

Authority Fragmentation Within Sentra Gakkumdu and Its Impact on The Effectiveness of Electoral Criminal Law Enforcement in Indonesia

La Radi Eno

Lecturer of Law, Faculty of Law, Bung Karno University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: laradieno6@gmail.com

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.55299/jsh.v5i1.1912>

Article history: Received May 27, 2026: Revised June 22, 2026: Accepted June 29, 2026

ABSTRACT

Enforcement of electoral crimes is an integral part of the electoral justice system, which functions to guarantee the integrity of the election process, protect citizens' political rights, and strengthen the legitimacy of democracy based on the principles of justice, legal certainty, and political equality. However, the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu), consisting of Bawaslu, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, has not been fully able to realize an integrated electoral crime law enforcement system. This study aims to analyze the factors causing the fragmentation of authority within the Sentra Gakkumdu and formulate an ideal institutional model to increase the effectiveness of electoral crime enforcement based on the principles of electoral justice. This study employs normative legal research with a statutory, conceptual, and case approach. Legal materials are analyzed qualitatively through descriptive-analytical and prescriptive methods to obtain legal constructions relevant to the problem under study.

The research findings indicate that the design of the Gakkumdu Center's authority remains coordinative, leading to fragmentation in normative aspects, institutions, evidentiary standards and decision-making mechanisms. This situation results in low legal certainty, hampered case handling, and suboptimal enforcement of election crimes. This study proposes a reconstruction of the Integrated Electoral Criminal Justice System (IECJS) model that integrates oversight, investigation, and prosecution functions through harmonization of authority, unification of evidentiary standards, and effective mechanisms for resolving conflict of authority. This model is expected to strengthen the effectiveness of election law enforcement while realizing electoral justice and maintaining the integrity of democracy in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Gakkumdu Center, Election Crimes, Integrated Electoral Criminal Justice System.*

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is a democratic country that continuously strives to improve the quality and image of its democratic system at the international level. This commitment is evident in Article 1 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which affirms that supreme power rests with the people. This concept of popular sovereignty aligns with the values contained in Pancasila, which aims to realize a just, prosperous, and prosperous life for the Indonesian nation.

General elections are a fundamental instrument in a democratic constitutional state that functions as a means of implementing the sovereignty of the people as guaranteed in Article 1 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. From the perspective of constitutional democracy, elections are not only understood as a mechanism for the periodic change of power, but also as an instrument of political legitimacy that determines the quality of representation and the sustainability of a democratic system of government. Therefore, the implementation of elections must be carried out based on the principles of direct,

general, free, secret, honest and fair as stated in Article 22E paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

In modern democracies, election integrity is determined not only by the quality of regulations and election organizers, but also by the effectiveness of the law enforcement system against any violations that could undermine democratic principles. Election violations that are not effectively addressed have the potential to undermine the legitimacy of election results, undermine public trust in democratic institutions, and threaten the principle of political equality for citizens. Therefore, the existence of an election law enforcement mechanism is an inseparable part of efforts to maintain electoral integrity in a democratic country.

The regulation of election crimes in the Indonesian legal system is a manifestation of the state's criminal policy to protect the democratic process of elections. Criminal law is positioned as an instrument of *ultimum remedium*, functioning to prevent and address various forms of violations that threaten the integrity of the people's voice. In this context, Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections regulates various types of election crimes, including violations of election stages, money politics, abuse of office, manipulation of election results, and various actions that hinder the exercise of citizens' political rights.

As a consequence of the complexity of handling election crimes, lawmakers established the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (*Sentra Gakkumdu*) consisting of elements from the General Elections Supervisory Agency (*Bawaslu*), the Indonesian National Police, and the Indonesian Attorney General's Office. The establishment of the *Sentra Gakkumdu* is intended as a coordination and integration mechanism in handling election crimes so that the law enforcement process can take place quickly, effectively, and provide legal certainty. Conceptually, the institutional design of the *Sentra Gakkumdu* reflects the application of the principle of an integrated criminal justice system that positions each law enforcement institution as an interconnected subsystem in achieving the common goal of effective and just law enforcement.

However, the implementation of election crime law enforcement still faces various obstacles. The existence of the *Gakkumdu* Center has not been able to fully optimize the case handling process, as reports and findings of alleged election crimes often encounter obstacles during the discussion, investigation, and prosecution stages due to differing perspectives and legal interpretations among the institutions involved. In many cases, the Election Supervisory Agency (*Bawaslu*) assesses that the elements of an election crime have been met, while the Police or Prosecutor's Office argues otherwise because they are deemed to have not met the standard of proof required by criminal procedure law. These differences often result in the termination of case handling, creating a public perception of the weak effectiveness of election law enforcement.

This phenomenon indicates a fragmentation of authority within the *Gakkumdu* Center. This fragmentation of authority is not only defined as the division of tasks between institutions, but also encompasses differences in paradigms, institutional orientations, evidentiary standards, and decision-making mechanisms that influence the effectiveness of law enforcement. From the perspective of authority theory, each institution involved in the *Gakkumdu* Center has a different basis for attribution and function, potentially leading to conflicts of authority if not regulated through a clear coordination mechanism.

Theoretically, the success of a criminal justice system is largely determined by the harmony of relationships between the subsystems involved. Muladi emphasized that the criminal justice system can only function effectively if all components involved share a common vision, orientation, and goals in the law enforcement process. When each institution maintains its own sectoral ego and uses different parameters in assessing legal events, the integration intended to establish the system turns into fragmentation, hindering the effectiveness of law enforcement.

Previous studies have generally examined the effectiveness of the *Gakkumdu* Center from the perspective of institutional coordination, obstacles to law enforcement, and the implementation of election crime provisions. However, these studies tend to position coordination issues as technical administrative issues and have not comprehensively analyzed the fragmentation of authority as a structural issue within the *Gakkumdu* Center's institutional design. In fact, the primary issue contributing to the low effectiveness of election law enforcement lies not solely in coordination but in differences in institutional paradigms that impact the decision-making process in handling election crime cases.

Based on these conditions, this study offers a new perspective through the concept of a Fragmented Electoral Criminal Justice System. This concept stems from the argument that the Sentra Gakkumdu, normatively designed as an integrated criminal justice system, has in practice developed into a fragmented electoral criminal law enforcement system due to differences in authority, institutional orientation, and evidentiary standards among the Election Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. This fragmentation directly impacts the effectiveness of enforcing election crimes, particularly in terms of legal certainty, electoral justice, and protecting democratic integrity.

FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

Based on the description of the background above, the problems in this research can be formulated as follows:

1. Why has the design of authority in the Gakkumdu Center failed to create an integrated election crime law enforcement system in Indonesia?
2. How can the ideal institutional model of the Gakkumdu Center be reconstructed to overcome the fragmentation of authority and increase the effectiveness of enforcing election crimes based on the principle of electoral justice?

RESEARCH PURPOSES

In relation to this research, the research outlines its objectives as follows:

1. Analyzing the weaknesses in the design of authority in the Gakkumdu Center, which causes fragmentation of law enforcement for election crimes in Indonesia.
2. Formulate an institutional reconstruction model for the Gakkumdu Center that is capable of integrating the functions of supervision, investigation, and prosecution in order to realize the effectiveness of enforcing election crimes that are just and have legal certainty.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is a normative legal research that aims to analyze the fragmentation of authority within the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) and its impact on the effectiveness of enforcing election crimes in Indonesia. The approaches used include the statute, conceptual, and case approaches. The statutory approach is used to examine various regulations governing the authority of the Sentra Gakkumdu in handling election crimes, while the conceptual approach is used to analyze the concept of authority, the integrated criminal justice system, and electoral justice. The case approach is used to examine the implementation of the authority of the Sentra Gakkumdu in handling election crimes.

The legal sources in this study are grouped into primary legal materials, secondary legal materials, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include various laws and regulations that serve as the basis for regulating election law enforcement, including the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections. Secondary legal materials are obtained from relevant scientific literature, such as books, journal articles, research results, and the views of scholars related to election law and the criminal justice system. Tertiary legal materials are used as supporting materials to clarify legal concepts and terminology, including legal dictionaries, encyclopedias, and other relevant reference sources.

The legal materials were collected through library research, then analyzed qualitatively using legal interpretation and construction methods. The analysis was conducted to identify the fragmentation of authority within the Gakkumdu Center, evaluate its impact on the effectiveness of election crime enforcement, and formulate an institutional strengthening model to achieve effective, legally certain, and just election law enforcement.

RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION.

Gakkumdu Center from the Perspective of the Integrated Criminal Justice System

The establishment of the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) is part of a legal policy design aimed at strengthening the effectiveness of handling election crimes through a coordinated working mechanism between law enforcement agencies. The presence of the Sentra Gakkumdu reflects the

state's efforts to build an election law enforcement system capable of maintaining the integrity of the electoral process and ensuring the implementation of the principles of honest and fair elections. Legally, the existence of the Sentra Gakkumdu is legally based in Article 486 of Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, which places the General Elections Supervisory Body (Bawaslu), the Indonesian National Police, and the Indonesian Attorney General's Office in an integrated mechanism for handling election crimes. This regulation demonstrates the intention of lawmakers to integrate the functions of supervision, investigation, and prosecution into one coordinated law enforcement mechanism.

Conceptually, the Gakkumdu Center is an implementation of the Integrated Criminal Justice System (ICJS) theory, which positions law enforcement agencies as an interconnected system in achieving law enforcement goals. According to Mardjono Reksodiputro, the criminal justice system must be understood as a unified whole comprising various subsystems that work synergistically to ensure effective crime prevention and the protection of the public's legal interests. Within the framework of enforcing criminal election law, this integration is important considering that election violations are not only related to violations of criminal norms, but also concern the protection of citizens' constitutional rights and the legitimacy of democracy.

Within this framework, Bawaslu oversees and reviews allegations of election crimes, the police conduct investigations and inquiries, and the Prosecutor's Office prosecutes. This division of authority demonstrates a complementary functional relationship in the election law enforcement process. Therefore, the effectiveness of the Gakkumdu Center depends heavily on the level of coordination, authority harmonization, and shared perceptions among the institutions involved.

According to Muladi, an integrated criminal justice system requires a unified vision, unified policy, and unified action among law enforcement officials. If each institution exercises its authority based on a different paradigm, the goal of integration will be difficult to achieve. In practice, the Gakkumdu Center still faces issues such as differing legal interpretations, evidentiary standards, and institutional orientations, which have the potential to hinder optimal law enforcement against election crimes.

According to the legal system theory proposed by Lawrence M. Friedman, the effectiveness of the Gakkumdu Center is determined by the alignment between the legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture. The legal structure relates to the institutional relationship between Bawaslu, the Police, and the Prosecutor's office; the legal substance relates to the regulation of authority and procedures for handling election crimes; and the legal culture relates to the commitment and work patterns of law enforcement officers in realizing the objectives of enforcing election law.

From the perspective of the Integrated Criminal Justice System, the Gakkumdu Center is a strategic instrument designed to integrate the entire process of enforcing election crimes. However, the effectiveness of this system is largely determined by the ability of each institution to build coordination, align law enforcement paradigms, and set aside sectoral egos to ensure legal certainty, justice, and election integrity.

Forms of Fragmentation of Authority in Gakkumdu Centers

The Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) is an institutional mechanism established to strengthen synergy between Bawaslu (Elections Supervisory Agency), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office in handling election crimes. Its establishment is aimed at creating integration between the supervisory, investigative, and prosecution functions so that the election law enforcement process can proceed effectively, consistently, and provide legal certainty. Within this framework, Sentra Gakkumdu is expected to serve as a means of integrating law enforcement agencies to realize electoral justice.

However, the implementation of the Gakkumdu Center in practice does not fully reflect an integrated law enforcement system. Various problems still arise due to differences in authority, institutional perspectives, and working mechanisms among the institutions within it. This situation has given rise to a fragmentation of authority that is evident not only in administrative aspects but also in the normative, structural, and technical dimensions of case handling. As a result, the effectiveness of enforcement of election crimes is often affected by differences in legal interpretation, standards of proof, and decision-making processes among law enforcement agencies.

1. Fragmentation of Normative Authority

The first form of authority fragmentation stems from the construction of legal regulations that divide the function of enforcing election crimes among several institutions. The Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) is authorized to receive and review reports or findings of alleged election crimes, while investigative authority rests with the police and prosecution with the Prosecutor's Office. This division of authority indicates that each stage of law enforcement falls under the authority of a different institution.

Although intended to implement the principle of functional differentiation in the criminal justice system, this arrangement has the potential to lead to differences in interpretation, standards of proof, and assessment of cases. Consequently, coordination between institutions is not always effective, preventing the goal of integrating law enforcement through the Gakkumdu Center from being fully achieved.

This normative construction indicates that the Gakkumdu Center is not an independent law enforcement agency, but rather a coordinating forum that brings together the authority of three different institutions. Consequently, the law enforcement process is highly dependent on each institution's interpretation of applicable legal norms. According to Philipus M. Hadjon, differences in the sources and basis of authority have the potential to lead to conflicts of authority if not accompanied by a clear and firm coordination mechanism.

2. Fragmentation of Institutional Authority

Fragmentation is also evident in the institutional aspects. The Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office (AGO) have different characteristics, organizational structures, and institutional orientations. Bawaslu functions as an election supervisory body focused on protecting the integrity of the democratic process. In contrast, the Police and the Prosecutor's Office are law enforcement institutions focused on proving criminal acts based on the principle of due process of law.

These differing orientations often result in differing perspectives on assessing legal incidents. The Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) tends to emphasize violations of the principles of free and fair elections, while the Police and Prosecutors' Office place greater emphasis on fulfilling the elements of a crime and the sufficiency of evidence as required by criminal procedure law. As a result, a report of alleged election crimes that Bawaslu deems worthy of follow-up may not necessarily receive the same assessment from investigators and prosecutors.

3. Fragmentation in the Standard of Proof

Another form of fragmentation lies in the differing standards of proof used by each element of the Gakkumdu Center. In carrying out its oversight function, Bawaslu uses monitoring results, public reports, and studies of alleged violations as the basis for its initial assessment of a legal event. In contrast, the Police and the Prosecutor's office are bound by the provisions of criminal procedure law, which require valid evidence to prove a crime.

These differences in evidentiary standards are often the primary reason why cases do not proceed to the investigation or prosecution stage. In several election crime cases, Bawaslu concluded that the elements of a violation had been met, but investigators or prosecutors argued that the available evidence did not meet the evidentiary standards required for criminal proceedings. This, showing a disharmony between the election supervision and criminal law approaches in the election law enforcement system.

4. Fragmentation in Decision-Making Mechanisms

The fragmentation of authority is also reflected in the decision-making mechanisms at the Gakkumdu Center. Although discussions are held collaboratively, there are no explicit provisions granting final authority to any entity in the event of a difference of opinion. As a result, the case handling process relies heavily on reaching an understanding between institutions.

From an organizational theory perspective, this situation indicates shared authority without a clear hierarchy, meaning a division of authority without a final authority to resolve differing opinions. This situation has the potential to cause stagnation in the case handling process and hinder the achievement of the goal of swift and effective law enforcement.

5. Fragmentation of Legal Culture Between Institutions

In addition to normative and institutional aspects, the fragmentation of authority is also influenced by differences in legal culture between institutions. Lawrence M. Friedman explains that legal culture is a crucial factor determining how the law is implemented in practice. In the context of the Gakkumdu Center, each institution brings different traditions, work patterns, and professional orientations.

These differences in legal culture often give rise to sectoral egos that hinder the integration process. Officials from each institution tend to maintain their own institutional paradigms, so the coordination established within the Gakkumdu Centers does not always result in shared perceptions. As a result, the Gakkumdu Centers, which were normatively designed as instruments for an integrated criminal justice system, in practice reflect a more fragmented model of inter-institutional coordination.

The fragmentation of authority within the Gakkumdu Center encompasses five main dimensions: normative fragmentation, institutional fragmentation, evidentiary standards, decision-making mechanisms, and legal culture. These five forms of fragmentation demonstrate that the problems faced by the Gakkumdu Center are not merely technical coordination issues, but rather structural issues related to the design of the election crime law enforcement system itself. Therefore, efforts to improve the effectiveness of election law enforcement must begin with improvements to the sources of this fragmentation of authority so that the goal of establishing the Gakkumdu Center as an integrated election law enforcement instrument can be optimally realized.

The Impact of Fragmentation of Authority on the Effectiveness of Enforcement of Election Crimes

The fragmentation of authority within the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) not only impacts the coordinative relationship between institutions but also impacts the overall performance of election crime enforcement. In studies of legal effectiveness, a law enforcement mechanism is deemed effective if it achieves its legal objectives, namely ensuring legal certainty, realizing justice, and providing benefits to the community. Therefore, the existence of fragmented authority has the potential to reduce the ability of the election law enforcement system to optimally achieve these objectives. Therefore, when there is disharmony in authority between law enforcement agencies, the effectiveness of the election law enforcement system becomes difficult to achieve, the impacts of which include:

1. Decreasing legal certainty in handling election crimes.

One consequence of the fragmentation of authority within the Gakkumdu Center is reduced legal certainty in handling election crimes. Differences in interpretation regarding the elements of a crime, the quality of evidence, and the suitability of a case for further proceedings often lead to divergent attitudes among the Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. As a result, reports or findings of alleged election crimes do not always receive uniform and sustainable handling. This situation can lead to unclear legal status of a case and undermine public trust in the effectiveness of election law enforcement mechanisms. In fact, legal certainty is one of the fundamental principles of a state based on law which demands the application of the law in a consistent and predictable manner.

2. The fragmentation of authority also affects the smooth handling of election crime cases. Unlike criminal cases in general, the handling of election crimes is constrained by strict deadlines, requiring each stage to be carried out quickly and in a coordinated manner. Under these circumstances, differences in assessment or stance among elements of the Gakkumdu Center can slow down the decision-making process and reduce the efficiency of case handling. As a result, some cases cannot be processed optimally due to time constraints stipulated in legislation, making it difficult to achieve the objectives of election law enforcement to the fullest extent.

3. The deterrent effect of election-related criminal law is declining. Ineffective law enforcement means that election violations do not always result in legal proceedings that provide a deterrent effect for perpetrators. According to Muladi and Barda Nawawi Arief, one of the functions of criminal law is to prevent crime through the imposition of effective and consistent sanctions. When election violations are not optimally addressed due to fragmented authority, the preventive and repressive functions of criminal law become less effective in maintaining election integrity.

4. Declining quality of electoral justice. The electoral justice system essentially aims to ensure that any violations of the electoral process are handled quickly, fairly, and effectively. The fragmentation of authority often results in the law enforcement process being unable to provide optimal protection for the political rights of citizens and election participants. Consequently, the goal of electoral law enforcement as an instrument for protecting democracy is not fully achieved.

Furthermore, the fragmentation of authority has the potential to undermine the legitimacy of election results. In a democracy, election legitimacy is determined not only by the voting process but also by the state's ability to prosecute any violations that could affect the integrity of the election results. When law enforcement is perceived as ineffective, public trust in election management institutions and law enforcement agencies will also decline.

Based on the above description, it can be concluded that the fragmentation of authority within the Gakkumdu Center has consequences that are not only institutional in nature, but also affect the performance of the election law enforcement system as a whole. These implications include reduced legal certainty, decreased effectiveness of case handling, weakened preventive functions of criminal law, less than optimal realization of electoral justice, and the potential to reduce public trust in the democratic process. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen the integration of authority, a common perception, and synergy among elements of the Gakkumdu Center to build a more effective, equitable, and legal certainty system for enforcing election crimes.

Reconstruction of the Law Enforcement Model for Election Crimes

The fragmentation of authority within the Gakkumdu Center indicates that the election crime enforcement system is still dominated by a coordinative approach and does not fully reflect the principles of an integrated criminal justice system. This situation gives rise to differences in legal interpretations, evidentiary standards, and institutional orientations, which impact the effectiveness of case handling. Therefore, a reconstruction of the election crime enforcement model is needed that strengthens the integration of authority across law enforcement agencies. This effort is crucial for achieving more effective election law enforcement, ensuring legal certainty, and strengthening election fairness and integrity.

Reconstructing the electoral crime enforcement system needs to begin with a renewal of the law enforcement paradigm. To date, the handling of electoral crimes has been largely influenced by a general criminal law approach that emphasizes formal evidence. However, election crime violations have broader dimensions, relating to the protection of citizens' political rights, the integrity of the electoral process, and the legitimacy of election results.

Based on this, election law enforcement needs to be guided by an electoral justice system paradigm that prioritizes protecting election integrity. Within this framework, the function of criminal law is not limited to imposing sanctions on violators but also plays a role in maintaining the fairness of the election process, protecting citizens' constitutional rights, and strengthening the quality of democracy.

From an institutional perspective, reconstruction needs to be directed at strengthening the position of the Gakkumdu Center, transforming it from a mere coordination forum to a more integrated law enforcement mechanism. The current model places the Elections Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office in a coordinating relationship, allowing each institution to exercise its authority based on its own institutional paradigm. This situation has the potential to lead to different assessments of cases. Therefore, strengthening regulations that provide uniform operational standards and legal parameters for all elements of the Gakkumdu Center in handling election crimes is necessary.

The next step in the reconstruction process is the decision-making mechanism. One of the main weaknesses in the current system is the lack of a final and binding mechanism for resolving disagreements. As a result, many cases cannot be pursued due to differing views among elements of the Gakkumdu Center. To address this issue, a more structured decision-making model is needed, including the establishment of an internal adjudication forum or legal review mechanism that can provide final decisions on differing legal interpretations that arise during case discussions. This way, the law enforcement process is not hampered by conflicts of authority between institutions.

Another equally important aspect of the reconstruction of the enforcement of election crimes is the harmonization of evidentiary standards across law enforcement agencies. In practice, differences in assessments regarding the sufficiency of evidence and the fulfillment of the elements of a crime often lead to disagreements among elements of the Gakkumdu Center, thus affecting the continuity of the case handling process. This situation indicates a lack of uniformity in the parameters for assessing alleged election crimes.

Therefore, it is necessary to formulate integrated evidentiary guidelines that apply uniformly to Bawaslu, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office. These guidelines must contain clear criteria regarding the sufficiency of evidence, indicators for fulfilling the elements of a crime, and procedures for assessing cases at each stage of law enforcement. Harmonizing these evidentiary standards is crucial for strengthening legal certainty, increasing consistency in case handling, and minimizing the potential for differences in interpretation between law enforcement agencies.

From the perspective of Lawrence M. Friedman's legal system theory, the reconstruction of law enforcement for election crimes must be carried out comprehensively across three main elements of the legal system: legal structure, legal substance, and legal culture. In terms of legal structure, institutional integration between elements of the Gakkumdu Center is needed to be strengthened. In terms of legal substance, harmonization of regulations governing the authority and procedures for handling election crimes is needed. In terms of legal culture, the development of a collaborative work culture that prioritizes the objectives of election law enforcement over the sectoral interests of each institution is needed.

This study proposes a model for the Integrated Electoral Criminal Justice System, a criminal law enforcement system for elections that integrates the functions of oversight, investigation, and prosecution within the framework of electoral justice. This model is built on four main principles: integration of authority, harmonization of evidentiary standards, a binding mechanism for resolving conflicts of authority, and an orientation toward protecting electoral integrity. Through this model, the Gakkumdu Center no longer functions solely as an inter-institutional coordination forum but rather as an instrument for enforcing electoral law capable of ensuring legal certainty, effective case handling, and protection of constitutional democracy.

CLOSING

Conclusion

The institutional design of the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) has not been fully capable of establishing an integrated election crime enforcement system because the relationship between Bawaslu, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office still relies on a pattern of coordination between institutions with different authorities, procedures, and institutional orientations. This configuration has given rise to fragmented authority, evidenced by the interpretation of legal norms, standards of proof, and mechanisms for determining case follow-up. As a result, Sentra Gakkumdu has not yet operated as an integrated election criminal justice system but rather exhibits characteristics of partial inter-institutional work. This condition has implications for reduced legal certainty, decreased effectiveness in handling election crimes, and suboptimal protection of the integrity of the electoral process and citizens' constitutional rights in the implementation of democratic elections.

Institutional reform of the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Sentra Gakkumdu) needs to be directed toward developing an Integrated Electoral Criminal Justice System (IECJS) oriented toward the principles of electoral justice. This model places oversight, investigation, and prosecution functions within an integrated law enforcement framework through the alignment of authority between institutions, harmonization of evidentiary standards, and the establishment of a mechanism for resolving disagreements that is binding on all law enforcement elements.

Through this approach, the Gakkumdu Center no longer functions solely as a coordination forum between institutions, but rather develops into an integrated and effective system for enforcing election crimes. This integration is expected to increase legal certainty, strengthen electoral justice, guarantee the protection of citizens' political rights, and support the maintenance of the integrity and legitimacy of constitutional democracy in Indonesia.

Suggestion

FormerThe law needs to reformulate the regulations for Gakkumdu Centers in the General Election Law.by strengthening the design of the integration of authority between Bawaslu, the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, including regulations regarding uniform standards of proof and a final and binding mechanism for resolving disagreements. This step is necessary to reduce the fragmentation of authority that has hampered the realization of an effective, integrated, and legally certain system for enforcing election crimes.

The institutional model update of the Gakkumdu Center needs to be directed at implementing the concept*Integrated Electoral Criminal Justice System (IECJS)*based on the principle of electoral justice. This model must be realized through strengthened substantive coordination between law enforcement agencies, harmonized case handling procedures, and the development of a collaborative legal culture that prioritizes the protection of election integrity and citizens' constitutional rights. This will enhance the effectiveness of handling election crimes while strengthening public trust in Indonesia's democratic system and election administration.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Book:

- Abdullah H Rozali, *Realizing a Higher Quality Election*, Raja Grafindo Persada., Jakarta, 2019.
- Andi Hamzah, *Indonesian Criminal Procedure Law*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta 2023.
- Gustav Radbruch, *Legal Philosophy*, Harvard University Press, Massachusetts, 1950.
- International IDEA, *Electoral Justice Handbook*, International IDEA, Stockholm, 2020
- Jimly Asshiddiqie, *Introduction to Constitutional Law*, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta, 2023
- Lawrence M. Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*, Russell Sage Foundation, New York, 1975.
- Mardjono Reksodiputro, *The Indonesian Criminal Justice System*, University of Indonesia Press, Jakarta, 2022
- Muladi and Barda Nawawi Arief, *Criminal Theories and Policies*, Alumni, Bandung, 2018.
- Muladi, *Selected Chapters on the Criminal Justice System*, Diponegoro University Publishing Agency, Semarang, 2019.
- Philipus M. Hadjon, *Introduction to Indonesian Administrative Law*, Gadjah Mada University Press, Yogyakarta, 2020.
- Pippa Norris, *Why Electoral Integrity Matters*, Cambridge University Press, New York, 2014.
- Ramlan Surbakti, *Elections and Constitutional Democracy*, Kemitraan, Jakarta, 2019.
- Soerjono Soekanto, *Factors Influencing Law Enforcement*, Rajawali Pers, Jakarta, 2019.
- Topo Santoso, *Election Law Enforcement in Indonesia*, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta, 2021.
- Topo Santoso, *Election Crimes in Indonesia*, Rajawali Pers, Depok, 2022

Legislation

- The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.
- Law Number 8 of 1981 concerning Criminal Procedure Law.
- Law Number 20 of 2025 concerning the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP),
- Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections.
- General Election Supervisory Agency Regulation Number 31 of 2018 concerning the Integrated Law Enforcement Center.

Journal:

- Akhmad Hairil Anwar, *The Role of Bawaslu in Law Enforcement and Election Justice*, Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan, Vol. 3 Number 2, September 2019.
- Andiraharja, Diyar Ginanjar. "Legal Politics in Handling Election Crimes." *Legal Treasury* 2. 1. (tt).
- Fahmi, Khairul. "Problems of Enforcing Election Crimes in the Indonesian Election System." *Constitutional Journal* 18, No. 2 (2021): 228–247.
- Fahmi, Khairul. "Gakkumdu Center and the Effectiveness of Election Law Enforcement." *Indonesian Legislation Journal* 19, No. 1 (2022): 45–61.