



The Historical Transformation of Anti-Corruption Policy in Indonesia's Criminal Justice System

Suud Sarim Karimullah

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi IEU, Surabaya, Indonesia

*Corresponding author email: suudsarimkarimullah@gmail.com

Article Info

Received: 10/02/2026

Revised: 06/04/2026

Accepted: 01/05/2026

Published: 02/06/2026



Copyright © 2026 by Author(s)
This work is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Abstract

The transformation of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia has evolved dynamically alongside successive changes in political regimes. Nevertheless, much of the existing scholarship has examined anti-corruption policy in a fragmented manner, primarily focusing on regulatory reform, institutional effectiveness, or the performance of individual enforcement bodies. This study examines the historical transformation of anti-corruption policy within Indonesia's criminal justice system by identifying shifts in anti-corruption paradigms, analysing the evolving relationship between the institutional independence of anti-corruption bodies and state intervention, and tracing changes in the legal-political orientation of anti-corruption governance across different periods of government. Employing a normative legal research method with a historical approach, the study finds that Indonesian anti-corruption policy has undergone a substantive transformation from an instrument of political legitimization during the Old Order and New Order regimes into a modern criminal justice framework grounded in institutional independence, due process of law, and the recognition of corruption as an extraordinary crime requiring exceptional legal responses. This transformation, however, has not proceeded linearly. Each change in political regime has been accompanied by a reconstruction of legal policy that has reshaped institutional design, redistributed authority, and reconfigured relationships among law-enforcement institutions. This study contributes to the literature on the legal politics of anti-corruption by conceptualising policy transformation as a systemic and historically contingent process in which regime change, institutional development, and the dynamics of the criminal justice system interact within an integrated analytical framework.

Keywords: *Anti-corruption policy, Criminal justice system, Legal politics, Institutional independence, Legal history*

INTRODUCTION

Corruption is no longer understood merely as the abuse of power for personal gain, but rather as a structural phenomenon that reduces the state's capacity to provide public services, undermines institutional legitimacy, exacerbates social inequality, and hinders the achievement of sustainable development goals. This complexity has led to the anti-corruption policy evolving in a highly dynamic manner, in line with shifts in the paradigm of criminal law, public administration, and international standards on good governance. The United Nations Convention against Corruption (UNCAC) emphasises that the fight against corruption must be built on an approach that simultaneously integrates the dimensions of prevention, enforcement, asset recovery, international cooperation and institutional strengthening.¹

These paradigm shifts have significant implications for the criminal justice systems in various countries, including Indonesia. The history of Indonesia's anti-corruption policies demonstrates that each phase of political and constitutional development has given rise to a different approach to designing anti-corruption measures. In the early years of independence, corruption was viewed as an administrative issue, the resolution of which still depended on general criminal law instruments. Entering the New Order period, corruption began to be framed as a threat to national development, giving rise to various specialised regulatory mechanisms.² However, their implementation remained overshadowed by the dominance of executive power.

The Reform Era then became the most decisive turning point, marked by the establishment of a modern anti-corruption legal regime, characterised by the creation of specialised corruption courts, the strengthening of investigative and prosecutorial powers, and the formation of independent institutions with characteristics distinct from those of conventional law enforcement bodies. However, the dynamics of legal policy over the past decade have shown that this transformation has not proceeded linearly. Changes to various regulations, institutional repositioning, the development of oversight mechanisms, the expansion of preventive approaches, the digitalisation of public administration, and the emergence of policies on the recovery of state losses all indicate that anti-corruption policies are undergoing continuous reconfiguration, which in turn influences the orientation of Indonesia's criminal justice system.

This transformation demonstrates that anti-corruption policy is, in fact, the product of a complex interplay between developments in criminal law, political configurations, institutional dynamics, and changing societal needs. Therefore, changes to anti-corruption regulations cannot be understood merely as a replacement of legal norms, but must be interpreted as a dynamic process of penal policy that reflects a shift in the state's paradigm in defining corruption, determining models of criminal liability, regulating relations between law enforcement agencies, and balancing repressive and preventive approaches. This perspective is important because the effectiveness of the criminal justice system is determined not only by the severity of criminal penalties but also by the coherence of criminal policy, which can create continuity among legal formulation, institutional implementation, and the objective of protecting the public interest.

Various previous studies have made significant contributions to explaining the development of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia. Most of these studies have examined the institutional

¹ Sunčana Roksandić and Marc Engelhart, "Environmental Corruption: Fighting Two Evils through International Criminal Law Alongside Introducing a Special Protocol to Uncac and Untoc," *International Criminal Law Review* 25, no. 2–3 (2025): 247–81, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10225>.

² A Achmad Aulia, "Disruption in Corruption Eradication in Indonesia," *Public Integrity* 27, no. 6 (2025): 736–57, <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2025.2455757>.

effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts, particularly the independence of anti-corruption commissions, relationships among law enforcement agencies, the effectiveness of courts in handling corruption offences, and the impact of regulatory changes on law enforcement.³ Other studies have focused on analysing the legal politics behind the drafting of anti-corruption legislation, changes in institutional powers, and evaluating the implementation of prevention strategies through bureaucratic reform, transparency in public services, and the digitalisation of government.⁴

In more recent developments, several studies have begun to link anti-corruption efforts to public governance, public sector integrity, state capacity, asset recovery, and the strengthening of administrative compliance mechanisms.⁵ These studies indicate that the fight against corruption is increasingly shifting from a punitive orientation towards a multidimensional approach that simultaneously involves institutional, social, economic and administrative aspects. Nevertheless, this evolving literature still exhibits significant conceptual fragmentation. The majority of studies focus on evaluating a single institution, a single regulation, or a specific period of government, thereby yielding a partial understanding of the dynamics of anti-corruption policy.

Studies examining the history of anti-corruption efforts are generally structured as a chronology of regulatory developments, without systematically linking these developments to shifts in the criminal justice system's paradigms.⁶ Conversely, studies on the criminal justice system tend to focus on relationships among law enforcement subsystems without explaining how transformations in anti-corruption policy have shaped new configurations in the design of the national criminal justice system. Consequently, to date there remains a dearth of studies capable of fully explaining how changes in legal policy, institutional developments, regulatory dynamics and shifts in law enforcement paradigms interact to shape the transformation of anti-corruption policy within the historical trajectory of Indonesia's criminal justice system.

This knowledge gap has become increasingly relevant as Indonesia's legal system faces new challenges, including the growing complexity of corruption schemes, the digitalisation of financial transactions, corporate involvement, transnational crime, money laundering, and demands to strengthen technology-based governance.⁷ These challenges demonstrate that the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts can no longer be understood through a standalone institutional approach, but rather requires a historical analytical framework capable of revealing both the continuity and discontinuity in the development of anti-corruption criminal

³ Yudi Kristiana and Benny Hutahayan, "Judicial Corruption in the Post-Reform Era: Assessing the Effectiveness of Legal Reforms in Indonesia," *International Criminal Law Review* 25, no. 2–3 (2024): 420–41, <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10208>; Derry Angling Kesuma and Mohammed Nasir Uddin, "The Enforceability and Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Laws in Reducing Corruption Cases in Indonesia," *Kanun Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 26, no. 1 (2024): 158–75, <https://doi.org/10.24815/kanun.v26i1.35600>.

⁴ Benedetto Ponti, Agustí Cerrillo-i-Martínez, and Fabrizio Di Mascio, "Transparency, Digitalization and Corruption," in *Understanding and Fighting Corruption in Europe: From Repression to Prevention* (Springer, 2022), 97–126, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82495-2_6; Miftakhul Huda and José Manuel Naranjo Gómez, "Strengthening Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption Efforts for Sustainable Legal Development in Indonesia," *Justitia Nova: Indonesian Journal of Modern Law* 1, no. 1 (2025): 66–80, <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21311562>.

⁵ Suud Sarim Karimullah, "The Role of Law Enforcement Officials: The Dilemma Between Professionalism and Political Interests," *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 13, no. 2 (2024): 365–92, <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.13.2.2024.365-392>; Rihantoro Bayuaji and Fikri Hadi, "Asset Recovery In Corruption Cases In Indonesia: A Human Rights Perspective," *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 19, no. 1 (2025): 93–112, <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v19no1.4024>; Kiky Srirejeki and Khairurrizqo Khairurrizqo, "The Role of Community Engagement as Corruption Control Strategy in Local Governments: Insights from Indonesia," *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 38, no. 7 (2025): 872–94, <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-12-2024-0407>.

⁶ Kamsi Kamsi, Very Julianto, and Suud Sarim Karimullah, "Intentionally Changing Everything: Deliberate Constructing in Corruption Case," *Lex Scientia Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 449–88, <https://doi.org/10.15294/lesrev.v7i2.59866>.

⁷ Yuki Tanaka Fitri Ramadhani, Fitria Handayani, Humaira Syakira, Olivia Smith, "Reorientation of the Principle of Legality in the Handling of Corruption Offences in Indonesia," *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 41–53, <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.9>.

policies over time. Such a historical analysis is crucial, as it enables the identification of patterns of change within the legal paradigm, the factors influencing the success or failure of policies, and the direction of development of Indonesia's criminal justice system in response to ongoing social, political, economic, and technological changes.

Building on this premise, this study offers a different perspective by positioning the transformation of anti-corruption policy as a dynamic process of legal politics within the history of Indonesia's criminal justice system, rather than merely a regulatory or institutional development. Through this approach, the study seeks to integrate historical, normative, institutional, and criminal policy dimensions into a single analytical framework that comprehensively explains the relationship between shifts in the paradigm of anti-corruption efforts and the development of the national criminal justice system. This integrative approach is expected to enrich the development of theory on criminal law politics, broaden the conceptual understanding of anti-corruption policy transformation, whilst providing an analytical foundation for formulating legal policies that are more adaptable to the dynamics of contemporary corruption offences.

Based on the above, this study aims to comprehensively analyse the transformation of anti-corruption policies within the history of the Indonesian criminal justice system by identifying developments in legal paradigms, changes in legal policy, institutional dynamics, and their implications for the design of the national criminal justice system. This study is expected to make a scholarly contribution by strengthening the conceptual framework regarding the relationship between the dynamics of anti-corruption policy and the development of the criminal justice system, whilst also generating relevant recommendations for the development of criminal law policies that are more consistent, adaptive and oriented towards strengthening the integrity of state administration amidst the increasingly complex challenges of combating corruption.

METHODS

This study employs a normative legal research method, utilising historical, legislative, conceptual and comparative approaches to analyse the transformation of anti-corruption policy within the development of the Indonesian criminal justice system by examining the dynamics of legal politics, regulatory changes and the institutional dynamics of anti-corruption efforts. The focus of the study is on the paradigm shift in anti-corruption policy as a political-legal construct that influences the design of the criminal justice system, with data sources comprising primary, secondary and tertiary legal materials selected purposively based on their substantive relevance to regulatory developments, court rulings, legal doctrines and the latest academic literature.

Data collection was carried out through a systematic literature review, accompanied by a search of credible legal documents and academic publications, whilst the validity of the analysis was ensured through source triangulation, systematic interpretation, and the consistency of legal arguments. Subsequently, the data were analysed qualitatively using descriptive-analytical techniques, incorporating historical, systematic and teleological interpretations, to identify patterns of policy transformation, elucidate the interconnections between different periods in the development of the law, and formulate a conceptual framework regarding the dynamics of anti-corruption policy within the history of the criminal justice system in Indonesia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A Paradigm Shift in Anti-Corruption Policy

From a legal-historical perspective, anti-corruption policies during the Old Order and New Order eras developed within a political framework that positioned the law as an instrument to underpin the stability of power. Consequently, the fight against corruption was directed more towards serving the regime's interests in terms of legitimacy than towards establishing an independent law enforcement system.⁸ Corruption during that period was indeed characterised as an act detrimental to the state's finances.⁹ Still, the policy framework was not yet oriented towards strengthening the criminal justice system, one that guarantees equality before the law, the independence of law enforcement agencies, and accountable oversight mechanisms. Consequently, the implementation of anti-corruption policies was heavily influenced by prevailing power dynamics, so the intensity of law enforcement often increased at specific political junctures but failed to develop into a system with normative or institutional continuity.

This phenomenon indicates that the effectiveness of the fight against corruption at that time was not primarily determined by the quality of legal norms, but rather by the extent to which those norms were used as instruments for maintaining political stability and the government's legitimacy. These characteristics demonstrate that anti-corruption criminal law in its early stages reflected a selective, repressive approach rather than a systemic approach oriented towards legal certainty. Law enforcement had not yet been fully established on the principle of the rule of law.¹⁰ Still, it remained within a framework that allowed those in power to intervene in the processes of investigation, inquiry, prosecution, and sentencing.

Anti-corruption policies had not yet produced control mechanisms capable of operating independently, as law enforcement institutions were embedded within a bureaucratic structure heavily influenced by the executive authority.¹¹ These conditions have led to disparities in law enforcement, weak institutional accountability, and low effectiveness in overseeing state officials. In other words, the primary focus of anti-corruption policy during that period remained centred on safeguarding governmental stability, such that criminal law functioned as a political instrument rather than as a mechanism for the impartial protection of the public interest.

Fundamental changes began to emerge following the 1998 Reform, when demands for democratisation spurred the repositioning of the law as both a mechanism to limit power and an instrument for protecting citizens' constitutional rights. The Reform not only altered the structure of the state but also transformed the paradigm of criminal policy from an approach oriented towards the interests of the state to one that places the rule of law as the foundation of governance.¹² In the context of combating corruption, these changes gave rise to a new institutional framework that established independence as a key prerequisite for effective law enforcement.

⁸ Aristo Pangaribuan, "Indonesia's Criminal Justice System: A Case Study of Inter-Agency Conflict and the Fight for Power," *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 12, no. 4 (2025): 600–626, <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2025.10018>.

⁹ Kempe Ronald Hope Sr, "Channels of Corruption in Africa: An Analytical Review and Assessment of Trends in Economic and Financial Crimes," *Corruption, Sustainable Development and Security Challenges in Africa: Prospects and Policy Implications for Peace and Stability*, 2023, 35–56, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-32229-7_3.

¹⁰ Henny Saida Flora et al., "The Rule of Law Corrupted by Law Enforcers: A Study of Police Misconduct," *UNES Law Review* 6, no. 4 (2024): 9814–24, <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i4.1932>.

¹¹ Dhani Erlangga and Mohamad Rapik, "Investigative Authority and Institutional Autonomy in Corruption Crimes: A Comparative Study between Indonesia and Hong Kong," *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law* 6, no. 3 (2025): 306–23, <https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v6i3.48446>.

¹² Faisal et al., "Genuine Paradigm of Criminal Justice: Rethinking Penal Reform within Indonesia New Criminal Code," *Cogent Social Sciences* 10, no. 1 (2024): 2301634, <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2301634>.

The establishment of specialised institutions with integrated powers of investigation, inquiry, and prosecution reflects the recognition that corruption possesses characteristics distinct from those of conventional criminal offences and thus requires different mechanisms for its handling. This change also marks a shift in policy orientation from a dominance of power towards a system of law-enforcement governance built on the principles of accountability, professionalism, transparency and judicial oversight. This paradigm shift has been further strengthened by the development of the concept of corruption as an 'extraordinary crime'. This concept is not merely intended to justify the imposition of harsher criminal sanctions. Still, it demonstrates a recognition that corruption has multidimensional impacts that go beyond financial losses to the state.

Corruption disrupts the functioning of public services, hinders economic development, erodes public trust in state institutions, undermines fair competition in business, and threatens citizens' enjoyment of their social, economic and political rights.¹³ Consequently, the fight against corruption requires legal instruments capable of addressing this complexity through the strengthening of investigative powers, the reversal of the burden of proof within certain limits, the confiscation of the proceeds of crime, asset tracing, witness protection, international cooperation, and the development of prevention strategies based on good governance. Nevertheless, the development of the 'extraordinary crime' paradigm cannot be separated from the principle of due process of law, which underpins a democratic state governed by the rule of law.

The strengthening of law enforcement powers must not be interpreted as legitimising the disregard of the rights of suspects or defendants, as the effectiveness of the fight against corruption must remain within the constitutional framework that guarantees legal certainty, equality before the law, the presumption of innocence, the independence of the judiciary, and the protection of human rights. In this context, the transformation of anti-corruption policy reflects a balance between the need to introduce extraordinary legal measures and the obligation to uphold the principles of a fair trial.¹⁴ This shift indicates that the modernisation of Indonesia's justice system is not aimed at expanding the state's power without limits, but rather at striking a balance between the effectiveness of law enforcement and the protection of every citizen's constitutional rights.

The shift in the anti-corruption paradigm also reflects a change in the orientation of criminal policy from an offender-centred approach to a more comprehensive one that integrates repressive, preventive, restorative, and administrative functions. Corruption is no longer viewed merely as individual behaviour subject to criminal sanctions, but rather as a manifestation of weaknesses in governance, low institutional integrity, and ineffective public oversight systems.¹⁵ Consequently, modern anti-corruption policy does not merely emphasise prosecution and punishment, but also develops prevention strategies through bureaucratic reform, the digitalisation of public services, the strengthening of internal control systems,

¹³ Ahmad Jukari, Suud Sarim Karimullah, and Muhajir Muhajir, "Identity Politics in the Construction of Electoral Laws: A Qualitative Analysis," *Walisono Law Review (Walrev)* 5, no. 2 (2023): 139–54, <https://doi.org/10.21580/walrev.2023.5.2.14414>.

¹⁴ Mahrus Ali, Andi Mulyono, and Syarif Nurhidayat, "The Application of a Human Rights Approach toward Crimes of Corruption: Analyzing Anti-Corruption Regulations and Judicial Decisions," *Law* 12, no. 4 (2023): 68, <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws12040068>.

¹⁵ Thomas Duke Labik Amanquandor, "Limitations of the International Approach to Anti-Corruption: A Systematic Review of South Africa's Compelling Case of Failing Anti-Corruption," *Crime, Law and Social Change* 82, no. 3 (2024): 493–516, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-024-10152-y>.

freedom of information, anti-corruption education, risk management, and the fostering of a culture of integrity.¹⁶

This shift demonstrates that the modern criminal justice system no longer functions exclusively as a mechanism for punishment, but has become part of a governance ecosystem that integrates the functions of law, public administration and institutional oversight within a single, mutually reinforcing policy framework. From a legal-political perspective, this transformation reveals that anti-corruption policy has evolved from a paradigm that positions the law as an instrument of the legitimisation of power towards a paradigm that positions the law as a mechanism for the control of power. This shift alters the relationship between the state, society and law enforcement agencies. In contrast, previously the state was the dominant actor determining the direction of law enforcement based on political interests; in the modern criminal justice system, the legitimacy of anti-corruption policy is instead built upon institutional independence, the accountability of judicial processes, transparency of information, and public oversight of the exercise of power.

The history of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia is, in fact, the history of the paradigm shift within the criminal justice system itself.¹⁷ The changes taking place are not merely a shift from a repressive model of law enforcement towards a more democratic one, but constitute a conceptual reconstruction of the function of criminal law within a modern constitutional state. Within this framework, corruption is understood as a threat to state governance and the quality of democracy. Consequently, combating it cannot rely solely on conventional criminal law instruments or piecemeal regulatory changes.

Rather, the effectiveness of the fight against corruption depends on the criminal justice system's ability to integrate institutional dependence, respect for due process of law, coordination amongst law enforcement agencies, preventive mechanisms, asset recovery, and public oversight within a single coherent policy framework. This perspective demonstrates that the transformation of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia is not merely a historical journey of legislative change, but rather the dynamics of the rule of law paradigm, which is gradually transforming criminal law from an instrument of political legitimisation into the cornerstone of a modern criminal justice system oriented towards integrity, accountability and the supremacy of law.

The Tug-of-War between the Independence of Anti-Corruption Institutions and State Intervention

In the early stages of anti-corruption policy development, the law enforcement structure still relied entirely on the police, the public prosecutor's office, and the judiciary prosecutor subsystems of the criminal justice system. Normatively, these three institutions possess clear powers in accordance with their respective functions of investigation, inquiry, prosecution and the examination of cases in court. However, in practice, the effectiveness of efforts to handle corruption offences is often influenced by strong hierarchical ties to the executive branch.¹⁸ This situation means that the independence of law enforcement has not yet been fully realised, as both the investigation and prosecution processes remain vulnerable to political pressure,

¹⁶ Salma Khairunnisa Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Syaifuddin, Yasmin Ahmed, "The Reconstruction of Criminal Law on Corruption Based on the Integrity of the Judicial System," *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 54–66, <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.10>.

¹⁷ Nabilah Talithania Azaria Putri, Ayu Ratnasari, and Givana Adhitya Firananda, "Restorative Justice and Anti-Corruption Law: Toward a Progressive Penal Policy in Indonesia," *Supremasi Hukum: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum* 13, no. 2 (2024), <https://doi.org/10.14421/hnqvpv26>.

¹⁸ Mariana Mota Prado, Fabio Kerche, and Marjorie Marona, "Corruption and Separation of Powers: Where Do Prosecutors Fit? M. Prado et Al.," *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 16, no. 3 (2024): 643–69, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40803-024-00229-0>.

bureaucratic interests and power dynamics. Consequently, the fight against corruption relies more on the government's political will and the institutional strength of the criminal justice system itself.¹⁹ This configuration has resulted in law enforcement that is erratic and selective and has not yet established consistent legal certainty for all public officials, regardless of their position or the powers they hold.

These conditions were among the factors behind the emergence of the paradigm of institutional independence, through the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). The presence of the KPK represents a fundamental change in the design of Indonesia's criminal justice system, namely, Indonesia's recognition that corruption is a crime with specific characteristics, thus requiring an institution with institutional independence, integrated powers, and a higher level of accountability than conventional law enforcement mechanisms.²⁰ In contrast to the sectoral division of powers in the previous system, the KPK was designed with integrated powers of investigation, inquiry, prosecution, coordination, supervision, prevention and monitoring. The integration of these powers was intended to address fragmentation in law enforcement, expedite the prosecution of corruption cases, and reduce the potential for intervention, which had long been a major obstacle to the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts.

This change in institutional design has simultaneously given rise to a new dynamic characterised by a tug-of-war over powers amongst law enforcement agencies. The coordinative relationship among the KPK, the police, and the Public Prosecutor's Office was initially established based on prosecutorial complementarity.²¹ However, in practice, it has often evolved into a competition for authority, influenced by differing interpretations of the scope of each institution's duties. This issue relates not only to the institutions' powers of investigation or prosecution, but also concerns institutional legitimacy in determining the key actors in the fight against corruption.

On the one hand, the existence of the KPK is viewed as a corrective mechanism against the low effectiveness of conventional law enforcement institutions. On the other hand, the expansion of the KPK's powers has sparked debate over the balance among KPK's within the integrated criminal justice system.²² These dynamics demonstrate that the independence of anti-corruption institutions is never isolated. Rather, it always interacts with the authority structures of other law enforcement agencies, meaning that inter-institutional relations are one of the key variables determining the effectiveness of anti-corruption efforts.

The debate over this independence has intensified alongside various regulatory changes that affect the KPK's institutional position within Indonesia's constitutional system. Changes to institutions' design, oversight mechanisms, Indonesia's laws, procedures for conducting wiretapping, coordination of investigations, and the strengthening of supervisory functions have given rise to two perspectives that are developing in parallel. The first view holds that regulatory changes constitute a form of institutional governance reform aimed at strengthening accountability, legal certainty and checks and balances, thereby ensuring that extraordinary powers remain within the control of a democratic state governed by the rule of law.²³

¹⁹ Suyahman Suyahman, Suud Sarim Karimullah, and Muh Akbar Fhad Syahril, "Intersectionality in Social Justice: Unpacking the Complexity of Oppression," *Jambura Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2025): 275–308, <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i1.27828>.

²⁰ Pangaribuan, "Indonesia's Criminal Justice System: A Case Study of Inter-Agency Conflict and the Fight for Power."

²¹ Luciano Da Ros and Manoel Gehrke, "Convicting Politicians for Corruption: The Politics of Criminal Accountability," *Government and Opposition* 59, no. 3 (2024): 951–75, <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2023.48>.

²² Ragil Jaya Tamara et al., "The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Supervisory Board's Role as a Grantor of Permits in Corruption Crimes," *Corruptio* 2, no. 2 (2021): 73–82, <https://doi.org/10.25041/corruptio.v2i2.2342>.

²³ M Nawawi, Ellena Lee, and Rifqi Muhammad Firdaus, "The Meaning of Pancasila in Civil Society Movements for Strengthening Democracy," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 166–81, <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.31>.

The second view argues that these changes actually narrow the KPK's independence by increasing the potential for administrative and political interference in law enforcement. This difference in perspective demonstrates that the concept of independence in the fight against corruption cannot be understood in dichotomous terms, as a state of being entirely free or entirely controlled, but rather as an institutional spectrum that is constantly influenced by developments in political law, regulatory design and changes in the structure of government. In this context, the relationship between the government and anti-corruption agencies is dynamic.

The government has a constitutional obligation to formulate national legal policy and to ensure that all state institutions function effectively. At the same time, the government is also a potential subject of scrutiny in corruption cases involving public officials. This dual position creates a paradoxical relationship, as the state functions simultaneously as the formulator of anti-corruption policy and as a party that must submit to anti-corruption oversight mechanisms. Consequently, any regulatory change concerning anti-corruption institutions is almost always perceived from two perspectives: either as an effort to strengthen institutional governance or as a form of restructuring that could reduce independence. A historical perspective shows that this debate is not a new phenomenon, but rather an inherent consequence of the process of institutionalising systems to oversee the exercise of power in a democratic state.

The courts play no less an important role in these dynamics, as the independence of law enforcement is ultimately tested through an adjudication process free from external influence.²⁴ The existence of specialised corruption courts demonstrates an effort to build expertise in resolving corruption cases, ensuring that proceedings are conducted by judges with specific competence regarding the characteristics of corruption offences. However, the independence of the courts depends not only on their institutional design, but also on the quality of the evidence presented by investigators and public prosecutors, the consistent application of criminal procedure law, and the integrity of the judiciary as a whole.²⁵ Therefore, the relationship among investigators, public prosecutors, and judges cannot be understood as hierarchical but rather as a functional relationship that constitutes a unified criminal justice system. Within this framework, any weakening of independence in one subsystem will undermine the legitimacy of the system as a whole, since the success of the fight against corruption depends on the synergy among all institutions operating within their respective remits.

Subsequent developments have shown that the independence of anti-corruption institutions is no longer determined solely by formal relationships among state institutions but also by the growing role of civil society, the mass media, academics, professional organisations, and the international community in overseeing the law-enforcement process. Public accountability has evolved into a vital instrument that strengthens institutional legitimacy whilst limiting the potential for abuse of authority by law enforcement officials. This phenomenon indicates that the concept of independence within the modern criminal justice system has undergone a broadening of meaning: it is not merely freedom from government intervention, but also the ability to account for all law enforcement actions in an open, transparent and professional manner, subject to scrutiny through both legal mechanisms and public oversight.

²⁴ Gao Yong, "A Comparative Study on Procedural Adjudication," in *Criminal Procedural Trial in China: Procedure of Excluding Illegal Evidence as an Example* (Springer, 2024), 63–123, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4935-5_3.

²⁵ Lucia Manzi, "Prosecutorial Gatekeeping and Its Effects on Criminal Accountability: The Roman Prosecutor's Office and Corruption Investigations in Italy, 1975–1994," *Justice System Journal* 43, no. 3 (2022): 445–69, <https://doi.org/10.1080/0098261X.2022.2100727>.

The dynamics of anti-corruption efforts in Indonesia do not follow a linear pattern of institutional strengthening and weakening but rather involve a continuous process of reconstructing the criminal justice system's design. Every regulatory change essentially reflects the state's efforts to strike a balance among the effectiveness of law enforcement, the protection of constitutional rights, the distribution of state powers among institutions, and oversight mechanisms for the exercise of extraordinary powers. This perspective shows that the main issue lies not merely in the strength or weakness of any single institution, but in the ability of the entire criminal justice subsystem to establish coherent, mutually monitoring and mutually reinforcing relationships within the framework of a democratic rule of law.²⁶ Thus, the independence of anti-corruption institutions should be understood as a systemic characteristic arising from the balance between institutional autonomy, inter-institutional coordination, public accountability and the rule of law, so that the effectiveness of the fight against corruption no longer depends on the dominance of a single institution, but rather on the quality of integration of all components of the Indonesian criminal justice system.

The Transformation of Anti-Corruption Policy from a Historical Perspective

In the early years of independence, the orientation of anti-corruption policy was still centred on efforts to maintain the integrity of the state administration whilst it was establishing a national system of government. Corruption was understood as a deviation in the conduct of government that hampered the effectiveness of the bureaucracy.²⁷ However, it was not yet regarded as a systemic threat to democracy or to the state's governance. This situation was influenced by the state's nature, which remained focused on institutional consolidation and the development of post-colonial government structures. Consequently, legal policy was directed more towards building the state's capacity than towards developing an independent oversight system. In this context, criminal law instruments had not yet become the primary mechanism for controlling the abuse of power, as policy orientation still prioritised political stability over strengthening government accountability.²⁸

With the advent of the New Order era, a shift in the national development paradigm reoriented legal policy towards political stability and economic growth as the state's primary objectives.²⁹ In this context, the fight against corruption received greater attention through the establishment of various regulatory frameworks and institutional mechanisms. However, their implementation took place within a highly centralised political system.

Anti-corruption policies developed as part of the national development agenda, linked to bureaucratic efficiency and the success of economic development. However, the scope for independence in law enforcement remained constrained by the executive branch's dominance. Consequently, the fight against corruption often exhibits a paradoxical nature: normatively, it is strengthened through the creation of new legal instruments, but empirically, its effectiveness is limited by a political configuration that has not yet fully established the law as a mechanism

²⁶ Salma Khairunnisa Nur Azizah, Dewi Lestari, Putri Amalia, Nabila Zahra, "Redefining the Role of Judges in Achieving Substantive Justice in Corruption Cases," *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 1–13, <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.6>.

²⁷ Mutiara Safira Nour Mansour, Anisa Rahma, Siti Aisyah, Karim Abdullah, "Reformulating the Sentencing System in Corruption Cases Based on Effectiveness," *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 14–26, <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.7>.

²⁸ Zumiyati Ibrahim et al., "Integration of Maqasid Al-Shariah in the Criminal Law Reform to Achieve Justice and Human Dignity," *Jurnal Hukum Islam* 23, no. 1 (2025): 105–44, <https://doi.org/10.28918/jhi.v23i1.04>.

²⁹ Maharatna Shifa Nurizka et al., "Criticism of the Neoclassical Approach in Islamic Economic Policy in Indonesia," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 1 (2025): 17–30, <https://journal.mahkotascience.org/index.php/jpr/article/view/9>; Ngurah Wisnu Murthi et al., "Indonesia's Inclusive Economic Diplomacy Based on the Pancasila Ideology," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 152–65, <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.30>; Cahaya Rembulan et al., "The Impact of the Digital Economy on Economic Empowerment Models for Muslim Youth in Indonesia," *Jurnal Lentera Insani* 1, no. 1 (2025): 48–63, <https://doi.org/10.65586/jli.v1i1.17>.

for overseeing the exercise of power. This situation demonstrates that regulatory changes are not always synonymous with a paradigm shift in law enforcement, as the effectiveness of policies is heavily dependent on the surrounding political structure.³⁰

The 1998 reforms marked a turning point that fundamentally altered the direction of Indonesia's legal policy by strengthening constitutional democracy, the rule of law, decentralisation of power, and the protection of human rights.³¹ These changes ushered in a new conception of the fight against corruption as a key instrument of governance reform. Corruption is no longer viewed merely as a breach of public finances, but as a threat to democracy, social justice, economic development, and public trust in state institutions.

This paradigm shift has driven the establishment of various regulations that expand law enforcement powers, create independent bodies, strengthen oversight mechanisms, and integrate preventive and punitive approaches within a single national policy framework. From a legal-political perspective, this phase marked a significant shift from a legal model designed to underpin power towards one aimed at limiting its exercise through more transparent and accountable oversight mechanisms. Nevertheless, the journey of anti-corruption legal reform has not been linear.

Adjustments to regulatory design, institutional structures, the distribution of powers among law enforcement agencies, and the applicable oversight mechanisms have invariably accompanied changes of government in each subsequent period. This phenomenon demonstrates that anti-corruption policy is highly dynamic, as it lies at the intersection of legal and political interests. Any regulatory change is generally accompanied by normative arguments regarding the enhancement of law enforcement effectiveness, the improvement of institutional governance, or the strengthening of the principle of checks and balances. At the same time, however, such changes also give rise to debates concerning a potential shift in the balance of power between law enforcement agencies and the other branches of government.

From the perspective of legal political theory, this situation demonstrates that the interaction between norms, institutions and political interests always influences the formation of law.³² Whilst the law does serve the function of steering social change, it is simultaneously a product of a political process shaped by evolving power configurations. Consequently, anti-corruption regulatory reform cannot be understood solely in terms of textual changes to legal norms. Rather, it must be analysed in terms of the relationship among the objectives of regulatory formation, the political context that underpins it, and its implications for the distribution of power within the criminal justice system.

Such an approach demonstrates that the effectiveness of an anti-corruption policy is determined not only by the quality of legislation, but also by the degree of independence of law enforcement institutions, the consistency of policy implementation, the legal culture of society, and the political commitment to placing the law above the interests of those in power. These developments raise a critical question regarding the nature of anti-corruption legal reform in Indonesia: namely, whether every regulatory change is genuinely aimed at strengthening the

³⁰ Suyuti Dahlan Rifa'i et al., "Deconstructing Colonial Law Through Critical Race Theory in Indonesian Regulations," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 1 (2025): 46–60.

³¹ Bagus Hermanto, Asrul Ibrahim Nur, and Made Subawa, "Indonesia Parliamentary Reform and Legislation Quality Backsliding Phenomenon: Case of Indonesia Post Reformasi," *The Theory and Practice of Legislation* 12, no. 1 (2024): 73–99, <https://doi.org/10.1080/20508840.2024.2316507>.

³² Bahrul Ulum et al., "The Narrative of Pancasila as Indonesia's Moral Identity in Global Politics," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 182–97, <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.32>; Muhammad Ilham Daffa et al., "The Narrative of New Order Development in the Relationship between Pancasila and the Legitimacy of Power," *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 215–30, <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.34>.

effectiveness of the fight against corruption, or whether it is instead more influenced by shifts in the political configuration during each administrative period.

This question is significant because history shows that almost all major changes in anti-corruption policy have invariably coincided with shifts in the structure of power, whether through regime change, shifts in development priorities, institutional restructuring, or the repositioning of relations between state organs. This fact indicates that anti-corruption legal reform never takes place in a completely autonomous sphere, but is always influenced by political dynamics that shape the direction, intensity and scope of policy changes.³³ However, this relationship cannot be reduced to a form of the law's subordination to politics, as the law has, on many occasions, evolved into an instrument that limits the scope of power by strengthening accountability mechanisms, public oversight, and judicial independence.

The evolution of anti-corruption policy has shifted from a punishment-centred approach to a more comprehensive one that integrates prevention, law enforcement, asset recovery, bureaucratic reform, government transparency, digitalisation of public services, and the strengthening of public participation.³⁴ This shift indicates that anti-corruption legal policy no longer aims merely to control the behaviour of individual perpetrators of corruption, but rather to build a system of government capable of preventing the abuse of power from the outset. In this context, policy changes do not merely reflect a change of government, but also demonstrate the development of a modern rule-of-law paradigm that places institutional integrity at the core of governance.

From this perspective, the transformation of anti-corruption policy in Indonesia's history demonstrates that shifts in the orientation of the fight against corruption are, in fact, a reflection of the dynamics of the national legal-political landscape, which evolves through a continuous process of adaptation, contestation and institutional reconstruction. Changes in Indonesia's regimes do indeed influence the direction of anti-corruption policy.³⁵ Still, this influence is not deterministic, as the effectiveness of legal reform ultimately depends on the legal system's ability to uphold the rule of law amid ever-changing political dynamics.

The history of anti-corruption policy not only illustrates how politics shapes the law but also demonstrates how it gradually builds the capacity to regulate politics by strengthening institutional independence, the rule of law, and democratic accountability. This perspective offers a more comprehensive understanding that the transformation of anti-corruption policy is not merely a series of regulatory changes with each change of government, but rather a process of the institutionalisation of legal politics that continually tests the state's ability to balance the interests of power with the ideal of realising an independent, effective and integrity-driven criminal justice system.

CONCLUSION

The dynamics of the fight against corruption are not merely a series of regulatory and institutional changes but rather a manifestation of political and legal change, shaped by the configuration of power, the development of the rule of law, and the demands of modern governance. Consequently, its effectiveness is determined not only by the existence of independent institutions or increasingly repressive legal instruments, but also by the ability to

³³ Nkosingiphile Mkhize, "Plans without Action? Politics and Institutional Challenges of Anti-Corruption Reforms in the BRICS Countries," *Journal of Economic Criminology*, 2025, 100197, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2025.100197>.

³⁴ Noor Fatima Zahwa Khairunnisa, Naura Khadijah, Raisa Amani, "Reformulation of Corruption Sentencing Policy Based on Substantive Justice," *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 27–40, <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.8>.

³⁵ Ade Paranata, "A Systematic Literature Review of Anti-Corruption Policy: A Future Research Agenda in Indonesia," *Public Organization Review* 25, no. 3 (2025): 1181–1214, <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-025-00847-8>.

strike a balance between independence, accountability, due process of law, and integration within the criminal justice system. These findings enrich previous studies, which tended to examine regulations or institutions in isolation, by demonstrating that shifts in the orientation of anti-corruption policy must be understood as a dynamic process of legal politics unfolding historically, institutionally, and systemically.

Theoretically, this study broadens our understanding of the dialectical relationship between law and power in the formulation of anti-corruption policy. From a practical and policy perspective, this study emphasises the importance of establishing a stable, independent and accountable institutional framework so that anti-corruption reforms are not dependent on government change dynamics. Nevertheless, this study remains limited to a normative-historical analysis. It has not yet empirically measured the effectiveness of policy implementation or the behaviour of law enforcement agencies. Consequently, future research needs to develop a comparative-empirical approach across countries and across government terms to examine how changes in political configurations affect the quality of institutional independence, the coordination of the criminal justice system, and the sustainability of anti-corruption policies in strengthening the rule of law in Indonesia.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors wish to express their gratitude for the incisive feedback received from the editor, reviewers, and institutional colleagues. All remaining deficiencies remain solely the responsibility of the authors.

REFERENCES

- Achmad Aulia, A. "Disruption in Corruption Eradication in Indonesia." *Public Integrity* 27, no. 6 (2025): 736–57. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2025.2455757>.
- Ali, Mahrus, Andi Mulyono, and Syarif Nurhidayat. "The Application of a Human Rights Approach toward Crimes of Corruption: Analyzing Anti-Corruption Regulations and Judicial Decisions." *Laws* 12, no. 4 (2023): 68. <https://doi.org/10.3390/laws12040068>.
- Bayuaji, Rihantoro, and Fikri Hadi. "Asset Recovery In Corruption Cases In Indonesia: A Human Rights Perspective." *Fiat Justisia: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 19, no. 1 (2025): 93–112. <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v19no1.4024>.
- Daffa, Muhammad Ilham, Razi Alif Al Faiz, Abdel-Dzhalil Niyazov, and Yahya Muhamad. "The Narrative of New Order Development in the Relationship between Pancasila and the Legitimacy of Power." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 215–30. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.34>.
- Erlangga, Dhani, and Mohamad Rapik. "Investigative Authority and Institutional Autonomy in Corruption Crimes: A Comparative Study between Indonesia and Hong Kong." *PAMPAS: Journal of Criminal Law* 6, no. 3 (2025): 306–23. <https://doi.org/10.22437/pampas.v6i3.48446>.
- Faisal, Andri Yanto, Derita Prapti Rahayu, Dwi Haryadi, Anri Darmawan, and Jeanne Darc Noviayanti Manik. "Genuine Paradigm of Criminal Justice: Rethinking Penal Reform within Indonesia's New Criminal Code." *Cogent Social Sciences* 10, no. 1 (2024): 2301634. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2301634>.
- Fitri Ramadhani, Fitria Handayani, Humaira Syakira, Olivia Smith, Yuki Tanaka. "Reorientation of the Principle of Legality in the Handling of Corruption Offences in Indonesia." *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 41–53. <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.9>.
- Flora, Henny Saida, Suhendar Suhendar, Mega Fitri Hertini, Endah Rantau Itasari, and Erwin

- Erwin. "The Rule of Law Corrupted by Law Enforcers: A Study of Police Misconduct." *UNES Law Review* 6, no. 4 (2024): 9814–24. <https://doi.org/10.31933/unesrev.v6i4.1932>.
- Hermanto, Bagus, Asrul Ibrahim Nur, and Made Subawa. "Indonesia Parliamentary Reform and Legislation Quality Backsliding Phenomenon: Case of Indonesia Post Reformasi." *The Theory and Practice of Legislation* 12, no. 1 (2024): 73–99. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20508840.2024.2316507>.
- Hope Sr, Kempe Ronald. "Channels of Corruption in Africa: An Analytical Review and Assessment of Trends in Economic and Financial Crimes." *Corruption, Sustainable Development and Security Challenges in Africa: Prospects and Policy Implications for Peace and Stability*, 2023, 35–56. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-32229-7_3.
- Huda, Miftakhul, and José Manuel Naranjo Gómez. "Strengthening Rule of Law and Anti-Corruption Efforts for Sustainable Legal Development in Indonesia." *Justitia Nova: Indonesian Journal of Modern Law* 1, no. 1 (2025): 66–80. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.21311562>.
- Ibrahim, Zumiyati, Suud Karimullah, Andi Assaad, Rina Septiani, and HÜSEYİN Okur. "Integration of Maqasid Al-Shariah in the Criminal Law Reform to Achieve Justice and Human Dignity." *Jurnal Hukum Islam* 23, no. 1 (2025): 105–44. <https://doi.org/10.28918/jhi.v23i1.04>.
- Jukari, Ahmad, Suud Sarim Karimullah, and Muhajir Muhajir. "Identity Politics in the Construction of Electoral Laws: A Qualitative Analysis." *Walisongo Law Review (Walrev)* 5, no. 2 (2023): 139–54. <https://doi.org/10.21580/walrev.2023.5.2.14414>.
- Kamsi, Kamsi, Very Julianto, and Suud Sarim Karimullah. "Intentionally Changing Everything: Deliberate Constructing in Corruption Case." *Lex Scientia Law Review* 7, no. 2 (2023): 449–88. <https://doi.org/10.15294/lesrev.v7i2.59866>.
- Karimullah, Suud Sarim. "The Role of Law Enforcement Officials: The Dilemma Between Professionalism and Political Interests." *Jurnal Hukum Dan Peradilan* 13, no. 2 (2024): 365–92. <https://doi.org/10.25216/jhp.13.2.2024.365-392>.
- Kesuma, Derry Angling, and Mohammed Nasir Uddin. "The Enforceability and Effectiveness of Anti-Corruption Laws in Reducing Corruption Cases in Indonesia." *Kanun Jurnal Ilmu Hukum* 26, no. 1 (2024): 158–75. <https://doi.org/10.24815/kanun.v26i1.35600>.
- Kristiana, Yudi, and Benny Hutahayan. "Judicial Corruption in the Post-Reform Era: Assessing the Effectiveness of Legal Reforms in Indonesia." *International Criminal Law Review* 25, no. 2–3 (2024): 420–41. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10208>.
- Labik Amanquandor, Thomas Duke. "Limitations of the International Approach to Anti-Corruption: A Systematic Review of South Africa's Compelling Case of Failing Anti-Corruption." *Crime, Law and Social Change* 82, no. 3 (2024): 493–516. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10611-024-10152-y>.
- Manzi, Lucia. "Prosecutorial Gatekeeping and Its Effects on Criminal Accountability: The Roman Prosecutor's Office and Corruption Investigations in Italy, 1975–1994." *Justice System Journal* 43, no. 3 (2022): 445–69. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0098261X.2022.2100727>.
- Mkhize, Nkosingiphile. "Plans without Action? Politics and Institutional Challenges of Anti-Corruption Reforms in the BRICS Countries." *Journal of Economic Criminology*, 2025, 100197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jeconc.2025.100197>.
- Mota Prado, Mariana, Fabio Kerche, and Marjorie Marona. "Corruption and Separation of Powers: Where Do Prosecutors Fit? M. Prado et Al." *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law* 16, no. 3 (2024): 643–69. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40803-024-00229-0>.
- Muhammad Ali, Muhammad Syaifuddin, Yasmin Ahmed, Salma Khairunnisa. "The Reconstruction of Criminal Law on Corruption Based on the Integrity of the Judicial System." *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 54–66.

- <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.10>.
- Murthi, Ngurah Wisnu, Ihsan Taufiq, Emily Yee, and Ninda Ayuk Aktaniensia. "Indonesia's Inclusive Economic Diplomacy Based on the Pancasila Ideology." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 152–65. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.30>.
- Nawawi, M, Ellena Lee, and Rifqi Muhammad Firdaus. "The Meaning of Pancasila in Civil Society Movements for Strengthening Democracy." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 166–81. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.31>.
- Nour Mansour, Anisa Rahma, Siti Aisyah, Karim Abdullah, Mutiara Safira. "Reformulating the Sentencing System in Corruption Cases Based on Effectiveness." *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 14–26. <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.7>.
- Nur Azizah, Dewi Lestari, Putri Amalia, Nabila Zahra, Salma Khairunnisa. "Redefining the Role of Judges in Achieving Substantive Justice in Corruption Cases." *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.6>.
- Nurizka, Maharatna Shifa, Aufa Islami, Moh Rofi'ieh, and Muhammad Lathif Dzulfikar. "Criticism of the Neoclassical Approach in Islamic Economic Policy in Indonesia." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 1 (2025): 17–30. <https://journal.mahkotascience.org/index.php/jpr/article/view/9>.
- Pangaribuan, Aristo. "Indonesia's Criminal Justice System: A Case Study of Inter-Agency Conflict and the Fight for Power." *Asian Journal of Law and Society* 12, no. 4 (2025): 600–626. <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2025.10018>.
- Paranata, Ade. "A Systematic Literature Review of Anti-Corruption Policy: A Future Research Agenda in Indonesia." *Public Organization Review* 25, no. 3 (2025): 1181–1214. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11115-025-00847-8>.
- Ponti, Benedetto, Agustí Cerrillo-i-Martínez, and Fabrizio Di Mascio. "Transparency, Digitalization and Corruption." In *Understanding and Fighting Corruption in Europe: From Repression to Prevention*, 97–126. Springer, 2022. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-82495-2_6.
- Putri, Nabilah Talithania Azaria, Ayu Ratnasari, and Givana Adhitya Firananda. "Restorative Justice and Anti-Corruption Law: Toward a Progressive Penal Policy in Indonesia." *Supremasi Hukum: Jurnal Kajian Ilmu Hukum* 13, no. 2 (2024). <https://doi.org/10.14421/hnqvpv26>.
- Rembulan, Cahaya, Ibnu Roghidul Maghfur, Mahrus Alwi Hasan Siregar, Moh Ali Jakfar, and Sofiatius Solehah. "The Impact of the Digital Economy on Economic Empowerment Models for Muslim Youth in Indonesia." *Jurnal Lentera Insani* 1, no. 1 (2025): 48–63. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jli.v1i1.17>.
- Rifa'i, Suyuti Dahlan, Mahrus Alwi Hasan Siregar, Indah Pratiwi Utami, Ach Mujahid, and Adinda Zeranica Putri Fakhis. "Deconstructing Colonial Law Through Critical Race Theory in Indonesian Regulations." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 1 (2025): 46–60.
- Roksandić, Sunčana, and Marc Engelhart. "Environmental Corruption: Fighting Two Evils through International Criminal Law Alongside Introducing a Special Protocol to Uncac and Untoc." *International Criminal Law Review* 25, no. 2–3 (2025): 247–81. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10225>.
- Ros, Luciano Da, and Manoel Gehrke. "Convicting Politicians for Corruption: The Politics of Criminal Accountability." *Government and Opposition* 59, no. 3 (2024): 951–75. <https://doi.org/10.1017/gov.2023.48>.
- Srirejeki, Kiky, and Khairurriszqo Khairurriszqo. "The Role of Community Engagement as Corruption Control Strategy in Local Governments: Insights from Indonesia." *International Journal of Public Sector Management* 38, no. 7 (2025): 872–94. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPSM-12-2024-0407>.

- Suyahman, Suyahman, Suud Sarim Karimullah, and Muh Akbar Fhad Syahril. "Intersectionality in Social Justice: Unpacking the Complexity of Oppression." *Jambura Law Review* 7, no. 1 (2025): 275–308. <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i1.27828>.
- Tamara, Ragil Jaya, Heni Siswanto, Tri Andrisman, and Budi Riski. "The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) Supervisory Board's Role as a Grantor of Permits in Corruption Crimes." *Corruptio* 2, no. 2 (2021): 73–82. <https://doi.org/10.25041/corruptio.v2i2.2342>.
- Ulum, Bahrul, Arsy Shakila Putri, Muhammad Zahran Agung Dewantoro, Imam Ragimov, and Bernardus Agus Rukiyanto. "The Narrative of Pancasila as Indonesia's Moral Identity in Global Politics." *Jurnal Pelita Raya* 1, no. 3 (2025): 182–97. <https://doi.org/10.65586/jpr.v1i3.32>.
- Yong, Gao. "A Comparative Study on Procedural Adjudication." In *Criminal Procedural Trial in China: Procedure of Excluding Illegal Evidence as an Example*, 63–123. Springer, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-97-4935-5_3.
- Zahwa Khairunnisa, Naura Khadijah, Raisa Amani, Noor Fatima. "Reformulation of Corruption Sentencing Policy Based on Substantive Justice." *Indonesian Journal of Corruption and Criminal Justice* 1, no. 1 (2026): 27–40. <https://doi.org/10.65586/ijccj.v1i1.8>.