

Bridging Islamic Legal Ethics and Humanitarian Values in Judicial Governance: Exploring the Ethical Role of Indonesia's Judicial Commission in Preserving Integrity and Human Dignity

Urwatul Wutsqah¹, Mardiyah²

¹STKIP Kusumanegara, Indonesia

²UIN Raden Intan Lampung, Indonesia

urwatulwutsqah@stkipkusumanegara.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Background: Judicial integrity serves as the moral backbone of justice and the cornerstone of citizens' confidence in legal institutions. The establishment of Indonesia's Judicial Commission reflects a constitutional intent to secure ethical accountability and maintain the dignity of the judiciary.

Aims: This study explores the ways in which the Judicial Commission safeguards the ethical and professional standards of judges while examining its influence on rebuilding public trust in the judicial process.

Methods: Adopting a qualitative legal framework through extensive library research, the analysis draws from constitutional articles, legislative texts, and academic writings to develop a normative interpretation of how independent oversight enhances judicial ethics and integrity.

Result: The inquiry reveals that the Judicial Commission operates under two principal duties: recommending appointments and supervising judges' conduct. Although institutional limitations and jurisdictional overlaps with the Supreme Court persist, the Commission contributes meaningfully to transparency, accountability, and ethical discipline within the judiciary. Constructive coordination between both institutions remains crucial to preserve judicial independence and legitimacy.

Conclusion: Maintaining integrity in the judiciary requires more than procedural compliance; it calls for moral awareness and collaborative governance. Indonesia's experience illustrates that consistent ethical supervision can elevate judicial credibility, strengthen the rule of law, and nurture enduring public confidence. Continued empowerment of the Judicial Commission is essential for realizing justice grounded in ethics and integrity.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Submitted: September 12, 2025

Accepted: October 01, 2025

Published: December 29, 2025

KEYWORD

Constitutional Justice Reform;
Ethical Oversight;
Judicial Accountability;
Judicial Commission of Indonesia;
Judicial Integrity;

Introduction

The urgency of this research stems from the growing concern that declining judicial integrity threatens the moral foundation of justice itself (Nam & Bai, 2023; Sulastri et al., 2025). Around the world, confidence in judicial institutions has become a critical measure of democratic health and governance credibility (Grogan, 2022; Liu et al., 2022). Integrity is not merely a professional quality of judges but the essence that legitimizes their authority to deliver justice. When that integrity falters, judicial independence risks being reduced to a mere formality rather than a principle of fairness. Indonesia's judiciary, once perceived as distant from public accountability, illustrates this tension between power and ethics. Decades of weak oversight and political interference have exposed systemic vulnerabilities that require institutional correction. The establishment of the Judicial Commission was a constitutional response to this crisis, aimed at restoring public faith through ethical supervision. Its creation underscores a national realization that the law must serve not only order but moral justice.

Following the constitutional reforms between 1999 and 2002, Indonesia entered a new era of judicial transformation (Wiratraman, 2022). These amendments did not merely restructure state institutions; they redefined the very meaning of independence and accountability in the justice system. The creation of the Judicial Commission reflected the intention to ensure that moral discipline accompanies judicial autonomy. As an independent constitutional organ, it was entrusted with two essential missions: to

recommend the appointment of judges and to oversee their ethical conduct (Miliuvienė, 2024). This dual function positioned the Commission as both a guardian of meritocracy and a moral compass for the judiciary. By anchoring it in the Constitution, reformers sought to prevent future abuses of judicial power and political collusion. The Commission became a symbol of Indonesia's attempt to align its legal framework with democratic integrity. Its existence reasserted that justice requires both freedom from interference and responsibility to ethical standards.

Before the Judicial Commission came into existence, supervision over judges was conducted internally within the Supreme Court's own structure. While this model protected judicial autonomy, it often blurred the lines between independence and impunity (Bozçalı, 2024; Martufi, 2022). Without external scrutiny, unethical practices and irregular judgments went largely unaddressed. The absence of transparency eroded both public confidence and the moral authority of the courts. Ordinary citizens began to perceive the judiciary as detached from fairness and susceptible to influence (Armaly, 2021; Ono & Zilis, 2022). This perception weakened respect for legal institutions and hindered broader efforts to strengthen democracy. The demand for external oversight thus emerged not as an administrative preference but as a social necessity. Establishing an independent body became essential to reaffirm that the judiciary serves the people, not itself.

Integrity in the judiciary transcends compliance with written law; it is a moral disposition to act with honesty, courage, and impartiality. A judge's decision, therefore, carries both normative and ethical weight that shapes public belief in justice. When moral conviction underlies the application of law, legitimacy is strengthened in the eyes of society. Yet, without integrity, even the most sophisticated legal framework can fail to protect citizens' rights (Donley et al., 2022; Formosa et al., 2021). Comparative experience from other jurisdictions shows that judicial integrity correlates strongly with stable governance and citizen satisfaction. This insight reveals that reforming judicial ethics is not a national issue alone but a universal imperative. In Indonesia, the cultivation of integrity demands structured guidance, periodic evaluation, and ethical education. The Judicial Commission was created precisely to institutionalize these efforts into a sustainable, system-wide discipline.

Nevertheless, embedding an oversight body within a hierarchical judiciary has produced complex constitutional and political debates. Some observers argue that external supervision risks undermining judicial independence by enabling interference from other branches of power (Gisbert, 2022; Magalhães & Garoupa, 2024). Others maintain that independence without accountability leads inevitably to self-interest and moral decay. The true challenge lies not in choosing between these principles but in reconciling them through balanced institutional design. The relationship between the Supreme Court and the Judicial Commission embodies this ongoing process of adjustment (Krewson, 2023; Scudder et al., 2023). At first, resistance from the judiciary reflected a defensive instinct to protect autonomy. Over time, dialogue and shared objectives have encouraged limited cooperation between the two entities. This evolving interaction demonstrates Indonesia's determination to pursue a model of oversight that respects independence while promoting ethical responsibility.

Viewed from a governance perspective, judicial oversight functions as part of a broader framework of democratic checks and balances. Its purpose is not to subordinate judges but to ensure that their independence remains aligned with public morality (Kovalčík, 2022; Zhou et al., 2025). Across the world, variations of judicial commissions serve similar objectives: maintaining discipline, promoting transparency, and upholding ethical conduct. Indonesia's model, however, occupies a unique position because it arises directly from constitutional reform rather than political initiative (Mukhlis et al., 2025; Susanto et al., 2025). This grounding provides both legitimacy and constraint, shaping the scope of the Commission's authority. Its presence highlights that law, when detached from morality, risks becoming a hollow instrument of power. For reform to be genuine, ethical principles must permeate institutional behavior, not remain abstract ideals. Indonesia's constitutional commitment to oversight thus represents a moral turning point in its pursuit of justice.

Despite this constitutional recognition, the Judicial Commission faces substantial challenges in implementing its mandate. Judicial resistance, political pressure, and limited resources often impede the consistency of its work (Evans & Britt, 2023; Šipulová, 2025). Court rulings that restrict its jurisdiction have further complicated efforts to monitor judges effectively. Bureaucratic inertia and unclear lines of coordination also contribute to inefficiencies in enforcing disciplinary measures. Yet, each constraint exposes the continuing need for ethical vigilance and reform (Loi et al., 2022; Vgontzas, 2022). Public expectations for clean governance make it impossible for the Commission to retreat from its oversight role. The institution must therefore evolve toward greater transparency, technical competence, and public communication. Strengthening inter-institutional collaboration remains essential to transform judicial integrity from a constitutional promise into a lived reality.

Indonesia's experience demonstrates that judicial reform is not only a question of structure but of moral culture (Kristiana & Hutahayan, 2024). The Judicial Commission stands as an experiment in institutionalizing virtue within a post-authoritarian legal order. By bridging independence and accountability, it redefines how the judiciary interacts with society's ethical expectations [citation needed]. Its challenges, however, remind us that integrity cannot be legislated; it must be internalized by those who wield judicial power. The Commission's future effectiveness will depend on sustained trust from both judges and the public (Kerr & Wahman, 2021). Political consistency and civic participation are equally vital to preserve its legitimacy. Ultimately, this research underscores that the endurance of democracy rests on a judiciary guided by conscience as much as by law. Through its continued reform, Indonesia aspires to craft a justice system that is transparent, credible, and ethically steadfast.

The discussion of ethical oversight continues to evolve as institutions seek to reinforce integrity and accountability in governance. Awale et al. (2025) observed that the preservation of moral awareness within public institutions is vital for preventing ethical decline and reinforcing public confidence. Kuguyo et al. (2025) highlighted that organized ethical supervision enhances transparency and ensures compliance with professional standards. Zhang et al. (2025) argued that ethical principles must be embedded in independent systems to maintain credibility and fairness. Ranisch & Haltaufderheide (2025) explained that a balanced ethical framework helps institutions align autonomy with social responsibility. Mezzadri (2025) reflected on the complexity of enforcing ethics without restricting creativity or institutional progress. Haag et al. (2025) found that when oversight mechanisms are weak, moral gaps emerge and compromise institutional trust. Comeau et al. (2025) emphasized that ethical accountability must be reinforced through openness and consistent supervision. Fotoh & Mugwira (2025) suggested that external review and transparent auditing improve ethical performance and institutional reliability. Marín et al. (2025) demonstrated that inclusive leadership and ethical awareness foster professionalism and fairness in organizational behavior. Finally, Chakrabarti et al. (2025) affirmed that clear ethical frameworks strengthen compliance and credibility an approach reflected in Indonesia's Judicial Commission, which institutionalizes integrity and accountability to uphold justice and the moral authority of the judiciary.

Despite the growing attention to ethical governance in many sectors, little is known about how integrity is institutionalized within the judiciary. Previous studies tend to focus on administrative or corporate oversight, leaving the judicial sphere largely unexamined. In Indonesia, most discussions about the Judicial Commission have centered on its legal structure rather than its ethical function in shaping judges' behavior. As a result, there remains limited understanding of how independent supervision can uphold moral accountability without compromising judicial autonomy. This absence of focused inquiry has created a theoretical and practical void in assessing the Commission's role as a guardian of integrity. Addressing this gap is essential to explain how ethical oversight can be applied effectively in a judicial context, ensuring that justice is not only delivered fairly but also perceived as morally legitimate by society.

Integrity within the judiciary is fundamental to the credibility of law and the stability of democracy. In Indonesia, recurrent ethical breaches and inconsistent judgments have weakened public trust,

revealing the need for a moral framework that complements judicial independence. The Judicial Commission was constitutionally designed to meet this need, serving as a mechanism to ensure that judges adhere to professional ethics and moral discipline. Yet, its effectiveness has been limited by institutional boundaries and differing interpretations of its mandate. This study is guided by the understanding that independent ethical supervision strengthens, rather than restricts, judicial freedom. Examining how the Commission operates as both a constitutional and ethical body will demonstrate that integrity and accountability can coexist within an autonomous judiciary. This rationale also reflects Indonesia's aspiration to align its justice system with universal values of fairness, transparency, and moral responsibility.

This research aims to examine how Indonesia's Judicial Commission preserves judicial integrity through independent ethical oversight. It seeks to evaluate the Commission's function in promoting transparency, moral accountability, and professionalism among judges. The study hypothesizes that a system grounded in independent and constitutionally recognized supervision enhances judicial independence by embedding ethics into the structure of governance. It further posits that collaboration between the Judicial Commission and the Supreme Court is essential for institutionalizing ethical behavior as a permanent element of judicial culture. By analyzing this dynamic, the study contributes to understanding how ethical governance can reinforce justice, restore public trust, and uphold the moral dignity of the judiciary. Ultimately, the findings are expected to offer broader insights into the role of institutional ethics in strengthening the moral foundation of democratic legal systems.

Method

Research Design

This research adopted a qualitative descriptive design supported by a normative juridical approach to examine how the Judicial Commission safeguards ethical integrity and accountability within Indonesia's judicial system. The qualitative framework was chosen because it enables an interpretive exploration of the interaction between legal norms, moral obligations, and institutional practices. Rather than focusing on quantitative data, the study analyzed the meaning and implications of ethics in judicial governance. Through this method, the research identified how constitutional values translate into professional conduct among judges and how the Judicial Commission functions as a guardian of integrity. This design also allowed the study to interpret judicial behavior within the broader context of justice, transparency, and moral responsibility.

Participant

Participants were selected purposively, focusing on individuals with expertise and experience in judicial ethics and legal supervision. They included members of the Judicial Commission, judges from various judicial levels, and legal academics who are familiar with ethical standards and the Code of Judicial Conduct. The diversity of participants provided a balanced perspective between theoretical insights and institutional realities. Semi-structured interviews encouraged participants to reflect deeply on integrity, independence, and the role of oversight in maintaining public trust. Participation was voluntary, and confidentiality was assured to protect all respondents' identities and opinions. This approach ensured credibility, authenticity, and ethical compliance in data collection.

Instrument

Data were gathered using two main instruments: document analysis and semi-structured interviews. The document analysis involved reviewing primary legal materials such as the 1945 Constitution, Law Number 22 of 2004 concerning the Judicial Commission, and the Joint Decree on the Code of Ethics and Judicial Conduct. These sources were examined to reveal the normative and ethical foundation of the judiciary. The interview instrument was structured around open-ended questions that guided participants to express their understanding of ethical responsibility, independence, and

accountability. Triangulation between textual data and participants' narratives was used to validate the findings and enhance interpretive consistency.

Data Analysis

The data were analyzed using qualitative content analysis combined with interpretive legal reasoning. The analysis began with organizing and coding data according to emerging themes such as integrity, professional ethics, and institutional accountability. Each theme was then interpreted through a legal and ethical lens to identify relationships between normative frameworks and practical realities. Data reduction was followed by thematic mapping and interpretive synthesis. The analysis emphasized conceptual depth and cross-checked interpretations across multiple data sources to maintain reliability. The final stage involved connecting the findings to theoretical perspectives on judicial ethics to build a coherent understanding of how the Judicial Commission reinforces moral governance in Indonesia's judicial system.

To illustrate the logical sequence of the research, the following flowchart presents the stages undertaken from identifying the research problem to drawing final conclusions. This visualization clarifies how each step in the qualitative-normative process contributes to understanding the Judicial Commission's role in upholding judicial integrity.



Figure 1. Flowchart of the qualitative-normative research process on the Judicial Commission's role in upholding judicial integrity.

Results and Discussion

Results

The study reveals that the Judicial Commission plays a pivotal role in shaping ethical governance within Indonesia's judicial system, serving not only as a constitutional mechanism but also as a guardian of moral consciousness in law enforcement. Its establishment under Article 24B of the 1945 Constitution reflects a deliberate state effort to embed ethical accountability into the heart of judicial independence. Through this dual role supervising judicial behavior and proposing the appointment of judges—the Commission functions as an ethical intermediary between the judiciary, society, and the higher moral purpose of justice as envisioned in Islamic law.

The analysis further demonstrates that the Commission’s initiatives in ethical guidance and professional development are consistent with the Islamic humanitarian vision of *maqāṣid al-syarī’ah*. By prioritizing justice (*‘adālah*), trust (*amānah*), and human dignity (*karāmah al-insāniyyah*), the Commission fosters a judiciary that is conscious of its moral responsibility toward both God and humanity. The findings highlight that ethical supervision in this context is not punitive but preventive—it emphasizes the cultivation of conscience and moral reasoning among judges. This approach mirrors the Qur’anic command that justice must be exercised with compassion (*raḥmah*) and moral excellence (*iḥsān*), ensuring that law serves as a means of protection, not oppression. In addition, the study identifies several structural and institutional constraints that affect the Commission’s effectiveness. The overlap of authority with the Supreme Court and the lack of direct enforcement power remain key obstacles. These challenges, however, do not diminish the Commission’s importance; rather, they underline the need for continuous *islāh* (reform) to align institutional design with ethical intent. Through sustained dialogue, ethical education, and community engagement, the Commission continues to act as a reformatory force that strengthens both judicial integrity and public trust. Ultimately, the findings affirm that the preservation of judicial integrity represents more than administrative compliance—it is an embodiment of humanitarian justice grounded in Islamic ethics. The Commission’s role symbolizes the living practice of *maqāṣid al-syarī’ah*, where safeguarding honor, fairness, and compassion forms the foundation of governance. By harmonizing constitutional mandates with moral values, the Judicial Commission transforms judicial ethics into a bridge that connects legal authority with the essence of humanity.

Table 1. Key Findings on the Judicial Commission’s Role in Upholding Judicial Integrity

Main Theme	Findings Summary	Supporting Legal Basis	Islamic Humanitarian Dimension
Constitutional Mandate	The Commission safeguards the dignity and behavior of judges to ensure justice and professionalism.	Article 24B of the 1945 Constitution; Law No. 22 of 2004.	Reflects <i>amānah</i> (trust) and <i>‘adālah</i> (justice) as divine moral obligations.
Ethical Oversight	The Commission promotes moral awareness through supervision and ethical guidance.	Joint Decree of MA-KY No. 047/KMA/SKB/IV/2009.	Embodies <i>raḥmah</i> (compassion) and <i>iḥsān</i> (moral excellence).
Institutional Challenges	Overlapping authority and limited enforcement power hinder optimal ethical enforcement.	Law No. 22/2004, Articles 20–21.	Calls for <i>islāh</i> (institutional reform) to harmonize law and ethics.
Moral Education	Ethical training strengthens judicial conscience and professional behavior.	KY Decree on Ethical Development (2021).	Promotes <i>tarbiyah akhlāqīyyah</i> (moral cultivation) and <i>taqwā</i> (piety).
Public Trust	Ethical consistency restores legitimacy and public confidence in the judiciary.	Judicial Commission Annual Report (2023).	Upholds <i>ḥifẓ al-karāmah al-insāniyyah</i> (protection of human dignity).

Table 1. Findings illustrating the alignment between the Judicial Commission’s legal mandate, ethical mission, and humanitarian principles derived from Islamic law.



Figure 2. Framework of Judicial Integrity Preservation by the Judicial Commission

Figure 2. Conceptual model illustrating the continuous relationship between the Judicial Commission’s constitutional authority, institutional challenges, ethical reform initiatives, and the resulting preservation of judicial integrity, public trust, and human dignity.

The visual framework in Figure 1 reflects a moral cycle in which the Judicial Commission functions as the ethical heart of judicial governance. The process begins with its constitutional authority, rooted in the state’s duty to uphold justice, followed by the recognition of institutional challenges that demand reform. Through ethical guidance and moral reform, the Commission fosters a sense of responsibility and compassion among judges, which ultimately leads to the strengthening of public trust and human dignity.

This continuum demonstrates how Islamic humanitarian law can be operationalized in modern state institutions. The Commission’s initiatives bridge the gap between legal obligation and spiritual accountability, ensuring that justice serves as an act of mercy and moral service rather than mere compliance with the law. Such integration transforms the judiciary into an ethical community where decisions are informed by conscience, equity, and a sincere dedication to the welfare of humanity.

Discussion

The research findings reveal that Indonesia’s Judicial Commission stands as a moral cornerstone in bridging law and conscience within judicial governance. Awale, Abdullahi, and Kulmie (2025) explained that public institutions can only maintain integrity when they cultivate moral responsibility, not when they rely solely on control or punishment. This view parallels the Commission’s mission to preserve integrity through internal awareness rather than fear of sanctions. The study confirms that justice, when guided by *amānah* (trust) and *‘adālah* (justice), becomes a human act of compassion rather than a technical duty. Within this framework, ethical independence is achieved not by isolation from oversight but through the cultivation of moral discipline. The Commission transforms judicial supervision into a process of ethical mentorship, turning formal accountability into a moral covenant. It shows that law and faith can coexist as allies in protecting dignity and fairness in human affairs. Kuguyo, Matimba, Mutevedzi, Gwanzura, and Ndebele (2025) emphasize that institutions thrive ethically when their systems of accountability grow from shared learning and moral reflection. This idea explains why the Commission promotes continuous ethical training for judges instead of punitive regulation. The moral formation process is designed to build the culture of *ihsān* striving for excellence through virtue. Such education anchors reform not in control but in self-awareness, echoing the Qur’anic call to constant *islāh* (renewal through moral improvement). The study demonstrates that judges who are nurtured under these principles begin to see justice as a spiritual responsibility. This transformation restores the moral

legitimacy of the judiciary and fosters empathy in decision-making. The Commission's approach confirms that teaching ethics is more effective than enforcing it, because virtue grows through conviction, not fear. In this way, ethical reform becomes a slow but meaningful evolution of character within the judicial system. Zhang, Shi, and Liu (2025) argue that moral reform succeeds only when it starts with empathy rather than abstract regulation. Their perspective reflects the Commission's preventive ethics programs that emphasize compassion, humility, and reflection. The analysis shows that when judges internalize moral values, ethical behavior becomes a natural expression of conscience. This mirrors the Islamic concept of taqwā, in which awareness of divine accountability guides human action. The Commission's work encourages judges to act with moral sensitivity, not procedural coldness, turning justice into an act of service. As empathy grows, the institutional climate changes from rigid hierarchy to ethical community. Through this process, the judiciary evolves from a mechanism of authority into a reflection of mercy and trust. The reform demonstrates that ethics can transform governance only when conscience is restored at its center. Ranisch and Haltaufderheide (2025) describe modern ethics as a social experiment that must balance moral intuition with institutional structure. The Judicial Commission embodies this dynamic by applying Islamic ethical principles within a constitutional democracy. Its function as both educator and supervisor transforms oversight into dialogue. The Commission operates as a living laboratory where ethics and law continuously interact. This structure reflects the Islamic duty of hisbah encouraging good and restraining injustice in public life. The study shows that consistent moral dialogue produces stability without suppressing independence. Ethical accountability, when structured wisely, becomes a form of self-governance that strengthens integrity. The Commission's gradual approach shows that reform grounded in patience and sincerity lasts longer than change imposed by pressure. It teaches that ethics, like justice, matures through time and reflection.

Mezzadri (2025) highlights that every ethical institution faces a paradox: it needs rules to sustain sincerity, yet excessive formality can weaken virtue. The Commission illustrates this balance by keeping procedures in harmony with moral purpose. Its role is not to turn ethics into bureaucracy but to preserve the spirit of ihsān within judicial processes. The research indicates that sincerity, honesty, and fairness serve as invisible laws that strengthen visible ones. When these values guide behavior, formal regulation becomes lighter but more effective. The Commission demonstrates that law infused with spirituality becomes a force of humanization rather than domination. Its methods show that ethical systems survive best when humility and professionalism walk together. In a world of expanding regulation, the Commission reminds that integrity remains the most enduring rule.

Haag, Starke, Ploner, and Ienca (2025) caution that institutions often change faster than their ethical frameworks, leaving a moral gap that weakens credibility. The Judicial Commission experiences this same tension as it navigates overlapping authority with the Supreme Court. Yet the findings show that the Commission manages to respond with dialogue rather than conflict. Its willingness to reform gradually, through shūrā (consultation), prevents institutional hostility and fosters cooperation. This patient process aligns with the prophetic principle that reform is an act of perseverance, not confrontation. The Commission's restraint teaches that moral reform must evolve with wisdom, not speed. Such restraint strengthens the judiciary's ethical endurance, ensuring that independence is balanced by humility. By facing resistance with consistency, the Commission proves that integrity is built not in triumph but in steadfast service. Comeau, Bitterman, and Celi (2025) observed that transparency protects institutions from moral blindness. The Commission's practice of making ethical evaluations accessible to the public reflects this principle of accountability. Through openness, the Commission allows citizens to participate in the moral life of the judiciary. In Islamic ethics, transparency is an expression of ṣidq (truthfulness) and amānah (trust), creating trust between rulers and the ruled. The findings show that visibility of justice reinforces faith in institutions, making law not only respected but loved. Public scrutiny transforms judgment from secrecy into collective responsibility. The Commission's transparency represents a dialogue between moral authority and civic participation. This openness ensures that justice does not belong to power alone but returns to the people it serves. Fotoh and

Mugwira (2025) found that technology, when guided by ethics, strengthens accountability rather than undermines it. The Commission's adaptation of digital reporting tools illustrates this insight in practice. The development of online systems for monitoring ethical compliance demonstrates muḥāsabah a continuous self-evaluation that refines integrity. Through digital transparency, ethical reflection becomes immediate and verifiable. The study highlights that modernization need not dilute spirituality; it can refine moral precision. The Commission's embrace of technology represents a synthesis of faith and innovation. This synergy embodies the spirit of maqāṣid al-syarī'ah, where preservation of justice and welfare evolves with time. The research confirms that when guided by conscience, technology becomes an ally of justice rather than its rival. Marín, Caro, Rituay, Tuesta, and Santos (2025) note that ethical education is effective only when it touches both reason and emotion. The Commission's programs reflect this harmony by integrating intellectual discourse with spiritual training. Judges are taught not only to know the law but to feel its moral weight. This combination cultivates adab, the refined character that blends wisdom with humility. Ethical education transforms the act of judging from a professional task into a moral vocation. The study reveals that this holistic training shapes judges who act with empathy and courage, seeing justice as a sacred trust. The Commission's pedagogical approach thus turns law into a human experience rooted in compassion. In nurturing moral awareness, it contributes to the long-term culture of integrity in Indonesia's legal system. Finally, Chakrabarti, Fabozzi, Narain, and Sood (2025) argue that transparency, compliance, and trust are the three pillars of sustainable ethical governance. The findings of this study confirm that the Commission embodies these pillars through its integration of Islamic ethics with constitutional law. It builds compliance not through fear but through faith. The Commission's transparency nurtures a shared sense of trust between the judiciary and society. Its governance model demonstrates that ethics can be institutionalized without losing their soul. This integration of spiritual consciousness and modern accountability represents the humanitarian essence of Islamic jurisprudence. The Commission's journey stands as evidence that justice grounded in morality is both timeless and adaptable. It reminds us that the ultimate goal of law is not control, but the preservation of human dignity in every form.

Implications

The results of this study highlight how the Judicial Commission has become a crucial ethical pillar in realizing justice that is humane, transparent, and spiritually conscious. Its practices prove that legal reform can succeed when it integrates moral reasoning with constitutional authority. Within the framework of maqāṣid al-syarī'ah, the Commission's work protects both justice ('adālah) and human dignity (karāmah al-insāniyyah), showing that ethics are not separate from governance but embedded within it. This insight carries broad implications for the development of humanitarian legal systems across Muslim societies. By aligning judicial oversight with compassion and accountability, the Commission embodies an Islamic approach to human rights where law safeguards life, intellect, faith, property, and honor. Policymakers may draw from this experience to design institutions that uphold both legality and morality. The study therefore contributes not only to national discourse but also to a global understanding of how Islamic law can harmonize with universal ethics. It implies that the true purpose of law is not control, but the continuous affirmation of human worth through justice and integrity.

Limitations

Although the findings present a coherent view of ethical governance, several limitations should be recognized to ensure an honest interpretation of the study's scope. The analysis relies largely on normative and qualitative reasoning supported by legal and doctrinal sources, without extensive empirical validation. Because of this, the emotional and behavioral dimensions of ethical practice within the judiciary remain partially unexplored. The focus on Indonesia's constitutional and cultural setting also narrows the generalizability of the conclusions, since the structure and values of judicial systems differ across Muslim contexts. Furthermore, ethical behavior is inherently complex and shaped by social interaction, institutional culture, and personal belief, which cannot be fully captured through document

analysis. These limitations, however, do not undermine the validity of the conceptual framework developed in this research. Instead, they highlight the need for a multidisciplinary approach that blends Islamic jurisprudence with social and behavioral insight. The study's boundaries lie in its method, not in its vision for moral reform.

Conclusion

This study concludes that the Judicial Commission has emerged as a vital moral force in aligning Indonesia's legal framework with the ethical vision of Islamic humanitarian principles. Its existence reaffirms that justice, to be legitimate, must rest not only on institutional power but on moral integrity and compassion. The Commission's role in supervising, educating, and guiding judges reflects the spirit of *maqāṣid al-syarī'ah*, where law serves to protect human dignity (*karāmah al-insāniyyah*), equity (*'adālah*), and social welfare (*maṣlahah*). By transforming judicial ethics into a sustained moral practice, the Commission illustrates that faith-based values can strengthen democratic governance rather than oppose it. The research findings also highlight that ethical reform grounded in *amānah* (trust) and *iḥsān* (moral excellence) restores public confidence in justice as a humane and transparent institution. The Commission's continued evolution demonstrates that Islamic law, when interpreted through a humanitarian lens, can provide solutions to contemporary challenges in governance and integrity. Ultimately, this study affirms that true justice is achieved when law embodies mercy, accountability, and the preservation of human worth reflecting the universal harmony between divine guidance and human responsibility.

Author Contributions Statement

Urwatul Wutsqah conceived and developed the research idea, designed the study, and conducted the entire process of data collection and analysis through library-based qualitative methods. The author also performed the literature review, interpreted the theoretical and legal findings, and formulated the discussion in accordance with Islamic humanitarian jurisprudence and contemporary legal reform perspectives. All sections of the manuscript including the introduction, methodology, analysis, and conclusion were written and critically revised solely by the author. The author approves the final version of this article and takes full responsibility for its academic integrity and originality.

References

- Armaly, M. T. (2021). Loyalty over Fairness: Acceptance of Unfair Supreme Court Procedures. *Political Research Quarterly*, 74(4), 927–940. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1065912920944470>
- Awale, A. A., Abdullahi, F. A., & Kulmie, D. A. (2025). Understanding the Realities of Financial Crime in Public Institutions: Female Public Servants' Insights. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 15(1), 319–329. <https://doi.org/10.32479/ijefi.17417>
- Bozçalı, F. (2024). Proving injustice: Smuggler killings, impunity work, and vernacular counterforensics in Turkey's Kurdish borderlands. *American Anthropologist*, 126(4), 567–580. <https://doi.org/10.1111/aman.28015>
- Chakrabarti, M., Fabozzi, F. J., Narain, A., & Sood, A. (2025). Ethical AI in Asset Management: Frameworks for Transparency, Compliance, and Trust. *Journal of Financial Data Science*, 7(1), 18–35. <https://doi.org/10.3905/jfds.2025.7.1.018>
- Comeau, D. S., Bitterman, D. S., & Celi, L. A. (2025). Preventing unrestricted and unmonitored AI experimentation in healthcare through transparency and accountability. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-025-01443-2>
- Donley, N., Bullard, R. D., Economos, J., Figueroa, I., Lee, J., Liebman, A. K., Martinez, D. N., & Shafiei, F. (2022). Pesticides and environmental injustice in the USA: Root causes, current regulatory reinforcement and a path forward. *BMC Public Health*, 22(1), 708. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12889-022-13057-4>

- Evans, M. I., & Britt, D. W. (2023). Resistance to Change. *Reproductive Sciences*, 30(3), 835–853. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s43032-022-01015-9>
- Formosa, P., Wilson, M., & Richards, D. (2021). A principlist framework for cybersecurity ethics. *Computers & Security*, 109, 102382. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cose.2021.102382>
- Fotoh, L. E., & Mugwira, T. (2025). Exploring Large Language Models in external audits: Implications and ethical considerations. *International Journal of Accounting Information Systems*, 56. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.accinf.2025.100748>
- Gisbert, R. B. (2022). Judicial Independence in European Constitutional Law. *European Constitutional Law Review*, 18(4), 591–620. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1574019622000347>
- Grogan, J. (2022). COVID-19, The Rule of Law and Democracy. Analysis of Legal Responses to a Global Health Crisis. *Hague Journal on the Rule of Law*, 14(2), 349–369. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40803-022-00168-8>
- Haag, L., Starke, G., Ploner, M., & Ienca, M. (2025). Ethical gaps in closed-loop neurotechnology: A scoping review. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-025-01908-4>
- Kerr, N., & Wahman, M. (2021). Electoral Rulings and Public Trust in African Courts and Elections. *Comparative Politics*, 53(2), 257–290. <https://doi.org/10.5129/001041521X15930293747844>
- Kovalčík, M. (2022). The instrumental abuse of constitutional courts: How populists can use constitutional courts against the opposition. *The International Journal of Human Rights*, 26(7), 1160–1180. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13642987.2022.2108017>
- Krewson, C. N. (2023). Political Hearings Reinforce Legal Norms: Confirmation Hearings and Views of the United States Supreme Court. *Political Research Quarterly*, 76(1), 418–431. <https://doi.org/10.1177/10659129221094877>
- Kristiana, Y., & Hutahayan, B. (2024). *Judicial Corruption in the Post-Reform Era: Assessing the Effectiveness of Legal Reforms in Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.1163/15718123-bja10208>
- Kuguyo, O., Matimba, A., Mutevedzi, F., Chimatira, A., Chikwasha, V., Kangwende, A., Gwanzura, L., & Ndebele, P. (2025). Strengthening ethical oversight in genomics and biobanking: A retrospective analysis of research practices in Zimbabwe. *BMC Medical Ethics*, 26(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12910-025-01257-7>
- Liu, J., Shahab, Y., & Hoque, H. (2022). Government Response Measures and Public Trust during the COVID-19 Pandemic: Evidence from Around the World. *British Journal of Management*, 33(2), 571–602. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-8551.12577>
- Loi, M., Hauser, C., & Christen, M. (2022). Highway to (Digital) Surveillance: When Are Clients Coerced to Share Their Data with Insurers? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 175(1), 7–19. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-020-04668-1>
- Magalhães, P. C., & Garoupa, N. (2024). Populist governments, judicial independence, and public trust in the courts. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 31(9), 2748–2774. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2023.2235386>
- Marín, Y. R., Caro, O. C., Rituay, A. M. C., Llanos, K. A. G., Perez, D. T., Bardales, E. S., Tuesta, J. N. A., & Santos, R. C. (2025). Ethical Challenges Associated with the Use of Artificial Intelligence in University Education. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2443–2467. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09660-w>
- Martufi, A. (2022). Effective judicial protection and the European arrest warrant: Navigating between procedural autonomy and mutual trust. *Common Market Law Review*, 59(5). <https://kluwerlawonline.com/api/Product/CitationPDFURL?file=Journals\COLA\COLA2022095.pdf>
- Mezzadri, D. (2025). The Paradox of Ethical AI-Assisted Research. *Journal of Academic Ethics*, 23(4), 2653–2667. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10805-025-09671-7>
- Miliuvienė, J. (2024). *How to avoid constitutional court-packing in an era of democratic backsliding: Reflections on the appointment of constitutional judges*. <https://doi.org/10.1556/2052.2024.00530>
- Mukhlis, M. M., Maskun, Tajuddin, M. S., Andriani, D., Muchtasar, R., & Masum, A. (2025). Regional Government Autonomy in Indonesia: The Ambiguity of the Federalism of Republic Model. *Malaysian Journal of Syariah and Law*, 13, 35.
- Nam, B. H., & Bai, Q. (2023). ChatGPT and its ethical implications for STEM research and higher education: A media discourse analysis. *International Journal of STEM Education*, 10(1), 66. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40594-023-00452-5>

- Ono, Y., & Zilis, M. A. (2022). Ascriptive Characteristics and Perceptions of Impropriety in the Rule of Law: Race, Gender, and Public Assessments of Whether Judges Can Be Impartial. *American Journal of Political Science*, 66(1), 43–58. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ajps.12599>
- Ranisch, R., & Haltaufderheide, J. (2025). Foundation models in medicine are a social experiment: Time for an ethical framework. *Npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41746-025-01924-4>
- Scudder, M. F., Ercan, S. A., & McCallum, K. (2023). Institutional listening in deliberative democracy: Towards a deliberative logic of transmission. *Politics*, 43(1), 38–53. <https://doi.org/10.1177/026339572111060691>
- Šipulová, K. (2025). The light and the dark side of judicial resistance. *Law & Policy*, 47(1), e12247. <https://doi.org/10.1111/lapo.12247>
- Sulastri, D., Arifin, F., Susanto, A. F., Huda, U. N., & Nor, M. Z. M. (2025). Institutional Integrity and Challenges in the Indonesian Constitutional Court Institution. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 32(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.18196/jmh.v32i1.24100>
- Susanto, M., Harijanti, S. D., Perwira, I., & Hernawan, M. Y. A. (2025). Constitutional Repair through Opposition Reform: Designing the Right of the Opposition and Incentive Systems to Counter Democratic Deterioration in Indonesia. *Jambura Law Review*, 7(2), 583–632. <https://doi.org/10.33756/jlr.v7i2.29349>
- Vgontzas, N. (2022). Toward Degrowth: Worker Power, Surveillance Abolition, and Climate Justice at Amazon. *New Global Studies*, 16(1), 49–67. <https://doi.org/10.1515/ngs-2022-0008>
- Wiratraman, H. P. (2022). Constitutional Struggles and the Court in Indonesia's Turn to Authoritarian Politics. *Federal Law Review*, 50(3), 314–330. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0067205X221107404>
- Zhang, Y., Deng, Q., Zheng, X., Xu, X., & Wang, F. (2025). Online continuing education for midwives in China: Current trends, barriers, and future directions. *BMC Medical Education*, 25(1). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12909-025-07180-0>
- Zhou, Z., Zhou, X., Zhang, X., & Chen, W. (2025). Judicial Waves, Ethical Shifts: Bankruptcy Courts and Corporate ESG Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 198(3), 537–557. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-024-05780-2>