

Reconstructing Spatial Planning Law Through Neo-Progressivism: Towards an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture

Santi Rianti Vandan Wangi

Doctoral Program in Law, Universitas Islam Bandung, Bandung, Indonesia, E-mail: vandanwangi@ymail.com

Abstract. *Spatial planning law has evolved into a complex legal domain where environmental sustainability, governance, legal certainty, economic development, and social justice must be reconciled within an increasingly interconnected legal landscape. However, existing jurisprudential approaches generally address these dimensions separately, resulting in fragmented legal reasoning and limiting the capacity of spatial planning law to respond to contemporary challenges. This article aims to reconstruct spatial planning law through Neo-Progressivism by proposing an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture capable of harmonizing justice, sustainability, governance, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility within a coherent legal framework. The study employs normative legal research using statutory, conceptual, philosophical, and comparative approaches. It critically analyses major jurisprudential traditions, including Natural Law, Legal Positivism, Responsive Law, Progressive Law, and contemporary sustainability discourse, to formulate a reconstructed theoretical framework for spatial planning law. The findings demonstrate that the principal challenge of contemporary spatial planning law is no longer merely regulatory enforcement, but the absence of an integrated jurisprudential architecture capable of reconstructing the relationships among legitimate legal values. To address this theoretical gap, the article introduces Neo-Progressivism, grounded in the First Principle that justice without sustainability is temporary justice, and advances Sustainable Justice together with the Integrated Legal Order as the normative orientation for reconstructing spatial planning law. The study concludes that Neo-Progressivism offers a novel jurisprudential framework that extends beyond sectoral legal approaches by integrating the enduring contributions of existing jurisprudential traditions into a coherent architecture capable of sustaining justice throughout the continuing evolution of civilization.*

Keywords: *Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture; Neo-Progressivism; Spatial Planning Law.*

1. Introduction

Spatial planning law has undergone a fundamental transformation from its traditional function as a regulatory framework governing land use, zoning, and territorial development. Contemporary spatial planning now operates at the intersection of multiple governance domains, encompassing environmental sustainability, economic development, public administration, constitutional rights, disaster resilience, democratic participation, and intergenerational responsibility. This evolution reflects the broader character of spatial planning as an interdisciplinary and governance-oriented process through which competing demands upon land, natural resources, infrastructure, and public space must be coordinated within a coherent policy framework (Healey, 2006; Needham et al., 2018; Sun, 2014).

The importance of spatial planning law has increased substantially under conditions of accelerated urbanization, ecological degradation, climate change, infrastructure expansion, and technological transformation. Land-use decisions no longer produce exclusively local or immediate consequences; instead, they directly influence environmental carrying capacity, economic resilience, investment certainty, community welfare, disaster risk reduction, and the rights of future generations (Healey, 2006).

Recent scholarship further demonstrates that contemporary spatial planning increasingly operates within multi-level governance systems, where balancing economic growth, environmental sustainability, and social equity remains one of the principal challenges of sustainable development (Banikoi et al., 2024; Bosselmann, 2016; Ostrom, 2009; Writer, 2023). Consequently, contemporary spatial planning requires legal frameworks capable of integrating rather than fragmenting these interconnected governance objectives.

Despite this recognition, a critical problem persists: contemporary spatial planning conflicts rarely involve a single normative objective. A development decision may simultaneously affect economic opportunity, environmental protection, investment certainty, community rights, administrative legality, technological governance, public participation, and future generations.

The problem is therefore not merely that legal values compete; the deeper jurisprudential problem is that existing approaches provide insufficient guidance for determining how those values should be related within a coherent legal order before one of them is prioritized. This fragmentation produces legal uncertainty, institutional incoherence, and outcomes that may satisfy formal legality while undermining substantive justice, ecological resilience, or intergenerational equity.

The theoretical basis for addressing this problem draws upon five jurisprudential traditions that have shaped contemporary understanding of law, governance, and justice. Legal Positivism explains the validity and institutional authority of legal norms, providing essential frameworks for understanding how spatial planning regulations derive their binding force from established legal procedures and institutional hierarchies (Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Penelitian et al., 2024). Natural Law connects legal legitimacy with reason, justice, and the common good, reminding spatial planning law that its authority ultimately depends upon its capacity to serve human flourishing and collective welfare (Tollefsen, 2020).

Responsive Law emphasizes the ability of legal institutions to adapt to changing social conditions, highlighting spatial planning law's need for institutional flexibility and procedural openness (Nonet & Selznick, 2017). Progressive Law, particularly within Indonesian legal thought, places humanity and substantive justice at the centre of legal development and rejects the mechanical subordination of justice to formal rules (Satjipto Rahardjo, 2010). Sustainability scholarship further emphasizes that contemporary governance must preserve ecological systems and institutional capacities over time rather than pursue short-term development objectives in isolation (Bosselmann, 2016; Gerasimova, 2017; Ostrom, 2009; Writer, 2023).

These theoretical traditions remain indispensable because spatial planning law requires legality, moral legitimacy, institutional responsiveness, and substantive justice simultaneously. Planning theory has also emphasized relational, collaborative, and governance-based understandings of spatial development rather than treating planning as a purely technical exercise (Healey, 2006). While land-use scholarship has demonstrated that planning systems necessarily mediate relationships among property rights, public regulation, economic interests, and collective welfare (Needham et al., 2018; Sun, 2014). Together, these theoretical resources provide essential tools for analysing spatial planning law, though they have largely developed within separate disciplinary or jurisprudential perspectives.

The existing literature generally approaches the challenges of spatial planning through these separate lenses: planning scholarship explains governance and institutional interaction; environmental scholarship emphasizes sustainability; administrative law focuses on authority, legality, and accountability; and Progressive Law centres human welfare and substantive justice. Although these perspectives are complementary, limited theoretical attention has been devoted to the architecture through which their legitimate values should be reconstructed when they operate simultaneously within the same spatial planning dispute. Three interconnected gaps emerge from this fragmentation: the literature lacks a comprehensive framework capable of relating justice, sustainability, governance,

legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility within a coherent legal order; existing approaches provide insufficient guidance for determining how these values should be related before normative prioritization occurs, often defaulting to ad hoc balancing or formalistic application of discrete legal provisions; and while individual jurisprudential traditions offer important insights, no integrated theoretical architecture has been developed specifically to address the interconnected complexity of twenty-first-century spatial governance.

This gap does not arise because justice, sustainability, governance, legal certainty, or institutional accountability have been ignored; rather, these values have often been developed within separate legal and policy frameworks, producing a fragmented structure of legal reasoning when contemporary spatial planning requires them to operate together. This limitation becomes particularly significant as spatial planning disputes increasingly involve multiple competing values that cannot be adequately resolved through existing sectoral or disciplinary approaches alone.

Building upon this theoretical gap, this research develops Neo-Progressivism as an original Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture for the reconstruction of spatial planning law. Neo-Progressivism is not proposed as a replacement for Legal Positivism, Natural Law, Responsive Law, Progressive Law, environmental jurisprudence, or planning theory; instead, it seeks to reconstruct their enduring contributions within a relational legal architecture capable of responding to the interconnected complexity of twenty-first-century spatial governance. The specific objectives of this research are threefold: first, to demonstrate that contemporary spatial planning law suffers from jurisprudential fragmentation rather than merely regulatory insufficiency; second, to establish that spatial planning requires the reconstruction of relationships among legitimate legal values before normative prioritization occurs; and third, to reconstruct spatial planning law through Neo-Progressivism by developing an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture oriented toward Sustainable Justice and an Integrated Legal Order.

Neo-Progressivism is grounded in the First Principle that justice without sustainability is temporary justice. This principle affirms justice as the highest legal aspiration while recognizing that justice cannot endure where ecological resilience, institutional legitimacy, democratic accountability, and intergenerational continuity are progressively weakened. Sustainability is therefore not treated as an external policy consideration or as a value competing against justice; it functions as a condition through which justice remains possible across time. The research contributes to contemporary jurisprudence by shifting the object of analysis from isolated legal values toward the reconstruction of their relationships within spatial planning law.

2. Research Methods

This study employs normative doctrinal legal research to reconstruct spatial planning law through the theoretical framework of Neo-Progressivism. Normative legal research is particularly appropriate because the objective of this study is to analyse, interpret, evaluate, and reconstruct legal norms, doctrines, concepts, and jurisprudential foundations rather than to investigate empirical behavioural phenomena. In doctrinal legal scholarship, legal research is directed toward developing coherent legal arguments through the systematic interpretation of authoritative legal sources and conceptual analysis of legal principles (Hutchinson & Duncan, 2012; Smits, 2015).

The research adopts four complementary approaches: the statutory approach, the conceptual approach, the philosophical approach, and the comparative approach. The statutory approach examines Indonesian legislation governing spatial planning, environmental protection, and sustainable development, particularly the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945, Law Number 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning, Law Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management, and Law Number 6 of 2023 concerning Job Creation. The conceptual and philosophical approaches analyse major jurisprudential traditions—including Legal Positivism, Natural Law, Responsive Law, and Progressive Law—to identify their respective contributions and limitations in addressing contemporary spatial planning challenges. The comparative approach is employed to examine how these traditions conceptualize justice, legal certainty, governance, sustainability, and institutional legitimacy within different jurisprudential paradigms (Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Satjipto Rahardjo, 2010; Tollefsen, 2020).

The legal materials consist of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. Primary legal materials include constitutional provisions, statutes, and international instruments relevant to spatial planning and sustainable development. Secondary legal materials comprise scholarly books, peer-reviewed journal articles, judicial interpretations, and academic publications concerning jurisprudence, spatial planning, environmental governance, sustainability, and public administration. Tertiary legal materials, including legal dictionaries and encyclopaedias, are used to support conceptual clarification where necessary.

Data were collected through an extensive library-based legal review, focusing on authoritative legal literature and jurisprudential scholarship. The collected materials were systematically classified according to their relevance to six principal legal values examined in this study: justice, legal certainty, sustainability, governance, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility. This analytical classification enabled the identification of conceptual relationships

among existing jurisprudential traditions while simultaneously revealing areas of theoretical fragmentation within spatial planning law.

The analysis employs doctrinal legal analysis, conceptual analysis, and comparative jurisprudential analysis. Doctrinal analysis is used to examine the coherence of legal norms regulating spatial planning. Conceptual analysis identifies the philosophical relationships among legitimate legal values developed within different jurisprudential traditions. Comparative jurisprudential analysis critically evaluates the strengths and limitations of these traditions in responding to contemporary spatial planning challenges. Building upon the findings of these analyses, this study develops Neo-Progressivism as an original Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture for reconstructing spatial planning law toward Sustainable Justice and an Integrated Legal Order.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1. The Fragmentation of Contemporary Spatial Planning Law

Contemporary spatial planning law has evolved into one of the most complex fields of public law, extending far beyond its traditional function of regulating land use and territorial development. Modern spatial planning simultaneously encompasses environmental protection, economic growth, infrastructure development, constitutional rights, administrative governance, disaster resilience, technological transformation, and public participation. Consequently, spatial planning has become a multidimensional legal process through which governments continuously balance competing public and private interests while pursuing sustainable territorial development (Healey, 2006; Needham et al., 2018; Sun, 2014)

This transformation has substantially increased the complexity of legal decision-making. Spatial planning disputes rarely concern a single legal issue. Instead, they involve multiple normative considerations, including environmental sustainability, investment certainty, property rights, indigenous and community interests, democratic participation, institutional accountability, and intergenerational equity. The coexistence of these legitimate legal values requires legal systems to move beyond sectoral regulation toward more integrated forms of legal reasoning capable of addressing increasingly interconnected governance challenges (Bosselmann, 2016; Ostrom, 2009; Writer, 2023)

Despite continuous legislative development, many spatial planning conflicts remain characterized by fragmented legal responses. Different legal regimes frequently pursue distinct normative objectives. Administrative law emphasizes procedural legality and governmental accountability; environmental law prioritizes ecological protection; investment law promotes regulatory certainty;

while constitutional law safeguards fundamental rights and democratic participation. Although each legal regime performs an essential function, they often operate independently, producing overlapping institutional authority, inconsistent policy implementation, and conflicting legal outcomes within spatial planning governance (Healey, 2006; Sun, 2014).

The increasing complexity of spatial planning is further reinforced by contemporary global challenges. Climate change, biodiversity loss, rapid urbanization, digital transformation, and large-scale infrastructure development continuously reshape the legal environment within which spatial planning operates. Recent planning scholarship further argues that spatial planning within multi-level governance remains constrained by the difficulty of integrating economic, environmental, and social sustainability into coherent planning decisions (Hudu et al., 2024). These developments demonstrate that spatial planning can no longer be understood solely as a technical regulatory activity. Rather, it has become a strategic governance instrument through which states seek to reconcile environmental sustainability, economic competitiveness, institutional legitimacy, and long-term public welfare (Bosselmann, 2016; Gerasimova, 2017; Writer, 2023).

Accordingly, the principal problem confronting contemporary spatial planning law is not merely the existence of regulatory inconsistency or institutional overlap. The more fundamental challenge lies in the absence of a jurisprudential framework capable of reconstructing the relationships among the legitimate legal values simultaneously operating within spatial planning disputes. Without such a framework, legal reasoning risks becoming fragmented, with each legal regime pursuing its own normative objectives without sufficient integration into a coherent legal order

3.2. Theoretical Limitations of Existing Jurisprudential Approaches

The development of spatial planning law has been significantly influenced by diverse jurisprudential traditions, each contributing valuable insights into the understanding of law, governance, and justice. Legal Positivism provides a coherent explanation of legal validity through institutional authority and normative certainty, thereby strengthening the predictability and stability of legal systems (Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Penelitan et al., 2024). Natural Law emphasizes that legal legitimacy ultimately depends upon justice, reason, and the common good rather than solely upon formal enactment (Tollefsen, 2020). Responsive Law advocates legal institutions capable of adapting to changing social conditions and public expectations (Nonet & Selznick, 2017), whereas Progressive Law places substantive justice and humanity at the centre of legal development,

encouraging law to serve human welfare rather than merely preserving procedural formalism (Satjipto Rahardjo, 2010).

These jurisprudential traditions continue to provide indispensable foundations for contemporary legal reasoning. Their contributions remain highly relevant because spatial planning law simultaneously requires legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, substantive justice, public accountability, and responsiveness to evolving social conditions. Consequently, this study does not question the validity or continuing significance of these jurisprudential traditions. Instead, it recognizes them as complementary intellectual foundations that have substantially enriched contemporary legal scholarship.

Nevertheless, the increasing complexity of spatial planning governance reveals an important theoretical limitation. Existing jurisprudential approaches generally explain particular dimensions of legal reasoning rather than the relationships among those dimensions when they operate simultaneously within the same legal problem. Legal Positivism primarily explains institutional validity; Natural Law focuses upon moral legitimacy; Responsive Law emphasizes institutional adaptability; while Progressive Law prioritizes substantive justice. Although each perspective provides an essential analytical contribution, none of them was originally developed to function as an integrated jurisprudential framework capable of systematically reconstructing the interaction among justice, sustainability, governance, legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility in spatial planning law.

This limitation becomes increasingly evident under conditions of contemporary governance. Decisions concerning spatial planning frequently require governments and courts to reconcile competing public interests, environmental sustainability, economic development, constitutional guarantees, technological transformation, democratic participation, and ecological resilience. These legal values cannot simply be ranked according to fixed hierarchical priorities because each possesses legitimate normative significance within different legal contexts. Contemporary legal complexity therefore requires jurisprudence to explain not merely the content of individual legal values but also the principles governing their continuous interaction and reconstruction (Bosselmann, 2016; Morin, 2004; Ostrom, 2009).

Accordingly, the principal theoretical challenge confronting contemporary spatial planning law is not the absence of legal values, legal institutions, or legal doctrines. Rather, it is the absence of an integrated jurisprudential architecture capable of reconstructing the relationships among those legitimate legal values before legal prioritization takes place. Existing scholarship has extensively examined justice, sustainability, governance, legality, and institutional accountability as important

legal objectives; however, limited attention has been devoted to the jurisprudential architecture through which these objectives should be continuously related within an evolving legal system.

It is this theoretical gap that provides the foundation for the present study. Rather than proposing an alternative jurisprudential tradition, this article develops Neo-Progressivism as an original Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture intended to reconstruct the relationships among legitimate legal values while preserving the enduring contributions of existing jurisprudential thought.

3.3. Neo-Progressivism as an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture for Spatial Planning Law

The theoretical gap identified in the preceding discussion demonstrates that contemporary spatial planning law requires more than the refinement of individual legal doctrines. The increasing interaction among environmental sustainability, governance, legal certainty, constitutional rights, institutional legitimacy, technological transformation, and intergenerational responsibility requires a jurisprudential framework capable of reconstructing the relationships among these legitimate legal values before they are prioritized in legal decision-making. Building upon this theoretical necessity, this study develops Neo-Progressivism as an original Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture for the reconstruction of spatial planning law.

Neo-Progressivism does not seek to replace existing jurisprudential traditions or establish a new hierarchy of legal values. Instead, it proceeds from the premise that the enduring contributions of Legal Positivism, Natural Law, Responsive Law, Progressive Law, and contemporary sustainability scholarship remain indispensable for understanding modern legal systems (Bosselmann, 2016; Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Nonet & Selznick, 2017; Tollefsen, 2020). The originality of Neo-Progressivism therefore lies not in introducing unfamiliar legal values, but in reconstructing the relationships among legitimate legal values that have traditionally been examined through separate jurisprudential perspectives.

Within Neo-Progressivism, jurisprudential analysis no longer begins by asking which legal value should prevail in situations of normative conflict. Rather, it begins by examining how justice, legal certainty, governance, sustainability, institutional legitimacy, democratic participation, and intergenerational responsibility may be reconstructed into a coherent legal framework. This shift represents a change in the object of jurisprudential inquiry—from the prioritization of isolated legal values toward the reconstruction of their interrelationships within an evolving legal civilization.

The philosophical foundation of Neo-Progressivism is articulated through its First Principle, namely that justice without sustainability is temporary justice. This principle maintains that justice remains the highest aspiration of law while recognizing that justice cannot endure if the ecological, institutional, democratic, economic, and social conditions supporting its continuity are progressively weakened. Consequently, sustainability is understood not as an external policy objective competing with justice, but as an indispensable condition for the continuity of justice itself. This perspective extends contemporary sustainability discourse beyond environmental governance into the normative foundations of jurisprudence (Bosselmann, 2016; Gerasimova, 2017; Writer, 2023).

Building upon this foundation, Neo-Progressivism advances Sustainable Justice as the normative orientation of legal reconstruction. Sustainable Justice requires legal decision-making to preserve not only present rights and legal certainty but also institutional integrity, ecological resilience, democratic legitimacy, and intergenerational continuity. Through this perspective, spatial planning law is no longer understood merely as an instrument regulating territorial development but as a jurisprudential process directed toward maintaining the conditions necessary for justice to endure across changing social and environmental circumstances.

Accordingly, Neo-Progressivism proposes the Integrated Legal Order as the continuing normative horizon of legal development. The Integrated Legal Order does not represent a perfectly harmonious legal system in which conflicts disappear. Rather, it serves as a jurisprudential orientation through which legitimate legal values are continuously reconstructed so that justice, governance, sustainability, institutional legitimacy, legal certainty, and technological development strengthen rather than undermine one another. In this respect, Neo-Progressivism reconceptualizes spatial planning law as a dynamic legal framework capable of responding to the increasing complexity of contemporary governance while preserving the continuity of justice.

The principal contribution of Neo-Progressivism therefore lies in shifting jurisprudential analysis from value prioritization to relational reconstruction. By treating the relationships among legitimate legal values as the primary object of jurisprudential inquiry, this study offers a conceptual framework capable of strengthening the coherence, adaptability, and long-term sustainability of spatial planning law without abandoning the enduring contributions of existing jurisprudential traditions.

3.4. Challenges and Recommendations for Reformulating Mediation Based on *Musyawah Mufakat*

The development of Neo-Progressivism as an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture has significant implications for the reconstruction of spatial planning law. Conventional approaches generally understand spatial planning as a regulatory mechanism for controlling land use, allocating development rights, and ensuring administrative compliance with statutory requirements (Needham et al., 2018; Sun, 2014). However, contemporary planning scholarship increasingly recognizes that spatial planning must also function as an integrated governance framework capable of balancing environmental sustainability, economic development, institutional coordination, and community participation across multiple levels of government (Healey, 2006). Building upon these developments, Neo-Progressivism extends the discussion from planning governance to jurisprudential reconstruction by providing an integrated legal architecture through which these legitimate legal values may be systematically related within legal decision-making.

Consequently, the reconstruction proposed by Neo-Progressivism extends beyond legislative reform or institutional restructuring. It begins with the reconstruction of jurisprudential reasoning itself. Rather than evaluating legal disputes through isolated legal doctrines, Neo-Progressivism requires legal actors to examine how legitimate legal values relate to one another before determining legal priorities. This reconstructed mode of legal reasoning enables spatial planning decisions to move beyond fragmented regulatory analysis toward a more coherent understanding of law as an integrated normative system.

Within this framework, spatial planning decisions are no longer directed solely toward achieving legal certainty or maximizing economic development. Instead, legal reasoning seeks to reconcile justice, sustainability, governance effectiveness, constitutional protection, ecological resilience, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility within a single analytical process. Such an approach reflects the growing recognition that contemporary governance requires legal integration rather than sectoral decision-making, particularly in areas where environmental, economic, and social interests inevitably converge (Healey, 2006; Ostrom, 2009; Writer, 2023).

The reconstruction also carries important implications for public institutions responsible for spatial planning. Contemporary planning governance commonly involves national governments, regional authorities, environmental agencies, licensing institutions, judicial bodies, and affected communities operating under different legal mandates. Without an integrated jurisprudential orientation, these institutions frequently pursue separate regulatory objectives that generate overlapping authority, inconsistent implementation, and fragmented legal

outcomes (Bosselmann, 2016; Sun, 2014). Neo-Progressivism proposes that institutional coordination should be guided not merely by administrative efficiency but by the continuous reconstruction of the relationships among the legitimate legal values underlying spatial planning decisions.

Furthermore, Neo-Progressivism expands the temporal dimension of legal reasoning. Conventional legal analysis often evaluates planning decisions according to their immediate legality or short-term policy effectiveness. By contrast, Neo-Progressivism requires legal actors to assess whether present legal decisions preserve the ecological, institutional, democratic, and social conditions necessary for justice to remain sustainable across future generations. This perspective aligns with the contemporary understanding of sustainable development while extending it into jurisprudence through the principle that justice must remain capable of enduring over time (Bosselmann, 2016; Gerasimova, 2017; Writer, 2023).

Accordingly, the reconstruction of spatial planning law proposed in this study transforms spatial planning from a sector-specific regulatory framework into a continuing process of jurisprudential reconstruction. Rather than asking how law should regulate space, Neo-Progressivism asks how law should continuously reconstruct the relationships among legitimate legal values within spatial governance so that justice remains institutionally, ecologically, and democratically sustainable. This shift represents the principal practical implication of Neo-Progressivism for the future development of spatial planning law.

3.5. Toward Sustainable Justice and an Integrated Legal Order

The preceding analysis demonstrates that the reconstruction of spatial planning law requires a fundamental reorientation of jurisprudential reasoning. Contemporary spatial planning disputes no longer involve isolated questions of land use or regulatory compliance. Instead, they require legal systems to reconcile environmental sustainability, economic development, constitutional rights, governance effectiveness, legal certainty, democratic participation, and intergenerational responsibility within increasingly interconnected legal environments. Recent scholarship similarly emphasizes that sustainable spatial planning depends upon integrating these dimensions within multi-level governance rather than addressing them through fragmented sectoral policies (Banikoi et al., 2024; Writer, 2023). Accordingly, the future development of spatial planning law depends not only on regulatory refinement but also on the capacity of jurisprudence to integrate these legitimate legal values within a coherent normative framework.

Existing jurisprudential traditions continue to provide indispensable foundations for legal reasoning. Legal Positivism contributes institutional certainty and legal validity (Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Penelitan et al., 2024). Natural Law provides moral legitimacy and orientation toward the common good (Tollefsen,

2020), Responsive Law strengthens institutional adaptability (Nonet & Selznick, 2017), while Progressive Law emphasizes substantive justice and human welfare (Satjipto Rahardjo, 2010). Collectively, these traditions explain essential dimensions of law. Nevertheless, contemporary spatial planning governance increasingly requires a jurisprudential framework capable of relating these dimensions systematically rather than treating them as separate analytical domains.

Building upon these enduring contributions, Neo-Progressivism reconstructs spatial planning law through an Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture that relates justice, sustainability, governance, legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, democratic participation, and intergenerational responsibility within a single jurisprudential framework. Rather than replacing existing legal theories, Neo-Progressivism provides a relational structure through which their respective strengths may be continuously integrated in response to contemporary legal complexity.

This reconstruction redefines the normative orientation of spatial planning law. Conventional legal approaches frequently assess planning decisions according to procedural legality, regulatory compliance, or immediate policy effectiveness. Neo-Progressivism expands this perspective by proposing that legal reasoning should also preserve the ecological resilience, institutional continuity, democratic legitimacy, and social conditions necessary for justice to endure over time. In this respect, Sustainable Justice represents not merely a policy aspiration but a jurisprudential orientation through which the continuity of justice becomes an integral component of legal reasoning. This understanding is consistent with the broader objectives of sustainable development while extending those objectives into legal philosophy (Bosselmann, 2016; Gerasimova, 2017; Writer, 2023).

Accordingly, the Integrated Legal Order functions as the continuing normative horizon of Neo-Progressivism. It should not be interpreted as a final institutional arrangement or a legal system free from conflict. Rather, it represents a continuous process through which legitimate legal values are reconstructed so that justice, governance, sustainability, legal certainty, institutional legitimacy, and technological development reinforce one another within an evolving legal civilization. Through this perspective, spatial planning law becomes an adaptive jurisprudential framework capable of responding to increasingly complex societal challenges without sacrificing its commitment to justice.

The principal contribution of this study therefore lies in developing Neo-Progressivism as an original Integrated Jurisprudential Architecture for reconstructing spatial planning law. By shifting jurisprudential analysis from the prioritization of isolated legal values toward the continuous reconstruction of their

relationships, this study contributes a novel conceptual framework that strengthens the coherence, adaptability, and long-term sustainability of contemporary spatial planning law while establishing a foundation for future jurisprudential research.

4. Conclusion

This study set out to address a fundamental jurisprudential challenge in contemporary spatial planning law, namely the absence of an integrated framework capable of reconstructing the relationships among legitimate legal values operating within increasingly complex legal environments. The analysis demonstrates that the principal challenge confronting contemporary spatial planning is not merely regulatory fragmentation or institutional overlap, but the lack of a coherent jurisprudential architecture through which justice, legal certainty, sustainability, governance, institutional legitimacy, and intergenerational responsibility may be systematically related within legal reasoning. Existing jurisprudential traditions continue to provide indispensable foundations for understanding these dimensions (Chateaubriand & de Lucena, 2022; Nonet & Selznick, 2017; Satjipto Rahardjo, 2010; Tollefsen, 2020), however, contemporary spatial planning requires a framework capable of integrating rather than separating their respective contributions.

5. References

- Banikoi, H., Dakyaga, F., & Cobbinah, P. B. (2024). Embedding spatial planning in contemporary multi-level governance: The sustainability entanglement. *Land Use Policy*, 146. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2024.107324>
- Bosselmann, K. (2016). The Principle of Sustainability: Transforming Law and Governance. In *The Principle of Sustainability: Transforming Law and Governance*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315553962>
- Chateaubriand, A., & de Lucena, G. M. R. (2022). THE CONCEPT OF LAW. *Revista de Direito Civil Contemporaneo*, 33(9). <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351000277-3>
- Gerasimova, K. (2017). Our common future. In *Our Common Future*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781912281220>
- Healey, P. (2006). URBAN COMPLEXITY AND SPATIAL STRATEGIES: TOWARDS A RELATIONAL PLANNING FOR OUR TIMES. In *Urban Complexity and Spatial Strategies: Towards a Relational Planning for Our Times*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203099414>
- Hutchinson, T., & Duncan, N. (2012). Defining and Describing What We Do: Doctrinal Legal Research. *Deakin Law Review*, 17(1). <https://doi.org/10.21153/dlr2012vol17no1art70>

- Morin, E. (2004). Epistemology of complexity Edgar Morin. *Gazeta de Antropología*, 20.
- Needham, B., Buitelaar, E., & Hartmann, T. (2018). Planning, law and economics: The rules we make for using land. In *Planning, Law and Economics: The Rules We Make for Using Land*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315111278>
- Nonet, P., & Selznick, P. (2017). Law and society in transition: Toward responsive law. In *Law and Society in Transition: Toward Responsive Law*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203787540>
- Ostrom, E. (2009). A general framework for analyzing sustainability of social-ecological systems. In *Science* (Vol. 325, Number 5939). <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1172133>
- Penelitian, L., Hasil, P., Ensiklopedia, P., & Hukum, F. (2024). THE PURE THEORY OF LAW: HANS Kelsen. *Ensiklopedia of Journal*, 6(3).
- Satjipto Rahardjo. (2010). Hukum Progresif: Sebuah Sintesa Hukum Indonesia. In *Yogyakarta: Genta Publishing*. (Vol. 1, Number 1).
- Smits, J. M. (2015). What is Legal Doctrine? On the Aims and Methods of Legal-Dogmatic Research. *SSRN Electronic Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2644088>
- Sun, L. (2014). Takings international: A comparative perspective on land use regulations and compensation rights. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2014.902907>
- Tollefsen, C. (2020). The Good of Play in John Finnis's «Natural Law and Natural Rights». *Persona y Derecho*. <https://doi.org/10.15581/011.83.009>
- Writer, S. (2023). Transforming our world: the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development | Department of Economic and Social Affairs. In *United Nations*.
- Regulations :**
- Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 26 of 2007 on Spatial Planning.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2009 on Environmental Protection and Management.
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2023 concerning the Stipulation of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation as Law.