutional commitment. This contradiction must be resolved not through rhetorical affirmation of Pancasila's values, but through structural reforms that embed these values into every layer of the legal enforcement system: its institutional architecture, procedural rules, professional culture, and accountability mechanisms.

3.Structural Dimension: Law Enforcement as a Determinant of Social Justice

Scientific research findings consistently show that the values of Pancasila, particularly the Second and Fifth Principles, play a fundamental role as the philosophical foundation of the Indonesian judicial system, and that a judicial system with a strong constitutional approach can function as an effective instrument to realize social justice in accordance with the values of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution. These findings have critical normative implications: the quality of law enforcement directly determines the extent to which social justice can be felt and experienced by all layers of Indonesian society without discrimination.

In the context of Indonesia, these three components indicate significant deficiencies that collectively weaken the realization of social justice. At the level of legal substance, many laws and regulations contain provisions that are unclear, internally inconsistent, or vulnerable to selective interpretation that harms economically and socially marginalized groups. At the level of legal structure, institutional weaknesses including inadequate resources, lack of independence from political and economic forces, corruption in law enforcement institutions, and the absence of strong accountability mechanisms result in systematic gaps in the implementation of legal norms. At the level of legal culture, ingrained attitudes of respect for authority, normalization of corruption, and the general public's distrust of formal legal institutions create an environment in which failures in law enforcement to achieve social justice are maintained and reproduced from generation to generation.

Soerjono Soekanto's analysis further complements this structural understanding by identifying specific factors that influence the effectiveness of law enforcement, including the quality of the law

itself, the quality and integrity of law enforcement officers, the availability of facilities and infrastructure, the responsiveness of society, and the prevailing social and cultural conditions. When these factors are systematically weighed against the interests of the poor and the weak as evidenced in contemporary Indonesia the result is a law enforcement system that functions as a mechanism for reproducing social inequality rather than improving it.

4. Justice Gap: Between Constitutional Promises and Social Reality

The gap between the constitutional promise of social justice and the social reality experienced by millions of Indonesians is one of the most urgent and concerning dimensions in the country's legal landscape. Indonesia officially declares itself as a state based on law a country governed by law according to Article 1, paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution. However, the practical meaning of this statement is highly debated when law enforcement is carried out in ways that consistently favor the powerful over the weak, the rich over the poor, and those with political connections over ordinary citizens. Symbolic cases, such as the prosecution of elderly women for minor offenses related to basic needs while high-profile corruption perpetrators receive very light treatment, have become strong symbols in Indonesian public discourse of what critics call the social inequality.

Addressing this justice gap requires more than merely gradual adjustments to legal procedures or existing institutional arrangements. It demands a fundamental shift in the philosophy of law enforcement in Indonesia a shift from a formalistic, rule-bound concept of law that prioritizes procedural accuracy over substantive justice, to a progressive concept of law centered on humans and placing the realization of social justice for all citizens, especially the most vulnerable, at the core of its goals and practices. This shift, grounded in the values of Pancasila and energized by the enduring spirit of the Reform Era, shapes the normative horizon toward which this study is directed and which becomes the focus of the subsequent analysis.

B. The Values of Pancasila as the Spirit of Law Enforcement

Pancasila must not be understood merely as a formal state ideology written in constitutional documents and official declarations, but as a source of basic values that is alive and dynamic, which must permeate, inspire, and provide moral guidance in every aspect of law enforcement practice in Indonesia. In this context, Pancasila functions not only as a symbolic reference point but as an operational normative framework that actively shapes how laws are interpreted, how institutions are built, and how justice is administered in the daily life of the nation. Therefore, the relationship between Pancasila and law enforcement is not a passive symbolic support but an active normative guidance. Pancasila as the Grundnorm demands that every legal norm, institutional practice, and law enforcement decision be evaluated based on whether it genuinely serves the values of divinity, humanity, unity, deliberative democracy, and social justice contained therein.

Code (KUHP) aim to shift the paradigm from mere retribution (retributive justice) toward rehabilitation and restoration. Thus, the adoption of the concept of restorative justice in the new Criminal Code and regulations of law enforcement agencies constitutes a concrete manifestation of the spirit of deliberation, humanity, and unity in resolving criminal cases. This step demonstrates that the internalization of Pancasila values into positive law is indeed underway, although it is still far from perfect. The new Criminal Code introduces several normative innovations that have significant implications for the relationship between law enforcement and social justice. Among the most notable is the official recognition of living law (living law) as a source of criminal norms alongside statutory provisions, reflecting a progressive acknowledgment that justice in Indonesia cannot be fully achieved through a purely positivist legal framework that disregards the diverse customary legal traditions of many communities across the archipelago. The Code also introduces a more gradual and human-centered approach to criminal sanctions, expanding the range of non-custodial alternatives to punishment, and emphasizing rehabilitation and social reintegration alongside penalties a development in line with Satjipto Rahardjo's vision of progressive law and the constitutional mandate to protect human dignity.

The future development of the rule of law in Indonesia must be more substantive in nature, namely ensuring the realization of a state based on the rule of law and the protection of human rights, guaranteeing a democratic political system, accelerating the realization of social justice for all Indonesians, and ensuring the establishment of a proper government. This underscores that Pancasila is not merely an abstract philosophical foundation, but a concrete roadmap for national legal development.

C. Structural Obstacles to Fair Law Enforcement

Although a normative framework for law enforcement exists in Indonesia, various structural obstacles remain a formidable barrier to the realization of true justice. These obstacles can be grouped into three main dimensions, namely:

1. Corruption Within Legal Institutions

Corruption is the most dangerous enemy of fair law enforcement in society. Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Behavior Index (IPAK) for 2024, as recorded by the Central Statistics Agency, dropped to 3.85 on a scale of 5 lower than in 2023. This indicates a decline in anti-corruption practices and awareness among the public, while Indonesia's Corruption Perceptions Index in 2024 reached only a score of 37 out of 100, placing Indonesia at 99th out of 180 countries. These figures reflect just how seriously the issue of corruption continues to undermine Indonesia's legal system.

This is a major cause for concern that corruption might actually take root within the very institutions tasked with eradicating it. Corruption within the judiciary itself poses a serious obstacle, as it leads to bribery and collusion within the legal system, which can influence the outcomes of investigations, prosecutions, and court rulings. Law enforcement officials, who are supposed to take firm action against corruption, are instead involved in corrupt practices and undermine the credibility of the system, making this a serious threat.

The impact of corruption within the legal system does not stop at institutional damage alone. It also spreads a much deeper social wound because many cases appear to be politicized, where the law is not applied objectively and fairly but is influenced by political and economic power. Cases of petty theft involving the poor often result in harsh sentences, while corruption cases worth billions of rupiah can drag on indefinitely without legal certainty. This fosters the perception that the law favors those with power and money, as there is ample evidence to support this. Corruption also severely erodes trust between the government and citizens, whereas strict enforcement of the law would ensure that justice is upheld and strengthen public confidence in the government's transparency.

In other words, every act of corruption committed by law enforcement officials does not merely harm a single victim but undermines the public's trust in the state and the ideals of social justice enshrined in Pancasila. Public trust can certainly be restored when social justice is truly realized for everyone, without discrimination against any citizen. However, everyone must be treated equally and receive fair punishment because we are all equal before the law.

2. Political Interference in Judicial Independence

The independence of the judiciary is an absolute prerequisite for the upholding of fair justice. However, in reality, in 2024 the KPK conducted only two sting operations (OTT), the lowest number since the agency's establishment, sparking criticism regarding the KPK's effectiveness in combating corruption in Indonesia. Not only that, but criticism has also emerged regarding efforts to weaken anti-corruption institutions and cases involving political interests, which often create the perception that law enforcement is not entirely free from interference.

Political interference in law enforcement does not stop there. Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW) highlights that interference in court rulings constitutes a form of undermining the judiciary and a disregard for the principle of separation of powers, which ultimately seriously undermines judicial independence. When the executive branch interferes in the judicial process, public trust in the legal system is further eroded.

3. Weak Coordination Among Law Enforcement Agencies

One of the main obstacles to law enforcement in Indonesia is the weak coordination among law enforcement agencies such as the KPK, the Police, and the Attorney General's Office. This lack of effective coordination often leads to overlapping jurisdictions, inter-agency rivalry, and inefficiency in case handling, resulting in slow and suboptimal legal proceedings. This situation is exacerbated by a shortage of competent and ethical personnel within law enforcement agencies, making the problem worse by the day.

D. Legal Reform as the Path to Social Justice

Recognizing the various obstacles that exist, comprehensive legal reform has become a non-negotiable necessity. Transforming the national legal system is an urgent necessity to address the various structural problems that hinder the achievement of justice and legal certainty. There are at least four strategic areas that must be prioritized: the judiciary and law enforcement, agrarian affairs and natural resources, the prevention and eradication of corruption, and legislation.

In the institutional sphere, one crucial step is to strengthen the Judicial Commission's role in selecting judges and court officials, including involving the KPK and PPATK in the verification of assets and financial transactions. Additionally, enhancing the information technology system is necessary to improve case management transparency, prevent manipulation, and expedite court proceedings. Reforms must also address the cultural and public legal awareness dimensions. Thus, when reforming the judicial system to restructure these ambiguous laws, it is essential to prevent further misinterpretations. Furthermore, public legal awareness plays a significant role in realizing firm and fair law enforcement; therefore, the public must receive legal education, actively participate in oversight, and strengthen the media's role in promoting legal transparency.

These reforms must be supported by a commitment from all law enforcement agencies. All law enforcement agencies including the National Police, the Attorney General's Office, the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Supreme Court, and the courts under its jurisdiction must take responsibility and work to improve the image of law enforcement. Therefore, the leaders of all these agencies need to come together to review the situation and find appropriate solutions to ensure that breaches of integrity do not occur again and again.

E. The Urgency of Fair Law Enforcement for All Indonesian Citizens

Ultimately, fair law enforcement is not merely a technical-legal matter but concerns the dignity and fundamental rights of every citizen. In principle, the Indonesian state is guided by Pancasila as a philosophy or way of life, in which the fifth principle states "Social Justice for All Indonesian People." In reality, injustice often occurs in this country, particularly in the legal context.

Improving the effectiveness of law enforcement requires comprehensive reform through strengthened regulations, enhanced professionalism among officials, tangible political commitment, and active public participation. These four elements must operate synergistically and simultaneously. No single element can function effectively without the support of the others.

Throughout history, the law has not been oriented toward the pursuit of justice; rather, it has tended to be used as a tool to advance the interests of those in power during the colonial era and has been employed as an instrument of colonization. Not only that, but during the Soekarno era, the law was also used as a tool of revolution; during the Soeharto era, it was used as a tool of development; and from the Reformation era to the present day, the law has often been used as a tool of political power. Faculty of Law This vicious cycle must be broken so that the law can return to its true nature as a servant of justice for all the people, not a tool of power for a select few. Achieving the enforcement of just laws is not a task that can be accomplished overnight. It demands long-term commitment, consistency, and the courage to resist entrenched vested interests. Yet it is precisely here that the relevance of Pancasila and the spirit of reform lies, as the moral compass that continually reminds us that Indonesian law was not created to serve power, but to dedicate itself to social justice for all the people of Indonesia.

CONCLUSION

Based on the entire discussion presented in the introduction, literature review, methodology, and analysis, I have drawn the following conclusions:

First, fair law enforcement is the key and an absolute prerequisite for the realization of social justice in Indonesia. Social justice, as mandated by the fifth principle of Pancasila, will never become a reality as long as law enforcement remains biased, selective, and favors those in power. Laws that are strong in theory but weak in enforcement are merely meaningless symbols for the people who need real protection.

Second, Pancasila, as the philosophical foundation and ideology of the state, provides a comprehensive framework of values for the Indonesian legal system. The second principle regarding just and civilized humanity and the fifth principle regarding social justice for all the people of Indonesia unequivocally reject all forms of discrimination and inequality in the enforcement of the law. Thus, any legal policy or practice that does not adhere to the values of Pancasila is, in essence, a betrayal of the founding fathers' ideals.

Third, the reform era since 1998 has ushered in a new chapter in the overhaul of Indonesia's legal system through the establishment of various independent institutions such as the KPK and the Constitutional Court. However, after more than two decades, our legal reforms still face serious structural obstacles, including corruption that has permeated the judiciary itself, the weakening of anti-corruption agencies' independence due to political intervention, poor coordination among law enforcement agencies, and a decline in the number of corruption cases prosecuted, which reached its lowest point in the last five years in 2024.

Fourth, data and facts reveal a concerning situation. Indonesia's Corruption Perceptions Index for 2024 scored only 37 out of 100, ranking Indonesia 99th out of 180 countries, while the Anti-Corruption Behavior Index dropped to 3.85 on a scale of 5. Furthermore, throughout 2024, ICW recorded a 54 percent drop in the prosecution of corruption cases compared to the previous year, and from 2011 to 2024, 29 judges were named as suspects in corruption cases. These figures are not merely statistics; they reflect just how far Indonesia's legal system has strayed from the true ideal of justice.

Fifth, corruption within law enforcement agencies poses the most dangerous threat to the realization of social justice because it not only directly harms victims but also erodes public trust in the entire legal system and the state. When judges, prosecutors, and police officers who are supposed to be servants of justice are instead involved in corrupt practices, ordinary citizens lose the only protective shield they should have, as they no longer trust the institutions that are supposed to stand on the side of the good and the righteous.

REFERENCES

Reference from scientific journals:

- Ansori, L. (2017). Reformasi penegakan hukum perspektif hukum progresif. *Jurnal Yuridis*, 4(2), 148–163. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/282166-reformasi-penegakan-hukum-perspektif-huk-068a307f.pdf>
- Jurnal Eksekusi: Ilmu Hukum dan Administrasi Negara. (2025). Analisis efektivitas penegakan hukum terhadap korupsi di Indonesia. *Eksekusi: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Administrasi Negara*, 3(2). <https://journal-stiayappimakassar.ac.id/index.php/Eksekusi/article/download/1839/2170/7830>
- Jurnal Gara. (2023). Peran hukum dalam mewujudkan keadilan sosial di masyarakat. *Jurnal Gara*, 1, 140.
- Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik. (2025). Efektivitas sistem peradilan pidana dalam menangani kasus korupsi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum dan Kebijakan Publik*, 2(2), 1021–1023. <https://jurnal.kopusindo.com/index.php/jkhkp/article/download/717/670/2029>
- Jurnal Khatulistiwa. (2025). Vigilantisme dan ketimpangan penegakan hukum: Studi kasus penghakiman massa terhadap pelaku pencurian. *Khatulistiwa*, 5(2), 1–15. <https://researchhub.id/index.php/Khatulistiwa/article/download/5924/3352/18046>
- Saragih, G. M., dkk. (2024). Evaluasi penerapan nilai-nilai Pancasila dan penegakan hak asasi manusia dalam sistem peradilan Indonesia. *Jurnal Reformasi Hukum*, 28(3).

Reference from dictionaries/encyclopedias online :

- Asshiddiqie, J. (n.d.). *Gagasan negara hukum Indonesia*. https://pn-gunungsitoli.go.id/assets/image/files/Konsep_Negara_Hukum_Indonesia.pdf
- Binus University Character Building. (2025, April). Hukum yang tumpul di atas kertas: Realita penegakan hukum Indonesia. *Binus.ac.id*. <https://binus.ac.id/character-building/2025/04/hukum-yang-tumpul-di-atas-kertas-realita-penegakan-hukum-indonesia/>
- Fakultas Hukum UMJ. (n.d.). Internalisasi nilai-nilai Pancasila dalam pembentukan peraturan perundang-undangan. *Fh.umj.ac.id*. <https://fh.umj.ac.id/internalisasi-nilai-nilai-pancasila-dalam-pembentukan-peraturan-perundang-undangan/>
- Hidayat, D. T. (n.d.). Ketimpangan hukum dan kebijakan: Mengapa rakyat kecil selalu jadi korban? *Jakartamu.com*. <https://www.jakartamu.com/ketimpangan-hukum-dan-kebijakan-mengapa-rakyat-kecil-selalu-jadi-korban-12836>
- Hukumonline. (2025, Januari 7). 2025: Momen memperbaiki citra penegakan hukum di Indonesia. *Hukumonline.com*. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/2025--momen-memperbaiki-citra-penegakan-hukum-di-indonesia-lt677ca4c015615/>
- Hukumonline. (2025, Januari 9). Penegakan hukum tahun 2024: Potret buram berlatar suram. *Hukumonline.com*. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/penegakan-hukum-tahun-2024--potret-buram-berlatar-suram-lt678005ed8c139/>
- Hukumonline. (2024, Desember 31). Praktisi hukum ini sebut percepatan reformasi hukum harus jadi prioritas 2025. *Hukumonline.com*. <https://www.hukumonline.com/berita/a/praktisi-hukum-ini-sebut-percepatan-reformasi-hukum-harus-jadi-prioritas-2025-lt6772b7bee99f0/>

- IAINU Tuban. (2022, Juni 28). Analisis ketimpangan konsepsi keadilan dalam penerapan hukum di Indonesia berdasarkan nilai yang tercermin pada Pancasila sila ke-5. *Iainutuban.ac.id*. <https://iainutuban.ac.id/2022/06/28>
- Indonesia Corruption Watch (ICW). (2025, November 26). Dari ruang sidang ke ruang lobi: Hentikan intervensi penegakan hukum tindak pidana korupsi. *Antikorupsi.org*. <https://antikorupsi.org/id/dari-ruang-sidang-ke-ruang-lobi-hentikan-intervensi-penegakan-hukum-tindak-pidana-korupsi>
- Indonesiana.id. (n.d.). Ketimpangan keadilan bagi rakyat kecil. *Indonesiana.id*. <https://www.indonesiana.id/read/184667/ketimpangan-keadilan-bagi-rakyat-kecil>
- Jakartasatu.com. (2025, November 22). KUHAP ancam rakyat kecil? *Jakartasatu.com*. <https://jakartasatu.com/2025/11/22/kuhap-ancam-rakyat-kecil/>
- Mahasiswa Indonesia. (2025, Desember 15). Korupsi tak pernah usai: Saat sistem lebih kuat dari penegakan hukum. *Mahasiswaindonesia.id*. <https://mahasiswaindonesia.id/korupsi-tak-pernah-usai-saat-sistem-lebih-kuat-dari-penegakan-hukum/>
- Media Hukum Indonesia. (2025). Penegakan hukum dalam kerangka Pancasila. *Ojs.daarulhuda.or.id*. <https://ojs.daarulhuda.or.id/index.php/MHI/article/download/2563/2729>
- Pusiknas Bareskrim Polri. (2025, Oktober 21). Penegakan hukum di Indonesia: Presiden Prabowo bela rakyat lemah. *Pusiknas.polri.go.id*. https://pusiknas.polri.go.id/detail_artikel/penegakan_hukum_di_indonesia:_presiden_prabowo_bela_rakyat_lemah
- Suara USU. (2025, Februari 12). Krisis kepercayaan publik terhadap institusi hukum semakin dalam. *Suarausu.or.id*. <https://suarausu.or.id/krisis-kepercayaan-publik-terhadap-institusi-hukum-semakin-dalam/>
- Susanti, B. (dikutip dalam Jakartasatu.com, 2025, November 22). KUHAP ancam rakyat kecil? *Jakartasatu.com*. <https://jakartasatu.com/2025/11/22/kuhap-ancam-rakyat-kecil/>
- Universitas Andalas. (2024, April 1). Problematika penegakan hukum berkeadilan di Indonesia. *Unand.ac.id*. <https://www.unand.ac.id/berita/opini/861-opini-mahasiswa-unand>
- Universitas Gadjah Mada. (2001). *Kajian konsep keadilan dalam Pancasila sebagai dasar negara hukum Indonesia* [Tesis]. Repository UGM. <https://etd.repository.ugm.ac.id/penelitian/detail/23760>