

Corruption Eradication in Indonesia: The Experience of The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK)

Leo Agustino^{1*}, Indah Fitriani², Harits Hijrah Wicaksana³, Ahmad Daelami³

¹Department Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University

²Department of Accounting, Faculty Economic and Business, Indonesia University of Education

³Department Public Administration, college of social science and political science (STISIP) Setia Budhi

*Corresponding Author: https://www.ee.agustino@untirta.ac.id

Abstract: The focus of this paper is on the discussion and analysis of corruption eradication attempts in Indonesia with the Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK), The Corruption Eradication Commission) as its centre. As an activity, the commencement of the corruption eradication dates to the pre-Reformation Era. However, its presence is mainly in the form of the foundation of the anti-corruption body without playing real roles as a nominal anti-corruption institution. As a response towards pressure from the IMF, in 2002 the Corruption Eradication Commission was formed as a specialized institution to tackle chronic corruption issues strangling Indonesia in the era of Soeharto's New Order. Unfortunately, since its inception, there has been no president who is committed to the eradication attempts and therefore sided with the KPK. It is due to the commission's huge constitutional power (investigation, probing, tapping, arrest, and prosecution) and hence these frighten many corrupt officials. Numerous political elites have been arrested by the KPK such as ministers, governors, regents, mayors and law-enforcers top officials. Consequently, unsurprisingly the KPK faces multi-directional attacks attempting at its weakening through the arrests of its top leaders, iterating its ad-hock (can be dissolved at any time.) status, and the revision of KPK law. Therefore, the government should act firmly to provide protection and supports to the KPK against those potential threats aiming at weakening the commission, to block any legislation potentially lessening the functions of the KPK, and to make sure both KPK's top leaderships and average personnel are impartial and free of vested interests.

Keywords: corruption; corruption eradication; corruption resistance; reformation; KPK.

Introduction

Indonesian political shift since 1998 does not only yield positive results, but also undesired consequences. Those intended results of the shift include the term limits of president's powers (Crouch 2010), reformation in the army roles (Honna 2003; Mietzner 2009), administration and regional autonomy reformation (Baswedan 2007), and many more. On the other hand, the undesired consequences include high-cost politics (Wibowo 2013), party cartels (Ambardi 2008), political dynasties (Agustino 2010; Kenawas 2013), and ever strangling corruption up to the grass-



root level (van Klinken & Aspinall 2011; Agustino 2019). It seems that this political shift has been like two opposite sides of a coin so far.

Corruption in Indonesia does not only occur in the Reformation era but has occurred long before that (Juwono 2016). This article focuses on the discussion corruption in of the Indonesian Reformation era (up to the era of President Joko Widodo). One that is very worrying about corruption cases in Indonesia, according to Agustino dan Fitriani (2017), is the spread of corruption starting from the central government level to the regional level (it even occurs at the village level). In the past, the Indonesian people never thought that corruption would occur in areas considered taboo, such as in the religious, education and health sectors. But now, it is precisely in these areas that the epicenter of corruption occurs. The question now, how is the eradication of corruption in Indonesia? What is the role Eradication of the Corruption Commission (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, KPK) so far? Is there any resistance against the KPK in combating corruption in Indonesia? Some of these questions are discussed in this article.

Methods

The issue of corruption is not a central issue that was widely discussed by scholars in the last five decades. The reason is that the focus of the era was on the issue of security and competition between the two major blocs (between the United States in the West and the Soviet Union in the East). However, after the Cold War era, the issue of corruption began to be part of scientific debates in line with the demands (zeitgeist) of democratization. The impact of this shift is now the issue of corruption is receiving the attention of academics, policymakers, and others. Rose-Ackerman (1999) in his classic book explains that bribery or corruption will not produce an efficient bureaucracy as Huntington (1968) had written decades earlier. Leff (1964) once wrote that corruption can be used to improve welfare. But now, referring to Gupta et al. (2001) for example - who Rose-Ackerman's (1999)supports argument - explains that in countries with high levels of corruption, health and services education are running ineffectively and inefficiently.

Although the issue of corruption is the center of attention of scholars until now there is no consensus on the definition of corruption. United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) (1999: 7) for instance, defines corruption as follows, "... the misuse of public power, office or authority for private benefit through bribery, extortion, influence peddling, nepotism, fraud, speed money or embezzlement." Rose-Ackerman (2008) defines corruption into two categories: (i) small corruption and (ii) big corruption.

Minor corruption leads to exclusive and unfair profit sharing and to officials' efforts to complicate the bureaucracy. While major corruption causes state failure because it may be that certain sectors of government function as "bribery machines" (Rose-Ackerman 2008: 331). But the definition of Rose-Ackerman (2008) is too broad and complicated to be used as a foothold discussing corruption in as а multidimensional problem (political,



economic and sociocultural). Meanwhile, Jakob (2005) defines corruption as an abuse of public power for personal or private interests which harms the public in ways that are contrary to applicable legal provisions. This definition is quite helpful in limiting the discussion about corruption, but the weakness of this definition lies in the bias that tends to discredit the public sector, as well as a definition that does not cover acts of corruption by the private party even though it is equally detrimental to the public.

So how to deal with the problem of corruption in Indonesia before the Reformation era? Not an easy question to answer. According to several sources, at least the illustration is as follows. Corruption is not a new problem in Indonesia. It is inherited since the era of kingdoms (Carey 2017). Then, it is continued during the Dutch occupation. Back then, at the beginning of the 18th Century, the VOC (Vereenigde *Oostindische Compagnie*, the Dutch East India Company) went bankrupt due to the rampant corruption in its body (Margana 2009). After the proclamation of independence, many Dutch officials returned to their homeland, and the vacant positions were then filled by native formerly worked for the Dutch (ambtenaar) who grew up in a corrupt environment. It is this corrupt culture that continues in post-independence Indonesia. Nevertheless, according to King (2000), corruption at the beginning of independence barely existed. This is the implication of the idealism of the nation's founders, including their political elites. But when Sukarno

imposed Demokrasi Terpimpin (the Guided Democracy) in 1959, Demokrasi Parlementer (the Parliamentary Democracy) system was dissolved, the press was restrained, foreign companies were nationalized, and monopolies were created, then opportunities for rentseeking (King 2000: 607) were wide opened. Mackie (1970) explained that corruption became endemic under Guided Democracy when financial accountability almost collapsed because of ugly administrative management in era Sukarno's leadership. the of Unfortunately, this weakness was not corrected during the Suharto New Order era. By using his power, Suharto participated and "was enjoying" bribes, gratuities, and other unlawful personal benefits (Robison 1986; Winters 2011; Juwono 2016). The inability of Soeharto's New Order regime to deal with the problem of corruption is not without cause. According to Liddle (1996: 88), the cause was that corruption was used as a means of gaining resources and supports in such a way that corruption became commonplace in decision making and its implementation in the Soeharto New Order era (Liddle 1996: 88).

Does this show that the New Order does not care about corruption? Not really. Because from an institutional perspective, there had been many anticorruption institutions formed by Soeharto. In 1968, based on Presidential Decree Number 228 of 1967, President Soeharto formed a team aimed at eradicating corruption (Agustino and Fitriani 2017: 5). This team is called the *Tim Pemberantasan Korupsi* (TPK, the Corruption Eradication Team). Shortly



after the formation of the TPK, President Soeharto strengthened efforts to eradicate corruption by forming a the *Komisi* 4 (the Commission 4) whose main tasks were: (i) conducting research and evaluating the policies and results achieved in eradicating corruption and (ii) considering the Government regarding policies that were still needed in combating corruption (Agustino and Fitriani 2017: 6). Based on these authorities, Komisi 4 moves to eradicate corruption in the Ministry of Religion, the Agency for Logistics (Badan Urusan Logistik, Bulog), Telkom (the stateowned telecommunication enterprise), and Pertamina (Perusahaan Tambang dan Minyak Negara, the state-owned mining and oil company) which at that time were considered as the most government institutions. corrupt However, the results and findings of the studies by the commission in the field were never heeded by the government. In the end, the Soeharto's New Order regime was uprooted by the people power movement that demanded, among other things, to prosecute the criminal act of corruption committed by Soeharto and his family (Ali 2001; O'Rourke 2002; Aspinall 2005).

Result and Discussion

TheCorruptionEradicationCommission(KPK):TheBirthandAuthorities

The Corruption Eradication Commission (*Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi*, KPK) is a State Institution formed under Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption. In Article 43 of the law, it is stated that the KPK must be formed within no later than two years. Due to this time constraints, the government at that time sent several top leaders in the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Kementerian Hukum dan Hak Asasi Manusia, KemenkumHAM) to conduct a comparative study to the Hong Kong Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC) in Hong Kong (Juwono 2016: 228). Not only the ICAC, but the KPK also conducted correspondence (to strengthen its role and function) with anti-bribery institutions from many countries, such as the Malaysian Anti-Corruption Commission (MACC), the Brunei Anti-Corruption Bureau (ACB), the Thai National Counter Corruption Commission (NCCC), the Philippine Ombudsman, the New South Wales Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC), and the Singapore **Corrupt Practices Investigation Bureau** (CPIB). Despite learning a lot from the ICAC and other anti-corruption organizations, the KPK did not fully replicate the ICAC, which only handles investigations on corruption cases. Rather, the KPK handles investigations and prosecutions of corruption cases, and it is even granted authority to search, tap, and arrest (Article 6 of Law No. 30/2002). Therefore, the authority of the KPK is greater than the ICAC.

These humongous righteous authorities of the KPK's triggered most parties in the House rejected the formation of this commission (*Tempo* 24-30 December 2012: 74). As a result, the International Monetary Fund (IMF) "forced" the Indonesian government to establish the KPK; otherwise, foreign assistance loan from the IMF would not be disbursed (Kuris 2012: 5). The "coercion" from the IMF appeared in the



Letter of Intent (LoI) signed by the Indonesian government with the IMF, in which the LoI stated that the disbursement of the loan to Indonesia would be carried out after the KPK's establishment timeline of the second quarter of 2002 was met. The impact of this pressure pushed the House plenary session in November 2002 to support the passing of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission (otherwise known as the KPK Law).

Furthermore, the consideration chapter of Law No. 30 of 2002 explained that the eradication of corruption had not been carried out optimally and the government institutions that handle corruption cases had not functioned effectively and efficiently. There. corruption was mentioned as a crime or a violation of the social and economic rights of the people and it brought disasters to the national economy and also to the life of the nation. For this reason, corruption could no longer be classified as an ordinary crime, but rather an "extraordinary" crime, so its eradication also had to be carried out in "extraordinary" ways. With the establishment of an independent KPK with its broad authorities, it was hoped that corruption eradication could be carried out systematically, effectively, and maximally. For this purpose, the tasks of the KPK (as stipulated in Article 6 of Law No. 30 of 2002), include coordination and supervision, investigation, investigation, and prosecution of criminal acts of corruption, and also the prevention and

monitoring of governance in the eradication of corruption.

In addition, the KPK was also asked to focus on efforts to eradicate corruption involving law enforcement officials, state administrators and other relevant actors. The KPK was also assigned to chase corruption cases that received widespread attention and disturbed the public and inflicted state losses of at least Rp.1 Billion (Law No. 30 of 2002).

To implement these tasks, the KPK had been given considerable authorities to crack down (Peran *Penindakan KPK*, Role of Enforcement) on the corrupt officials, namely: (i) Taking over investigations/prosecutions that were being conducted by the Police / Prosecutors Office; (ii) Tapping into recording conversations; and (iii) Ordering relevant agencies to prohibit someone from traveling abroad; (iv) Instructing banks or financial institutions to freeze accounts suspected of having been the result of corruption belonging to a suspect, defendant or other related parties; (v) Ordering the leaders or superiors of suspects to temporarily dismiss suspects from their positions; Temporarily and (vi) terminate a financial transaction, trade transaction and other agreements (Act No. 30 of 2002).

Not only in terms of prosecution, but the KPK also had the authority to prevent corruption (Peran Pencegahan KPK, Prevention Role) through the authority to receive registration and examination of State Officials' Assets (Laporan Harta Kekayaan Penyelenggara Negara, LHKPN), receive reports and



determine gratification status, conduct anti-corruption education, conduct socialization and campaigns fighting and do bilateral corruption. or multilateral cooperation. When it comes monitoring government to administration, the KPK had the authority to conduct an assessment of the administrative management system in all state and government institutions, advising the leadership of state and government institutions to make changes if the administrative management system has the potential to be corrupt.

In addition to the great authority of the KPK, this commission was also given the authority to coordinate investigations and prosecutions of corruption, establish a reporting system in the eradication of corruption, request corruption information about eradication activities from the relevant agencies, conduct hearings or meetings with related agencies regarding the prevention of corruption. Whereas in terms of supervision, the KPK had the conduct surveillance, authority to research on agencies that fight against corruption and agencies that provide public services, as well as take over investigations/prosecutions of corrupt officials who are being carried out by the police or prosecutors.

KPK's Role During The Indonesian Reformation Era

Post-Soeharto Indonesia is known as the "Reformation" era. In this era, five presidents have led the island nation, they are: Burhanuddin Jusuf Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid (also known as Gus Dur), Megawati Sukarnoputri (daughter of Indonesia's first president, Sukarno), Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (often called SBY)), and finally Joko Widodo (also known as Jokowi). Unlike in the Soeharto New Order era which placed the President as the sole actor in Indonesian politics, in the Reformation era, other actors had to be taken into account in the Indonesian political landscape, namely: Parliament and the general public. Even though technically Indonesia is more democratic, actually Indonesia's political landscape is very complex and diverse because most political elites want to play in the new Indonesian political arena.

the Habibie During period, Indonesia made many breakthroughs towards a democratic country. Some of the steps he took include: changing regulations and electoral systems so that they did not produce authoritarian political elites, encouraging the birth of participatory civil society, professionalizing the army, and ensuring press freedom (O'Rourke 2002; Crouch 2010). Even SO, the Habibie administration was tainted bv the allegation of corruption by the presidential campaign team related to Bank of Indonesia Liquidity Assistance (Bantuan Likuiditas Bank Indonesia, BLBI) for Bank of Bali (Juwono 2016: 197). Also, his administration was considered problematic because Habibie was too protective (not to say "not brave") in exposing the corruption cases of Suharto and his family. Although some of Soeharto's wealth was scrutinized by Time (1999).

Meanwhile, in the era of President Gus Dur, the handling of corruption did not appear to have progressed despite the formation of the Joint Team for



Corruption Eradication (Tim Gabungan Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi, TGPTPK). Unfortunately, TGPTPK could not run optimally due to strong opposition from various parties, especially the Supreme Court (Mahkamah Agung, MA). In the end, TGPTPK was interrupted by division and vacancy of leadership, then it was dissolved after the Supreme Court approved the application for a judicial review that cancelled the TGPTPK regulation in March 2001. During the Megawati era, governance reforms were crucial. This is due to the success of her administration and the House to pass the Amendments to the 3rd and 4th of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 2001 and 2002, which ensures that the president and vice president are directly elected (including regional heads (governors, regents, and mayors)), the formation of the Constitutional Court (Mahkamah Konstitusi, MK), and most importantly the formation of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).

The first period of SBY administration (2004-2009)was considered quite successful because it succeeded in reforming the bureaucracy, such as the Ministry of Finance, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and several others (Juwono 2016). Besides, SBY also managed to stem the influence of oligarchs in economic policy, especially those relating to policies that favored their business unfairly. This can be seen from the many interests of politiciansentrepreneurs (such as Jusuf Kalla (vice president in SBY's first term (2004-2009) and Jokowi's (2014-2019),

Aburizal Bakrie (General Chair of the Functional Group Party of 2009-2014; former Coordinating Minister for the Economy in 2004-2005; former Coordinating Minister for People's Welfare in 2005-2009), etc.) which could eventually be "controlled."

It is in the SBY period that the KPK succeeded in establishing itself as a stable institution. Not only that, the KPK -led by Taufiqurrahman Ruki - also succeeded in increasing its reputation as an independent corruption eradication institution in Indonesia by prosecuting former Megawati's ministers who were charged with corruption, and handling corruption cases in the General Election Commission (Komisi Pemilihan Umum, KPU), including ensnaring the chairman and other KPU top leaders. The next succeeding chair of KPK, Antasari Azhar, lead this anti-corruption agency even more aggressively in carrying out corruption eradication operations, including those involving former Governor of Bank Indonesia (BI) (Burhanuddin Abdullah) former Deputy Governor of BI (Aulia Pohan (President SBY's in-law)), and former Chief of Police of the Republic of Indonesia (General Rusdiharjo). With all of these activities, the KPK began to face significant counterattacks, with one major incident was the arrest of two of their commissioners (Bibit Samad Riyanto and Chandra Hamzah) who almost paralyzed the KPK. This shows that since its inception, the Corruption Eradication Commission has been exposed and attacked by corrupt elites or people to weaken this anti-corruption institution.



In his second term (2009-2014), SBY appeared to be more moderate he was because too careful in "maintaining political stability" bv securing supports from the House and its political coalition at the expense of substantial-good governance reforms (McBeth 2016). As a result, the pace of governance reforms was not as progressive as in his first term. This is affecting directly the eradication of corruption agenda. This was seen when SBY was reluctant to intervene in the lengthy conflict between the police and the KPK commissioners. Although in the end, due to public pressure, SBY took popular measures to end the friction by supporting the KPK. Despite pressure from the police and SBY's neglect, the KPK under Abraham Samad leadership reached the peak of its influence as it accelerated the judicial process of cases already in the KPK's list including those involving "close people" (one party with) of SBY, such as Minister of Youth and Sports (Andi Mallarangeng, elite Democratic Party), Minister of Energy and Mineral Resources (Jero Wacik, Democratic Party elite), Anas Urbaningrum (Democratic Partv Chairperson), and others (Agustino and Fitriani 2017). Since these cases affected the SBY's last term, the results of the 2014 General Election, unfortunately, hit the Democratic Party hard.

Jokowi succeeded SBY in 2014, but the KPK was no better. First, Jokowi's decision to promote the Police Commissioner General Firli Bahuri (former Deputy for the Prevention of the Corruption Eradication Commission and also former Chief of the South Sumatera Regional Police) as Chair of the KPK for 2019-2023 let down anti-corruption activists (including the Indonesian Corruption Watch (ICW)). concerned activists believed that Firli had violated ethics because he met with a litigant, namely Tuanku Guru Bajang as a witness the Newmont divestment in investigation (cnnindonesia.com, 2020). Second, Jokowi was perceived as breaking his promise by approving the revision of the KPK Law which was considered to weaken the roles and functions of the KPK. The President did not make any move to lobby the leaders of parties in order to stop the revision of the KPK Law. President Jokowi also failed to issue a Government Regulation in Lieu of Law (Peraturan Pemerintah Pengganti Undang-undang, Perppu) of the KPK to address the anti-corruption activists' concerns over the weakening of the KPK. And thirdly, President Jokowi considered to be unwilling to firmly settle the acid attack case against one of KPK's experienced senior investigators, Novel Baswedan - who succeeded in uncovering major corruption cases in Indonesia. The Baswedan case has never been completed even though the investigation has been conducted since 2017.

ChallengesandConstraints:Corruption Resistance Against KPK

An important question to ask is whether the corruption felons do not fight back (those who have not been caught) or retaliate (for those who have been arrested) against the KPK? It is not an easy question to answer. However, based on past events, we can infer that as long as the KPK exists, there would be



always challenges and obstacles in our collective corruption eradication efforts.

Several cases demonstrate that the challenges and obstacles blocking the KPK in enforcing anti-corruption laws. First (and always occurred in every leadership regime) weakening mode is by means of attempted arrests of the KPK top leaders (known as commissioners) when they are dealing with major corruption cases. The first arrest of the KPK leader occurred when the Police Commissioner General Susno Duadji (Head of the Indonesian National Police's Criminal Investigation Agency (Kepala Badan Reserse Kriminal Kepolisian (Kabareskrim)) Republik Indonesia arrested Antasari Azhar (Chair of the KPK second period) Antasari was charged with murdering Nasrudin Zulkarnaen (Director of PT. Rajawali Putra Banjaran) in 2009.

Another arrest of the KPK leader occurred when KPK investigators named the Police Inspector General Djoko Susilo (Head of the Indonesian National Police's Traffic Corps (Kepala Korps Lalu Lintas Kepolisian (Kakorlantas)) as a suspect in the procurement of a steering simulator worth Rp.782 billion in 2012. The weakening of the KPK motif was evident from the targeting of Novel Baswedan, the lead investigator of the simulator procurement case, which was hunted down to the KPK office in October 2012 a few days after the arrest of Djoko Susilo (Tempo 23-29 December 2013). The Baswedan's arrest was based on the allegations of severe torture causing the death of a prisoner allegedly committed by Baswedan, when he was still serving in the Bengkulu regional police in 2004 (*Tempo* 7-13 March 2016).

The most recent case of the KPK leader's attempted arrest occurred when Abraham Samad and Bambang Widiojanto were criminalized after the appointment of the Police Commissioner General Budi Gunawan (former Deputy Chief of Police of the Republic of Indonesia and currently head of the State Intelligence Agency (Badan Intelijen Negara, BIN)) as a bribery and gratification suspect in mid-January 2015. Fortunately, the tension between two law-enforcer institutions became somewhat eased after the appointment of General Tito Karnavian (then as the Chief of the Indonesian National Police (Kepala Polisi Republik Indonesia, Kapolri) and now as the Minister of Home Affairs) managed to "bridge" good communication between these two institutions. In the end, Budi Gunawan case subsided and was abandoned.

The second weakening mode is an ever-growing popular proposal among lawmakers that pushes the KPK to be made an *ad-hoc* institution. It implies that the KPK can be dissolved at any time. The term *ad-hoc* institution always surfaces especially after the KPK has been able to prove itself as an institution to eradicate corruption that is different from the Prosecutors' Office and the Police. The difference is based on the performance of the KPK which has always been able to uncover corruption scandals in the circle of state institutions such as the House, high-rank state officials (both at central and regional levels: ministers, governors, regents, mayors, directors and commissioners of



state-owned enterprises), the judiciary, and other law enforcers. The results of KPK's top performance encourages corrupt-minded officials - who are in state institutions - to always push this idea. For example, in 2011, in a consultation meeting between the House, the police, the prosecutor's office, and the KPK, the idea of dissolving the KPK came up. The reason was that the anticorruption institution is considered under-performed in dealing with the corruption eradication agenda. It was perceived that the KPK in was only succeeded in the prosecution stage, but was failed in the precaution stage so that overall it was failed as an anti-corruption institution. The idea of the dissolution of the KPK (as an *ad-hoc* institution) reappeared in August 2015, at the Constitutional Seminar at the Parliament Building when Megawati said that ad-hoc institutions could be dissolved because of their temporary design, including (Nasional Tempo, 2020).

Third, legislation was also targeted by those who benefited from a weak anti-corruption agency. To achieve this, they proposed to revise Law Number 30 of 2002 about the Corruption Eradication Commission and change it into Law Number 19 of 2019 about the Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 about the Corruption Eradication Commission. Some observers said that the new Corruption Eradication Commission Law reduces the KPK's role and power. This is because the KPK has the right to issue an Order to Cease Investigations Letter (also known as SP3 (Surat Perintah Penghentian *Penyidikan*)) which has never happened before; the next thing they propose is to limit the recruitment of independent investigators so that all investigators must be from the police (which may be an easy mode for senior police officers to control the investigators); The last thing they seek to accomplish through legislation is to make the wiretapping illegal unless permitted by the Supervisory Board (a new structure within the KPK that determines the steps and movements of the new KPK).

In addition, those orchestrated attempts, the House of Representative is also trying to weaken the KPK through the revision of the Book of Criminal Code (Kitab Undang-undang Hukum Pidana, KUHP) by including corruption offenses into the draft (at the time of this writing was completed, March 2020, the draft was not passed yet). If this proposal is passed, then corruption will no longer be considered as an extra-ordinary crime, but merely an ordinary crime. In fact, in the draft, cumulative penalties do not apply and there is also charge reduction by a third of the maximum sentence for probation. co-administration. and conspiracy of corruption. And some of the things mentioned above are different from the corruption eradication laws that were previously in force. This weakening through legislation will certainly hamper KPK's efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia - as like the dream of the general public at the beginning of the Reformation Era about Indonesia free of corruption, collusion, and nepotism (Korupsi, Kolusi, and Nepotisme, KKN).

Conclusion

The presence of the KPK is an important milestone in Indonesia's



political and public administration landscape. Compared to the failures of various corruption eradication initiatives in the previous era, the KPK succeeded in setting new standards in eradicating corruption by shaking the impunity of high officials and acting on it, such as their ability to crack down on ministers, governors, regents and mayors, members of parliament at the central and regional levels, police officers, and more. Despite its success, the KPK is still vulnerable to counterattacks by corrupt officials and groups with malicious intent.

If the various attempts at weakening and dissolution of the KPK succeed, then the one who cheers (gains) is certainly the corrupt elites and those who benefit from the dissolution of the KPK. Because it will allow them to be free to seize the state wealth. In the end, this condition will undermine the democracy that has been fostered since the beginning of the Reformation. This is a major concern for civil society today. Under these conditions, responsible political commitment and goodwill of the government are needed to strengthen the role and position of the KPK by, first, the government must provide protection and support to the KPK from all kinds of attacks that could potentially cripple the KPK. For many people, the main thing to do to ensure the future of the eradication agenda is to save the KPK from the KPK "killers." Secondly, the government must prevent legislation that has the potential to weaken the function of the Corruption Eradication Commission, and thirdly, the government must ensure that both KPK's top leaderships and average personnel

are impartial and free of vested "interests" to optimize the eradication of corruption in Indonesia.

About Authors

Leo Agustino is a lecturer at the Departement Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa University. His research focus on political, public policy, Corruption, Corruption Eradication, Corruption Resistance, and Reformation.

Indah Fitriani, is a lecturer at the Departement of Accounting, Faculty Economic and Business, Indonesia University of Education. Her research interest relate to Financial Accounting, Auditing, Good Governance, and Fraud.

Harits Hijrah Wicaksana is a lecturer at the Departement Public Administration, college of social science and political science (STISIP) Setia Budhi. His research focus on Public Policy, Political, Good Governance, Corruption Eradication, and science phylosophy.

Ahmad Daelami is a lecturer at the Departement of Government, college of social science and political science (STISIP) Setia Budhi. His research focus on electronic government and Government Science.

Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank the Team research. The funding source for this research is from the Private Budget, November 30, 2021.

References

Agustino, Leo. 2010. "Dinasti Politik Pasca-Otonomi Orde Baru: Pengalaman Banten." *Prisma* 29(3), 102-116.



- Agustino, Leo. 2019. "The Roots and Actors of Corruption in Political Realm." In *After Reformation: Changes in Political and Ideological Contestation*, ed. Max Lane. Singapore: ISEAS, 171-194.
- Agustino, Leo. and Fitriani, Indah. 2017. *Korupsi: Akar, Aktor, dan Locus.* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Ali, Denny J. 2001. "Democratization from Below: Protest Events and Regime Change in Indonesia 1997-1998. PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, The Ohio State University.
- Ambardi, Kuskrido. 2008. "The Making of the Indonesian Multiparty System: A Cartelized Party System and Its Origin." PhD dissertation, Department of Political Science, The Ohio State University.
- Aspinall, Edward. 2005. Opposing Soeharto: Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Baswedan, Anies. 2007. "Regional Autonomy and Patterns of Democracy in Indonesia." PhD dissertation. Departemt of Political Science, Northern Illinois University, Dekalb.
- Butt, Simon. 2012. *Corruption and Law in Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Carey, Peter. 2017. Korupsi dalam Silang Sejarah Indonesia dari Daendles (1808-1811) sampai Era Reformasi. Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
- Crouch, Harold. 2010. *Political Reform in Indonesia After Soeharto*. Singapore: ISEAS.
- Gupta, Sanjeev, Davoodi, Hamid, and Tiongson, Erwin. 2001. "Corruption and Provision of Health Care and Education Services." In *The Political*

Economy of Corruption, ed. Arvind K Jain. London: Routledge, 111-141.

- Honna, Jun. 2003. *Military Politics and Democratization in Indonesia*. London: Routledge.
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. New Haven: Yale Univerity Press.
- Jakob, Svensson. 2005. "Eight Question About Corruption." *Journal of Economic Perspective* 19(3), 19-42.
- Juwono, Visnhu. 2016. "Berantas Korupsi: A Political History of Governance Reform and Anti-Corruption Initiative in Indonesia 1945-2014." PhD dissertation. Department of International History, London School of Economics and Political Science (LSE), England, UK.
- Kenawas, Yoes. 2013. "The Rise of Political Dynasties in Decentralized Indonesia." Master thesis, S. Rajaratnam School of International Studies, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.
- King, Dwight Y. 2000. "Corruption in Indonesia: A Curacle Cancer?" *Journal of International Affairs* 53(2), 603-624.
- Kuris, Gabriel. 2012. Inviting A Tiger into Your Home: Indonesia Creates an Anti-Corruption Commission with Teeth, 2002-2007. Princeton: Innovation for Successful Societies (ISS) Princeton University.
- Leff, Nathaniel H. 1964. "Economic Development Through Bureaucratic Corruption." *American Behavioral Scientist* 8(3), 8-14.
- Liddle, R. William. 1996. *Leadership and Culture in Indonesian Politics*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Mackie, J.A.C. 1970. "The Commission of Four Report on Corruption." *Bulletin*



Agustino, et al., Corruption Eradication in Indonesia: The Experience of The Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK)

of Indonesian Economic Studies 6(3), 87-101.

- Margana, Sri. 2009. Akar Historis Korupsi di Indonesia. In *Korupsi Mengorupsi Indonesia: Sebab, Akibat, dan Prospek Pemberantasan,* eds. Wijayanto and Ridwan Zacharie. Jakarta: Gramedia, 25-42.
- McBeth, John. 2016. Loner: President Yudhoyono's Decade of Trial and Indecision. Singapore: The Strait Times.
- Mietzner, Marcus. 2009. *Military Politics, Islam and the State in Indonesia.* Singapore: ISEAS.
- Mietzner, Marcus. 2014. "Stagnasi Demokratik Indonesia: Elite Konservatif vs Masyarakat Sipil." In *Merancang Arah Baru Demokrasi: Indonesia Pasca-Reformasi*, eds. AE. Priyono dan Usman Hamid. Jakarta: Gramedia, 151-183.
- O'Rourke, Kevin. 2002. *Reformasi: The Struggle for Power in Post-Soeharto Indonesia*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Robison, Richard. 1986. *Indonesia: The Rise of Capital*. Sydney: Allen & Unwin.
- Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 1999. Corruption and Government: Causes, Consequences, and Reform. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Rose-Ackerman, Susan. 2008. "Corruption and Government." *International Peacekeeping* 15(3), 328-343.

Tempo, 24-30 December 2012.

Tempo, 23-29 December 2013.

- *Time*, 24 May 1999 (<u>http://content.time.com/time/wo</u> <u>rld/article/0,8599,2056697,00.htm</u> <u>1</u> 3 January 2021).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 1999. *Fighting Corruption to Improve Governance.* New York: United Nations Development Programme (UNDP).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP). 2008. Tackling Corruption Transforming Live: Accelerating Human Development in Asia and the Pacific. New Delhi: MacMillan.
- van Klinken, Gerry. & Aspinall, E. 2011. "Building Relations: Corruption, Competition and Cooperation in the Construction Industry." In *The State and Illegality Indonesia*, eds. Edward Aspinall and Gerry van Klinken. Leiden: KITLV, 139-163.
- Wibowo, Pramono Anung. 2013. Mahalnya Demokrasi Memudarnya Ideologi. Jakarta: Penerbit Kompas.
- Winters, Jeffrey A. 2011. *Oligarchy*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

