Silatul Afkar: Jurnal Pemikiran Sosial dan Keagamaan
Vol. 08, No. 1, 2026, p. 1-23
Published by Lakpesdam PWNU NTB; p-ISSN 3026-1090, e-ISSN 2988-7887,
https://ypppm.or.id/index.php/silatulafkar/en/index

Community-Based Symbolic Audit As An Emerging Accountability Regime: Digital Vigilance, Regulatory Capture, And Asset Forfeiture Reform In Indonesia

Basriadi, Ihsan Hamid, Ishak Hariyanto, Miptahudin Khairi, Ahmad Saleh Tabibuddin

basriadibasriadi98@gmail.com, ihsanhamid@uinmataram.ac.id, giddensantok89@gmail.com, miptahkhairi@gmail.com, ahtabibuddin@gmail.com

Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Syariah Darussalam Beremi
Universitas Islam Negeri Mataram, Indonesia
Universitas Mataram

Abstract: *This article examines how regulatory capture enables oligarchic hegemony and subnational executive abuse in Indonesian elections, while exploring civic-led alternatives particularly community-based symbolic auditing to improve electoral governance, asset transparency, and accountability regimes. Drawing on qualitative document analysis and digital ethnography of the Instagram account @cabinetcouture_idn (which was geo-restricted by Indonesia's Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs in mid-2026), we analyze how civil society crowdsources visual verification of unexplained wealth accumulation when formal institutions fail. We argue that symbolic auditing represents a hybrid accountability mechanism that leverages digital platforms, visual analysis, and public discourse to expose asset misappropriation that formal asset reporting systems (LHKPN) systematically miss due to self-reporting bias and administrative opacity. Our analysis reveals three critical findings: (1) the structural vulnerability of formal wealth declaration systems to deliberate underreporting and omission; (2) the technological and social efficacy of crowdsourced visual monitoring in detecting and estimating the market value of high-net-worth assets held by public officials; and (3) the state's counterintuitive response to suppress digital accountability rather than investigate substantive claims of unexplained wealth. We recommend a three-pronged reform agenda:*

(a) mandatory photographic asset inventories integrated with blockchain-verified ownership chains; (b) legal frameworks protecting civic digital auditing as a form of legitimate civic participation; and (c) illicit enrichment provisions with lower evidentiary burdens aligned with UNCAC protocols. This article contributes to debates on digital governance, accountability pluralism, and asset recovery in contexts where formal institutions are captured by elites they purport to regulate.

Keywords*: Symbolic Audit, Digital Accountability, Regulatory Capture, Illicit Enrichment, Asset Forfeiture, Civil Society Monitoring, Unexplained Wealth, Indonesia*

Introduction

Official wealth declaration systems constitute a foundational pillar of democratic governance, yet their effectiveness remains deeply contested in scholarship on anti-corruption and public administration (Bauhr & Grimes, 2014; Heywood, 2017) In Indonesia, the Office of the Attorney General mandates that all state officials file the Laporan Harta Kekayaan Penyelenggara Negara (LHKPN) a self-reported wealth declaration regime established under Law No. 8 of 1997 on State Officials' Documents and strengthened through the Anti-Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, or KPK). This administrative apparatus was designed to function as a primary detection mechanism for unexplained wealth accumulation and to serve as an evidentiary foundation for corruption prosecutions (Alatas et al., 2016; Sulaksono et al., 2018) However, scholarly consensus increasingly recognizes that self-reporting wealth declaration systems suffer from endemic structural vulnerabilities: they depend entirely upon the voluntary honesty of the very officials they are meant to monitor, they often classify high-value portable assets such as luxury watches, designer handbags, and fine jewelry as personal or gifted items beyond reporting scope, and they create perverse incentives for officials to deliberately omit or undervalue assets held in the names of family members, corporate shells, or foreign jurisdictions (Karsten & Moilanen, 2014; Transparency International, 2018)

The limitations of formal transparency bureaucracies have catalyzed an emergent form of civic supervision: crowdsourced, digitally-enabled, visually-centered monitoring of public officials' conspicuous consumption and lifestyle indicators (Hussain & Howard, 2013; Tüfekçi, 2014) This phenomenon represents neither entirely new nor entirely digital, but it has taken on distinctive characteristics in the age of social media platforms and visual documentation technologies. One of the most emblematic manifestations of this accountability modality appeared in Indonesia in the form of the Instagram account @cabinetcouture_idn, a user-generated media project that systematically photographed, identified, estimated the market value of, and publicly annotated luxury goods displayed by state officials and their families in public settings. The account operated under various guises and naming conventions colloquially referenced as "Kabinet Kuchcio" (Cabinet Haute Couture) or simply "Tata Busana Kabinet" (Cabinet Fashion) and accumulated considerable public attention by demonstrating the stark disparity between the officially declared assets of public officials and the tangible, visible, monetizable possessions they displayed at public events, diplomatic functions, and social gatherings (RakyatPos Network, 2026; Wartadigital.id, 2026)

The account's operational methodology was straightforward yet sophisticated: practitioners of this civic audit monitored public photographs, video footage, and media documentation of official events; identified branded luxury items visible in these public records; researched current international market prices for equivalent items; cross-referenced official LHKPN filings to determine whether such items had been declared; and published comparative analyses that highlighted the discrepancies between official asset declarations and visible consumption patterns. For instance, the account documented that Indonesia's then-Minister of Communication and Digital Affairs, Meutya Hafid Ansyah, had publicly displayed a Hermès Lindy 30 handbag (Noir) valued at approximately Rp 100-180 million, a Bottega Veneta Jodie bag (Rp 56 million), and a Gucci GG Marmont belt, yet these items did not appear in her published LHKPN filing (RakyatPos

Network, 2026). Similarly, the account's documentation of watches worn by Indonesia's Vice President's wife, Selvi Ananda Gibran including a Rolex Datejust 41 valued at approximately Rp 304 million and Cartier LOVE bracelets revealed asset holdings substantially exceeding the official wealth declarations associated with her household (YouTube, 2026).

In response to sustained public attention and growing media coverage of these discrepancies, the Indonesian government specifically through the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs (Kementerian Komunikasi dan Informatika, or Komdigi) implemented a geographic restriction (geo-blocking) on the @cabinetcouture_idn account in July 2026, preventing Indonesian internet users from accessing the account's content while leaving it visible to international audiences (Wartadigital.id, 2026). This act of digital censorship represented a significant institutional response to civic accountability efforts, yet it did not result in parallel institutional action to investigate the substantive claims regarding unexplained wealth that the account had raised (Komdigi, 2026). This asymmetry where the state moved to suppress the messenger rather than investigate the message prompted critical analysis from civil society organizations, media observers, and legal scholars, many of whom invoked metaphors of institutional dysfunction: "turning off the fire alarm while the building burns" became a common characterization of the government's response strategy (Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2026).

Scholarly literature on accountability and transparency increasingly recognizes that formal, bureaucratic, state-centered mechanisms of financial oversight are insufficient to detect and deter corruption in contexts where political elites exercise significant control over regulatory institutions (Kaufmann et al., 2011; Rose-Ackerman, 2008) The phenomenon of "regulatory capture" wherein the regulated entities (in this case, high-level state officials) come to exercise disproportionate influence over the regulators (the KPK, the Attorney General's Office, and other oversight bodies) through formal and informal mechanisms creates structural impediments to effective enforcement of transparency norms (Carpenter & Moss, 2013; Stigler, 1971) Indonesia's weak institutional separation of powers, combined with high levels of elite consensus around informal power-sharing arrangements and the historically contingent penetration of anti-corruption capacity into subnational governments, has produced conditions wherein formal accountability institutions often function as political instruments deployed selectively against rivals rather than as impartial arbiters of legal compliance (Aspinall, 2010; Buehler, 2016) In response, civil society actors including journalists, digital activists, civic networks, and public intellectuals have developed alternative accountability strategies that circumvent formal institutions and instead mobilize horizontal networks, digital platforms, and public discourse to expose wrongdoing and create reputational consequences for misconduct (Hindman, 2008; Yochai, 2006)

The concept of "symbolic audit" employed in this article refers to the practice of systematically examining, documenting, evaluating, and publicizing the material manifestations of officials' wealth and lifestyle choices through digital platforms and public discourse, with the explicit intention of identifying discrepancies between officially reported asset holdings and visibly consumed luxury goods, thereby creating epistemic, legal, and reputational pressure for institutional accountability (Schultz & Flanagan, 2016). Symbolic auditing differs from formal auditing in several significant respects: it relies on visual and photographic evidence rather than documentary verification; it operates through diffuse, decentralized networks of civic participants rather than hierarchical auditing firms or government institutions; it depends upon horizontal communication and public discourse rather than confidential bureaucratic processes; and it generates accountability pressure through reputational and informational mechanisms rather than through formal legal sanctions (though it may subsequently provide evidence supporting legal action). The "symbolic" dimension of this accountability form emphasizes that it operates significantly in the realm of meaning-making, cultural interpretation, and public narrative construction; the material facts (a luxury watch, a designer handbag) acquire their accountability significance not merely through their monetary value but through their symbolic associations with inequality, elite privilege, and the betrayal of public trust implicit in the juxtaposition of official austerity narratives against ostentatious private consumption (Bourdıeu, 2018; Bracci et al., 2021, p. 1517)

This article proceeds from the fundamental premise that community-based symbolic auditing constitutes a legitimate, analytically significant, and increasingly consequential form of accountability practice that merits serious scholarly attention from researchers concerned with governance, anti-corruption, digital society, and democratic accountability. This study employs qualitative document analysis, digital ethnography, and critical discourse analysis to examine how civic actors deploy digital platforms, visual documentation, market research, and public communication to create accountability pressure around unexplained wealth; to analyze how formal institutions respond to these civic initiatives; and to develop policy recommendations that could integrate informal civic accountability mechanisms with reformed formal institutions in ways that strengthen anti-corruption capacity while respecting democratic participation and digital rights. The article makes three primary contributions to the existing literature: (1) it extends accountability theory beyond the state-centric and institution-centric frameworks that have dominated English-language scholarship to encompass hybrid accountability mechanisms that blend formal and informal, state and non-state, institutional and network-based dimensions; (2) it contributes to research on digital activism and platform-based civic participation by examining how visual media, social platforms, and distributed networks can be mobilized for governance accountability purposes; and (3) it advances policy analysis regarding asset forfeiture reform, illicit enrichment provisions, and unexplained wealth frameworks by demonstrating both the limitations of self-reporting wealth declaration systems and the feasibility of complementary mechanisms for asset detection and verification.

Methods

In summary, existing scholarship leaves several critical analytical gaps. First, while the literature on social accountability documents important cases of civic monitoring, it has not adequately examined civic accountability initiatives that target elite enrichment and wealth concealment in national contexts characterized by regulatory capture and state suppression capacity. Second, the literature on digital activism and platform-mediated civic participation has not fully integrated findings regarding regulatory capture and elite resistance, potentially leading to overly optimistic assessments of digital platform affordances for accountability. Third, interdisciplinary scholarship on governance, anti-corruption, and digital society remains fragmented; insights from regulatory capture theory are rarely integrated with findings from digital activism scholarship, and both remain somewhat disconnected from discussions of asset recovery and unexplained wealth frameworks. Fourth, there remains insufficient empirical documentation and analysis of the precise mechanisms through which civic digital auditing operates how specific claims of wealth misappropriation are constructed, validated, and publicized, and how formal institutions respond to civic accountability initiatives. This article addresses these gaps by providing an integrated analysis of community-based symbolic auditing as a hybrid accountability mechanism that blends formal legal frameworks, civic participation, digital platforms, and public discourse.

Synthesizing these theoretical traditions permits development of an integrated analytical framework that recognizes symbolic auditing as: (1) a form of accountability practice that operates through informal channels and distributed networks while complementing formal institutional accountability mechanisms; (2) a practice particularly significant in contexts of regulatory capture wherein formal institutions prove unreliable in detecting elite misconduct; (3) a cultural practice of interpretation and meaning-making that denaturalizes elite consumption by recontextualizing visible wealth as potential evidence of illicit enrichment; (4) a platform-mediated practice that both enables new forms of civic participation and remains subject to state suppression through platform governance mechanisms; and (5) a practice that generates informational foundations for deployment of legal mechanisms (unexplained wealth frameworks) that might not otherwise be activated due to institutional political economy constraints. This theoretical framework guides the analysis that follows.

Worldview and Epistemological Positioning

This research is grounded in an interpretivist epistemology that recognizes social reality as constructed through meaning-making practices, contested interpretation, and the agency of multiple actors operating from differing perspectives and power positions. Rather than presuming that empirical reality is transparently knowable through application of neutral observation methods, interpretivist epistemology emphasizes that meaning emerges through processes of social interpretation and that the researcher's own positioning within power relationships inevitably shapes what can be known and how interpretation proceeds (Lincoln & Guba, 2000; Schwandt, 2000) This epistemological stance is particularly appropriate for analysis of symbolic auditing, which is itself fundamentally a practice of meaning-making and interpretation; the "audit" consists not merely in collecting factual data (identifying objects, researching prices) but in interpreting those facts within frameworks that connect material consumption to questions of state legitimacy, resource allocation, and social inequality. The research approach therefore does not presume that some objective "truth" about officials' wealth holdings exists independently of the interpretive frameworks deployed to construct accounts of those holdings; rather, it examines how diverse actors (civic auditors, government officials, media commentators, affected officials) construct competing interpretations and claims regarding official wealth, and how those competing interpretations generate accountability pressures and institutional responses.

Research Approach and Design

This research employs a qualitative research design that synthesizes document analysis, digital ethnography, and critical discourse analysis. The qualitative approach is appropriate for addressing the research questions, which are not primarily concerned with quantifying the prevalence of particular phenomena but rather with understanding how community-based symbolic auditing operates as an accountability mechanism, what institutional factors shape this accountability form, and what policy implications flow from the analysis. The multimethod approach (combining multiple qualitative data sources and analysis techniques) is employed to strengthen the analytical validity of findings through triangulation and to permit examination of symbolic auditing from multiple angles as a civic practice, as an institutional response phenomenon, and as a cultural discourse.

The first component of data collection and analysis involved systematic document analysis of materials generated by or responding to the @cabinetcouture_idn symbolic audit initiative. This included: (1) reconstructed examples of content posted to the account (where available through media archives, screenshots, and secondary reporting, as direct access was constrained by geo-blocking); (2) media reporting on the account and the government's response, from both mainstream news outlets and digital media platforms; (3) statements by government officials, Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs announcements, and policy documentation regarding the account's blocking; (4) responses from civil society organizations, legal scholars, journalists, and public intellectuals engaging with the controversy; and (5) comparative documentation of similar civic digital monitoring initiatives in other national contexts and on other platforms. Document analysis proceeded through systematic coding to identify key themes, patterns, and discourses (Bowen, 2009; Braun & Clarke, 2006)

The second component involved digital ethnography focused on understanding platform affordances, algorithmic visibility, and how social media platforms shaped the conditions under which symbolic auditing could operate and be suppressed (Hine, 2015; Kozinets, 2015) This involved examination of Instagram's technical features, platform policies, and the various mechanisms through which accounts can be geo-restricted or blocked. Rather than claiming direct immersive participation (constrained by geographic restrictions), the digital ethnography relied on secondary documentation, platform policy analysis, and theoretical engagement with platform studies scholarship to understand how technical and policy mechanisms shape political communication (Gillespie, 2010; Plantin, 2018)

The third component involved critical discourse analysis of how various actors government officials, civic commentators, affected officials, media outlets constructed narratives and claims regarding symbolic auditing, regulatory legitimacy, and accountability (Dijk, 1993; Harber et al., 2023, p. 102584) Discourse analysis examined how official justifications for account blocking employed particular framings (national security, combating misinformation) and what these framings revealed about state conceptions of legitimacy and governance. It similarly examined how civic advocates framed symbolic auditing as a legitimate accountability practice and how affected officials constructed responses and counter-narratives.

Data Sources and Sampling

The document corpus for analysis includes approximately 180 documents spanning multiple categories:

(a) Media reporting on @cabinetcouture_idn (n=42): News articles, digital media pieces, and feature journalism coverage from both mainstream Indonesian media outlets (Kompas.id, Detik.com, Tempo.co) and digital media platforms (Warta Digital, RakyatPos, Bengkulu Antara News) covering the account's operations and the government's blocking response, published between March 2025 and December 2026.

(b) Government and official institutional documents (n=18): Statements from the Ministry of Communication and

Digital Affairs, announcements regarding the blocking, official justifications for account removal, and legal/policy documentation regarding platform governance and content regulation.

(c) Civil society and expert responses (n=35): Statements from anti-corruption organizations (Corruption Watch Indonesia, Indonesia Corruption Watch, PSHK), legal scholars' commentary, media freedom organizations' analysis, and public intellectual engagement with the controversy.

(d) Comparative scholarly and policy literature (n=55): Academic literature on digital activism, accountability, asset recovery, social auditing, platform governance, and corruption (drawn from Scopus, Google Scholar, and repository searches for peer-reviewed journal articles, book chapters, and policy reports by international organizations).

(e) Legal and policy documentation (n=20): Relevant Indonesian legislation (Law No. 8/1997 on State Officials' Documents, Law No. 30/2002 on the Anti-Corruption Commission), international standards (UNCAC documentation, FATF guidelines), and draft legislation regarding asset forfeiture reform.

(f) Technical and platform documentation (n=15): Instagram platform policies, content moderation guidelines, geo-restriction procedures, and platform-related research documentation.

Analysis Techniques and Procedures

Document analysis proceeded through systematic coding using qualitative data analysis methods appropriate to exploratory, theory-building research (Miles & Huberman, 1994; Saldaña, 2009) Coding involved line-by-line examination of source materials to identify themes, concepts, and patterns related to: (1) how symbolic auditing was operationalized (specific methods, technologies, verification procedures); (2) what claims were made regarding official wealth holdings; (3) how government and officials responded; (4) what civil society actors and expert commentators identified as significant institutional or normative issues; and (5) what policy solutions were proposed. Following open coding that generated initial thematic categories, focused coding integrated related concepts into higher-order conceptual categories that permit systematic comparison across data sources.

Discourse analysis examined how different actors constructed arguments regarding legitimacy, accountability, and governance through analysis of rhetorical devices, metaphors, framing choices, and underlying assumptions (Van Dijk, 1993; Fairclough, 2003). For instance, analysis examined how government justifications for account blocking employed security-related framings, what those framing choices revealed regarding state conceptions of governance threats, and how civic actors counter-framed symbolic auditing as a form of legitimate democratic participation.

The analysis synthesized findings across data sources to develop integrated understanding of symbolic auditing as an accountability mechanism, its relationship to formal institutional accountability channels, the conditions enabling or constraining its operation, and the policy implications of the case. Particular attention was paid to potential contradictions or divergent findings and to analysis of how power relationships and institutional interests shaped different actors' interpretations and claims.

Validity, Reliability, and Ethical Considerations

Validity in this qualitative research design is pursued through multiple strategies. Triangulation (Denzin, 1978) involves examining symbolic auditing through multiple methods (document analysis, digital ethnography, discourse analysis) and multiple data sources (media, official documents, civil society commentary, scholarly literature), permitting assessment of findings' consistency across independent sources. Member checking was conducted through engagement with available commentary from directly affected parties (affected officials' statements, civil society responses) that provide alternative perspectives and potentially rival interpretations. Reflexivity systematic attention to how the researcher's positioning and analytical choices shape findings is addressed through explicit articulation of the study's epistemological foundations and recognition that this analysis represents one interpretation among potentially multiple defensible interpretations. The specification of analytical procedures, coding frameworks, and data sources permits readers to assess the analytical transparency and to evaluate whether alternative analytical procedures might generate different conclusions.

Reliability in qualitative research is pursued through systematic documentation of research procedures and through recognition that qualitative research does not presume identical replicability (appropriate to natural science paradigms) but rather presumes that careful documentation permits assessment of whether analytical procedures were conducted rigorously and consistently (Lincoln & Guba, 2000). This research documents the coding frameworks employed, the systematic procedures for document selection and analysis, and the reasoning underlying interpretive conclusions.

Ethical considerations in this research include several dimensions. The research does not involve direct engagement with human research subjects; rather, it analyzes publicly available documents and media reporting. However, the research involves analysis of materials pertaining to named individuals (state officials whose wealth holdings are documented in the symbolic audit) and therefore requires careful consideration of privacy, defamation, and dignity concerns. This research does not advocate for any particular outcome regarding affected officials, but rather examines the systemic questions regarding accountability mechanisms and institutional responses. The research aims to contribute to scholarly understanding of governance and anti-corruption rather than to participate in public campaigns against particular individuals. All citations are to publicly available sources, and all quotations are accurate representations of source materials.

In synthesis, symbolic auditing's operation illustrates that symbolic auditing emerges as a hybrid accountability mechanism when: (1) formal institutions prove inadequate or captured; (2) technological capacity enables distributed, visually based monitoring; (3) civic actors possess both capacity and motivation for accountability mobilization; and (4) political openness though partial and contested permits platform-based civic expression. The mechanism operates through a sequence of steps that involve observation, verification, cross-referencing, public communication, and amplification. It generates accountability pressure through multiple channels: informational (revealing discrepancies), reputational (associating officials with excess), epistemic (undermining official narratives), legal (providing evidence for potential actions), and cultural (reframing consumption meanings). The institutional response observed in this case state suppression rather than substantive investigation reveals both the efficacy of symbolic auditing in creating accountability pressure and the strength of elite interests in suppressing accountability mechanisms that threaten their wealth concealment.

Results

Self-Reporting Bias and Deliberate Omission in LHKPN Filings

Analysis of documented cases within symbolic auditing practice reveals systematic patterns indicating that Indonesia's formal wealth declaration system (LHKPN) operates within structural parameters that facilitate deliberate or negligent underreporting of asset holdings, particularly regarding high-value portable assets such as luxury watches, designer handbags, and jewelry. The fundamental mechanism through which underreporting occurs is rooted in the self-reporting nature of the LHKPN system: officials are required to file declarations of their personal asset holdings and those of their immediate families, yet verification of these declarations is limited, enforcement capacity is constrained, and penalties for false declaration are inconsistently applied (Alatas et al., 2016; Sulaksono et al., 2018)

The data compiled by symbolic audit initiatives reveals, for instance, that Indonesia's Minister of Communication and Digital Affairs (Meutya Hafid Ansyah) displayed publicly a Hermès Lindy 30 handbag valued at approximately Rp 100-180 million (approximately USD $6,500-$11,500 at mid-2026 exchange rates), yet this item does not appear in her published LHKPN declaration (RakyatPos Network, 2026). Similarly, multiple Cartier LOVE bracelets, a Rolex Datejust 41 watch, and various other luxury accessories owned by Selvi Ananda Gibran (wife of Indonesia's Vice President) valued in aggregate at approximately Rp 524 million were not reflected in officially available wealth declarations (YouTube, 2026). While the absence of particular items from official declarations might individually result from documentation errors, forgetfulness, or legitimate claims that items were gifts rather than personal acquisitions, the systematic pattern across multiple officials suggests something more structurally significant: a functioning system wherein underreporting is endemic rather than exceptional.

Analysis of relevant Indonesian legislation reveals several factors facilitating this endemic underreporting. First, the LHKPN system classifies certain categories of property as exempt from disclosure: gifts valued below particular thresholds, inherited property claimed as separate marital assets, and property held by spouses in their independent legal capacity (Law No. 8/1997, Article 8). These categorical exemptions, while perhaps individually defensible, create space for strategic classification of assets as "gifted" or "inherited" rather than acquired through potentially questionable means. Second, the LHKPN system does not provide regulatory space for what might be termed "asset authentication" verification that claimed ownership is legitimate, that valuations are accurate, or that property acquisition was conducted through lawful channels (Buehler, 2016; Quah, 2011) Third, enforcement mechanisms for false declaration are significantly weakened by several institutional factors: the KPK, which nominally has authority to investigate false LHKPN declarations, is itself subject to various pressures and constraints that limit its willingness to pursue high-ranking officials; the Attorney General's Office, which has primary authority for public official discipline, has demonstrated selective enforcement based on political considerations; and judicial proceedings regarding LHKPN violations are lengthy, uncertain, and subject to political interference (Akbar & Vujić, 2014; Aspinall & Feith, 2010)

The structural vulnerability of the LHKPN system becomes particularly acute when considering the specific category of portable, high-value assets that symbolic auditing specifically targets: luxury watches, designer handbags, jewelry, and fine art. These categories of property possess certain characteristics that distinguish them from other asset categories and that systematically facilitate underreporting. Unlike real estate property (land and buildings), which must be registered in centralized property registries and which cannot be transferred without documentary evidence, portable luxury assets typically do not require registration with government authorities and do not generate documentary trails through transfer. Unlike motor vehicles, which require registration with traffic authorities and which are identified through license plates and registration documents visible in public, luxury handbags and watches do not require government registration and are identified only through distinctive visual characteristics visible to individuals with sufficient product knowledge. This combination of high market value, low regulatory visibility, and transferability without documentation creates conditions wherein high-value portable assets can be transferred, hidden, and displayed without creating documentary evidence of ownership or transfer (KPK, 2026; PPATK, 2026)

Symbolic audit initiatives exploit precisely this combination of factors: they focus on categories of assets (luxury goods) that are legally acquirable and that do not require documentary justification, yet are also among the most visible markers of wealth and consumption patterns. The audit works by creating informational pressure: if an official cannot or will not explain how documented visible consumption (a million-dollar watch collection) aligns with officially declared income and assets, this discrepancy creates reputational and legal vulnerability. The self-reporting bias of the LHKPN system means that officials have strong incentives to avoid disclosing such assets, while the low verification capacity of formal institutions means that many forms of underreporting will go undetected absent alternative verification mechanisms like symbolic auditing (Alatas et al., 2016; Transparency International, 2018)

Market Valuation Methodology and Asset Identification

The methodology employed by symbolic auditing initiatives involves several technical steps that merit detailed examination, as they constitute the evidentiary foundation for accountability claims. First, practitioners engage in visual documentation and asset identification: they examine public photographs, video footage, and media documentation of official events and identify branded luxury items visible in those records. This identification requires significant product knowledge; practitioners must distinguish authentic branded items from counterfeits, must recognize product lines and specific editions, and must understand visual characteristics that distinguish similar items produced in different years or variations.

For instance, practitioners of the symbolic audit identified that a watch worn by an Indonesian official was a Rolex Datejust 41 in a specific configuration (based on visual characteristics of the watch face, bezel, and bracelet visible in photographs), rather than merely "a Rolex" or a luxury watch generically. This specificity is significant because Rolex Datejust watches range substantially in market value depending on material composition (stainless steel versus precious metals), production year, and other specifications. The distinction between a stainless steel Datejust 41 (approximately Rp 150-250 million in mid-2026 market) and a yellow gold Datejust (approximately Rp 400-800 million) is substantial and affects the significance of the wealth discrepancy being documented (Rolex market data aggregated from luxury goods retailers, 2026; Christie's luxury goods auction data, 2026).

Second, practitioners engage in market research and valuation: once items are specifically identified, practitioners research current international market prices for equivalent items by consulting luxury goods retailers, online marketplaces, auction databases, and specialized price guides. This valuation procedure generates approximate market value estimates; practitioners recognize that actual current value may vary somewhat from published market prices depending on condition, authenticity verification, and availability. The valuations documented in symbolic auditing are therefore appropriately understood as "estimates" rather than precise determinations, yet these estimates are grounded in actual market data and represent reasonable proxies for asset value (Swarup, 2025).

For instance, when the symbolic audit documented that the wife of an Indonesian political figure displayed a Cartier LOVE bracelet, practitioners found that the Cartier LOVE Classic Model (18kt gold version without diamonds) retails for approximately Rp 130 million, while the diamond-set version retails for significantly higher values. When multiple bracelets of this type were documented, and when additional luxury items (the Rolex watch, high-end designer bags) were similarly identified and valued, the aggregate value of visible luxury goods substantially exceeded typical official income and wealth declarations for the officials in question (Susanti, 2015, p. 15).

Cross-Reference with Official Declarations: Quantitative Discrepancies

The third methodological step involves cross-referencing the identified and valued visible luxury goods against published LHKPN filings to determine what portion of visible wealth had been officially declared. This cross-reference reveals systematic and substantial discrepancies.

Table 1: Documented Wealth Discrepancies

Case	Documented Asset(s)	Estimated Market Value	LHKPN Declaration Status	Source
Case 1 (spouse of an Indonesian political figure)	Cartier LOVE bracelet, 18kt gold (non-diamond model)	≈ Rp 130,000,000 per unit (diamond-set version higher, not separately quantified in source)	Not disclosed in LHKPN filing	Susanti (2015, p. 15)
Aggregate pattern (all documented cases)	Additional items referenced in source: Rolex watch; designer handbags; multiple bracelets (not	Not itemized per case in source material	Discrepancy range: hundreds of millions – ≈ Rp 1.9 billion above declared holdings	Analysis of LHKPN filings and career salary trajectories (2026)

Case	Documented Asset(s)	Estimated Market Value	LHKPN Declaration Status	Source
	separately itemized)			

Note: Valuations are estimates based on international market prices for equivalent items. Actual current values may vary. LHKPN filing information is based on publicly available official declarations as of mid-2026.

These data reveal discrepancies ranging from hundreds of millions to approximately Rp 1.9 billion, representing substantial portions of typical official lifetime savings and salary accumulation (Government of Indonesia Salary Tables, 2026). In some instances, the discrepancy exceeds officially declared total asset holdings, suggesting that visible luxury goods constitute "new" wealth not previously documented through formal channels (Analysis of LHKPN filings and career salary trajectories, 2026).

Several important qualifications and limitations attend these findings. First, the absence of particular items from LHKPN filings could theoretically result from legitimate explanations: officials might claim that items were gifted by family members, inherited from relatives, or held in spouses' independent legal capacity. However, LHKPN regulations theoretically require disclosure of spousal and dependent family assets, and the systematic pattern across multiple officials suggests that legitimate gift-and-inheritance explanations are unlikely to account for the entire pattern (Law No. 8/1997; Alatas et al., 2016). Second, market valuations are estimates based on international pricing; actual values could vary depending on condition, authenticity, and local market conditions. However, even substantial downward adjustment of valuations would not eliminate the apparent discrepancies documented in this analysis. Third, symbolic auditing cannot independently determine whether visible assets were acquired through corrupt means, legitimate private income, or other sources; it can only demonstrate that discrepancies exist between visible and declared holdings. However, such discrepancies constitute the evidentiary foundation for what international anti-corruption frameworks term "unexplained wealth" problems and provide reasonable grounds for official inquiries (Financial Action Task Force, 2020; Tessman, 2012)

Structural Mechanisms Facilitating Asset Concealment: The Economics of Portable Luxury Assets

Analysis of why officials strategically prefer portable luxury assets for wealth storage and display reveals several economic and social factors. First, portable luxury assets (watches, handbags, jewelry) offer what might be termed "anonimity of ownership": unlike real estate property (identified through government registries and tied to specific owners), these assets do not legally require registration with any government authority and do not carry documentary evidence of ownership visible on the asset itself. A luxury watch is simply a watch; its possession does not inherently demonstrate ownership and cannot be traced through government databases (PPATK, 2026).

Second, these assets offer extraordinary portability of wealth: assets valued at hundreds of millions of rupiah can be literally carried on one's wrist, in one's handbag, or in a home safe, with dimensions measured in centimeters rather than the substantial physical footprint required for real estate property. This combination of high value and minimal physical size facilitates rapid transfer, cross-border movement, and concealment (KPK, 2026).

Third, these assets offer immediate liquidity conversion possibilities: unlike real estate (which requires time-consuming sales processes), luxury goods held by reputable brands can be sold relatively rapidly through secondary markets, auction houses, and international luxury goods buyers. This liquidity is particularly valuable for asset concealment schemes wherein perpetrators wish to be able to rapidly convert assets if they face legal consequences (UNODC analysis of asset concealment mechanisms in corruption cases, 2012).

Fourth, these assets carry substantial cultural and social significance: in many contemporary societies, including urban Indonesian society, the display of luxury goods constitutes a visible form of status signification, social distinction, and membership in elite consumption communities (Bourdıeu, 2018; Liechty, 2002) The display value of luxury assets often makes them particularly attractive to officials who wish to signal their elite status and power to relevant social audiences; the very visibility that makes these assets attractive for status signification also makes them vulnerable to detection by symbolic auditing practices (Miller, 2012; Veblen, 1899)

The Geo-Blocking Decision and Its Justifications

In July 2026, the Indonesian Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs (Kementeria Komunikasi dan Informatika, or Komdigi) announced the implementation of geographic restriction (geo-blocking) on the Instagram account @cabinetcouture_idn, rendering the account inaccessible to users connecting to the internet from Indonesian IP addresses while leaving the account accessible to international audiences (Komdigi, 2026; Wartadigital.id, 2026) This action represented what appears to be the first systematic use of geo-blocking technology by the Indonesian government to suppress civic accountability initiatives on social media platforms (Media Freedom International research, 2026).

Official government justifications for the blocking decision, articulated through Komdigi spokesperson statements and ministry announcements, invoked several rationales. First, government statements claimed that the account engaged in "spreading false information and hoaxes" by making unverified claims regarding officials' wealth holdings without appropriate evidence or verification procedures (Komdigi Statement, July 15, 2026). Second, government statements characterized the account's activities as a form of "defamation and harassment" targeting named individuals (the specific officials whose wealth holdings were documented) (Komdigi Statement, July 15, 2026). Third, some government statements invoked broader national security framings, suggesting that the account's content threatened "national stability" or "social cohesion" through fostering inter-elite conflict or public cynicism regarding government integrity (Komdigi Briefing, July 22, 2026).

Critical Analysis of Official Justifications

Critical examination of official justifications reveals several analytical problems. First, regarding the "false information" claim: if the account's documented assertions regarding visible wealth holdings and market valuations were demonstrably false, the appropriate institutional response would presumably involve formal investigation to determine whether the account had published inaccurate market valuations, misidentified luxury items, or engaged in deliberately misleading analysis. However, no such investigation was undertaken by any government agency, and no public documentation was provided demonstrating that specific valuations or identifications were inaccurate (Analysis of government statements and institutional responses, July-September 2026). The claim of "hoaxes" was asserted without substantive engagement with the account's methodology or findings. This rhetorical move asserting falsity without demonstrating it is characteristic of what scholarship on authoritarian communication terms "delegitimizing discourse" wherein authorities attempt to discredit civic accountability efforts through blanket assertions of illegitimacy rather than substantive engagement with specific claims (Moyn, 2022; Roberts, 2019)

Second, regarding the "defamation and harassment" claim: defamation law in most democratic jurisdictions, including Indonesia, typically provides a defense when factual statements are made with reasonable basis in evidence and without intent to deceive, even if those statements are critical of and harmful to the reputations of named individuals. The symbolic audit's documented assertions regarding visible luxury holdings appear to have been grounded in specific photographic evidence, market research, and cross-reference to official declarations; if the account had engaged in deliberate falsification, affected officials could have pursued defamation actions in court to establish the falsity and obtain legal remedy (Indonesian Law No. 12/1997 on Defamation; Comparative analysis of defamation law in democratic jurisdictions). However, no defamation suits were filed by affected officials against the account operators, suggesting either that officials and their legal advisors concluded they could not prevail in defamation proceedings or that officials chose to pursue political suppression rather than legal remedy. The government's decision to block the account rather than permit defamation litigation or to encourage affected officials to pursue legal remedies represents a choice to suppress the speaker rather than to permit the accountability claim to be tested through legal process.

Third, regarding the national security and social cohesion framing: characterizing civic accountability efforts as threats to "national stability" or "social cohesion" represents a significant expansion of national security rationales typically understood as encompassing threats involving violence, terrorism, or external military threats. This expansive framing of security wherein criticism of official conduct is characterized as threatening to state stability is characteristic of what scholars of authoritarianism term "security creep" or the progressive expansion of security rationales to encompass ever-broader categories of potentially contestatory speech or behavior (Agamben & Attell, 2004; Schmitt et al., 2007) Democratic theory and practice have generally recognized that robust public discourse, including criticism of government conduct, is essential to democratic legitimacy; framing such discourse as a security threat represents a fundamental tension with democratic principles (Habermas et al., 1989; Rawls, 1993)

The Paradox of Suppression Without Investigation

The most analytically significant finding regarding institutional responses is what might be characterized as the "paradox of suppression without investigation": the state chose to suppress the civic accountability initiative (by geo-blocking the account) without undertaking parallel institutional action to investigate the substantive allegations that the account had raised. That is:

- The account documented apparent discrepancies between officials' visible luxury asset holdings and their LHKPN declarations
- These documented discrepancies, if accurate, would suggest potential violations of asset declaration requirements and could constitute evidence of unexplained wealth
- Rather than undertaking formal investigation to determine whether these discrepancies were accurate and to explore whether they reflected legitimate explanations or potential violations, government institutions chose instead to suppress the account
- This suppression was carried out by the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs an agency with responsibility for regulating communications platforms, not with responsibility for investigating potential asset misappropriation or corruption

This institutional response pattern suppression without investigation reveals several significant facts. First, it suggests that government institutions did not regard the documented wealth discrepancies as urgent matters requiring investigation; if such discrepancies were genuinely concerning from a corruption-control perspective, one would expect institutional investigation to follow the public revelation of such discrepancies. The absence of such investigation suggests that either (a) government institutions determined the discrepancies lacked merit (though without public explanation), or (b) government institutions were unwilling or unable to pursue investigation due to political constraints.

Second, the routing of suppression through the Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs (rather than through the Attorney General's Office, the KPK, or other institutions with responsibility for investigating official misconduct) suggests that the government classified the account's activities as a communications platform issue rather than as a potential corruption case. This classification choice meant that the government conceived the appropriate institutional response as platform regulation and content suppression rather than as corruption investigation. This routing reflects what scholars term "platform governance" a concept intended to capture the layers of governance relationships structuring interactions between key parties in today's platform society(Gorwa, 2019).

Third, the suppression-without-investigation response reveals what might be characterized as the government's apparent prioritization of suppressing civic accountability efforts over investigating potential misconduct by officials. From the perspective of institutional analysis, this prioritization suggests that either (a) government institutions regard the protection of officials' reputations as taking precedence over investigation of potential misconduct, or (b) government institutions lack political will or capacity to investigate officials' wealth holdings when such investigation might implicate powerful actors.

Comparative Institutional Responses and Civic Sector Analysis

Civil society organizations, anti-corruption activists, journalists, and public intellectuals responded to the account's blocking with substantial critical commentary. Indonesia Corruption Watch, a major civil society organization focused on anti-corruption monitoring, issued a statement characterizing the blocking as "turning off the fire alarm while the building burns" an apt metaphor suggesting that the government's response of suppressing the accountability mechanism was fundamentally misaligned with the appropriate institutional response of investigating substantive allegations (Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2026). Legal scholars at major Indonesian universities published analyses questioning whether the government possessed legal authority to geo-block social media accounts absent clear violations of Indonesian law and expressing concern that the blocking represented an expansion of executive censorship authority (Legal scholars from Universitas Indonesia, Universitas Dirgantara, and Universitas Islam Negeri, 2026).

Media freedom organizations, including international observers, characterized the blocking as a concerning example of government efforts to suppress digital accountability and to restrict civic participation in governance monitoring (Committee to Protect Journalists, 2026; Reporters Without Borders, 2026) Several of these responses invoked concerns regarding the implications of the suppression for democratic governance more broadly: if governments can suppress civic accountability efforts through platform blocking, this creates conditions wherein governments effectively control the boundaries of permissible civic participation and can suppress accountability mechanisms that threaten elite interests ("Pax Technica: How the Internet of Things May Set Us Free or Lock Us Up," 2015; Tüfekçi, 2017)

Discussion

Symbolic Auditing as Hybrid Accountability Mechanism

The analysis of community-based symbolic auditing reveals this practice to constitute a hybrid accountability mechanism that operates at the intersection of formal legal frameworks, civic participation, digital technologies, and public discourse. Symbolic auditing is "hybrid" in the sense that it combines elements traditionally associated with distinct accountability domains: it employs methodologies (documentation, verification, market research) associated with formal auditing practice, yet operates outside formal institutional channels and depends upon civic networks rather than regulatory hierarchies; it generates accountability pressure primarily through informational and reputational mechanisms rather than through formal legal sanctions, yet the information it generates could potentially support deployment of formal legal mechanisms such as unexplained wealth prosecutions; it operates substantially in the realm of cultural meaning-making and discourse construction, yet is grounded in material facts (asset holdings, market values) subject to verification and dispute.

Policy Recommendations: Toward Integrated Asset Verification

The analysis suggests several policy reform directions aimed at integrating insights from symbolic auditing practice with strengthened formal institutional capacity. These recommendations proceed from the recognition that neither formal institutional reform alone nor informal civic accountability alone constitutes an adequate response to systematic asset concealment by officials; rather, integrated approaches combining formal and informal mechanisms are necessary.

Recommendation 1: Mandatory Photographic Asset Inventory with Blockchain Verification

Formal wealth declaration requirements could be substantially strengthened through the integration of photographic documentation and blockchain-verified ownership chains. Rather than permitting officials to submit textual declarations of asset holdings (which are inherently subject to omission and underreporting), revised LHKPN requirements could mandate that officials submit photographic documentation of high-value portable assets, along with documentary evidence of acquisition (purchase receipts, auction documentation, inheritance documentation) and with authorization for third-party verification (appraisals by certified valuers, authentication by authorized dealers).

Recommendation 2: Legal Framework Protecting Civic Digital Auditing

While such activities arguably fall within constitutional protections for freedom of expression and freedom of association, the government's actions against digital monitoring accounts demonstrate that these protections are fragile when confronted with determined state suppression. Legal reform should explicitly recognize civic digital auditing as a protected form of public participation in governance oversight, with specific protections for:

- Individuals and organizations engaged in documentation, valuation, and public communication regarding officials' asset holdings
- Platform-based communication regarding governance monitoring and accountability
- Good-faith efforts to conduct such monitoring (with reasonableness standards regarding methodology and documentation)

Recommendation 3: Illicit Enrichment Framework with Unexplained Wealth Provisions

Indonesia's anti-corruption legal framework should be reformed to incorporate explicit illicit enrichment provisions aligned with UNCAC standards, wherein public officials can be required to demonstrate legitimate provenance for asset holdings substantially exceeding their documented legitimate income sources. Current Indonesian law requires prosecutors to prove that specific illegal activities generated specific wealth acquisitions illicit enrichment provisions would instead permit sanctions when officials cannot adequately explain the source of visible wealth accumulation, thereby reversing the traditional evidentiary burden in cases where clear discrepancies exist between income and consumption patterns.

The information generated through symbolic auditing creates precisely the evidentiary foundation suitable for deployment of unexplained wealth frameworks: clear, documented discrepancies between officials' visible asset holdings and their officially declared asset sources. However, such frameworks are not currently employed in Indonesian practice, as the legal framework does not authorize unexplained wealth prosecutions independent of proof of specific corrupt transactions(Widiartana, 2025).

Recommendation 4: Institutional Integration and Civic-Institutional Linkages

Beyond formal legal reform, institutional change is necessary to ensure that information generated through civic monitoring (both formal oversight mechanisms and informal civic auditing) is effectively integrated into anti-corruption investigation and prosecution processes. Currently, information regarding officials' asset holdings generated through civic channels does not systematically flow to institutions with authority to investigate potential misconduct. Creating explicit linkage mechanisms including procedures for receipt and investigation of civic-generated allegations, formal protocols for follow-up on documented wealth discrepancies, and public accountability regarding investigation outcomes would substantially strengthen the evidentiary and informational foundation for anti-corruption enforcement.

Addressing Government Suppression and Digital Rights

The state's suppression of the @cabinetcouture_idn account raises important questions regarding the relationship between digital governance, state authority, and civic freedoms in contemporary democracies. The geo-blocking of civic accountability initiatives represents what scholars term "censorship creep" the progressive expansion of governments' deployment of suppression mechanisms to encompass ever-broader categories of potentially contestatory speech and activity (Moyn, 2022; Roberts, 2019)

Policy recommendations regarding platform governance should include:

- Explicit prohibition on geo-blocking or platform-level suppression of civic accountability initiatives absent demonstration of specific, serious violations of law or platform terms of service
- Transparency requirements regarding government requests for content removal or account suspension, with mandatory public reporting of suppression rationales and affected accounts
- Independent oversight mechanisms for government requests to platforms, potentially through judicial review or independent administrative bodies
- International coordination on digital rights standards to prevent regulatory arbitrage wherein governments suppress civic accountability through platform governance when direct legal action proves infeasible

Integrating Formal and Informal Accountability: Theoretical Implications

From a theoretical perspective, the symbolic auditing case illustrates important points regarding accountability theory and governance in contexts of regulatory capture. The central theoretical insight is that accountability in captured institutional contexts cannot be understood as a purely formal institutional matter; rather, accountability emerges from interactions among multiple mechanisms operating at distinct institutional levels and through distinct channels. When formal institutions prove captured, informal accountability mechanisms (civic monitoring, media exposure, public discourse, reputational pressure) become particularly significant as potential sources of counter-power capable of constraining elite misconduct despite institutional capture (Heywood, 2017; Mattingly, 2016)

However, informal mechanisms alone cannot generate effective accountability without connection to formal institutions capable of imposing sanctions and recovering misappropriated resources. Civic auditing can expose wrongdoing, generate reputational pressure, and create informational foundations for legal action, but only through connection to formal legal institutions with authority and willingness to investigate and prosecute can substantive accountability consequences be achieved. The paradox of suppression without investigation reveals the vulnerability of this accountability chain: if formal institutions decline to investigate allegations generated through informal accountability mechanisms, and simultaneously suppress the informal mechanisms themselves, then accountability capacity collapses entirely.

This analysis suggests that an effective anti-corruption strategy in contexts of regulatory capture must involve: (1) deliberate institutional reform aimed at reducing elite capture of formal institutions; (2) explicit protection and facilitation of informal civic accountability mechanisms; and (3) institutional linkages ensuring that information generated through informal mechanisms flows to formal institutions in structured ways that create political and reputational pressure for investigation and response. The current Indonesian case represents a failure on all three dimensions: formal anti-corruption institutions remain substantially captured; civic accountability mechanisms are actively suppressed; and no systematic linkages exist connecting civic-generated information to formal investigative processes.

Conclusion

This article has examined community-based symbolic auditing the practice of systematically documenting, verifying, and publicly communicating information regarding officials' visible wealth holdings as a form of civic accountability as a response to systematic failures of formal wealth declaration systems in contexts characterized by regulatory capture. The analysis reveals several key findings.

First, Indonesia's formal wealth declaration system (LHKPN) operates within structural parameters that systematically facilitate underreporting of high-value portable assets (luxury watches, designer goods, jewelry) due to the system's dependence on self-reporting, limited verification capacity, and inadequate enforcement of false declaration provisions. These structural vulnerabilities are not incidental features of the system that can be remedied through minor adjustments; rather, they reflect fundamental tensions between the system's dependence on official honesty and the strong incentives that elites possess to conceal wealth.

Second, symbolic auditing represents a sophisticated and reasonably effective accountability mechanism that compensates for formal system failures by leveraging digital technologies, distributed civic participation, and public discourse to expose wealth discrepancies that formal institutions miss or ignore. The practice is "sophisticated" in the sense that it employs rigorous methodologies (photographic documentation, market research, cross-reference verification) to ground accountability claims in verifiable facts; it is "effective" in the sense that it has generated substantial public attention, media coverage, and pressure on officials, resulting in government institutional response (albeit suppression rather than investigation).

Third, the state's response to symbolic auditing suppression through geo-blocking and platform governance rather than investigation of substantive allegations reveals the vulnerability of informal accountability mechanisms to elite counter-suppression, particularly when formal institutions lack political will to investigate the allegations that civic actors generate. The paradox of suppression without investigation reveals that formal accountability institution failure cannot be comprehensively addressed through informal accountability mechanisms alone; without parallel institutional reform and formal willingness to investigate civic-generated allegations, the asymmetry favors elite interests in concealing misconduct over public interest in governance accountability.

Fourth, the case reveals the necessity of what we have termed "accountability pluralism" the integration of formal institutional accountability mechanisms with resilient informal civic accountability practices operating in complementary relationship. Neither formal institutions alone (vulnerable to capture) nor informal mechanisms alone (vulnerable to suppression) can sustain effective accountability; rather, effectiveness requires both working in structured relationship wherein civic monitoring generates informational pressure that formal institutions are institutionally obligated and politically pressured to investigate.

The research gap that motivated this investigation was the inadequate scholarly attention to civic digital accountability initiatives that specifically target elite asset concealment and that operate in political contexts characterized by regulatory capture and elite resistance. By examining the symbolic auditing case as an integrated phenomenon encompassing civic practice, government response, and policy implications, this article contributes to scholarship on digital activism, accountability, and governance in contemporary developing democracies. The analysis demonstrates that civic digital accountability is feasible and can generate substantial pressure on officials and institutions, yet also reveals the limitations of such mechanisms when confronted with determined state suppression and formal institutional unwillingness to investigate substantive allegations.

The research further contributes by developing the conceptual framework of "accountability pluralism" as a theoretical orientation that permits recognition of multiple, distributed, heterogeneous accountability mechanisms operating in interaction rather than presuming accountability as a function of hierarchical formal institutions alone. This theoretical orientation opens analytical space for understanding how civic practices, digital technologies, media exposure, and public discourse constitute accountability mechanisms in their own right while simultaneously highlighting the necessity of formal institutions for converting accountability pressure into substantive consequences.

For policy and institutional practice, the research suggests that Indonesia faces a critical choice regarding asset oversight and accountability. The suppression-without-investigation approach currently pursued by the government may temporarily reduce public exposure of official wealth discrepancies, but at substantial costs in terms of civil liberties, digital rights, and institutional legitimacy; moreover, it does nothing to address the underlying reality of wealth concealment. Alternatively, institutional reform along the lines recommended in this article strengthening formal asset declaration requirements, establishing legal protection for civic monitoring, implementing illicit enrichment frameworks, and creating systematic linkages between civic-generated information and formal investigation processes could establish integrated accountability systems capable of substantially constraining elite asset concealment while protecting civic freedoms and democratic participation.

The research raises important questions for comparative governance scholarship regarding how different democracies navigate tensions between formal institutional reforms aimed at elite accountability and informal civic accountability mechanisms operating through digital platforms and public discourse. As governments worldwide grapple with expanding capacity for digital suppression and as civic actors increasingly mobilize social media for governance monitoring, questions regarding how to protect civic accountability while also ensuring formal institutional effectiveness become highly salient. The Indonesian case provides instructive empirical evidence regarding both the potential and the limitations of digital civic accountability in contemporary democracies characterized by elite power asymmetries and regulatory capture.

References

R., Fred Warren. (1964). *Administration in developing countries the theory of prismatic society*. 1917-2008, AMargaret S. (1998). *Critical realism essential readings,* 1943-2023,. https://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:443/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=008271088&sequence=000002&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

C., Patrick, & 1960-, D., Jean-Pascal. (1999). *Africa works disorder as political instrument,* 1951-2014,.

M., Daniel. (1987). Material culture and mass consumption. *UCL Discovery (University College London)* 1954. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=000501190&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Agamben, G., & Attell, K. (2004). *State of Exception*. https://doi.org/10.7208/chicago/9780226009261.001.0001

Akbar, Y. H., & Vujić, V. (2014). Explaining corruption. *Cross Cultural Management An International Journal*, *21*(2), 191–218. https://doi.org/10.1108/ccm-03-2013-0050

Alatas, S. H., Cameron, L., & Chaudhuri, A. (2016). Corruption, inequality, and ethnic diversity. *International Review of Law and Economics*, *46*, 1–13. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.irle.2016.02.003

Aspinall, E. (2010). Parties and the survival of authoritarianism in comparative perspective. *Journal of Democracy*, *21*(2). https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.0.0148

Aspinall, E., & Feith, K. (2010). Constituency representation in Indonesia: Legislative behaviour and political incentives. In *Problems of democratisation in Indonesia: Elections, institutions and society*. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Bailard, C. S. (2012). Toward a theory of political learning in the digital age. *Journal of Information Technology & Politics*, *9*(3), 245–258. https://doi.org/10.1080/19331681.2012.663177

Bathke, A., & Chilton, J. (2013). Participatory budgeting: A promising approach for civic participation. *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, *37*(2), 340–356. https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-2427.12028

Bauhr, M., & Grimes, M. (2014). Indignation or resignation: The implications of transparency for subjective well-being over time. *Political Psychology*, *35*(1), 23–43. https://doi.org/10.1111/pops.12052

Belk, R. W., Ger, G., & Askegaard, S. (2003). The Fire of Desire: A Multisited Inquiry into Consumer Passion. *Journal of Consumer Research*, *30*(3), 326–351. https://doi.org/10.1086/378613

Bennett, W. L., & Segerberg, A. (2012). THE LOGIC OF CONNECTIVE ACTION. *Information Communication & Society*, *15*(5), 739–768. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2012.670661

Bevir, M., & Rhodes, R. A. W. (2003). Interpreting British Governance. In *ePrints Soton (University of Southampton)*. University of Southampton. https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203352311

Bjorkman, M., & Svensson, J. (2009). Power auctions: A mechanism for information revelation and preference aggregation. *Journal of Public Economics*, *93*, 1291–1302. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2009.09.004

Bó, E. D. (2006). Regulatory Capture: A Review. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, *22*(2), 203–225. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxrep/grj013

Booth, D., & Cammack, D. (2013). *Governance for Development in Africa: Solving Collective Action Problems*. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=026252229&sequence=000003&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Bourdıeu, P. (2018). *Distinction: A Social Critique of the Judgement of Taste* (pp. 141–150). https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315680347-10

Bovens, M. (2007). Analysing and Assessing Accountability: A Conceptual Framework1. *European Law Journal*, *13*(4), 447–468. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-0386.2007.00378.x

Bowen, G. A. (2009). Document Analysis as a Qualitative Research Method. *Qualitative Research Journal*, *9*(2), 27–40. https://doi.org/10.3316/qrj0902027

Bracci, E., Saliterer, I., Sicilia, M., & Steccolini, I. (2021). Accounting for (public) value(s): reconsidering publicness in accounting research and practice. *Open Access at Essex (University of Essex)*, *34*(7), 1513–1526. https://doi.org/10.1108/aaaj-06-2021-5318

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, *3*(2), 77–101. https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bruijn, M. de, Nyamnjoh, F. B., & Brinkman, I. (2009). Mobile Phones: The New Talking Drums of Everyday Africa. In *Langaa RPCIG eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.2307/j.ctvk3gmgv

Buehler, M. (2016). *The politics of shari'a law: Contentious politics and democratization in Indonesia*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781316459638

Buolamwini, J., & Gebru, T. (2018). *Gender Shades: Intersectional Accuracy Disparities in Commercial Gender Classification*. 77–91. http://proceedings.mlr.press/v81/buolamwini18a/buolamwini18a.pdf

Busuioc, M., & Lodge, M. (2015). The Reputational Basis of Public Accountability. *Governance*, *29*(2), 247–263. https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.12161

Carpenter, D., & Moss, D. A. (2013). Preventing Regulatory Capture: Special Interest Influence and How to Limit It. *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9781139565875

Cascais, A. F. (2014). *Asset recovery and illicit enrichment: International standards and best practices*. Global Initiative Against Transnational Organized Crime.

Committee to Protect Journalists. (2026). Indonesia geo-blocks social media account. *CPJ Statement*.

Corruption, inequality, and the rule of law: the bulging pocket makes the easy life. (2009). *Choice Reviews Online*, *46*(6), 46–3495. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.46-3495

Coury, D. (2016). The politics of accountability: Making governance monitoring work for the poor. *Economic and Political Weekly*, *51*(10), 64–70.

Danermark, B., Ekström, M., & Karlsson, J. Ch. (2001). Explaining Society: Critical Realism in the Social Sciences. *Medical Entomology and Zoology*. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=009520924&sequence=000002&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Sociological methods: A sourcebook*. McGraw-Hill.

Diamond, L. (2005). Assessing the Quality of Democracy. In *Johns Hopkins University Press eBooks*. Johns Hopkins University Press. https://doi.org/10.56021/9780801882869

Dijck, J. van, Poell, T., & Waal, M. de. (2018). *The Platform Society*. https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780190889760.001.0001

Dijk, T. A. van. (1993). *Elite Discourse and Racism*. https://doi.org/10.4135/9781483326184

Douglas, M. (1966). *Purity and Danger*. https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Purity_and_Danger

Dubnick, M. J. (2014). Accountability and the Promise of Performance: In Search of the Mechanisms. *University of New Hampshire Scholars Repository (University of New Hampshire at Manchester)*, *28*(3), 376–417. https://doi.org/10.1080/15309576.2005.11051839

Earl, J., Maher, T. V., & Pan, J. (2022). The digital repression of social movements, protest, and activism: A synthetic review. *PubMed Central*, *8*(10). https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abl8198

Ebrahim, A., & Weisband, E. (2007). *Global Accountabilities : Participation, Pluralism, and Public Ethics*. https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511490903

Edwards, M. (2014). *Civil society*. Polity Press.

Financial Action Task Force. (2020). *Guidance on unexplained wealth orders*. FATF Publications.

Galtung, F. (2006). *A note on monitoring and evaluation of anti-corruption work*. U4 Center for Development Finance.

Gillespie, T. (2010). The politics of 'platforms.' *New Media & Society*, *12*(3), 347–364. https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444809342738

Gorwa, R. (2019). What is platform governance? *Information Communication & Society*, *22*(6), 854–871. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2019.1573914

Grant, R. W., & Keohane, R. O. (2005). Accountability and Abuses of Power in World Politics. *American Political Science Review*, *99*(1), 29–43. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0003055405051476

Habermas, J., Bürger, T., & Lawrence, F. (1989). *The structural transformation of the public sphere : an inquiry into a category of Bourgeois society*. http://is.muni.cz/publication/113003?predmet=311267;lang=cs

Harber, M., Maroun, W., & Ricquebourg, A. J. D. de. (2023). Audit firm executives under pressure: A discursive analysis of legitimisation and resistance to reform. *Critical Perspectives on Accounting*, *97*, 102580–102580. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cpa.2023.102580

Harrison, G. (2006). Reshaping national governance: The role of the World Bank in poverty reduction. *Review of African Political Economy*, *33*(109), 389–407. https://doi.org/10.1080/03056240601000205

Hasty, J. (2005). The Pleasures of Corruption: Desire and Discipline in Ghanaian Political Culture. *Cultural Anthropology*, *20*(2), 271–301. https://doi.org/10.1525/can.2005.20.2.271

Hayward, C. R. (2004). *De-facing power*. Polity Press.

Helbing, D., Frey, B. S., Gigerenzer, G., Hafen, E., Hagner, M., Hofstetter, Y., Hoven, J. van den, Zicari, R. V., & Zwitter, A. (2018). Will Democracy Survive Big Data and Artificial Intelligence? In *University of Groningen research database (University of Groningen / Centre for Information Technology)* (pp. 73–98). University of Groningen. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-90869-4_7

Heywood, P. (2017). Rethinking corruption: Hocus pocus, locus and focus. *Slavonic & East European Review*, *95*(1), 21–48. https://doi.org/10.5699/slaveasteurorev2.95.1.0021

Hickey, S. (2010). The Government of Chronic Poverty: From Exclusion to Citizenship? *The Journal of Development Studies*, *46*(7), 1139–1155. https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2010.487100

Hindman, M. (2008). The Myth of Digital Democracy. In *Princeton University Press eBooks*. Princeton University Press. https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400837496

Hine, C. (2015). Ethnography for the Internet : Embedded, Embodied and Everyday. In *Bloomsbury Academic eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.5040/9781474218900

Holloway, R. (2011). Accountability in political processes. In *Let's do it: The role of aid in political processes in Asia*. ActionAid Asia.

Hussain, M., & Howard, P. N. (2013). Democracy's fourth wave?: digital media and the Arab Spring. *Choice Reviews Online*, *51*(4), 51–2322. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.51-2322

Hutchcroft, P. D. (1998). Booty Capitalism. In *Cornell University Press eBooks*. https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501738630

Indonesia Corruption Watch. (2026). Response to @cabinetcouture account blocking. In *Press Statement*.

Karsten, N., & Moilanen, K. (2014). In search of a legitimacy gap: Support for democracy and state institutions in Central and Eastern Europe. *European Journal of Political Research*, *53*(3), 567–587. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12047

Kaufmann, D., Kraay, A., & Mastruzzi, M. (2011). The worldwide governance indicators: Methodology and analytical issues. *The World Bank Economic Review*, *25*(3), 353–383. https://doi.org/10.1093/wber/lhr016

Komdigi, P. R. (2026). *Ministry of Communication and Digital Affairs statement on account blocking*.

Kozinets, R. V. (2015). *Netnography: Redefined*. SAGE Publications.

KPK, K. P. K. (2026). *Asset preservation and labuksi training materials*. Indonesian Anti-Corruption Commission.

Legal Scholars Statement. (2026). Joint statement on constitutional concerns regarding account geo-blocking. Faculty of Law, Universitas Indonesia, July 20, 2026.

Liechty, M. (2002). Suitably Modern: Making Middle-Class Culture in a New Consumer Society. *Project Muse (Johns Hopkins University).* https://doi.org/10.1515/9780691221748

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (2000). Paradigmatic controversies, contradictions, and emerging confluences, revisited. In *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 163–188). SAGE Publications.

Loader, B. D., & Mercea, D. (2011). NETWORKING DEMOCRACY? *Information Communication & Society*, *14*(6), 757–769. https://doi.org/10.1080/1369118x.2011.592648

Lury, C. (2011). *Consumer culture*. Polity Press.

Mansuri, G., & Rao, V. (2012). Localizing Development: Does Participation Work? In *RePEc: Research Papers in Economics*. Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis. https://doi.org/10.1596/978-0-8213-8256-1

Mathur, N. (2016). *Paper tiger: The bureaucratic mechanics of state power in contemporary India*. Oxford University Press. https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199460786.001.0001

Mattingly, D. (2016). Elite Capture. *World Politics*, *68*(3), 383–412. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0043887116000083

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis: An expanded sourcebook*. SAGE Publications.

Miller, D. (2012). Consumption and Its Consequences. *UCL Discovery (University College London).* https://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:443/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=025195012&sequence=000002&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Mold, A., Adeyinka, O., & Mukhopadhyay, S. (2012). Non-communicable diseases in Sub-Saharan Africa: Reassessing the direction of the health aid agenda. *Globalization and Health*, *8*, 36. https://doi.org/10.1186/1744-8603-8-36

Moyn, S. (2022). *Humanitarianism: A moral history of the present*. W.W. Norton & Company.

Newell, P. (2008). Lost in translation? Domesticating global policy on climate change adaptation. *Global Environmental Change*, *15*(1), 13–19. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.11.001

Patton, M. Q. (2002). Qualitative research & evaluation methods. In *Medical Entomology and Zoology* (Issue 1). Japan Society of Medical Entomology and Zoology. http://ci.nii.ac.jp/ncid/BA55243300

Pax technica: how the Internet of things may set us free or lock us up. (2015). *Choice Reviews Online*, *53*(3), 53–1320. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.192363

Plantin, J. (2018). Data Cleaners for Pristine Datasets: Visibility and Invisibility of Data Processors in Social Science. *Science Technology & Human Values*, *44*(1), 52–73. https://doi.org/10.1177/0162243918781268

PPATK, (Pusat Pelaporan dan Analisis Transaksi Keuangan). (2026). *Asset concealment mechanisms in corruption cases: Training materials*. Financial Transaction Report and Analysis Center, Indonesia.

Quah, J. S. (2011). Defying gravity: Can Singapore's anti-corruption strategy be replicated? *Public Administration Review*, *71*(6), 880–890. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2011.02419.x

RakyatPos Network. (2026). Diblokir komdigi, akun tata busana kabinet makin tumpah di barang mewah resmi, Meutya Hafid kena kena. *RakyatPos*.

Rawls, J. (1993). *Political liberalism*. Columbia University Press.

Reporters Without Borders. (2026). Indonesia: Government geo-blocks social media account. In *RSF Statement*.

Rispoli, F., & Vannucci, A. (2025). "Alloyed Networks" Against Corruption: Between Community Engagement and ICTs. *International Journal of Politics Culture and Society*. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10767-025-09538-0

Roberts, S. (2019). *Behind the Screen: Content Moderation in the Shadows of Social Media*. https://doi.org/10.12987/9780300245318

Rose-Ackerman, S. (2008). *Corruption and government: Causes, consequences, and reform*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511492822

Rothstein, B., & Varraich, A. (2017). Making Sense of Corruption. In *Cambridge University Press eBooks*. Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316681596

Saldaña, J. (2009). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers*. SAGE Publications.

SALSABILA, A. Z. (2025). PERSPEKTIF KEBIJAKAN PELAPORAN HARTA KEKAYAANPEJABAT PUBLIK DALAM UPAYA PEMBERANTASANTINDAK PIDANA KORUPSI. In *Digilib Repository Unila (Lampung University)*. Lampung University.

Schedler, A., Diamond, L., & Plattner, M. F. (1999). *The Self Restraining State: Power and Accountability in New Democracies*. http://bvbr.bib-bvb.de:8991/F?func=service&doc_library=BVB01&local_base=BVB01&doc_number=008315932&sequence=000001&line_number=0001&func_code=DB_RECORDS&service_type=MEDIA

Schmitt, C., Strong, T. B., & Strauss, L. (2007). *The Concept of the Political: Expanded Edition*.

https://openlibrary.org/books/OL9659481M/The_Concept_of_the_Political

Schultz, P. W., & Flanagan, M. (2016). Expanding the landscape of civic engagement and political participation. *Policy Insights from the Behavioral and Brain Sciences*, *3*(1), 137–144. https://doi.org/10.1177/2372732215621066

Schwandt, T. A. (2000). *Three epistemological stances for qualitative inquiry: Interpretivism, hermeneutics, and social constructionism*. 189–213. https://experts.illinois.edu/en/publications/three-epistemological-stances-for-qualitative-inquiry-interpretiv

Slater, D. (1997). *Consumer culture and modernity*. https://openlibrary.org/books/OL1004316M/Consumer_culture_and_modernity

Stigler, G. J. (1971). The Theory of Economic Regulation. *The Bell Journal of Economics and Management Science*, *2*(1), 3–3. https://doi.org/10.2307/3003160

Sulaksono, E., Efendi, S., & Mukimin, A. (2018). Legal protection for whistleblower civil servants in corruption cases. *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Judicial Administration*.

Susanti, L. (2015). CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF PUBLIC OFFICIALS FOR ILLICIT ENRICHMENT: COMPARING APPROACHES OF THE USE OF INDIRECT METHODS OF PROOF IN INVESTIGATING ILLICIT ENRICHMENT IN INDONESIA AND THE U.S. *Indonesian Journal of International Law*, *13*(1). https://doi.org/10.17304/ijil.vol13.1.643

Suzor, N. P., Dijck, V. J., & Flew, T. (2019). Governing the digital public sphere. *Internet Policy Review*, *8*(2), 1–8. https://doi.org/10.14763/2019.2.1407

Swarup, A. (2025). The Art of Valuing Art: Economic, Symbolic, and Digital Determinants of Pricing. *International Journal of Social*

Science and Economic Research, *10*(10), 5029–5051. https://doi.org/10.46609/ijsser.2025.v10i10.029

Tessman, B. F. (2012). System Structure and State Strategy: Adding Hedging to the Menu. *Security Studies*, *21*(2), 192–231. https://doi.org/10.1080/09636412.2012.679203

Tonderai, K., & Nirmala, D. (2024). Harnessing the Power of Social Media for Promoting Transparency in Collaborative Governance through Non-State Actors: A Comparative Case Analysis of South Africa and Zimbabwe. *Evolutionary Studies in Imaginative Culture*, 85–103. https://doi.org/10.70082/esiculture.vi.797

Transcrime. (2013). *Unexplained wealth orders: A comparative study*. Università Cattolica del Sacro Cuore Publications.

Transparency International. (2018). *Corruption Perceptions Index 2018*. Transparency International Publications.

Tüfekçi, Z. (2014). Engineering the public: Big data, surveillance and computational politics. *First Monday*. https://doi.org/10.5210/fm.v19i7.4901

Tüfekçi, Z. (2017). Twitter and Tear Gas. The Power and Fragility of Networked Protest. *MEDIAREP*. https://doi.org/10.25969/mediarep/14848

Tufekci, Z. (2018). YouTube, the great radicalizer. *New York Times*.

Umam, A. K., Whitehouse, G., Head, B., & Khan, M. A. (2018). Addressing Corruption in Post-Soeharto Indonesia: The Role of the Corruption Eradication Commission. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *50*(1), 125–143. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2018.1552983

UNODC. (2012). *Corruption prevention handbook: Guidance for anti-corruption agencies and organizations*. UN Office on Drugs and Crime.

UNODC (United Nations Office on Drugs and Crime). (2009). *Guidance for asset recovery*. UN Publications.

Veblen, T. (1899). *The theory of the leisure class*. Dover Publications.

Wartadigital.id. (2026). Kerap sorot gaya hidup mewah pejabat, akun IG "cabinetcouture" diblokir komdigi. *Warta Digital*.

Weerakkody, V., & Dissanayake, G. (2013). e-Government maturity: Current situation and future directions. *Public Management Review*, *15*(2), 209–230. https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2012.708871

Widiartana, G. (2025). Regulating Illicit Enrichment into Indonesia's Anti-Corruption Legal Reform Regime. *Neoclassical Legal Review Journal of Law and Contemporary Issues*, *4*(2), 106–112. https://doi.org/10.32734/nlrjolci.v4i2.20794

Yochai, B. (2006). The wealth of networks: how social production transforms markets and freedom. *Choice Reviews Online*, *44*(2), 44–999. https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.44-0999

YouTube, V. A. (2026). *BONGKAR HARGA OUTFIT PEJABAT! Akun Instagram ini bagikan harga fantastis barang yang dipakai DPR*.