



GETTING SMART ON JUSTICE HEALING HEARTS & SAFER SOCIETIES

*Originally delivered as a Keynote Address at the 7th World Congress
on Probation and Parole, held on April 14, 2026, in Bali, Indonesia.*

Prof. Dr. Yusril Ihza Mahendra, S.H., M.Sc.
Professor of Constitutional Law
Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia
Coordinating Minister for Law, Human Rights,
Immigration, and Corrections
Republic of Indonesia

15 April 2026

**GETTING SMART ON JUSTICE
HEALING HEARTS & SAFER SOCIETIES**

*Originally delivered as a Keynote Address at the 7th World Congress
on Probation and Parole, held on April 14, 2026, in Bali, Indonesia.*

Prof. Dr. Yusril Ihza Mahendra, S.H., M.Sc.
Professor of Constitutional Law
Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia
Coordinating Minister for Law, Human Rights,
Immigration, and Corrections
Republic of Indonesia

15 April 2026

Bismillahirrahmanirrahim.

Assalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh,

Peace be upon us all,

Honourable ministers, distinguished ambassadors, leaders of international organisations, esteemed academics, researchers, practitioners in probation, parole, and corrections, community supervisors, and all participants of the 7th World Congress on Probation and Parole 2026.

First, I would like to extend a warm welcome to all delegates and participants from across the world who are present in Bali, Indonesia. It is a privilege for us to host this seventh international congress under the theme, *"Getting Smart on Justice: Healing Hearts & Safer Societies"*. This theme is not only compelling from an academic perspective but also highly relevant in terms of public policy, as it invites us to rethink the relationship between justice, recovery, reintegration, and public safety as a cohesive unit.

This theme also carries a very important message. In the twenty-first century, justice can no longer be understood merely as the state's ability to impose punishment. The state's capability to strike a balance between accountability, protecting victims, ensuring public safety, respecting human dignity, and the possibility of rehabilitation for those who have offended is a

further aspect of justice.¹ In other words, smart justice is not only orderly in a normative sense but also institutionally mature, ethically clear, and socially reasonable.

I stand before you today as the Coordinating Minister for Law, Human Rights, Immigration, and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia. This is not a position confined to a single technical sector under our constitutional and governmental framework. It is a position responsible for synchronizing and coordinating the implementation of government affairs in the areas of law, human rights, immigration, and corrections, including inter-ministerial coordination. The perspective I will present this evening is one of policy architecture, examining how probation and parole fit into a modern rule of law framework that prioritises human dignity, public safety, and effective justice governance.²

In a forum such as this, my role is certainly not to set out technical operational details that fall within the authority of implementing agencies on the ground. My task is to situate our discussion within a broader context, encompassing the

¹ Z. Szablowinski (2008). "Punitive Justice and Restorative Justice as Social Reconciliation," *The Heythrop Journal*, 49(3), 405–422. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2265.2007.00373.X>.

² I. Sulhin, "Corrections (Pemasyarakatan) after Law Number 22 of 2022: New Principles and Policy Identification Regarding the Functions of Probation and Parole Offices," *Jurnal Ilmiah Kebijakan Hukum*, vol. 16, no. 3, p. 457, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.30641/kebijakan.2022.v16.457-478>.

M. F. Zarkasi, N. Azisa, and H. Haeranah, "Implications of Renewal System of Criminal Justice Based on the Principles of Restorative Justice on the Role of Probation and Parole Officer," *Khazanah Hukum*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 29–44, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v4i1.17354>.

trajectory of legal system reform, the state's efforts to balance law enforcement with human rights, the development of cross-sectoral coordination that moves beyond rhetoric, and Indonesia's approach to incorporating probation, parole, and community-based corrections into a rational and law-governed state framework.³

This forum matters precisely because today's world is facing realities that are far from simple. On the one hand, societies worldwide demand that the state be firm in addressing crime, responsive to victims, and capable of maintaining public order. However, there is growing recognition that criminal justice systems that rely almost exclusively on imprisonment do not always deliver better justice, reduce recidivism, and strengthen public safety in the long run.⁴ Consequently, many countries have begun reassessing their views on punishment, rehabilitation, and reintegration.

These developments suggest that the central question in contemporary criminal justice is no longer simply how the state punishes but how it wisely punishes.⁵The issue is no longer

³ M. Arafat, "Paradigma Pemidanaan Baru dalam KUHP 2023: Alternatif Sanksi dan Transformasi Sistem Peradilan Pidana Indonesia," *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 33–46, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.58540/jih.v2i1.1047>.
D. Sifa and M. A. Subroto, "Penerapan Community Based Correction dalam Sistem Pemasarakatan di Indonesia," *Journal Publicuho*, vol. 5, no. 1, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.35817/jpu.v5i1.24028>.

⁴ A. Coyle, C. Heard, and H. Fair, "Current Trends and Practices in the Use of Imprisonment," *International Review of the Red Cross*, vol. 98, no. 903, pp. 761–781, 2016, <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1816383117000662>.

⁵ S. M. Bucerius and M. Tonry, "Has the Prison a Future?" *Crime and Justice*, vol. 51, pp. 1–5, 2022, <https://doi.org/10.1086/722453>.

merely how the state demonstrates its authority but how that authority is exercised rationally, proportionately, and in a manner that can be justified. It is at this point, probation, parole, and various forms of community corrections acquire even more compelling relevance.

Therefore, I consider that probation and parole are not peripheral instruments within the justice system; in fact, they are among the measures of its maturity. A mature state is not one that only knows how to penalise, but one that also knows how to exercise firmness while serving justice, directing criminal responsibility to punish, correct, restore, and rehabilitate individuals to become responsible members of society again.⁶

The notion is stressed because public discourse is often constrained by overly simplistic binary oppositions, implying a choice between firmness and compassion, public security and rehabilitation, justice for victims and a second chance for perpetrators. I argue that a mature and modern law-governed state must move beyond false oppositions. It must be able to design a system that is firm without being brutal, humane without being naïve, and open to reintegration while remaining disciplined in supervision and accountability.

⁶ H. Mubarak and Y. Yulianti, "Peluang dan Tantangan Era Baru Sistem Pemidanaan Indonesia," *Restorative Journal*, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.61682/restorative.v1i1.6>.

In Indonesia, this perspective does not emerge in a vacuum. Our national development agenda under the 2025–2029 National Medium-Term Development Plan places the establishment of a transparent, fair, and impartial rule of law among its central objectives. This means that legal reform must not be understood merely as a procedural reform, let alone as the mere addition of new regulations. Legal reform must enhance the quality of the rule of law, governance, and human dignity protection in public life.⁷

In that sense, legal reform is concerned not only with the text of statutes but also with institutional ethos. It concerns how officials work, how citizens experience justice, how victims are treated, how data are used, how discretion is exercised, and how the success of public policy is measured.⁸ A country can have numerous laws and regulations, but if they are not complemented by a strong moral compass and effective institutional collaboration, they may be ineffective.

Corrections hold a strategic position within criminal law. Law No. 22 of 2022 affirms that the correctional system is a comprehensive framework for managing detainees, juveniles, and inmates, conducted through services, rehabilitation, community guidance, care, security, and monitoring. Within this

⁷ Zoelva, “Prospek Negara Hukum Indonesia: Gagasan dan Realita,” *Hasanuddin Law Review*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 178–193, 2015, <https://doi.org/10.20956/HALREV.V1I2.78>.

⁸ O. Juanda, “The Ideal Law State Concept in Indonesia: The Reality and the Solution,” *Journal of Law and Political Studies*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 251–262, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.38035/jlph.v3i2.172>.

system, Community Guidance Officers play a central role in conducting assessments, providing support, providing guidance, and supervising clients. Therefore, community guidance is not merely an add-on to punishment; it is an inherent part of the correctional system itself.

However, current realities present significant challenges. The total number of inmates has reached 271,752, comprising 215,378 convicted prisoners and 56,374 detainees, far exceeding the official capacity of 150,515. This represents an overcrowding rate of approximately 81 percent, resulting in congested facilities, high recidivism, and substantial social burdens.

These conditions underscore the critical importance of correctional guidance. By making it a core component of the system, the law recognizes that punishment does not end with the verdict. A criminal sentence marks a crucial milestone, but it is not the final point. Ensuring that inmates are properly rehabilitated, risks are managed, relationships with family and society are restored, behaviour is guided constructively, and the likelihood of reoffending is effectively minimised is equally important.

Furthermore, Indonesia's national criminal law reform is moving along the same path. The new Criminal Code, which came into force at the beginning of this year, emphasizes the visions of corrective, restorative, and rehabilitative justice. The new Code's punishment (KUHP) purposes also encompass four orientations: preventing crime, reintegrating convicted persons through guidance, resolving conflict and restoring balance, and relieving

the offender's sense of guilt. The underlined point is significant as it highlights that probation, parole, supervision, and social reintegration are not novel concepts in Indonesian law, but rather align with the reform paradigm currently being developed.⁹

I wish to emphasize is this, modern criminal law reform must change not only at the level of language but also at the level of mindset. If the system's orientation was previously overly simplistic, viewing punishment as retribution, we must now be willing to consider its purposes more broadly. The state must continue to uphold the norms. It must still be made clear that violations have consequences. However, the state must also recognize that a healthy social order is not built merely by imprisoning people; it is also built by ensuring that those who have undergone legal process are given a sensible path back to responsible citizenship.

A civilization may ultimately be judged by its use of power. In a law-governed state, the power to punish is essential. Therefore, it must be limited by law, guided by rationality, and guarded by the principle of humanity. It is here that human rights acquire their deepest meaning. I do not see human rights standards as an additional burden upon the state but as an ethical boundary that ensures that law enforcement does not lose its legitimacy.

⁹ H. Mubarak and Y. Yulianti, "Peluang dan Tantangan Era Baru Sistem Pidana Indonesia," *Restorative Journal*, 2023, <https://doi.org/10.61682/restorative.v1i1.6>.

A strong law-governed state cannot act without restraint. On the contrary, it is a state knows how to exercise its authority in a measured manner. It does not treat human beings as objects. It does not assume that all dignity is thereby lost because someone has violated the law. It continues to regard law as an instrument for ordering common life, not as a tool for erasing humanity.

At the same time, I must stress that humane justice is not weak justice. Intelligent justice is not equivalent to lenient justice. Smart justice continues to uphold accountability.¹⁰ It continues to protect victims. It continues to safeguard the public. It allows the state to act firmly in the face of serious crime. However, it rejects overly simplistic thinking, as though every social problem could be solved merely by expanding imprisonment. Smart justice begins with a more fundamental question: do the instruments we choose genuinely strengthen social order, reduce the risk of reoffending, and enhance public safety.¹¹

This is a crucial question for policymakers. States may easily be tempted to choose policies that appear tough on the surface but prove ineffective in the long term. However, one of the core tests of sound public policy is its capacity to address problems

¹⁰ N. Saini and S. Rajoria, "Potential Reforms for a More Effective and Humane Criminal Justice System: Reimagining Justice for the 21st Century," *International Journal for Multidisciplinary Research*, vol. 7, no. 2, 2025, <https://doi.org/10.36948/ijfmr.2025.v07i02.42473>.

¹¹ N. Hutton and C. Tata, "The Judicial Role in the Balance Between Two Visions of Justice in Sentencing," in *Sentencing and Society*, Oxford: Hart Publishing, 2000, pp. 307–323, <https://strathprints.strath.ac.uk/29410/>.

substantively, not merely symbolically. If a given instrument appears firm but fails to reduce recidivism, support reintegration, and build public trust, then alternative, more effective approaches should be considered or integrated.

Probation and parole must be seen as part of the public safety ecosystem, not as its opposite.¹² Many people still incorrectly perceive community-based approaches as a form of leniency that weakens the law. I take the opposite view. What matters is not whether a policy is labeled soft or hard but the quality of its design. When assessments are thorough, criteria are well-defined, supervision is expert, data and evaluations are accessible, and social support is sufficient, community-based corrections can balance two objectives: safeguarding society and facilitating responsible reintegration.

In other words, when the state makes room for probation and parole, it does not diminish its authority. Rather, it demonstrates maturity in policy. This shows that it is driven not merely by punitive instinct but by a more developed institutional rationality. It recognizes that sustainable public safety requires more than confinement; it requires risk management, behavioral guidance, restoration of social ties, and consistent policy coordination.

¹² M. A. Paparozzi and M. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole: Overworked, Misunderstood, and Under-Appreciated: But Why?" *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 275–296, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2311.2008.00522.X>.

Therefore, one of our major tasks moving forward is to strengthen the professions at the front line of this system. I wish to express my deepest appreciation to community supervisors, probation officers, parole officers, and all those who work at the forefront of corrections and reintegration.¹³ They work in an exceptionally complex field. They must assess risk, understand social backgrounds, connect law with human reality, balance supervision with guidance, and often serve as a bridge between the interests of the state, the family, and society. In many respects, the success or failure of reintegration is precisely determined by the quality of these professions.

They are the face of the state, present in the form of sanction and guidance. They must be capable of careful assessment, responsible recommendations, a sound understanding of family and social environments, and the ability to work under often intense public expectations. Therefore, genuine reform must include education, certification, professional ethics, supervision, and institutional capacity strengthening.

I believe we all agree that no reform can succeed if those who implement it on the ground are left to work without adequate support. Yes, reform requires not only ideas but also professions. Reform requires norms, but it also requires people who are trained, trusted, and properly equipped. In this respect,

¹³ M. A. Paparozzi and M. DeMichele, "Probation and Parole: Overworked, Misunderstood, and Under-Appreciated: But Why?" *Howard Journal of Criminal Justice*, vol. 47, no. 3, pp. 275–296, 2008, <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1468-2311.2008.00522.X>.

human resource investment is not an additional cost; it is an essential condition if policy is not to remain trapped on paper.

This congress also raises the issue of technology and AI. I consider this an important issue. In the twenty-first century, criminal justice, corrections, probation, and parole administration will increasingly intersect with data systems, digital platforms, risk analytics, and limited forms of automation. Technology can improve data accuracy, accelerate coordination, enhance service quality, and support more orderly decision-making. However, I wish to stress one principle that, in my view, must not be compromised: technology must never replace the state's moral responsibility.¹⁴ Although algorithms may assist, they cannot replace human judgment. Digital systems may accelerate processes, but they must not erode due process. Innovation may be embraced but not at the expense of transparency, non-discrimination, and respect for human dignity.

I wish to emphasize this point because we live in a time when technology is often treated as though it were always neutral and objective. Yet technology is only as sound as the governance that surrounds it. Incomplete data can be misleading. Opaque algorithms can multiply the bias. Unaccountable digital systems can distance citizens from decision-making processes that

¹⁴ C. Tata, "The Rise of Technology and the Demise of the Sentencing Professions," in *The Sentencing Judge and the Transformation of Criminal Justice*, Cham: Palgrave Pivot, 2020, pp. 119–143, https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-01060-7_6.

affect their lives. Therefore, when technology enters the realms of law and corrections, the state must respond with care and not with fascination.

This warning is important because justice systems cannot operate through numbers alone. Justice operates through human beings. Data matters. Empirical evidence is important. The outcome-based evaluation is important. However, human beings cannot be reduced entirely to risk scores, administrative categories, or statistical variables. Therefore, sound reform must combine evidence with ethics, bringing technocratic precision and institutional wisdom together.

In other words, technology must help the state become more just, not merely faster. More precise, yet also more responsible. More modern, but not colder. Without ethics, modernity can easily become injustice accelerated by systems.

Socioeconomic reintegration is another dimension that sometimes receives little attention. A person's formal release from a correctional institution does not necessarily mean that he or she has truly returned to normal social life. The real challenge often follows. Does the individual possess valid identification documents? Is he or she still accepted by their family? Is there access to education, employment, or meaningful activities? Is society willing to provide a second chance? If all these avenues remain inaccessible, then the state has merely relocated the issue from a confined institution to the broader community.

Therefore, reintegration must be understood realistically, not sentimentally. It requires social conditions that make change possible. It requires family support, access to training, employment opportunities, social acceptance, proper administrative identity, and mental health support. Without these, a person who has formally completed his or her sentence may remain trapped in social powerlessness, and the risk of reoffending remains high.

Reintegration cannot be viewed solely as a matter for one technical agency. It must become a cross-sectoral agenda. It includes education, vocational training, social protection, mental health, civil registration, local government, business sector, civil society organizations, and religious communities. Here, state coordination becomes essential. It is also here that the role of the coordinating ministry acquires its practical significance: to ensure that the reintegration agenda does not proceed in fragmented ways, but rather within one connected policy framework.

Sectoral tendencies that often weaken outcomes must be overcome from a policy standpoint. One institution may focus on law enforcement, another on guidance, and another on social or employment services. All of these are important; however, if they are used in isolation, their results will remain limited. Successful reintegration always requires continuity. It requires bridges across sectors. Policy leadership that is capable of seeing the whole is required, not merely the disconnected parts.

I believe that public trust is one of the most important issues in contemporary correction policy and community corrections. No matter how well regulations are drafted and how strong the academic argument behind them may be, policy will struggle to succeed if the public does not believe that the system operates fairly, measurably, and accountably.¹⁵ A clearer public explanation is therefore needed. Alternatives to imprisonment are not a denial of justice but a means of making justice work more rationally and effectively. We must be able to explain that reintegration is not a free gift but part of a medium- and long-term strategy for social security.

Public trust is not born of rhetoric. It is born of consistency. It is a result of procedural transparency, service quality, the state's ability to honestly explain public decisions, and its willingness to evaluate itself. Public trust in the field of probation and parole will increase if people see that assessments are conducted professionally, supervision is taken seriously, violations are dealt with firmly, and successful reintegration is regarded as a key indicator of policy success.

Therefore, our task is not only to design a good policy but also to build a public language capable of explaining why that policy is good. In a democracy, policy arguments must be answerable not only to fellow experts but also to the wider public. The more

¹⁵ G. Bazemore and M. F. Schiff, "Community Justice/Restorative Justice: Prospects for a New Social Ecology for Community Corrections," *International Journal of Comparative and Applied Criminal Justice*, vol. 20, no. 2, pp. 311–335, 1996, <https://doi.org/10.1080/01924036.1996.9678579>.

important a policy is for public safety and the public sense of justice, the more important it is for the state to explain it openly.

Simultaneously, we must be humble enough to recognize that no model can simply be copied wholesale from one country to another. Each country has a unique history, legal culture, social structure, and institutional capacity. Therefore, the true value of an international forum such as this is not to produce a single formula for the entire world but to broaden the horizon of shared learning. We come to gatherings like this to test ideas, study experiences, and enrich principles that can then be translated into each country's context.

In that regard, I see international forums, such as the WCPP, as epistemic and policy dialogue spaces. We come not only to speak, but also to listen. Not only to bring our own experience but also to remain open to lessons from elsewhere. In an increasingly interconnected world, the quality of public policy is determined by our ability to learn across contexts without losing the sharpness with which we read our own national realities.

Hosting the 7th World Congress on Probation and Parole carries special meaning for Indonesia. It is not merely a ceremonial honor. This is an opportunity to demonstrate that Asian countries, including Indonesia, can seriously and constructively contribute to global discussions on criminal justice reform. This is also a chance for us to learn from the experiences of others while ensuring that the legal reforms we pursue stay grounded in our Constitution, the values of Pancasila, the principles of democratic rule of law, and respect for human dignity.

Pancasila is not only the philosophical foundation of the state but also an ethical horizon for understanding the relationship between the state, society, and human beings. Commitments to humanity, social justice, deliberation, and civilized common life.¹⁶ Therefore, when Indonesia speaks of legal reform, corrections, and reintegration, we do not see them merely as administrative matters. We see them as a moral and constitutional responsibility to build a fair, safe, and humane social order.

As a host country, Indonesia now follows the path of previous congresses held in London, Los Angeles, Tokyo, Sydney, Ottawa, and The Hague. This shows that the congress is indeed an important forum in the global conversation on probation and parole. Hosting the event after that distinguished sequence of cities is certainly an honor, but it is also a responsibility. The obligation is to make a meaningful contribution, rather than simply attending. Ensuring that this global conversation yields practical ideas, tangible cooperation, and lasting commitment is a responsibility.

Allow me to add one final point, which is of great importance. Many justice discussions tend to focus on institutions, procedures, or norms. All of these points are undoubtedly important. However, beneath them all lies a more fundamental question, how does society regard those who have fallen? Are

¹⁶ M. C. Huda, "Strengthening Pancasila as National Ideology to Implementate the Balancing Values to Improve Law's Application in Indonesia," *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 1–12, 2018, <https://doi.org/10.26532/JPH.V5I1.3010>.

they seen only as problems? Or are they still seen as persons who must be held accountable, yet retain the possibility of change?

The moral quality of a country can be seen in how it answers that question. A mature state is not naïve about crime nor cynical about change. It does not close its eyes to risk, nor does it shut every door to recovery. It understands that public safety and human dignity must be designed together within a disciplined, rational, and sustainable policy framework.

Therefore, I regard probation and parole as more than administrative mechanisms following a judicial decision. The policies reflect a deeper philosophy of law, that the state can be firm yet retain its humanity, preserve public safety without losing its common sense, and uphold the law without foreclosing every possibility for a person to recover and reintegrate.

We must not be romantic. Not every case is simple. Not every risk is small. Not every offender is ready or able to change quickly. Therefore, careful policy formulation, sharp assessment, disciplined supervision, and accountable governance are still required. However, such caution must not become a total refusal of reintegration. Vigilance must not become cynicism. Firmness should not become a moral deadlock.

What we need is institutional wisdom. Wisdom that distinguishes between genuine and exaggerated threats. Wisdom that knows when the state must detain, guide, and protect and when it must

reopen a path back. In my view, this kind of wisdom must become the soul of smart justice.

In conclusion, I will underline three points.

First, a healthy justice system cannot be built merely by expanding the capacity to punish. It must also be constructed by enhancing the capability to guide, supervise, restore, and reintegrate.

Second, human dignity and public safety are not two goals that cancel each other out. They must be designed together within a careful, proportionate, and accountable policy.

Third, the reform of probation, parole, and corrections in the twenty-first century must simultaneously stand on three foundations: evidence, ethics, and coordination. Without evidence, policy becomes a slogan. Without ethics, policy loses legitimacy. Without coordination, policy fragments into sectoral fragmentation that weakens its own outcomes.

Without public trust and moral courage, even well-intentioned policies will struggle to bring about their full intended impact, remaining mostly pie in the air rhetoric that fails to lead to tangible change. Therefore, today's task is not merely to improve systems but also to build the intellectual and institutional courage to determine justice in more complete terms.

I believe that if we sustain those three foundations, coupled with a commitment to professionalism, cross-sectoral coordination,

and the willingness to learn from one another's experience, then we will not only build more efficient systems. We shall also build more just, institutionally mature, morally legitimate, and beneficial systems for society.

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Indonesia, I wish you all a successful and fruitful 7th World Congress on Probation and Parole 2026. May this forum produce honest exchanges of ideas, meaningful cooperation, and a shared commitment to building justice that is smarter, more humane, and better able to keep our societies safe.

Thank you.

Wassalamu'alaikum warahmatullahi wabarakatuh



Brief Biography

Prof. Dr. Yusril Ihza Mahendra, S.H., M.Sc.

Prof. Dr. Yusril Ihza Mahendra was born in Belitung on February 5, 1956. He pursued his undergraduate studies at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia, majoring in Constitutional Law, and at the Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Indonesia, majoring in Philosophy. He continued his graduate studies at the Postgraduate Program of Universitas Indonesia, specializing in Law and Islamic Studies, and at the Department of Philosophy, Graduate School of Humanities and Social Sciences, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Pakistan. He subsequently obtained his doctoral degree at the Institute of Postgraduate Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, Malaysia.

He embarked on an academic career as a lecturer and later became a Professor of Constitutional Law, Philosophy of Law, and Theory of Legal Studies at the Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia. His professional career includes serving as Assistant to the State Secretary of the Republic of Indonesia (1994–1999), Member of Parliament (DPR/MPR), Minister of Law and Legislation (1999–2001), Minister of Justice and Human Rights (2001–2004), and State Secretary (2004–2007). He also held several positions as Acting Minister of Foreign Affairs and Acting Minister of Defense. Additionally, he served as Government Commissioner of Pertamina (1999–2004) and as President of the Asian-African Legal Consultative Organization, headquartered in New Delhi, India (2002–2004). He is currently serving as Coordinating Minister for Law, Human Rights, Immigration, and Corrections of the Republic of Indonesia (2024–present).

In recognition of his dedication and service to the nation, the President of the Republic of Indonesia conferred upon Prof. Dr. Yusril Ihza Mahendra two distinguished honors: the Bintang Bhayangkara Utama (2002) and the Bintang Mahaputra Adipradana (2015).

TERIMA KASIH
THANK YOU