

CORRUPTION WARNING EFFORTS THROUGH EDUCATION AN IDIOLOGICAL APPROACH IN THE FRAMEWORK FULFILLING RIGHTS TO STATE RIGHTS

Dr. Adi Mansar, SH., M. Hum ¹

Dony Hendra Lubis, S.H., M.H ²

Ruben Sandi Yoga Utama Panggabean SH, MH ³

Nicholas Sutrisman, S.H., M.H. ⁴

¹ Lecturer in the Postgraduate Program, UMSU, Medan

Email: adimansar@umsu.ac.id

² Email: Donihendra075@gmail.com

³ Law Doctoral Program Student at the UMSU Postgraduate Program, Medan

Email: Twinsson593@gmail.com

⁴ Law Doctoral Program Student at the UMSU Postgraduate Program, Medan

Email: Nichorossi@yahoo.com

Article history

Received date : 11-6-2023

Revised date : 12-6-2023

Accepted date : 25-7-2023

Published date : 15-8-2023

To cite this document:

Adi Mansar, Lubis, D. H., Utama Panggabean, R. S. Y., & Sutrisman, N. (2023). Corruption warning efforts through education an idiological approach in the framework fulfilling rights to state rights. *Journal of Islamic, Social, Economics and Development (JISED)*, 8 (55), 388 – 399.

Abstract: *Education is strategically placed to ensure the protection of the nation's and state's life. As a result, any effort or action that undermines the state's integrity, such as terrorism, narcotics and psychotropics, corruption, and human trafficking, must be vigorously opposed. The integrity of the nation and state is jeopardized as a result of systematic and widespread structured corruption ranging from high-ranking officials to village officials. This is proven by the fact that many powerful cabinet ministers have become suspects/defendants (e.g., Idrus Marham). Governors, Regents, and Mayors, civil servants, village leaders, and members of the Senate and Legislature from the Center to the District all happen to be corrupt. In an effort to carry out the prevention and eradication of corruption as mandated in Presidential Regulation Number 55 of 2012 concerning the Long-Term National Strategy for Corruption Prevention and Eradication for 2012-2025 and the Medium Term for 2012-2014 (National Strategy for PPK), preventive and eradication measures have been taken. Every year the Corruption Crime (PPK) is contained in Presidential Instruction Number 2 of 2014 concerning Measures to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption in 2014, attachment to the Inpres section V (five) describes the anti-corruption education and culture strategy which consists of 22 action plans, and involves public and private universities in its implementation.*

Keywords: *Corruption, Education, State Rights.*

Introduction

The country's integrity is jeopardized due to the looming threat of corruption; however, in general, the perpetrators of corruption who become suspects/defendants/convicts today are citizens who lack anti-corruption education or are morally and ideologically uneducated of anti-corruption. As a first step toward eradicating corruption through education, anti-corruption ideology and behavior must be socialized.

The United Indonesia Cabinet Volume 1, 2 (SBY) period has laid the groundwork for anti-corruption education; for example, the Director General of Higher Education's Circular Letter Number 17 of 2011 concerning Action to Prevent and Eradicate Corruption in 2012 is a new chapter to socialize anti-corruption values for all levels of Indonesian society, particularly students carrying out assignments and undergoing study periods. On July 30, 2012, the government issued Circular number 1016/E/T/2012 to all State Universities and Private Universities (Kopertis Region I to Region XII) with the subject of the Circular Letter Concerning the Implementation of Anti-Corruption Education in Higher Education through the Ministry of Education and Culture Directorate General of Higher Education. The Presidential Instruction Number 17 of 2011 concerning Measures to Prevent and Eliminate Corruption in 2012 serves as the basis for issuing this circular letter.

One of the six demands for reform made in 1998 is the abolition of corruption, collusion, and nepotism (KKN). MPR Decree Number XI/MPR/1998 concerning Clean and KKN Free State Organizers ratified concrete steps to realize these demands. Furthermore, the concept of the MPR legal product was expanded upon in Law Number 28 of 1999. Corruption initially targeted state officials. 31 of 1999 (as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001) relating to the abolition of corruption crimes. As a replacement for Law No. 3 of 1971, Law No. 31 of 1999 defines much more comprehensive criminal acts of corruption, including regulating gratuities that are very likely to be carried out by state administrators. In fact, actions that have the potential to harm state finances are also elements of corruption. In addition to broadening the definition of acts that can qualify as criminal acts of corruption, Law No. 31 of 1999 also regulates the recovery of state financial losses, not to eliminate the treatment of corrupt perpetrators.

The public has empirically recognized corruption as a crime that is detrimental to state finances, referring to various definitions of corruption. Building anti-corruption understanding in the midst of corruption crimes, on the other hand, necessitates a specific strategy, one of which is the creation of an Anti-Corruption Education Curriculum in tertiary institutions and making it a compulsory subject, or at the very least elective courses.

The national strategy for preventing and eradicating corruption in Indonesia for the long term 2012-2025 and the medium term 2012-2014 is contained in Presidential Regulation Number 55 of 2012. National education, including higher education, has an obligation to succeed. PPK Actions are activities or programs outlined in the Nastra PPK and carried out by Ministries/Institutions and Local Governments. According to the Circular of the Directorate General of Higher Education No. 17 of 2011, the birth of a circular letter is not based on article 1 paragraph (2) of Presidential Decree No. 55 of 2012, because the first Circular Letter was issued shortly after Presidential Decree No. 55 of 2012. However, in Article 1 paragraph (2) of Presidential Decree Number 55 of 2012, PPK actions carried out by Ministries/Agencies and Local Governments were regulated.

As an illustration, sourced from data from the Supreme Court in 2015 there were 2551 corruption convicts with a total state loss of IDR 203.9 trillion. Corruption convicts are divided into several occupations which are described in the following table:

Employment	Number of Convicts	Financial Losses
Government Employees	1115 People	IDR 26.9 trillion
State Company Employee	149 People	IDR 8.7 trillion
Independent Institution	62 People	IDR 81.8 Trillion
Legislature	480 People	IDR 2 Trillion
Regional heads	75 People	IDR 1.8 trillion
Private	670 People	IDR 82,6 trillion

From the data, it can be obtained an overview based on the type of work, with the highest number of corruption convicts being civil servants, with a total of 1115 people and the lowest being from independent institutions with a total of 62 people. Based on the amount of losses, the type of work that generates the greatest state losses in corruption cases is the private sector with a total loss of 82.6 trillion and the lowest is the work of regional heads with a total state loss of Rp. 1.8 trillion.

Research Method

This research used is normative juridical method. In normative legal research, several approaches are used, they are statute, conceptual, analytical, comparative, historical, philosophical and case approach.

The nature of the research in writing this paper is descriptive. The descriptive research method primarily focuses on describing the nature of a demographic segment, and its aim is to obtain a complete description of the legal situation that applied in a certain place and time, or about the existence of juridical phenomena, or certain legal phenomena which is occurred in the society. The data used are primary and secondary data sourced from laws and regulations about corruption and eradicating corruptions, books and journals which discuss about Anti-Corruption Education Curriculum. In collecting the data, literature riview was used by reading the provisions of existing laws and regulations, then they were associated with legal theory and expert opinion and policy about anti corruption in other contry. Based on the riview of primary data, an abstraction and reconstruction were carried out by using the result of a riview form secondary data which consisted of literature in the field of law, especially about education anti corruption.

Anti-corruption understanding can be developed at a young age through comprehensive anti-corruption education and the application of preventive problem solving learning. As a result, the next generation will have good character and ethics in sociopolitical life, as well as the ability to apply anti-corruption values in daily life. Furthermore, a more comprehensive education system for overcoming various corruption threats can be realized.

Theoretical benefit is making a conceptual contribution to the government, in this case, the Ministry of National Education, in developing and implementing policies related to the application of political ethics learning and comprehensive anti-corruption education in Pancasila and Citizenship education as a method of preventing corruption.

The practical benefit is that it represents a step forward for the government, in this case the Ministry of National Education, as well as various aspects of life, such as the educational environment, family environment, and community environment, in terms of combating corruption from an early age.

Result and Discussion

Types of Corruption and Their Attacks.

Starting the description of corruption, the author begins with the expression God's Actions in Dani Krisnawati et al, as follows: Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely, power tends to corrupt corruption and absolute power tends to absolute corruption. As a starting point, the author uses the phrase "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely" from Dani Krisnawati et al. The researcher purposefully did it to prove Lord Acton's statement, with the intent and purpose of reminding us that power is always vulnerable to corruption wherever it exists on this planet. Lord Acton's assertion is bolstered by the existence of four types of corruption, as stated by Piers Beirne and James Messerschmids in Dani Krisnawati et al, where the four types or types of corruption are closely related to power, namely Political Bribery, Political bribes, election fraud, and corrupt campaign practices.

According to Law Number. 31 of 1999 in conjunction with Law Number. 20 of 2001 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes, corruption is defined as "whoever, including against the law, commits acts of self-enrichment, benefits himself or another person or a corporation, abuses his authority or opportunities or facilities because of his position or position which can be detrimental to state finances or the national economy." Bribes, illegal profits, secret transactions, gifts, grants (grants), embezzlement, collusion, nepotism, and abuse of position and authority, as well as state facilities, are all prohibited under the law.

Corruption, according to Political Science, is defined as abuse of office and administration, economic or political, whether caused by oneself or others, with the intent of gaining personal gain at the expense of the general public, businesses, or other people. Corruption, according to economists, is defined as a beneficial exchange (between achievements and partners, material or non-material rewards), which occurs secretly and voluntarily, violates applicable norms, and is at least an abuse of position or authority owned by one party. Corruption is, according to Haryatmoko, defined as "an attempt to intervene by using his position to misuse information, decisions, influence, money, or wealth for his own benefit."

Corruption is known as *Corruptio*, *Corruptus* in Latin, *Corruptie* in Indonesian, *Corruption* in English, and *Liter* in Sanskrit, which is found in the Kertagama Country Old Manuscript. Corruption manifests as financial-related behaviors that are dishonest, rotten, and corrupt. According to Black's Dictionary of Law, corruption is defined as "actions carried out to provide an advantage not consistent with the obligations of office and the rights of other parties, abuse of position or character to gain benefits for himself or others, as well as his actions.

As a result of the practice of extensive money politics and commercial influence, corruption endangers the development of democracy. In fact, the law enforcement community has made significant progress as a result of this aberrant behavior. As corruption's reach continues to grow, the anti-corruption movement's emphasis is shifting to extraordinary eradication imperatives. Because of this, Law Number 31 of 1999 requires the creation of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), an extraordinary organization. The establishment of a

Corruption Eradication Commission, which has the authority to investigate, investigate, and prosecute corruption, as well as perform cross-agency duties to coordinate with and manage other law enforcement agencies, is the only provision made in that regulation. The legislators' enthusiasm for making the eradication of corruption a top priority for the reform is in the necessary position as they begin to explore different arrangements. This agenda must necessarily intersect with the decision to create the KPK as a distinct institution. Because Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the KPK acknowledges that the police and prosecutors who previously handled corruption cases have not been effective and efficient in eradicating corruption, the position of the KPK is becoming more and more crucial. This indicates that the KPK is a comprehensive representation of the overall corruption eradication agenda. Therefore, it is imperative to provide protection for the KPK from any shots or assaults that could, within reason, paralyze this institution. It is challenging to envision the future of eradicating corruption without the KPK, though, as an image that is intertwined with the agenda for doing so. Even if they insist on leaving the KPK in a position of "like they are getting greedier", it would not be an exaggeration to say that the anti-corruption image of political leaders is moving towards its lowest point. Reflecting on the conditions that have occurred in the last few months, if Jon ST Quah in his book *Curbing Corruption in Asian Countries, An Impossible Dream* (2013) states that a country's political leaders do not have political will, eradicating corruption is difficult to achieve results. It could be that what we have faced in recent months has gone further than that: diluted and faded the anti-corruption image of political leaders. Because of this, it is no exaggeration if the newspaper arrives at the position that the KPK is threatened with disbandment during the Jokowi-Kalla era (Kompas, 18/2). In fact, if traced back a little, the concern over the fading image of anti-corruption was never imagined before. The reason is, in Jokowi-Kalla's Nawacita, this pair expressly stated their support for strengthening the KPK in preventing and eradicating corruption. Strengthening this, they are committed to rejecting all forms of weakening the KPK. Looking at the condition of the Corruption Eradication Commission, a fundamental question is more than worth asking: is the promise tree in the Nawacita an authentic representation? Pampering corruptors The declining image of the corruption eradication agenda can not only be traced from the conditions above, but can also be traced from the government's plan to review the rules for tightening remissions and parole. This plan of course repeats the debate 3-4 years ago when remissions were sold to corruption convicts. For this reason, it should be noted that the ratification of PP No. 99 of 2012 which is a revision of PP No. 32 of 1999 was the answer to the rejection of various groups with an interest in eradicating corruption when corruptors tried to shorten their sentences through remission and parole facilities. If you want to put it in the concept of deterrence effect in the grand design of eradicating corruption, granting remissions and parole without tightening can be said to be a form of luxury for corruptors. In fact, since the beginning of the legal process, some corrupt actors have received convenience. If the KPK is in charge of handling corruption cases, perhaps the luxury is a little less. It has been noted numerous times that the luxury enjoyed by corrupt individuals occurs both upstream and downstream, namely the simplicity with which they can obtain pardons and remissions. The Setyo Nopanto case, at the very least, provides more than enough of an example.

Elements of corruption

From a legal point of view, corruption in general fulfills the following elements:

- A. unlawful act
- B. abuse of authority, opportunity, or means
- C. enrich themselves, others, or corporations
- D. is detrimental to state finances or the country's economy.

Types of corruption include:

- A. giving or receiving gifts or promises (bribes),
- B. embezzlement in the office ,
- C. extortion in the office ,
- D. participate in procurement (for civil servants/state administrators), and
- E . receive gratuities (for civil servants/state administrators).

Corruption, also known as political corruption, is the use of public office for one's own benefit. All forms of government are susceptible to unethical behavior. Corruption can range in severity from the least serious, which takes the form of using support and influence to give and receive assistance, to the most serious formalized corruption, and so on. Kleptocracy, which literally translates to "a government of thieves," is the culmination of corruption because it eliminates all pretense of honesty.

Effects of Corruption on Various Aspects

According to the Financial and Development Supervisory Agency (BPKP) in 1997 as quoted by Rohim, corruption is caused by several aspects, namely:

1. the personal characteristics of corrupt individuals, such as their greed, moral weakness, and lack of faith, which causes them to be powerless against lust's temptations and their inability to make enough money to live a normal life;
2. organizational characteristics, like a lack of exemplary leadership, a poor organizational culture, and management practices that frequently conceal corruption within the organization; Aspects of society in which individuals and organizations, such as prevailing values, encourage corruption. The general public is unaware that corruption affects not only the state but also the larger community.

Anti-Corruption Law

The reforms proclaimed in 1998 mandated the eradication of corruption, collusion and nepotism (KKN) which were considered to have plunged the Indonesian nation and state into a multidimensional crisis, especially the economic downturn. The New Order and the advent of the Reformation era were expected to bring about major changes in the life of the nation and state, including the agenda for eradicating corruption.

Basically Law No. 20 of 2001 is an amendment or addition to several provisions in Law Number. 31 of 1999 which is considered incomplete. There are two reasons why Law No. 31 of 1999 needs to be changed. First, rampant corruption not only harms state finances, but also violates the social and economic rights of society at large, so acts of corruption need to be categorized as a crime that must be eradicated. amazing . Second, the guarantee of legal certainty avoids the occurrence of various interpretations of the law and provides legal protection for people's socio-economic rights, as well as fair treatment in eradicating corruption is an important thing to realize.

Several important and fundamental changes in Law No. 20 of 2001 is not listed in Law Number. 31 of 1999 as follows. First, there is a change in the editorial explanation of Article 2 paragraph (2) so that it becomes:

What is meant by "certain circumstances" in this provision are circumstances that can be used as an excuse for eradicating criminal acts of corruption offenders, namely if the criminal act is committed against funds intended to prevent a state of danger, loss to the state. disaster

mitigation due to widespread social unrest, overcoming economic and monetary crises, and tackling corruption crimes.

Second, the formulation of Articles 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and Article 12 directly states the elements in the provisions of the relevant articles, no longer referring to the articles in the Criminal Code (KUHP). In addition, the insertion of several articles in Article 12 into Article 12A, Article 12B, and Article 12C which mainly deal with (a) imprisonment and sentences in Articles 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11 and 12 does not apply for criminal acts of corruption whose value is less than Rp. 5,000,000.- (b) for acts of corruption whose value is less than Rp. 5,000,000.

Models or Forms and Types of corruption in various forms including extortion, bribery and gratuities have basically been going on for a long time with the perpetrators ranging from state officials to the lowest level employees. Corruption in essence starts from habits that are not realized by any apparatus, starting from the habit of receiving tribute, gifts, bribes, providing certain facilities or others and in the end these habits will eventually become seeds of real corruption and can be detrimental to the state. finance .

Some forms of corruption include the following:

1. Bribery includes the act of giving and receiving bribes, both in the form of money or goods.
2. Embezzlement, is an act of fraud and theft of resources committed by certain parties who manage these resources, either in the form of public funds or certain natural resources.
3. Fraud, is a ruse or economic crime. This includes the process of manipulating or distorting information and facts in order to gain certain advantages.
4. Extortion, the act of asking for money or other resources with violence or with certain intimidation by those in power. Usually carried out by local and regional mafia.
5. Favoriteism, is a mechanism of abuse of power which has implications for the privatization of resources.
6. Violate the law and harm the country.
7. All secrecy, even if done collectively or corruption in congregation.

A more operational type of corruption was also classified by a reform figure, M. Amien Rais who stated that there were at least four types of corruption, namely:

1. Extortion, namely in the form of bribes or kickbacks made by employers to authorities.
2. Corruption manipulative, such as requesting someone who has an economic interest to the executive or legislature to make regulations or laws that benefit their economic business.
3. Nepotistic corruption, namely the occurrence of corruption because there are family ties, friendships, and so on.
4. Subversive corruption, namely those who arbitrarily rob the country's wealth to be diverted by foreign parties for personal gain.

The patrimonial-bureaucratic state is the best environment for the presence of corruption. The patrimonial bureaucracy has given rise to a nepotism bureaucracy which gives special positions or services to relatives and friends. In the context of governmental power this is often referred to as a "power cake". Just look at the era of the Jokowi-Ma'ruf Amin government, a number of ministers of the Indonesia Maju Cabinet were caught up in corruption cases (i.g the Minister of Communication and Information, Johny G Plate, who is Secretary General of a political party

part of the current government party coalition). Education for citizens is tasked with educating and giving birth to an educated generation who have expertise, skills and morals that uphold high morals. The granting of positions or services to each person is carried out on the basis of ability or achievement (in other terms it is referred to as the concept of meritocracy) not on the basis of kinship or friendship. Factors causing the failure to realize the meritocracy system in Indonesia legally can be attributed to the non-fulfillment of the mandate of Law 28 of 1999 concerning Governance that is clean and free from Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism as one of the mandates of reform. Nevertheless, efforts through instilling anti-corruption values namely Responsibility, Discipline, Honesty, Modestness, Hard Work, Independence, Fairness, Courage and Caring for Indonesia's educated generation need to continue as implementation of Presidential Instruction Number 17 of 2011 concerning Action Prevention and Eradication of Corruption in 2012. In this instruction state officials including ministers who lead ministries to take steps guided by an anti-corruption education and culture strategy.

The Reform Version of the Corruption Eradication Agenda

Even though one of the main reform agendas is to eliminate corruption, collusion, and nepotism, the problem of corruption has shackled our country's bureaucracy since reform began. Even under the leadership of the Corruption Eradication Commission's commissioners, with their various accomplishments, they have not been able to solve this problem. Consider the large number of OTT cases involving bureaucratic apparatus all the way up to the education sector. The narrative of bureaucracy reform appears to have failed to produce the desired results. Extortion is still practiced in any business, from wanting to become a civil servant to obtaining death certificates. This problem is so heinous in our country that there is no doubt that it can only be solved with the commitment and example of the head of state. This anti-corruption agenda necessitates alignment between a leader's actions and words.

According to Lawrence M Friedman (1975:361), social demands cause changes in the law, which cause major social changes. The reform agenda that occurred in Indonesia in 1998 was a form of social demand that resulted in change, but there were obstacles along the way, particularly in the area of corruption eradication. Just look at how reform has materialized into legal changes with the birth of Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning State Administrators who are Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism, but the transformation in the field of clean governance from KKN through these regulations has not moved towards the changes desired by the law.

The reason is that now, after 25 years of reform, it is time to assess whether the political choice made at the time to merge the Corruption Eradication Commission with the Commission for Examining State Officials' Wealth as required by Law 28/1999 was the right one. If a comparison is made, it can be said that the Commission for Examining State Officials' Wealth's actual institutional function is more focused on preventing state administrators' KKN practices with progressive and permanent authority in monitoring and clarifying state assets that are indicated to practice corruption, collusion, and nepotism, rather than The KPK only eradicating corruption. Learning from the cases of luxury and glamor of state officials and their families that are currently going viral is natural if it turns out that the decision to merge the Commission for Examining the Wealth of State Officials with the Corruption Eradication Commission is a policy that actually hinders the vision of realizing state administrators who are free of KKN practices.

People are looking to the presidential candidates running in the next general election to present ideas and pledges that will significantly advance the administration of a nation free of corruption. In order to achieve a corruption-free government through preventive measures, for instance, make sure that those who commit corruption are sentenced to exile and reactivate the Commission for Examining State Officials' Wealth. One of the strongest indicators that a state official has engaged in corruption, collusion, and nepotism is unnatural wealth. A state administrator's income is transparent, making it simple to assess whether or not it is reasonable. Assessing a state administrator's fairness is the responsibility of the Commission for Examining the Wealth of State Officials. A state administrator, for instance, owns three (3) homes and three (3) vehicles after 20 years of employment. Given the irrationality of the current income, this improper activity opens the door for investigations by law enforcement into the sources of the assets held by the state administrator with the presumption that they are unquestionably connected to the abuse of their position as state administrators. Even more intriguing is the fact that the Commission for Examining the Wealth of State Officials is able to look into the wealth of former state administrators as well, expanding its scope beyond those who are currently serving terms in office.

It is conceivable that there will be a significant social change beginning with a legal change led by the president selected by the people if this institution is activated by the presidential candidate chosen by the people and combined with the approval of the Asset Confiscation Bill. Because we are eliminating not only corruption but also collusion and nepotism, the KPK cannot be left to fight corruption alone in this nation. Furthermore, it has been 23 years since this institution was founded, which is enough time to objectively evaluate the functional constraints of the commission. The infrastructure of other institutions is necessary to implement this massive corruption eradication agenda.

In order to further explain, the decision to combine the Wealth Checking Commission for State Officials into the Corruption Eradication Commission can be compared between Law 30 of 2002, which serves as the legal foundation for the KPK, and Law 28 of 1999, which addresses State Administrators who are Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism. The comparison will be made in order to determine which regulatory product of the two is most in line with the Law. The simple reason why Law 30 of 2002 regarding the eradication of corruption does not contain the word "reform" at all is why Law 28 of 1999 is the correct answer.

The best chance for national leaders who are elected in the upcoming general election to uphold reform is through the implementation of Law 28 of 1999 by launching the Commission to Examine the Wealth of State Administrators. Community involvement can be done as widely as possible through social media accounts, especially in the current era of the digital revolution. The citizens of the village can observe the daily activities of state officials at all levels, from the village level to the level of high state institutions. The State Officials Wealth Examination Commission will continue to investigate reports made by the public via social media about the irregularity of state administrators' wealth in order to seek explanations and hold those responsible accountable. The community's active monitoring role of the behavior of the officials in their immediate vicinity can be used to implement anti-corruption education for the community.

The Minister of Investment/Head of the Republic of Indonesia's BPKM Bahlil Lahadia alluded to the lack of investment from Muslim countries in the world to Indonesia. Based on Foreign

Direct Investment (FDI) data for the last 5 (five) years, of the many investments that have entered Indonesia, only 5.5 percent have come from Islamic countries. This submission was delivered in the context of offering downstream projects in 8 (eight) leading Indonesian commodity sectors in Jeddah, Saudi Arabia. The assumption is that if development projects in Indonesia are profitable and good from a business point of view, foreign investors will flock to them to invest as a source of project financing in Indonesia. Moreover, Indonesia is a vast archipelagic country and has a number of natural wealth potentials which can be said to be the richest when compared to countries in the Southeast Asian region. But in fact, according to Foreign Direct Investment (FDI) data, the largest amount of incoming investment throughout 2021 in the Southeast Asian region has gone to Singapore. A country that is broadly and in natural wealth is clearly under Indonesia.

When comparing Indonesia with neighboring Singapore, which is a Southeast Asian country with the highest investment value, of course one can easily surmise the cause, namely the corruption index. According to Transparency International, Singapore is ranked in the top 5 as an anti-corruption country in the world with an index of corruption perceptions of 85 while we are ranked 96th with an index of 38. Naturally, investors trust more in doing business in Halima Yacob country than us. Because the basic law of an investment is trustworthiness. Rampant corruption has resulted in our country having poor credibility in the eyes of the international community. Indeed, in the 2020-2024 National RPJM the government has a program to strengthen the anti-corruption system, but the strategic steps to implement the anti-corruption system have been quite slow. You see, it was only this year that discussions on the Asset Confiscation Bill from crime proceeds were sent to the Legislative for discussion.

Meanwhile, if you learn from Singapore, clean government is closely related to the high value of investment in a country. I hope the Minister of Investment can understand why not much investment from Muslim countries has entered Indonesia. The anti-corruption system is the foundation for the country's investment-supported development.

Comparison of several countries

A. Hong Kong.

As a result of teaching anti-corruption lessons to students in elementary, junior high, high school, and university levels, Hong Kong witnessed a significant drop in corruption.

B. Singapore.

Singapore's anti-corruption program is very effective. Singapore is the cleanest nation because anti-corruption education is effective and the CPIB Institute for Corruption is located in the private sector. 5 in the entire world.

The Efforts of the Global Community in Eradicating Corruption.

In an effort to combat corruption, Indonesia has extradition agreements with a number of nations, including:

1. Malaysia
2. Australia
3. Philippines
4. Hong Kong
5. Thailand
6. South Korea
7. Singapore (27 April '07).

The drafting of the UN Convention began in 2000 when the UN general assembly at its 55th session through resolution 55/61 on 6 December 2000 saw the need to formally form an international anti-corruption legal instrument. The main contents of the Convention are 8 Chapters, 71 Articles with the following systematics:

A. Chapter I: General Provisions, contains a statement of objectives; Use of terms; scope of implementation; and Sovereignty Protection.

B. Chapter II: Preventive Measures, contains policies and practices for preventing corruption; corruption prevention agency or body; Public sector; Public Official Code of Conduct; Actions related to Judicial and Prosecution services; Private sector; society participation; and Measures to prevent money laundering.

C. Chapter III: Crime and Law Enforcement, contains the bribery of foreign public officials and officials of international public organizations; Embezzlement, Misuse or other misappropriation of wealth by public officials; Trade influence; Abuse of function; Enrich yourself unlawfully; Bribery in the private sector; Embezzlement of wealth in the private sector; Laundering proceeds of crime; Concealment; Limiting processes; Responsibilities of legal entities; Participation and Experimentation; Knowledge, intent and purpose as elements of crime; Restriction rules; Prosecution and trials and witnesses; Freezing, confiscation and confiscation; Protection of expert witnesses and victims; Corruption; Loss compensation; special authorized body; cooperation with law enforcement agencies; Cooperation between national authorities; Cooperation between national authorities and the private sector; Bank secrecy; Crime record; and jurisdiction.

D. Chapter IV: International cooperation, including extradition; Transfer of Prisoners; Mutual legal assistance; Transfer of criminal proceedings; law enforcement cooperation; Joint investigation and special investigative techniques.

E. Chapter V Return of Assets, covering the prevention and detection of the transfer of proceeds of crime; Acts of direct return of wealth; Mechanisms for returning property through international cooperation in confiscation; International cooperation for the purpose of confiscation; Special cooperation; Return and delivery of assets; financial intelligence unit; and bilateral and multilateral agreements and arrangements.

F. Chapter VI: Technical assistance and information exchange; Contains training and technical assistance; Collection; Exchange and analysis of information on corruption and other acts; Implementation of the Convention through economic development and technical assistance.

G. Chapter VII: Implementation Mechanism; contains a conference of States Parties to the Convention; and secretariat.

H. Chapter VIII Final provisions; contains the implementation of the Convention; Re-dispute solution; Signature; Support; Reception; Consent and accession; Enactment; Amendment; Withdrawal; Storage and language.

By regulating the provisions of mutual assistance in the UNCAC, efforts to return assets can be carried out optimally. The easiest way to process assets that are outside the jurisdiction of the victim country is through mutual legal assistance. If the assets resulting from corruption are

placed abroad, the victim country represented by searchers, investigators or authorities may request cooperation with the receiving country to carry out the process of recovering assets. This is in accordance with what is stipulated in Article 46 of the UNCAC, whereby the country receiving the assets is obliged to provide assistance to the victim country in the context of the process of recovering the assets.

Conclusion

Efforts to eradicate corruption in constitutional obligations, anti-corruption education in schools is the right and appropriate step in disseminating anti-corruption values. anti-corruption values namely Responsibility, Discipline, Honesty, Modestness, Hard Work, Independence, Fairness, Courage and Caring.

References

Regulations

UU No 28 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Yang Bersih dan Bebas KKN

UU No 30 Tahun 2022 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi

Presidential Decree No. 55 of 2012 "National Strategy for Prevention and Eradication of Long-Term Corruption 2012-2025 and Medium-Term 2012-2014, hereinafter referred to as the National Strategy for PPK, is a document that contains the vision, mission, goals, strategy and focus of activities for preventing and eradicating corruption for the long term. long term 2012-2025 and medium term 2012-2014, as well as anti-corruption tools.

Perpres 18 Tahun 2020 Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Nasional Tahun 2020-2024

Book and law journal

Darwinsyah Minin. 2017. Potpourri (Criminal Law Politics for Eradicating Corruption Through Responsive Law). Medan: Prima Library.

Ermansyah Djaja. 2010. Typology of Corruption in Indonesia. Bandung: Mandar Maju.

Johny Ibrahim, *Teori dan Metodologi Penelitian Hukum Normatif*, Edisi revisi, Cetakan keempat (Malang: Bayumedia Publishing, 2011).

Lawrence M. Friedman ., 1975., *Legal System Perspective of Social Sciences*. Translated from Lawrence M Friedman's book, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective* (New York: Ruse Sage Foundation , 1975). Bandung: NusaMedia.

Mansyur Semma. 2008. *Negara dan Korupsi Pemikiran Mochtar Lubis Atas Negara, Manusia Indonesia, Dan Perilaku Politik*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta.

Pedoman Penulisan Disertasi Program Studi Doktor Hukum, Pascasarjana Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara, 2022.

Ruslan Renggong. 2016., *Special Criminal Law (Definition of Criminal Acts Outside the Criminal Code)*. Jakarta: PT. Main Son Charisma.

Romli Atmasmita, *Development of Criminal Law in the Era of Globalization*, 2008 MAHUPIKI Paper, Bandung.

Website

<https://www.cnbcindonesia.com/tech/20230518160738-37-438470/menkominfo-johnny-g-plate-tersangka-segini-harta-kekayaannya>

<http://irham93.blogspot.com/> "Definition of Corruption According to Law and Experts", accessed via.

<http://irham93.blogspot.com/2013/11/pengertian-korupsi-menurutundang.html>. August 2018,
16.21 WIB.