www.bircu-journal.com/index.php/birci
Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal)
Humanities and Social Sciences
ISSN 2615-3076 Online)
ISSN 2615-1715 (Print)
Budapest Institute

Corruption Crimes in Indonesia in Criminology Review

Mas Ahmad Yani
Universitas Muhammadiyah Jakarta, Indonesia
masahmadyani307@gmail.com

Abstract

Based on the origin of the word (etymology), it can be stated that the meaning of corruption is something that expresses a condition that was once whole, good, and true, became unkind, not whole, and unrighteous as a result of such deeds; bribing, deceiving, faking, deforming, and such. The culprit is called a corruptor. What is considered a deterioration can be imposed on what concerns physical wholeness and moral integrity? Jeremy Bentham wrote that the term corruption used to be used in the physical sense, from there it was then used in the moral sense. Meanwhile, informal control can be carried out through preventive measures carried out independently by the wider community, both individual individuals and groups or institutional organizations outside the criminal justice system. Prevention can be done by, among others, developing a culture of shame and fear of doing wrong (moral sensibility), so that it can be created collectively self-policing attitudes in the midst of society, that committing acts of corruption is a despicable and evil act.

Keywords
carbon tax; harminization of regulation; legal certainty; principle of justice

I. Introduction

Based on the origin of the word (etymology), it can be stated that the meaning of corruption is something that expresses a condition that was once whole, good, and true, became unkind, not whole, and unrighteous as a result of such deeds; bribing, deceiving, faking, deforming, and such. The culprit is called a corruptor. What is considered a deterioration can be imposed on what concerns physical wholeness and moral integrity? Jeremy Bentham wrote that the term corruption used to be used in the physical sense, from there it was then used in the moral sense.

Based on this understanding, gasoline sellers who have mixed kerosene into their gasoline can also be called corrupt of the purity of gasoline. Likewise, forging pieces of gold money by mixing bronze elements into them has made the purity of gold corrupted (reduced) in grade. Gold that is reduced in grade is called corruption, and the perpetrators of mixing elements are called corruptors. Likewise, a judge who decides a case not based on the principle of justice, but for example because of the appeal to one of the litigants who are able to give bribes, has corrupted the courts. Judges are corrupt, bribery is corrupt, and court rulings are also corrupt. From this side, the notion of corruption still reflects a very broad meaning.

One of the jurists, Laura S Undercuffler, concluded that the concept of corruption reveals traits/dispositions, even though the legal world can only "deal with actions". That is

why the rich meaning of the concept of "corruption cannot be accommodated simply through the conventional understanding of the law". According to Pratiwi (2020) in social life, law and society are two interrelated things that can never be separated. Through instruments, unlawful behavior is prevented and repressive measures are pursued (Tumanggor, 2019). From the aforementioned provisions, it proves the existence of new developments regulated in this Law (Purba, 2019). Likewise, the breadth of the concept of corruption, cannot be fully accommodated only through the definition of economics, politics, culture, morals, and so on.

This is because, both legal, economic, political, and so on definitions, according to Herry Priyono, are only the language of specialization to reveal a certain slice of the reality of complex problems. Quoting Sheldon S Wolin, Herry Priyono stated that the language of specialization was deliberately created to express meaning and the limits of meaning as carefully as possible.

Based on the foregoing, it can simply be stated. That corruption is a way of unlawfully acquiring property committed by one or more, because of the position or authority it has.

Thus, understanding the meaning of corruption holistically, and efforts to eradicate corruption to its roots can only be done with a perspective like the eradication of crime itself that cannot be zeroed (eliminated) at all.

II. Review of Literature

According to B. Herry Priyono, in the Document of the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (2004), which he saw as the only instrument of an anti-corruption law that is universally binding, no definition of corruption was found. Herri Priono asked about this during a symposium on anti-corruption teaching in universities organized by the United Nations on August 11-13, 2014 in Vienna Austria. A source from the United Nations Office of Drugs and Crime (UNODC), a division within the United Nations that deals with corruption and anti-corruption affairs, replied: "yes, that is a big weakness, but the law can only deal with deeds, while 'corruption' is a big concept that affects (umbrella concept) acts called corrupt".

Diego Gambetta Social Scientist who researches a lot of mafia groups and the "black world", called the diversity of meanings of the concept of corruption, which he divided into 3 (three). First; corruption points to the deterioration of the ethical disposition of the person/perpetrator, the lack of moral integrity, or even the depravity of the life of the person/perpetrator. Here corrupt deeds are fueled by corrupt motives and dispositions. Secondly; corruption generically describes a family of social practices, whatever their motives, that arise from or cause conditions of deterioration in the performance of institutions. Third; corruption designates some type of practice such as bribery or rewards for conspiracy.

According to Eddy O.S. Hiariej, from the point of view of criminal law, corruption as an extraordinary crime can at least be seen from 4 (four) characters. First, corruption is an organized crime; Secondly, corruption is usually carried out with a mode of operation that is difficult and it is not easy to prove; Third, corruption has always been concerned with power; Fourth, corruption is a crime related to the fate of the crowd, because the state finances that can be harmed, are of great benefit to improving the welfare of the people.

III. Discussion

3.1 Corruption in Legal Definition in Indonesia

In the realm of civilized society, the rule of law is a necessity that inevitably becomes the basis for cracking down on and handling corruption. In Indonesia, corruption, for example, is defined through articles 2 and 3 of Law Number 31 of 1999 juncto Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, as follows:

a. In Chapter II, Article 2: "unlawfully committing acts of enriching oneself or another person or a corporation that may harm the finances of the state or the economy of the country".
b. In Chapter II, article 3: "for the purpose of benefiting oneself or another person or a corporation abuses the authority, opportunity, or means available to it because of a position or position that may be detrimental to the finances of the state or the economy of the country".
c. Furthermore, the definition that covers 30 types of corruption crimes is explained in 13 articles in Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes.

Based on these articles, corruption is formulated in thirty forms/types of corruption crimes. The thirty forms can then be simplified into 9 (Nine) large groups, namely: state financial losses, bribery, embezzlement in office, extortion, fraudulent acts, conflicts of interest in procurement, gratuities, project corruption, and corruption threatened with "sedition". Each of the groups can then be deciphered as follows.

a. State Financial Losses

Article 2 paragraph (1) of the Law on Typographical Court jo. Constitutional Court Decision Number 25/PUU-XIV/2016 stipulates that: Any person who unlawfully commits an act of enriching himself or another person or a corporation that can harm the state finances or the country's economy, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for life or imprisonment for a minimum of 4 (four) years and a maximum of 20 (twenty) years and a fine of at least Rp200,000,000, 00 (two hundred million rupiahs) and a maximum of Rp1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiahs).

As once described in the article Corruption Law Adheres to State Losses in the Formal Sense, Professor of Criminal Law at Padjajaran University Komariah Emong Sapardjaja explained that the Tipikor Law adheres to the concept of state losses in the formal sense of delik. The word 'can' before the phrase 'harming the country's finances or economy' indicates that the crime of corruption is a formal offense.

The element of 'can harm the state's finances should be interpreted as harming the state in a direct or indirect sense. That is, an automatic action can be considered detrimental to the state's finances if the action has the potential to cause state financial losses. Thus, the existence of a criminal act of corruption is sufficient with the fulfillment of the elements of the act that have been formulated, not with the onset of consequences.

b. Bribery

The act of bribery in the Tipikor Law and its amendments are regulated in Article 5 of Law 20/2001, which reads:

“In paragraph (1), shall be punished with imprisonment for a minimum of 1 (one) year and a maximum of 5 (five) years and or a fine of at least Rp. 50,000,000.00 (fifty million rupiahs) and a maximum of Rp. 250,000,000.00 (two hundred and fifty million rupiahs) for any person who gives or promises something to a civil servant or state organizer with the

intention that the civil servant or state organizer does or does not do something in his position, contrary to his obligations; or give something to a public servant or state administrator because of or in connection with something contrary to obligations, done or not done in his office".

"In paragraph (2) of article 5 of Law 20/2001, it is determined that for civil servants or state administrators who receive gifts or promises as referred to in paragraph (1) letter a or letter b, they are punished with the same crime as referred to in paragraph (1)".

c. Embezzlement in Office

Embezzlement in the office is regulated in Article 8 of Law 20/2001 which reads:

"Shall be punished with imprisonment for a minimum of 3 (three) years and a maximum of 15 (fifteen) years and a fine of at least Rp. 150,000,000.00 (one hundred and fifty million rupiahs) and a maximum of Rp. 750,000,000.00 (seven hundred and fifty million rupiahs), civil servants or persons other than civil servants who are assigned to carry out a public office continuously or for a while, knowingly embezzling money or securities held because of his office, or allowing such money or securities to be taken or embezzled by others, or assisting in the conduct of such deeds".

According to R. Soesilo in his book The Criminal Code (KUHP) and His Comments Complete Article by Article (p. 258), embezzlement is almost the same crime as theft. The difference is that in theft, the goods owned are not yet in the hands of the thief and still have to be 'taken'. Whereas in embezzlement, when the act of embezzlement is committed, the item is already in the hands of the maker (as if as the owner), and the existence of the goods as if as the owner is done not by way of crime. Thus, embezzlement in office in the Law of Typists and its amendments, according to R Soesilo, refers to embezzlement by imposition, that is, embezzlement committed by the person holding the goods in connection with his work or his position (beroep) or because he gets wages.

d. Extortion

Extortion in the Typographical Law takes the form of actions:

"a civil servant or state organizer who with the intent of unlawfully benefiting himself or others, or by abusing his power compels a person to give something, pay, or receive payment with deductions, or to do something for himself"; a civil servant or state administrator who at the time of carrying out duties, requests or accepts work, or the delivery of goods, as if it were a debt to him when it is known that it is not a debt; or civil servants or state administrators who at the time of carrying out their duties, have used state land on which there is a right of use as if in accordance with laws and regulations, have harmed the rightful person, even though it is known that the act is contrary to the laws and regulations".

e. Cheating

Fraudulent acts in the Typographical Law and its amendments include:

"Contractors, builders who at the time of making buildings, or sellers of building materials who at the time handed over building materials, committed fraudulent acts that could endanger the security of people or goods, or the safety of the country in a state of war; any person in charge of overseeing the construction or delivery of building materials, deliberately allowing the above fraudulent acts; any person who at the time of handing over the goods needed by the Indonesian National Army and or the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia commits fraudulent acts that may endanger the safety of the country in a state of war; or any person in charge of supervising the delivery of goods needed by the Indonesian National Army and or the National Police of the Republic of Indonesia deliberately allows the above fraudulent acts".

f. Conflict of Interest in Procurement

A conflict of interest in the procurement of government goods/services is a situation in which a civil servant or state organizer, whether directly or indirectly, intentionally participates in the contracting, procurement, or rental, which at the time of the deed, is in whole or partly assigned to take care of or supervise it.

g. Gratuities

Any gratuity to a civil servant or state administrator is considered to be the giving of bribes, if it relates to his office and which is contrary to his obligations or duties, provided that:

"Whose value is IDR 10 million or more, the proof is that the gratification is not a bribe made by the recipient of the gratuity.

Which is worth less than Rp10 million, the proof that the gratuity is a bribe is proven by the public prosecutor.

The penalty for civil servants or state administrators who receive gratuities is life imprisonment or imprisonment for a minimum of four years and a maximum of 20 years, and a fine of at least Rp200 million and a maximum of Rp1 billion".

However, this provision (above) does not apply if the recipient reports the gratuity he received to the Corruption Eradication Commission, no later than 30 days from the date the gratification was received.

h. Project Corruption

Regarding project corruption, it could be that the object of corruption is project funds, especially projects funded with the APBN or APBD. Possible modes of corruption in the vicinity can be bribery, gratification, or embezzlement in office, in the process of auctioning or procuring the project.

On the other hand, the procurement procedure of the project can also be detrimental to the state's finances or there are indications of conflicts of interest. It could also be that there is blackmail in it.

Contractors, builders who at the time of making buildings, or sellers of building materials who at the time handed over building materials, committed fraudulent acts that could endanger the security of people or goods, or the safety of the country in a state of war, can also be considered corruption.

i. Corruption Threatened with Punishment

Corruption crimes that are threatened with punishment can be seen from the phrase "certain circumstances", as stated in the explanation of article 2 paragraph (2) of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes which has been amended by Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes.

In the explanation of article 2 paragraph (2) of Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, it is stated:

"What is meant by "certain circumstances" in this provision is intended as a burden for perpetrators of corruption crimes if the crime is carried out when the state is in a state of danger in accordance with applicable laws, at the time of a national natural disaster, as a repetition of the criminal act of corruption, or when the state is in a state of economic and monetary crisis".

According to Andi Hamzah, the provisions on the imposition of corruption crimes should be contained in the formulation of the offense {article 2 paragraph (2)} and not in the explanation. This is because, in addition to fulfilling the principle of legality in the imposition of a criminal sanction, it is also to avoid diversity of interpretations of an explanation of the law. With regard to this, the explanation of the statute should be viewed as a single entity of the statute.

For this reason, the explanation of article 2 paragraph (2) of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended in Law Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, can be used as a basis for providing additional sanctions for perpetrators of corruption crimes of a special nature (lex specialis).

As for how much (long) or how severe the additional sanctions for perpetrators of corruption crimes in quantity or qualitative, can be imposed or refer to criminal provisions of a general nature (lex generalis). In this connection, the basis for the punishment in quantity for perpetrators of corruption crimes can refer to article 52 of the Criminal Code concerning the imposition of office, whose complete formulation is as follows:

"Whenever an official for committing a criminal offense violates a special obligation of his office, or at the time of committing a criminal offense using the powers, opportunities, and means given to him because of his office, his sentence is increased by one-third".

Thus, referring to article 52 of the Criminal Code, it is in quantity for those who have positions or civil servants (Ambtenaar) who commit criminal acts by using /utilizing the following 4 (four) conditions: (1) Violating a special obligation of their office; (2) Exercise the power of office; (3) Using the opportunity because of his office; and (4) Use the means granted because of his office; An additional one-third of the criminal threats may be imposed.

As for the quality of punishment, in this case (corruption crime) is if the punishment occurs due to a change from one type of crime (corruption) that is lighter to another type of crime (corruption) that is more severe, taking into account article 69 of the Criminal Code concerning the comparison of the severity of the main punishment. Article 69 of the Criminal Code regulates approximately:

(1) A comparison of the severity of the principal punishment that is not of the same kind, is determined in the composition of article 10 of the Criminal Code;
(2) In the event that the Judge may choose between several principal sentences, then in comparison only the heaviest sentences may be chosen by him;
(3) The comparison of the severity of a similar principal punishment, is determined by its maximum.
(4) The comparison of the length of the principal penalty is not of the same kind, as well as the principal punishment of the same kind is determined by its maximum.

Perpetrators and Victims of Corruption

In criminology, actions committed by the state bureaucracy related to their legitimate office constitute crimes that fall within the scope of White Collar Crime (WCC). Within this framework, the elements are, that his deeds (referring to Sutherland's formulation), must be "committed by a person of respectability and high social status" which must be associated with "in the course of his occupation" and "in violation of trust". Examples commonly given include: (a) "defrauding stockholders", (b) "defrauding the public" and (c) "defrauding the government".

Ronny R Nitibaskara, (2007:14) interprets the WCC as referring to the framework of white-collar crimes introduced by Snider (1993:14), first; violations of the law committed are part of or closely related to official office; second, it is a violation of public trust and abuse of power; third, there is no direct physical coercion; fourth, the goal is money, prestige, and power; fifth, in particular, there are parties who deliberately benefit from the

crime; and sixth, the existence of attempts to disguise the crime committed, and the attempt to use power to prevent the use of applicable legal provisions.

An act in this category of WCC, even if it is a crime that cannot be seen in real terms by the general public, but it is an act that is actually far more detrimental to society than conventional crime. In this framework, the crime of corruption can be declared and understood as an extraordinary crime (extraordinary crime). Even if, the level of public concern for the symptoms of this type of crime, is relatively not as high as the level of concern for conventional crime.

The level of public concern about the symptoms of this crime is relatively not high compared to conventional crime, it must be understood because the type of WCC crime including corruption in it, is an act whose perpetrator is basically the victim himself. The perpetrator will feel like a victim, when realizing, at least among others the following 2 (two) conditions:

1. The cost of fulfilling his living needs is felt to be very expensive, unnatural, and getting bad public services (not in accordance with the standards of costs/costs that should be), unless he (as a victim) commits the same corruptive acts (as the perpetrator), for example giving extra money/bribes/gratuities to officers or officials who are authorized outside the jurisdiction/competence that is his authority, in order to obtain good services, or may win or facilitate a matter or affair;
2. The perpetrator and/or at the same time the victim, when committing a corruptive act, relatively do not feel moral error (moral insensibility).

These two conditions are in line with the theory of isolation initiated by Edwin Sutherland (1983). In this case, the meaning of the evil deed is isolated from the view that the deed is wrong or violates the law, morals, and ethics. The isolation of the act from the wrong nature, due to the development of group norms of the actors (business) itself, so that the acts that are actually violations, will be lived or interpreted as reasonable and common actions in the business world or their work.

Sutherland explained that the perpetrators of these crimes in carrying out their jobs (businesses), and committing violations of the law are not a continuation of the mischief he had committed as a child. They come from the educated upper class. When these actors study business, they at the same time learn special techniques for breaking the law, including the definition of the situation.

That what has been outlined above, will be evident in the crime of corruption by the mode of committing acts of insider trading or collusion within the scope of corporate crimes. In this regard, according to Clinard and Yeager (1980:53-57), today companies exercise tremendous influence over the government, both by legitimate and illegitimate means. The influence will be used to achieve a variety of benefits, from obtaining government contracts and subsidies to lawmaking and law enforcement that benefits corporations.

3.2 Social Control of Corruption Crimes

According to M. Kemal Dermawan, social or community reactions to crime are essentially a form of social control related to the purposes and objectives of efforts to prevent and overcome crime. The community reaction can be in the form of a formal reaction manifested in the judicial (criminal) system and can also be an informal reaction, among others, in the form of efforts to prevent crime independently by the community.

It is explained next, that the reaction of the community will arise if it is realized of the high level of seriousness (as a result) of the acts of crime/deviation itself. On the contrary, the reaction becomes weak or non-existent (regardless), if the consequences of the action do not cause danger/threat/disturbance/loss / do not cause victims to other parties, or the victim is unaware of the existence of actual crimes/deviations (abstract victims and collective victims)

have befallen themselves or certain groups of people, as is common in cases of white collar crimes which is usually neatly wrapped through the loopholes of applicable laws and regulations, so as to avoid community reproach or malicious labels/stigmas.

Based on this view, the reaction of society to the type of crime of corruption, its form can also be; 1) formal reactions embodied in the criminal justice system and 2) informal reactions, among others, in the forms of efforts to prevent crime independently by the community.

Formal Reaction to Corruption Crimes in Indonesia

As is known, formally in the criminal justice system in Indonesia, corruption crimes in Indonesia have been reacted to as extraordinary crimes. This can be seen, for example, through Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), which calcifies corruption as an extra ordinary crime.

For "perpetrators" or individuals or groups associated with the "perpetrator" and let alone the beneficiaries of the "perpetrator's" actions, corrupt behavior may be interpreted as "not an extraordinary crime". The pretexts and various reasons to explain this will return to the perception and reaction of the public to the meaning of corruption, whether it will be seen as a crime or not or simply considered as an aberration.

Based on this, according to the author, it makes the main point why the hopes and will of the community in efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia, through formal social control and currently lean on the KPK, are still considered unsuccessful and meet the expectations of most Indonesians.

Formal social control in the criminal justice system through authorized institutions, such as the Police, Prosecutors, KPK, and Judicial and Correctional Institutions related to efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption in Indonesia, is not only carried out in enforcement functions in the context of punishment or the provision of legal sanctions which are repressive in nature and can be imposed. But also make efforts – efforts are preventive.

Efforts that are corruption prevention through this informal social control mechanism, among others, include the establishment of the Center for Financial Transaction Reporting and Analysis, whose existence is regulated through the Law on the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering Crimes. article 1 number 10 of Law Number 25 of 2003 concerning Amendments to Law Number 15 of 2002 concerning Money Laundering, which was later last amended again through Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering Crimes.

In article 1 number 10 of Law Number 25 of 2003 concerning Amendments to Law Number 15 of 2002 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering Crimes, which was then last amended again through Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning the Prevention and Eradication of Money Laundering Crimes, it is determined that there is a special institution that functions as an investigating officer, namely what we know as the Financial Transaction Reporting and Analysis Center (PPATK). This institution is an independent institution that will carry out the investigative function of collecting, storing, analyzing, and evaluating transaction information that is suspected and suspected of money laundering before the information is forwarded to investigators for processing based on the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP).

The main task of PPATK according to article 39 of Law Number 8 of 2010 is to prevent and eradicate money laundering crimes. Meanwhile, in carrying out its duties, based on article 40 of the Law, PPATK has the following functions: (a). prevention and eradication of money laundering crimes; (b). management of data and information obtained by PPATK; (c) supervision of the Reporting Party's compliance; and (d). analysis or examination of reports and information on Financial Transactions indicating criminal acts of Money Laundering and/or other criminal acts as referred to in Article 2 paragraph (1) of this Law.

What is meant by other criminal acts in article 40 point d of Law number 2010, in which it includes corruption crimes, which in relation to money laundering crimes, corruption crimes are predicate crimes? Meanwhile, "money laundering" is crime after crime.

3.3 Informal Reactions to Corruption in Indonesia

The informal reaction, in this case, is an effort to prevent and overcome self-sufficiently by the community against corrupt behavior. In this regard, the informal reaction to corruption crimes (in Indonesia), is also strongly influenced by people's perceptions and views on the conception of corruption itself. Whether it is understood/interpreted as a crime (including extraordinary crime) or not, especially by the "victim" who in the category is not at the same time as the "perpetrator" of corruption crimes. This is because the victim is unlikely to be able to effectively carry out prevention or countermeasures, if the victim does not realize or does not feel material loss/loss due to the occurrence of a corruption crime.

That's the condition that we think is fundamentally why corruption cases are often protected from the reproach of society (the invisibility of certain crimes) so that both the perpetrator and the victim cannot feel the "moral insensibility" (moral insensibility), because it is considered just a violation of a rule of the game. These two conditions are in line with the theory of isolation initiated by Edwin Sutherland (1983). In this case, the meaning of the evil deed is isolated from the view that the deed is wrong or violates the law, morals, and ethics.

Judging from this aspect, it seems that prevention and countermeasures carried out independently by the community as "victims" (including law enforcement officials such as the KPK, for example) in the capacity as citizens of the community victims of corruption, cannot run effectively if they themselves do not feel any loss/loss materially (real) so that they cannot feel the moral error of the actions and consequences caused.

IV. Conclusion

Corruption, it seems worthy of being given the title of an extraordinary crime, is not precisely because of the nature of the act that causes feelings of tension and extraordinary fear of crime, but perhaps, on the contrary, it becomes an extraordinarily favorable act, that is, feeling safe and more profitable, when opportunities and opportunities are opened up.

Opportunities and opportunities are open because perpetrators of corruption, among others, have authority in their duties and functions attached to the job or expertise or position they hold, to arrange for their actions to be a form of compliance with the law and at the same time can avoid lawsuits in the future.

In addition, corruption is a type of crime that is isolated from the view that the act is wrong or violates the law, morals, and ethics. The isolation of these actions from the nature of being wrong, due to the development of group norms of the actors (businesses) themselves, so that actions that are actually violations are often lived or interpreted as reasonable and commonplace acts in the business world or their work.

It shows significantly the rational choice of why the crime of corruption that causes harm to the country's finances and/or economy was pursued by the perpetrators and at the same time became victims of such acts.

This condition fundamentally allows corruption to still leave obstacles and or obstacles that can cause difficulties in efforts to eradicate corruption crimes, especially in Indonesia.

In this regard, efforts to control corruption must always be carried out both formally and informally. Formally, corruption control through legal institutions and institutions, especially in the existing criminal justice system, which in Indonesia is currently strengthened, among others, by the role of the KPK through existing legal tools and facilities

with all the shortcomings and advantages it has, as well as the role of the Center for Financial Transaction Reporting and Analysis (PPATK) related to the prevention and eradication of Money Laundering Crimes (TPPU) in accordance with Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Analysis of Financial Transactions (PPATK) related to the prevention and eradication of Money Laundering Crimes (TPPU) in accordance with Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Analysis of Financial Transactions (PPATK) related to the prevention and eradication of Money Laundering Crimes (TPPU) in accordance with Law Number 8 of 2010 concerning Prevention and Analysis of Financial Transactions (PPATK) Eradication of Money Laundering.

Meanwhile, informal control can be carried out through preventive measures carried out independently by the wider community, both individual individuals and groups or institutional organizations outside the criminal justice system. Prevention can be done by, among others, developing a culture of shame and fear of doing wrong (moral sensibility), so that it can be created collectively self-policing attitudes in the midst of society, that committing acts of corruption is a despicable and evil act.

References

Adisubrata, K. Prent, J, dan Poerwadarminta, WJS, "Penyusun) Kamus Latin-Indonesia", Tanpa tahun, dalam: Priyono, B. Herry, "Korupsi, Melacak Arti, Menyimak Implikasi", PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta 2018.

Atmasasmita, Romli, "Korupsi, Good Governance Dan Komisi Anti Korupsi Di Indonesia", Badan Pembinaan Hukum Nasional Departemen Kehakiman dan HAM RI, Jakarta, 2002.

Bosman, Philip R," Corruption and Integrity: A Survey of the Ancient Terms", dalam P.Bosman (ed.,), "Corruption and Integrity in Ancient Greece and Rome", (Pretoria:Acta Classica Suplementum IV, 2012, halm. 3., dalam Priyono, B. Herry, 2018.

Bentham, Jeremy, "The Work of Jeremy Bentham Vol 9 (Constitutional Code), ed. John Bowring", Indianapolis: Liberty Fund,1999 [1843], Buku I, dalam: Priyono, B. Herry, 2018.

Dermawan, Kemal, "Strategi Pencegahan Kejahatan", Citra Adiya Bakti, Bandung, 1994.

Gambetta, Diego "Corruption: An Analytical Map", dalam S. Kotkin & A. Sajo (eds.), "political Corruption in Transition: A Skeptic's Handbook", Budapest: Central European University Press, 2002.

Heidenheimer, Arnold J, & Johnston, Michael (eds.), Gambetta, Diego, "Corruption: An Analytical Map", dalam S. Kotkin & A. Sajo (eds.), "political Corruption in Transition: A Skeptic's Handbook", Budapest: Central European University Press, 2002.

Hieriej, Eddy O.S., "Pembuktian Terbalik Dalam Pengembalian Aset Kejahatan Korupsi", Pidato Pengukuhan Guru Besar Pada Fakultas Hukum Universitas Gajah Mada, Yogyakarta, 2012.

Miller, Seumas, et.,al., "Corruption and Anti-Corruption: An Applied Philosophical Approach", New Jersey:Prentice Hall, 2005, hal. 1 – 2, dalam: Herry Priyono, 2018.

Mustofa, Muhammad," Kleptokrasi: Persekongkolan Birokrat- Korporat Sebagai Pola White Collar Crime di Indonesia", Kencana Prenada Media, Cetakan Pertama, Jakarta, 2010.

Neild, Robert, "Public Corruption: The Dark Side of Social Evolution", London: Antem Press, 2002.

Nitibaskara, Ronny R, "Tegakkan Hukum Gunakan Hukum", Penerbit Buku Kompas, Jakarta, 2007.

Noonan Jr., John T, “Bribes: The Intellectual History of a Moral Idea”, Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.

Pratiwi, P.F.P., Suprayitno, and Triyani. (2020). Existence of Customary Law through Comparative Education between Dayak Ngaju Customary Law and National Law. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 3 (2): 712-717.

Priyono, B. Herry, “Korupsi, Melacak Arti, Menyimak Implikasi”, PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta, 2018.

Purba, I.G., and Syahrin, A. (2019). Demand against Law and Using Authority in Corruption Criminal Action. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 2 (4): 194-206.

Reksodiputro, Mardjono,” Kemajuan Pembangunan Ekonomi dan Kejahatan”, Kumpulan Karangan Buku kesatu, Pusat Pelayanan Keadilan dan Pengabdian Hukum (d/h) Lembaga Kriminologi UI, Jakarta), 1997.

Rosenthal, Frans, “Gifts and Bribes: The Muslim View”, Proceeding of the American Philosophical Society 108/2, 1964, dalam: Priyono, B. Herry, 2018.

Rose, Susan-Ackerman, “Corruption: A Study in Political Economy”, New York Academic Press, 1978.

Tumanggor, F., Muazzul, and Zulyadi, R. (2019). Handling of Narcotics Child Victims in Child Special Coaching Institutions Class I Tanjung Gusta, Medan. Budapest International Research and Critics Institute-Journal (BIRCI-Journal) Vol 2 (4): 50-55.

Underkuffler, Laura S, “Captured by Evil: The Idea of Corruption in Law”, New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.

Wolin, Sheldon, S, “Politic and Vision: Continuity and Innovation in Western Political Thought”, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2004, expanded edition), hal. 12, dalam: Priyono, B. Herry, 2018.