

Social Justice as the Goal of Development Law in the 2025-2029 National Medium-Term Development Plan

Cassis Merinthia Ariapramuda¹, Irena Puspa Mega², Nur Rizkiah Hasanah³, Atiek Pratiwi Putri Naue⁴, Diani Sadiawati⁵

^{1,2,3,4,5}Universitas Pembangunan “Nasional” Veteran Jakarta, Indonesia

Article Info

Article history:

Received 2026-02-23

Revised 2026-03-10

Accepted 2026-03-20

Keywords:

Development Law

National Medium-Term

Development Plan


Public Policy

Social Justice

ABSTRACT

Social justice constitutes a fundamental principle embedded in the Fifth Precept of Pancasila and the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, positioning it as both a legal ideal and a guiding orientation for national development. This study examines the conceptual position of social justice as the objective of Indonesia's development law and evaluates the extent to which this principle is reflected in the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 20252029. Employing a normative juridical method with conceptual and statutory approaches, this research analyzes the integration of social-justice values into development policies articulated in the RPJMN. The findings reveal that, conceptually, social justice is affirmed as a central objective of Indonesia's development law, consistent with Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's Development Law Theory. The RPJMN 20252029 demonstrates partial incorporation of social-justice principles through its eight national priorities, particularly those emphasizing equitable development outcomes, the eradication of extreme poverty, and the development of distributive infrastructure. Nonetheless, key challenges remain in regulatory harmonization and evaluation mechanisms, which have not fully employed social-justice benchmarks. This study contributes to the existing scholarship by proposing the adoption of a social justice impact assessment as a mandatory component in development planning documents and advocating for strengthened inter-institutional coordination in implementing distributive justice-oriented development policies.

This is an open-access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Diani Sadiawati

Faculty of Law Universitas Pembangunan Nasional “Veteran” Jakarta

Email: dianisadiawati@upnvj.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

National development represents the manifestation of the state's responsibility to realize comprehensive collective welfare [1]. As a *Rechtsstaat* (rule of law state), Indonesia positions the law as the primary instrument for directing, controlling, and evaluating the trajectory of development. Pancasila, as the state ideology, reinforces the values of justice

and social welfare [2], in which social justice, within the Pancasila context, aims to "establish equality, balance, and prosperity for all citizens" [3]. This objective aligns with the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution, which explicitly enshrines social justice as a fundamental national aspiration. Consequently, the value of social justice, embedded in the fifth principle of Pancasila and reaffirmed in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution, should serve as the primary orientation in the formulation and implementation of developmental law [4].

Social justice is a foundational element of national development, aimed at achieving equitable welfare distribution for the entire population, free from social and economic discrimination [5]. Fundamentally, development seeks to create a decent living environment so that society may enjoy health, longevity, and a meaningful, productive life [6]. Its essence lies in the fulfillment of citizens' basic rights, particularly for vulnerable groups [7]. Concurrently, the fiscal efficiency of the central government remains a critical concern, as effective budget management is regarded as a prerequisite for achieving equitable and sustainable development.

National development planning is fundamentally rooted in the philosophical and historical foundations of the state's formation, namely, that Indonesia was established to protect the entire nation, advance general welfare, intellectualize the nation's life, and contribute to the maintenance of world order [8]. Following amendments to the 1945 Constitution, specifically the abolition of the Broad Guidelines of State Policy (GBHN) and the transition to direct presidential elections [9], a new regulatory framework for national development planning is necessary to ensure continued alignment with these constitutional objectives.

In the context of development, social justice refers to the principle that the fruits of development must be accessible to all strata of society without exception [10]. This involves the equitable distribution of wealth, opportunities, and available resources. Social justice is not confined to economic dimensions but also encompasses social, educational, health, and political liberties [11]. To mitigate regional disparities in Indonesia, the government formulated the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2025–2029 as a policy framework to translate the national vision into concrete programs. According to official documents from the State Secretariat (2025), this RPJMN outlines transformative measures in the social and economic sectors, including eight national priorities [12]. For instance, the sixth priority emphasizes rural-based economic development to achieve "economic growth, economic equity, and poverty eradication". Meanwhile, the eighth priority delineates the target of achieving a "just and prosperous society". Thus, the RPJMN 2025–2029 has essentially integrated social justice principles into its economic development targets [13].

However, in practice, development in Indonesia remains predominantly growth-oriented, resulting in the incomplete integration of equity and social justice. Social inequality, limited access to public services, and the marginalization of vulnerable groups indicate that social justice still faces significant implementation challenges [14]. Research by Rasya & Triadi further demonstrates that income disparity and gaps in access to justice remain pressing issues. Furthermore, although the RPJMN 2025–2029 serves as the "initial foundation" toward the "Golden Indonesia 2045" vision, the document has yet to explicitly position social justice as the primary benchmark for development [10]. This underscores the

increasing relevance of an inquiry into the extent to which the RPJMN prioritizes the principle of social justice.

To ensure the attainment of national development goals, synergy among all national elements is required to carry out development that aligns with constitutional ideals. The execution of development must proceed through systematic and measurable stages to ensure its direction remains within the corridors established by the people [15]. Thus, development serves as a strategic vehicle for realizing popular sovereignty, exercised in accordance with a mandate from the people. In this context, this article examines whether the principle of social justice is genuinely reflected in the RPJMN 2025–2029. This study is vital to ensuring that the future trajectory of development is structured equitably and that the law plays an active role in driving social change [16]. Based on these philosophical and constitutional underpinnings, the following sections will conceptually discuss how social justice is positioned as the objective of developmental law in Indonesia and how these principles are implemented within the RPJMN 2025–2029. Rahardjo posits that law must serve as a vehicle for realizing public policy objectives within society [17]. The function of law in development planning lies in its role as a foundation, guideline, and safeguard mechanism for the entire developmental process. Consequently, the law functions to ensure that the planning and execution of development proceed according to the established direction and remain free from deviations.

Every study should be compared with other studies that use similar analyses. This study has both differences and similarities with other studies, which serve as a basis for assessing the novelty of this study. First, the study conducted by Aris Munandar et al., which discusses constructive ideas in Indonesia's national development. As a nation characterized by its multicultural citizenry, Indonesia is often faced with issues of justice, especially in the distribution of welfare. Since its independence until now, Indonesia has continued to face various social conflicts and separatist movements involving ethnic, cultural, religious, and factional identities on an ongoing basis. These conflicts are not only triggered by differences in identity, a characteristic of the Indonesian nation as reflected in its motto “Bhineka Tunggal Ika” (Unity in Diversity). These conflicts are also triggered by social, economic, and power inequalities between identity groups [18]. The research context emphasizes collective similarities equated with their respective cultures and the nation's efforts to unite itself through its national motto.

Meanwhile, this study will focus on conceptual analysis based on the 2025-2029 National Medium-Term Development Plan and comprehensive social justice. This study will then focus its analysis on Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's theory of development law. The similarity between this study and the previous one is that they both use the same theoretical basis for analysis: the theory of social justice.

Lily Kalyana and Widodo Budidarmo wrote the second study. This study addresses land ownership rights from the perspective of Indonesian agrarian law and focuses its analysis on social justice theory. This study found that the dynamics of land ownership rights in the Indonesian agrarian legal system are very complex and contribute to the development of more equitable and sustainable land policies [19]. This research has a very significant difference from the previous study. The previous study conceptually discusses social justice

in the realm of agrarian legislation. Meanwhile, this study discusses national development in light of the 2025-2029 Medium-Term National Development Plan and relates it to the theory of social justice.

Basima Nyaz Mohsin and Ali Ayed Nasir wrote the third study referenced in this study. This study discusses economic inequality and the disproportionate impact of climate change on vulnerable groups in contemporary development. Indirectly, the study examines the relationship between social justice and sustainable development, evaluates current challenges, and reviews global experiences to propose an inclusive development model. Analysis of the study shows that social justice is the foundation of sustainable development, with Sweden, Kenya, Egypt, and the UAE demonstrating effective integration strategies. The article proposes a comprehensive framework that balances economic, social, and environmental dimensions through six strategic components: strengthening social policies, legislative reform, equitable resource distribution, recognition of diversity, monitoring mechanisms, and international cooperation [20]. This research differs from the present study mainly in terms of gap analysis and research approach. The gap analysis used in the study is a theoretical approach to three doctrines: distributive justice, procedural justice, and recognizable justice. Meanwhile, this study will use a fully normative legal approach, drawing on conceptual and legislative sources. Furthermore, the similarity between the two studies lies in the use of social justice analysis.

The research problems addressed in this study are as follows: 1) How is the concept of social justice positioned as the objective of developmental law in Indonesia, and 2) How is the principle of social justice implemented in the RPJMN 2025–2029 through the strengthening of national food security?

2. METHOD

This study employs a normative legal research method as the primary framework for examining the correlation between law and national development planning. This method serves to identify, examine, and analyze the legal norms encapsulated in the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2025–2029, particularly regarding the principle of social justice—a constitutional mandate enshrined in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. The primary emphasis of this approach is on content analysis of the normative formulation of development policies to determine whether social justice values have been substantially internalized in planning documents and to what extent they align with the trajectory of development law grounded in justice. Furthermore, this study applies conceptual and statutory approaches as complementary methods [21]. A conceptual approach is used to construct and elaborate a theoretical understanding of social justice and the objectives of developmental law, drawing on legal literature, theories of justice, and relevant legal philosophy [22]. Meanwhile, the statutory approach is conducted through an examination of the positive legal framework governing the national development planning system, including Law Number 25 of 2004 concerning the National Development Planning System and Law Number 17 of 2007 concerning the National Long-Term Development Plan, as well as their implementing regulations. The synergy between these three approaches provides a robust methodological foundation to critically assess the extent

to which the RPJMN 2025–2029 incorporates and represents the principle of social justice as an integral part of Indonesian developmental law.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Position of Social Justice as the Objective of Developmental Law

Law is a system of norms that emerges and evolves within societal life as a binding guide for behavior, limiting and directing individual actions to ensure they do not conflict with the public interest or the rights of others [23]. Social justice serves as the normative foundation for the entire trajectory of national legal development. The fifth principle of Pancasila, "Social justice for all the people of Indonesia," directs every legal policy toward ensuring equitable welfare [24]. Notonagoro asserts that social justice within Pancasila encompasses distributive, commutative, and legal justice, and that these principles must be reflected in all aspects of state governance.

The standing of social justice is reinforced in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms that the purpose of establishing a government is "to protect the entire Indonesian nation and the entire Indonesian homeland, to advance general welfare, to intellectualize the nation's life, and to participate in the implementation of a world order based on independence, eternal peace, and social justice for all the people of Indonesia" [25]. This principle is further emphasized in Article 33, paragraph (4), of the 1945 Constitution, which requires that the economy be conducted on the principles of togetherness, equitable efficiency, sustainability, and environmental consciousness, thereby positioning social justice as a constitutional mandate that must be reflected in development policies [3].

Within this framework, law maintains order, peace, and social tranquility while ensuring that every citizen receives equal legal treatment without discrimination [26]. Developmental law in Indonesia must not merely pursue economic growth; rather, it must be directed toward the equitable distribution of development outcomes (redistributive justice) as a manifestation of social justice [27]. This view aligns with Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's theory of developmental law, which positions law as a "tool of social engineering" [28]. Consequently, law is not merely normative but also a transformative instrument for realizing a just and humane social order.

To understand how these principles of justice operate within broader social dynamics, it is relevant to consider how modern legal theory expands the orientation of justice in development [29]. Satjipto Rahardjo emphasizes that law is not merely a collection of written regulations but a living law aimed at realizing substantive justice within society. This approach requires that legal development not rely solely on written rules but also consider the social context, the needs of vulnerable groups, and the dynamics of inequality that arise during the development process [30]. Thus, developmental law must be capable of addressing real societal issues rather than remaining at a purely normative level. The ultimate goal of developmental law is directed toward the realization of social peace, which comprises two aspects: *order* (reflecting the stability of external social relations) and *tranquility* (reflecting the inner peace of the individual) [31]. This perspective is strengthened by Harold J. Laski's Welfare State Theory, which asserts that the state must

not remain neutral toward social and economic disparities [32]. Under this framework, the state holds a moral and constitutional obligation to ensure the fair distribution of welfare through public policies that favor vulnerable groups.

This is consistent with Gøsta Esping-Andersen's (1990; 1999) view that welfare regimes reflect functional relationships among the state, the market, and households in guaranteeing protection against social risks [33]. Development, for Esping-Andersen, must be measured by its ability to narrow social gaps and strengthen social cohesion. In other words, social justice becomes the substantive benchmark for the success of development oriented toward collective welfare [34]. This perspective aligns with the direction of the RPJMN 2025–2029, which positions the state as the primary driver of social and economic transformation to create equitable distribution and eradicate extreme poverty, in accordance with the legal ideals (*Rechtsidee*) of Pancasila [35].

However, equitable development concerns not only socio-economic relations between humans but also the relationship between current and future generations [36]. This is where Edith Brown Weiss's theory of ecological justice becomes relevant, adding an intergenerational dimension to the concept of social justice [27]. Weiss emphasizes the importance of protecting environmental quality and access to natural resources for future generations. In the context of the RPJMN 2025–2029, this concept aligns with the green transformation agenda and sustainable development. In addition to welfare and ecological dimensions, social justice in development demands the fulfillment of basic human capabilities. This view, elaborated by Amartya Sen in *Development as Freedom*, expands the meaning of development as a process of expanding human capabilities [37]. Social justice is achieved when public policy creates substantive freedom for citizens to live with dignity. Regarding the RPJMN 2025–2029, this approach aligns with targets to improve human resource quality, promote social inclusion, and expand public participation.

From these various perspectives, it is evident that social justice in legal development cannot be confined to a single approach. By integrating the thoughts of Laski, Esping-Andersen, Weiss, and Sen into the developmental law framework formulated by Kusumaatmadja and Rahardjo, the concept of developmental law in Indonesia can be interpreted more comprehensively [38]. Law is no longer merely an instrument of social engineering; it has evolved into a tool for realizing social justice. This framework demands that every regulation contain principles of non-discrimination, empowerment of vulnerable groups, redistribution of welfare, and ecological responsibility [39]. Consequently, legal development characterized by social justice requires integrating constitutional values, modern legal theory, and public policy practice [40]. Social justice becomes the substantive measure of national development success, rather than just a formal indicator. Development that focuses solely on economic growth will produce structural inequality, whereas responsive and just legal development will create an inclusive, sustainable, and civilized society, consistent with the legal ideals of Pancasila and the mandate of the 1945 Constitution.

Implementing the Principle of Social Justice in the 2025–2029 RPJMN through the Strengthening of National Food Security

Food security holds a strategic imperative in realizing social justice, as food constitutes both a basic necessity and a constitutional right of every citizen. Article 28H, Paragraph (1) and Article 33, Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution underscore the state's obligation to guarantee welfare and manage natural resources for the maximum prosperity of the people. Consequently, food policy is inseparable from the state's mandate to deliver equitable prosperity [41]. Normatively, food security is anchored in Law No. 18 of 2012 concerning Food, which regulates the state's duty to ensure food availability, accessibility, and safety. From the perspective of developmental law, food is not merely an economic commodity but a social right that must be safeguarded through just legal instruments [42]. Presidential Regulation No. 12 of 2025 regarding the National Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMN) 2025–2029 positions food security as a cornerstone of the "Golden Indonesia 2045" vision. This regulation, serving as the legal basis for the RPJMN, establishes eight national priorities within the *Asta Cita* (Eight Aspirations) framework, encompassing economic, social, governance, and environmental transformations [43]. The government targets increased productivity among smallholder farmers, agricultural infrastructure development, and strengthening food supply chains [44]. Thus, this policy trajectory reaffirms that strengthening food security is an integral part of the state's effort to realize social justice. In this context, the reinforcement of food security reflects the notion of "law as a tool of social engineering," in which food policy serves as an instrument for social transformation and the equitable distribution of welfare.

The application of distributive justice principles in food policy holds that development outcomes must be enjoyed proportionately by all citizens, without discrimination. In the 2025–2029 RPJMN, the government targets the eradication of extreme poverty to 0% and an annual increase in agricultural productivity of 4–5% [45]. This measure demonstrates a developmental orientation that focuses not only on economic efficiency but also on the equitable distribution of social benefits for smallholders and rural communities. Distributive justice is further reflected in the development of agricultural infrastructure and food logistics, including irrigation systems, production roads, and distribution centers in regions. This policy serves as the operational manifestation of the mandate in Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution [46], which places the national economy on the principles of togetherness and equitable efficiency [47]. Therefore, the equity aspect of food policy is not merely normative; it is embedded in concrete developmental targets.

In the perspective of developmental law, food policy functions as an instrument of redistributive justice—a mechanism for equitably distributing development benefits through state intervention. The concept of progressive law emphasizes a bias toward the common people (*rakyat kecil*); thus, regulations regarding pricing, distribution, and food reserves represent a legal presence oriented toward substantive justice [48]. However, the implementation of food security policies still faces structural challenges, including land access inequality, agricultural land conversion, and the dominance of large corporations. Consequently, it is imperative to harmonize regulations across the Food Law, Law No. 41 of 2009 concerning the Protection of Sustainable Food Agricultural Land, and the derivative

policies of the RPJMN, aligning them with the principles of social justice and environmental sustainability. This regulatory alignment is crucial to bridging the gap between normative objectives and empirical realities [49].

To ensure that food policy is genuinely oriented toward social justice, a Social Justice Impact Assessment (SJIA) should be implemented at every stage of development planning. The SJIA approach has evolved into a public policy evaluation instrument to ensure that policies yield equitable impacts across all societal groups, particularly the vulnerable [7]. SJIA is widely utilized in international policy studies to assess the distribution of benefits, social risks, and policy alignment with lower-income groups. The OECD and UNDP also promote this instrument as an evaluative framework to ensure development truly "leaves no one behind" in the national development agenda. This approach evaluates the extent to which food policy delivers tangible impacts for people experiencing poverty, the vulnerable, and the marginalized [50]. Thus, social justice transcends normative rhetoric and becomes empirically measurable within development policy. Through SJIA, the principle of social justice gains an operational mechanism that enables policy evaluation to be conducted in a more structured, evidence-based manner.

The proposal to apply SJIA represents a methodological breakthrough in Indonesia's developmental law paradigm, which has historically been predominantly normative. SJIA expands the function of law from a mere regulatory instrument to a critical analytical tool for public policy impact [51]. Through this mechanism, every development policy or program can be measured from the perspective of social justice, specifically regarding benefit distribution, protection of vulnerable groups, and the enhancement of welfare for the lower classes. This approach underscores that developmental success cannot be judged solely by economic growth; it must be measured by the extent to which development narrows disparities and expands substantive social justice [52]. Therefore, SJIA has significant potential to serve as an evaluative instrument that integrates social justice principles throughout the national development policy cycle. In other words, SJIA strengthens the function of developmental law as a corrective mechanism against potential policy biases that disadvantage the weak.

By strengthening national food security, the state fulfills its role as the protector and guarantor of public welfare. A social-justice-oriented legal approach is essential to ensure that food development not only increases productivity but also creates social balance, eradicates poverty, and strengthens food sovereignty [53]. In this context, the integration of SJIA into the 2025–2029 RPJMN enables the Indonesian government to systematically assess the degree to which development policies fulfill distributive, intergenerational, and spatial justice, as emphasized by Edith Brown Weiss (1989) and Amartya Sen (1999). This integration also aligns with the social impact evaluation guidelines published by Bappenas (2020), marking a strategic step in reinforcing the trajectory of developmental law toward social justice [54]. Consequently, the 2025–2029 RPJMN fundamentally represents a concrete effort to realize the *Rechtsidee* (legal ideal) of Pancasila and the constitutional goal of "social justice for all the people of Indonesia."

Furthermore, several other critical points in the RPJMN indicate that the concept of social justice (equity, inclusion, and social protection) has been incorporated into policy directions:

1. The explicit statement that development pursues not only economic metrics but also "justice and national dignity." For instance, the President's remarks noted that the Pancasila Economy underlying the RPJMN is "not just about numbers, but about justice and the dignity of the nation."
2. The first national priority: "Strengthening the ideology of Pancasila, democracy, and Human Rights." The RPJMN summary states that human rights protection and civic participation are integral to inclusive development.
3. Social transformation: The RPJMN prioritizes equitable access to quality education, the empowerment of human resources, gender inclusion, and the rights of persons with disabilities. For example, the target for the Gross Enrollment Ratio (APK) in higher education is set to increase to expand access.
4. The formulation process of the RPJMN involves more inclusive and participatory, as well as sustainable, approaches, such as the Strategic Environmental Assessment (KLHS), which links social welfare with the environment—an essential component of intergenerational justice.

These policies directly apply the function of developmental law as an instrument for social equity. In John Rawls' view, the principle of social justice demands that public policies provide the greatest benefit to the least advantaged members of society (the *difference principle*). Additionally, the technocratic design of the RPJMN identifies indicators of equitable access, such as "access to basic infrastructure, housing, sanitation, and decent drinking water," as part of regional development policy. From a regulatory perspective, the RPJMN is based on Law No. 59 of 2024 concerning the 2025–2045 RPJPN and subsequently established through Presidential Regulation No. 12 of 2025. This provides a robust legal basis for social justice to serve as a vital foundation in five-year national planning and evaluation. Thus, the RPJMN targets not only economic growth but also the distribution of development outcomes and social inclusion, aligning with the constitutional values of "general welfare" and "social justice" as stipulated in the Preamble and Article 33 of the 1945 Constitution [55]. In a legal context, this opens the door to understanding that policy implementation—including law enforcement and criminal regulation—should focus not only on punitive measures but also on restorative measures, reconciliation, and access to justice for vulnerable groups [56]. Therefore, integrating equity and inclusion indicators in the RPJMN operationalizes the Fifth Principle of Pancasila through a regulatory and national planning framework.

Accordingly, the Social Justice Impact Assessment (SJIA) can be categorized as a conceptual innovation representing Indonesia's contribution to expanding the horizons of global developmental law theory. SJIA is a synthesis of the philosophical principles of Pancasila, particularly the fifth principle, with the theories of distributive justice and human freedom formulated by John Rawls and Amartya Sen [57]. Through this instrument, developmental orientation is measured not only by economic achievements but also by the extent to which public policies create equitable outcomes, strengthen social protection, and

expand human capabilities. Consequently, law functions not merely as a control mechanism but as a reflective mechanism to assess the justice and sustainability of a policy. Ultimately, SJIA offers a globally relevant evaluative framework while reaffirming the role of Indonesian law in driving a developmental paradigm oriented toward social justice and humanity.

Thus, the 2025–2029 RPJMN reflects a shift in orientation from purely economic development to development grounded in distributive justice and a bias toward vulnerable groups. The RPJMN also emphasizes the importance of spatial justice through equitable regional development. A primary national priority is "equitable infrastructure development," namely the provision of basic infrastructure in underdeveloped, border, and island regions to strengthen national connectivity [58]. This approach affirms that infrastructure development is not just about physical growth but serves as an instrument of social justice to reduce regional disparities.

While social justice principles are reflected in the RPJMN, several critical observations warrant attention. First, despite the formulation of targets, achieving equity across regions and groups remains a challenge. Public discourse on development gaps suggests a greater focus is needed to ensure programs meet expectations. Second, issues of data accuracy and program effectiveness remain significant tasks, particularly in ensuring social protection assistance is well-targeted. Third, social justice is not merely a matter of access but also of service quality, development outcomes, and full community participation. These aspects must be continuously monitored to ensure they are realized in practice, not just documented in planning papers.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the analysis of the conceptual relationship between developmental law and social justice, and its implementation in the 2025–2029 RPJMN, several key conclusions can be drawn. First, social justice is a fundamental objective of Indonesian developmental law, as affirmed in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution. Within the framework of Mochtar Kusumaatmadja's developmental law theory and Satjipto Rahardjo's progressive law approach, law functions not only to maintain order but also as an instrument for social transformation to achieve equitable welfare. The integration of Harold Laski's welfare state, Esping-Andersen's welfare regimes, Edith Brown Weiss's ecological justice, and Amartya Sen's capabilities concept demonstrates that social justice encompasses distributive, inclusive, and sustainable dimensions. Thus, Indonesian developmental law carries a constitutional mandate to drive equitable welfare, protect vulnerable groups, and ensure sustainability. Second, the implementation of social justice in the 2025–2029 RPJMN within the food security sector is evident through the strengthening of the right to food, policies favoring smallholders, and the development of agricultural and logistical infrastructure that supports regional equity. To strengthen the orientation to social justice in developmental law, as mandated by the 2025–2029 RPJMN, strategic steps are required to integrate social justice principles into the national planning and evaluation system. The government should establish regulations mandating that every development planning document, at both national and regional levels, be accompanied by a Social Justice Impact Assessment (SJIA). This

integration is vital to ensure that every development policy has undergone a comprehensive social justice evaluation. The SJIA model developed by the OECD (2020), UNDP (2018), and the European Commission (2021) can be adapted by Indonesia as a mandatory mechanism in the formulation of the RPJMN and RPJMD. This analysis will serve to assess the tangible impact of a policy on the poor, vulnerable, and marginalized. Thus, social justice will manifest as a measurable practice of public policy rather than mere normative jargon.

REFERENCES

- [1] Sukmana O. Konsep dan Desain Negara Kesejahteraan (Welfare State) Program Studi Ilmu Kesejahteraan Sosial , FISIP Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang. *J Sospol* 2016;2:102–20.
 - [2] Busemeyer MR, Kemmerling A, Van Kersbergen K, Marx P. *Digitalization and the welfare state*. Oxford University Press; 2022.
 - [3] Bua A, Bussu S. Between governance-driven democratisation and democracy-driven governance: Explaining changes in participatory governance in the case of Barcelona. *Eur J Polit Res* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12421>.
 - [4] Saraswati A. Custody (Hadhanah) Regulations in Indonesia and Malaysia: A Developmental Psychology Perspective on Child Welfare. *Sakina J Fam Stud* 2024;8:468–81.
 - [5] Prasetyo DE, Masnun MA, Nugroho A, Ikram D, Noviyanti N. Discrimination Related to Labour Age Limitation in Indonesia: A Human Rights and Comparative Law Perspective. *J Suara Huk* 2024;6:228–54. <https://doi.org/10.26740/jsh.v6n2.p228-254>.
 - [6] Akimov A, Simshauser P. Performance measurement in Australian water utilities. Current state and future directions. *Aust J Public Adm* 2020;79:111–42. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8500.12376>.
 - [7] Revillard A. Vulnerable rights: The incomplete realization of disability social rights in France. *Soc Sci* 2018;7:88.
 - [8] Cambero F, Esposito A, Miranda NAR. Chile’s Boric pledges an orderly economy, swift naming of Cabinet. Reuters 2021. <https://www.reuters.com/world/americas/chiles-left-cheers-boric-win-ripples-through-latin-america-2021-12-20/>.
 - [9] Khalyubi W, Perdana A. Electoral Manipulation Informationally on Hoax Production in 2019 Presidential and Vice Presidential Election in Indonesia. *J Gov Polit Issues* 2021;1:87–99.
 - [10] Jafari A, Azizi H. Factors of Emergence and Consolidation of Authoritarianism in Post-Soviet Central Asia. *Cent Eurasia Stud* 2021. <https://doi.org/10.22059/jcep.2021.303852.449934>.
 - [11] Mansuy D. Liberalism and Political Regimes: The Contribution of Montesquieu. *Rev Int Pensam Polit* 2015;10:255.
 - [12] Hakiki YR, Taufiqurrahman T. The Idea of Structuring National Legislation Based on The Ratio of Decidendi & Obiter Dictum Constitutional Court Decision. *J Konstitusi* 2023;20:78–99. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk2015>.
 - [13] Fadli M, Maulana I, Liemanto A. Politik Hukum Pembangunan Hukum Nasional dalam Garis-Garis Besar Haluan Negara Tahun 1973 dan Tahun 1978. *Divers J Huk* 2024;10:258–92.
 - [14] Halbe J, Holtz G, Ruutu S. Participatory modeling for transition governance: Linking methods to process phases. *Environ Innov Soc Transitions* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eist.2020.01.008>.
 - [15] Giawa Y, Sihotang J. A Legal Analysis of the Establishment and Regulatory Framework of the Merah Putih Village Cooperative in Indonesia Under Law Number 25 of 1992 on Cooperatives. *TOFEDU Futur Educ J* 2025;4:4445–56.
 - [16] Munck GL. What is democracy? A reconceptualization of the quality of democracy. *Democratization* 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13510347.2014.918104>.
 - [17] Rahardjo S. *Sisi-sisi lain dari Hukum di Indonesia*. Penerbit Buku Kompas; 2003.
 - [18] Munandar A, Syaipudin S. Reconstructing the Meaning of Social Justice. *Int J Interdiscip Soc Community Stud* 2022;17:215.
 - [19] Kalyana L, Budidarmo W. Dynamics of land ownership rights in the perspective of Indonesian agrarian law in the perspective of legal certainty and social justice. *JOSH J Sharia* 2025;4:234–43.
 - [20] Mohsin BN, Nasir AA. Social Justice and Sustainability: towards a more Inclusive Development Model. *Indones J Law Econ Rev* 2026;21:10–21070.
 - [21] Armia MS. *Penentuan Metode dan Pendekatan Penelitian Hukum*. Banda Aceh Lemb Kaji Konstitusi Indones 2022.
 - [22] Chroust A-H. The philosophy of law of Gustav Radbruch. *Philos Rev* 1944;53:23–45. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2181218>.
-

- [23] Ismatov A. Do Hybrid Legal Systems Matter in Foreign Legal-Aid Programmes? Some Philosophical Aspects of Legal Aid in Uzbekistan as Provided by the Donor States. *Asian J Law Soc* 2021;8:351–71.
- [24] Faiz PM. A Critical Analysis of Judicial Appointment Process and Tenure of Constitutional Justice in Indonesia. *Hasanuddin Law Rev* 2016;1:152. <https://doi.org/10.20956/halrev.v1n2.301>.
- [25] Samsul H, Sugiri B, Aprilianda N, others. Reconstruction Of “Obstruction Of Justice” As A Criminal Act In The Law On Eradicating Corruption In Indonesia. *Int J Environ Sustain Soc Sci* 2022;3:606–28.
- [26] Subrianto ATK, Apriani R. Hak Anti Diskriminasi Dan Upaya Hukum Bagi Tenaga Kerja Lanjut Usia Dalam Sektor Pekerjaan. *Widya Yuridika J Huk* 2022;5:429–38. <https://doi.org/10.31328/wy.v5i2.3636>.
- [27] Escobar O. Between radical aspirations and pragmatic challenges: Institutionalizing participatory governance in Scotland. *Crit Policy Stud* 2022. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19460171.2021.1993290>.
- [28] Safira ME. Law Is a Tool Of Social Engineering Dalam Penanganan Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia Ditinjau Dari Hukum Islam Dan Perundang-Undangan Di Indonesia. *Kodifikasi* 2017;11:181–208.
- [29] Arifin F. The Role of Administrative Law in Realizing Village Autonomy Based on Local Wisdom. *Al-Ishlah J Ilm Huk* 2024;27:249–67. <https://doi.org/10.56087/aijih.v27i2.495>.
- [30] Zalewski I. Alfred Schütz Revisited: SociExclusion of Refugees in Brandenburg. *Qual Sociol Rev* 2022. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1733-8077.18.2.04>.
- [31] Pyun HO, Edey Gamassou C. Looking for Public Administration Theories? *Public Organ Rev* 2018. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-017-0374-6>.
- [32] Richards MPM. Post-divorce arrangements for children: A psychological perspective. *J Soc Welf Fam Law* 1982;4:133–51.
- [33] Marleku A. Mounk, Yascha: PEOPLE VS. DEMOCRACY – WHY OUR FREEDOM IS IN DANGER AND HOW TO SAVE IT. *Politol Časopis - Czech J Polit Sci* 2020. <https://doi.org/10.5817/pc2020-1-94>.
- [34] Sembiring FR, Sundawati L, Nugroho B. The failure factors of collective action in promoting the recognition of customary forest: Case of Kenegerian Rumbio customary forest in Riau Province. *J Manaj Hutan Trop* 2021;27:110.
- [35] Kaban GGS. Penggunaan Cita Hukum (Rechtsidee) Pancasila sebagai Mercusuar bagi Politik Hukum Pidana di Indonesia. *Soedirman Law Rev* 2023;5.
- [36] Lim WM, Gunasekara A, Pallant JL, Pallant JJ, Pechenkina E. Generative AI and the future of education: Ragnarök or reformation? A paradoxical perspective from management educators. *Int J Manag Educ* 2023;21:100790.
- [37] Fauzani MA, Wahyuningsih A. Problematik Penjabat dalam Mengisi Kekosongan Jabatan Kepala Daerah. *Titik Taut Huk. Tata Negara dan Huk. Adm. Negara dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemerintah. Drh.*, 2021.
- [38] Narwadan TNA, Lubis AF, Abd Hakim H. *Teori Hukum Positif: Teori Komprehensif dan Perkembangannya*. PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia; 2025.
- [39] Oktoberina SR, Moeliono TP. Prinsip Common But Differentiated Responsibility Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup, Sumber Daya Alam Dan Hutan Tropis. *Verit Justitia* 2016;2:278–302.
- [40] Udoh JP. Sustainable nondestructive mangrove-friendly aquaculture in Nigeria II: Models, best practices and policy frame work. *Aquac Aquarium, Conserv Legis* 2016;9:151–73.
- [41] Riskiyono J. Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembentukan Perundang-Undangan Untuk Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan. *Aspir J Masal Sos* 2015;6:159–76. <https://doi.org/10.46807/ASPIRASI.V6I2.511>.
- [42] Yofirsta R, Danil E, Rembrandt R. Analisis Mengenai Dampak Lingkungan (AMDAL) sebagai Instrumen Pencegahan Pencemaran dan Perusakan Lingkungan Hidup Yang Berakibat Perbuatan Tindak Pidana Lingkungan ditinjau dari Undang-Undang Cipta Kerja. *Ranah Res J Multidiscip Res Dev* 2025;7:4885–97. <https://doi.org/10.38035/rrj.v7i6.1894>.
- [43] Tapung MM, Regus M, Payong MR, Rahmat ST, Jelahu FM. Bantuan sosial dan pendidikan kesehatan bagi masyarakat pesisir yang terdampak sosial-ekonomi selama patogenesis Covid-19 di Manggarai. *Transform J Pengabd Masy* 2020;16:12–26.
- [44] Pasondi M. Eksklusi Sosial dalam Dunia Pendidikan di Indonesia: Studi Kasus: Kesenjangan Digital dalam Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Jarak Jauh (PJJ). *Model J Progr Stud PGMI* 2024;11:477–86.
- [45] Alfrian GR, Pitaloka E. Strategi Usaha Mikro, Kecil, dan Menengah (UMKM) bertahan pada kondisi pandemik covid 19 di Indonesia. *Pros. Semin. Nas. Terap. Ris. Inov.*, vol. 6, 2020, p. 139–46.
- [46] Narindra MD. Konsep Mendapatkan Alat Bukti Surat dan atau Dokumen dalam Penanganan Perkara Dugaan Terjadinya Praktek Monopoli dan atau Persaingan Usaha Tidak Sehat. *Novum J Huk*
-

- 2017;4:171–80.
- [47] Muhammad H. Efektifitas Dan Efisiensi Penyelesaian Sengketa Ekonomi Syariah Di Peradilan Agama. *J Ilm MIZANI Wacana Hukum, Ekon Dan Keagamaan* 2020;7:35–48.
- [48] Syamsudin M. Keadilan Substantif yang terabaikan dalam Sengketa Sita Jaminan. *J Yudisial* 2012;5:36–50.
- [49] Fanani AZ. Sengketa Hak Asuh Anak Dalam Hukum Keluarga Perspektif Keadilan Jender. *Muslim Herit* 2017;2:153–76. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21154/muslimheritage.v2i1.1050>.
- [50] Ulfa M. Marginalisasi Pendidikan Siswa Di Daerah 3T: Studi Kasus SMPN 3 Tempurejo. *Compet J Educ* 2023;2:31–41.
- [51] Ramli AM, Dewi S, Rafianti L, Ramli TS, Putri SA, Lestari MA. Pelindungan Rahasia Dagang Dalam Industri Jasa Telekomunikasi (Protection of Trade Secrets in Telecommunication Industry). *J Ilm Kebijak Huk* 2021;15:215–30.
- [52] Yanto O, Susanto S, Darusman YM, Wiyono B, Gueci RS. Sosialisasi Dan Pelatihan E-Litigasi Di Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Unggul Tangerang Selatan Guna Meningkatkan Profesionalisme Dalam Rangka Pendampingan Masyarakat Pencari Keadilan Melalui Aplikasi Komputer. *J Abdimas Tri Dharma Manaj* 2020;1:1–9.
- [53] Rhofita EIR. Optimalisasi sumber daya pertanian Indonesia untuk mendukung program ketahanan pangan dan energi nasional. *J Ketahanan Nas* 2022;28:82.
- [54] Sulaiman S. Hukum Responsif: Hukum Sebagai Institusi Sosial Melayani Kebutuhan Sosial Dalam Masa Transisi (Responsive Law: Law as a Social Institutions to Service of Social Need in Transition). *J Huk Samudera Keadilan* 2014;9:199–205.
- [55] Zon F, Iskandar M, Zuhdi S. Tinjauan Sejarah Hukum Pasal 33 UUD 1945 sebagai Ideologi Ekonomi (The Legal History Review of Article 33 UUD 1945 as Economic Ideology). *Negara Huk Membangun Huk Untuk Keadilan Dan Kesejaht* 2017;7:111–25.
- [56] Aburaera S, Muhadar, Maskun. *Filsafat Hukum: Teori dan Praktik*. vol. 11. Jakarta: Kencana; 2019.
- [57] Efendi A, Poernomo F. Prinsip Isonomi Di Indonesia: Filosofi, Makna, Dan Perbandingan. *J Konstitusi* 2022;19:247–68.
- [58] Muś A, Jakubowski T, Kijonka J, Sarna P. Where Ethnoregionalism and Nationalism Meet: A Struggle for Recognition and a Clash of Identities. *Int J Minor Gr Rights* 2022;30:226–53.
-