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ABSTRACT

Corruption is a fact of life in Indonesia and has a significant negative impact. The malicious intention of corruption in Indonesia has normatively shifted in terms of its meaning, adjusting to its opportunity. However, the increase in corruption in Indonesia is not accompanied by a legal policy of anti-corruption supervisor design. This study analyzes the legal procedure of strengthening supervision for corruption prevention in realizing good governance. The results indicate that the derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption in the old order, new order, and reform era gradually reduces the significance of adversarial nature from the perspective of public morality and the state's ideology. The Corruption Eradication Commission has been given authority to prevent and prosecute criminal acts of corruption. Establishing anti-corruption institutions in the regions serves as an anti-corruption enforcement agency and a control and monitoring system for government administration in all agencies to achieve good governance.

This is an open access article under the CC–BY 4.0 license.

1. Introduction

In terms of concept, developing countries, however that corruption is a component of even a portion of the system itself degrades. As a result, there are those who are skeptical. Assert that integrated reaction is to enhance the system which does exist 1. The majority of people believe that good governance is an absolute necessity. The establishment of a political system of government that is more favorable to the people's interests with universal democratic principles. Governance plays an important role in the achievement of sustainable development; a common consensus of the definition must be achieved to realize development. After a closer examination of the definitions presented in the

literature, we see a clear split between the function of governance in relation to development.  

Corruption is defined as "misusing an organizational position or authority for personal or organizational (or subunit) gain, where misuse refers to deviations from accepted societal norms." Corruption is a global issue that affects many countries. The purpose corruption affects almost all circles, from the lowest to the highest. In many countries, workers are promoted to high-ranking officials such as ministers and presidents. Almost every comparative study of corruption in terms of countries, Indonesia is at the top of the pyramid, with a CPI of 89%. Concerning Indonesia, the Corruption Perception Index (GPA) in 2020 reached a value of 40 and was ranked 85 out of 180 countries. As a result, Indonesia over time, the government established The Corruption Eradication Commission (Komisi Pemberantas Korupsi - KPK). KPK to combat corruption throughout the economy. Takling and preventing corruption are difficult tasks, and attracted the attention of academics and policymakers. The primary rationale is that corruption encompasses all aspects of human life, including legal issues, issues of politics, economics, sociology, and morality.

Corruption is a fact of life in Indonesia, and it has a significant negative impact. Not only does it harm the state's wealth, but it also undermines the legitimacy of law enforcement by undermining public trust in the rule of law. This has the potential to devastate Indonesia's democracy and modernization. Aware of the situation, or perhaps for political correctness, post-independence governments declared a state of emergency in the fight against corruption. However, it was not until the arrival of the political era known to Indonesians as Era Reformasi in 2000 that the fight against corruption became more serious, with the passage of Law No. 30/2002, which established the Corruption Eradication Commission or Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (hereafter referred to as KPK). Since its inception, the Commission has been on the hunt for corrupt officials like never before. However, pursuing corrupt officials is a difficult task. Corruption finds illegal ways to bend or obstruct the law in order to get away with their heinous crime as KPK becomes

tougher due to increased legal support and public trust. This is referred to as obstructing justice 7.

Chart 1. Corruption Crime Cases by Region

Source: Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), 2021

Indonesia is a country divided into 34 provinces, 416 regencies, and 98 cities. Corruption cases are spread throughout Indonesia, both in the central and regional governments, according to the data above. The region with the most corruption cases was Java, with 341 cases, and the region with the fewest corruption cases was Nusa Tenggara Islands, with 17 cases. The possibility of large-scale corruption cases throughout Indonesia necessitates a collaborative effort among stakeholders.

Money laundering is a common form of corruption in Indonesia. The focus of a well-established strand of literature on AML regulation is the rule of law, an effective regulatory framework and judicial system, structures to prevent corruption, government effectiveness, and a deeply ingrained culture of compliance. While existing research convincingly argues that any deficiencies in these areas can jeopardize the development of an effective AML framework, evidence on the impact of AML action on financial crimes remains limited. Furthermore, there are no in-depth analyses of the best design for an AML institutional framework in general or for FIUs in particular 8.

Four factors influence law enforcement efforts as one of the pillars of democracy. First, there is the law itself, both in terms of the substance of statutory regulations and the formal law used to enforce material law. Second, law enforcement officers' professionalism. Third, adequate facilities and infrastructure are required; fourth, the public's perception of the law itself is required 9. In order to address the various challenges and problems of the Indonesian bureaucracy, we must consider ways or solutions to improve the bureaucratic administration system based on State Administrative Law. The effort to eradicate
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corruption through the implementation of laws prohibiting obstruction of justice should begin with a reform of corruption laws. There is a need to amend the laws dealing with criminal acts, particularly corruption, due to flaws in the formulation of obstruction of justice in Article 21, as well as other special criminal laws such as the law combating terrorism and the law combating human trafficking. This lack of adaptation not only leads to confusion and contradiction between laws, as previously stated, but also to conflicts of authority among law enforcement institutions. The laws mentioned above must be clearly formulated in order to specify their subjects and jurisdiction in plain legal language. In addition to the clear formulation of laws, the issue of investigative authority must be considered, because many institutions in the Indonesian criminal justice system today are authorized to investigate and prosecute corruption, including obstruction of justice in corruption cases. Although these are domestic issues, seeking international advice could be very beneficial.

The derived meaning of corruption in Indonesia represents the manifestation of the entire moral values, customs, and culture that live in society. The source of religious morality has served as the fundamental spirit above customary and cultural values in society. The derived meaning of corruption should not lean back-to-back with religion as the source of moral values in Indonesia within the frame of the principles of wisdom and unanimity. The derived meaning of corruption should be seen from more than just the perspective of conflicting political interests among powers. This derived meaning may set boundaries that erode the cultural and customary values ethically. The malice and good intention will no longer serve as ethical boundaries in society authentically. The derived meaning of corruption represents the manifestation of political power where political interests are derived collectively and partially.

The derivation of political interests partially determines the scope of malicious intention of corruption in the legislation. the meaning of this intention, as intended in the legislation, represents a pragmatic intention of politics that rules. The norm of corruption that should serve as clear boundaries between primary morality and political interests has partially shifted to the state of being permissive toward the pathological behavior of elites with power. The derivation of corruption has found the lexical identity according to its time. This identity experiences the process of internalization of latent elements in political power. The situation and certain periods of a lexical identity of the meaning of corruption manifest the brand and slogan of power in its time. The lexical identity of this definition

11Roger Cotterrell, Law, Culture and Society : Legal Ideas in the Mirror of Social Theory, Routledge, 1st edn (Routledge, 2017) https://doi.org/10.4324/9781351217989
is no longer authentic, reflecting the ethical nature and morality of the people and it represents a limitless reflection of dominant politics over other powers.

The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption becomes the contest stage between political power and modus of pseudo justification of development, social and justice interests, and the interests of economic and social rights and prosperity. The jargon malicious intention is attached to the lexical identity of political powers, one over another, creating the master status of position and opposition in the state governance within a legal framework. This study is focused on the derived meaning of corruption and the identity of the lexical meaning of corruption in the legislation in the old order, new order, and reform era in Indonesia.

It cannot be denied that law administration has become a necessity not only for the government, but also for a pluralistic society that is undergoing necessary development and is served by the government. This has happened to public officials who have been "caught" in corruption cases. In terms of administrative functions, efforts to realize a democratic, clean, and authoritative government system are a top priority for the people and government of Indonesia in the current reform era. Bureaucratic reform in the form of public service has become the beginning of the emergence of awareness of the mechanism of public service delivery and has become a pillar of the government's awareness to organize its government system. In order to strengthen the Indonesian bureaucracy and governance, good governance principles must be implemented and used as a guideline for state administrators.

In order to achieve good governance, regulations governing criminal acts of corruption must be strengthened. The derivation of corruption meaning in the philosophy and the legislation in all three orders in Indonesia serve as the guidance to the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in its time. The source of morality becomes the standard of meaning in the derivation of the meaning in the three orders. Various efforts must be realized within the bureaucracy by strengthening state administrative law, namely, the application of the principles of good governance and a closed system of bureaucracy in the practice of administering the state; uphold the principles of good governance in carrying out duties and responsibilities; legal strengthening; improvement of state institutions; improvement of the integrity and ethics of state administration; formation of community awareness.

2. Research Method

This study employs normative legal research with a conceptual and case study approach. To comprehend concepts related to bureaucracy and the corruption monitoring system, a conceptual approach is used. The case approach is used to investigate and solve problems in real-world situations. The research proposal is descriptive. The primary data source is secondary data derived from literature reviews. The collected data was analyzed using a qualitative descriptive analysis.
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3. Results and Discussion

3.1 A New Anti-Corruption Model in Indonesia

The derived meaning of corruption in the old order positioned the return of state finance over other interests of legal certainty and justice. The return of state finance was a determining factor in deriving the meaning of malicious intention of corruption. The following table presents normative elaboration indicating the derived meaning of corruption is reduced to the meaning of the return of state finance. The corruption was no longer seen from its malicious intention, but rather in transactions of civil matters that set the boundaries between good and bad faith of the corruptors individually. Corruptor’s incapable of returning the money or unwilling were reduced in terms of their status as debtors with bad faith or intention (te kwader trouw), while corruptors willing or capable of returning the money were regarded as debtors with good faith (te goudet trouw). The state was positioned as a creditor and the corruptors as debtors. Law Number 24 of 1960 represents a justification for erasing the malicious intention of corruption derivatively.

Law Number 24 of 1960 derived the meaning of malicious intention of corruption as a pure debt-related matter within the scope of civil matters. Law Number 24 of 1960 proves that privatization of public law took place, meaning that the public values were reduced to the interest of private and civil matters. The role and responsibility of the state in maintaining and realizing public interest in corruption cases was delegated to debt collectors as the committee. Economic sustainability is one of the indicators of sustainable development that emphasizes that the work of government institutions must have long-term objectives to protect the lives of future generations from the negative effects of overspending of public funds by some of these institutions, and to achieve the best use of economic resources to meet societal needs. The derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 24 of 1960 is elaborated in the following corruption is defined as the failure to pay off debts to the state, debts are collected with force by the committee formed by the state, corruption is defined as inappropriately using debts, corruption is defined as failing to pay or pay off the debts to the state, malicious intention of corruption remains unless an agreement of full payment is made, in agreement of full payment of debts is comparable to the decision made by a judge, this agreement serves as a basis for confiscation, auction, and hostage of a debtor and the debtor concerned is not allowed to hire a lawyer.

The derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 24 of 1960 has destructed the malicious intention of corruption that gives rise to lexical-semantic identity highlighting the state as a creditor and the corruptors as debtors. Law Number 24 of 1960 serves as the basis for the disruption of the literal meaning of the state of law. The lexical-semantic identity of the state as the creditor and corruptors as debtors not only disrupts the malicious intention but also disrupts the meaning of the state constitutionally.

---


KKN Practices (Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism) are common in the New Order government. Law Number 3 of 1971 gives meaning that corruption was committed by state apparatuses by inappropriately using authority, opportunities, or infrastructure embedded in an official and public position. A state apparatus that committed corruption gained a lexical identity of hampering the development and harming the finance or economy of the state. The derived meaning of corruption committed by a state apparatus was regarded as an act contravening the vigor of Korps (KORPRI). The lexical identity of a state apparatus as “abdi negara” (the servant of the state) was reduced to the meaning of serving and supporting economic development determined by authorities. State apparatuses committing corruption were linked to disruptors of development as a single meaning lexically established by state authorities.

The derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 3 of 1971 is referred to as the basis for maintaining the stability of security of the state (the militarization doctrine as often preferred in the government). Thus, the state apparatuses committing corruption gained the lexical identity as disruptors of the stability of the security of the state. This security stability served as an ideology of development that must be obeyed and performed by all state authorities of all scopes. Law Number 3 of 1971 also serves as a basis to justify all state apparatuses with either malice or good intention despite their existence under a single meaning established by executive powers (politicalization and governance of state apparatuses). The single interpretation of “abuse of existing authority, opportunities, or all infrastructure embedded in a person with public position” of state apparatuses is set forth in the norm of disciplinary rules of KORPRI.

The single authority of the state officials of all levels became the doctrine of obedience and loyalty among civil servants just to avoid to be lexically labeled as corruptors. The justification of the derived meaning of corruption served as the authority of state officials, leaving no public space to justify the meaning of corruption committed by civil servants and/or state officials. The lexical identity of a corruptor marked the demarcation between “insider” (in-group) in Korps and “outsider” (out-group). The state officials had enough space to draw this dividing line between the “in-group” and “out-group”.

The authority of the derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 3 of 1971 gave rise to the phenomenon of “latent corruption” and “manifest corruption”. The former is understood as the conduct of “abuse of power, opportunities, and infrastructure that came with the official position a person was entitled to”, done by the state apparatuses (the boss and/or the subordinates), and it harmed the state finance or economy and national development, but those conducting this wrongdoing were “in-group” people. Thus, it carries the lexical identity as “pseudo state servants”. The latter, however, carries the meaning implying that “abuse of authority, opportunities, and infrastructure due to official position” did or did not take place, but they were personally categorized as “out-group” certainly representing the lexical identity of “corruptor”. The derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 3 of 1971 can be summarized as follows the malicious intention of corruption is embedded in the conduct of abusing authority, opportunities, and
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infrastructure, receiving gifts and promising something performed due to the official or public position of a person; the standard of obedience and loyalty as pseudo “servants of the state”; hampering economic development; disrupting stability; and the pseudo doctrine of policies of promotion and demotion.

The Indonesian transformation process, known as the Era Reformasi, which began in 1999, was a significant institutional change in the social, political, and economic spheres that had the potential to impact income inequalities. The spirit of freedom and will to retaliate was within the interest of the public following the enactment of Law Number 31 of 1999. The derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption leaned more toward the narration of the spirit of freedom and will to revenge on the new order. The details of the conduct of corruption derivatively describe the will and the element of the reform agenda. The numbness felt in the new order was regarded as an authoritarian and corruptive system that was seemingly correctible by the articles in Law Number 31 of 1999. The enforcement of Law Number 31 of 1999 tended to correct, not improve, the system of corruptive government into a clean and corruption-free government.

The corrective spirit of the narration in the formulation of the meaning of corruption as in Law Number 31 of 1999 derivatively explains the will and a vital element of the freedom from corruptive new order government era. Corruption eradication was the intended target that negated the meaning of prevention to realize a clean and corruption-free government. The derived meaning of corruption in the formulation of the norm and open interpretation of law enforcers in giving the meaning of the element of corruption factually became a determinant factor. The law enforcers of all levels and structures regarding the awareness that corruption took place in a particular portion. Each law enforcer can neatly file in “a drawer” several documents that record corruption according to the interpretation and understanding of each enforcer.

Dedication and achievement of law enforcers were based on the capabilities and the number of derivative interpretation results. The derived meaning of corruption in texts was not always in line with that of context. The gap between textual and contextual spheres was intended to fulfill the target and submission as mentioned above not within the meaning of eradicating and preventing the malicious intention of corruption. The lexical identity of corruption as in Law Number 31 of 1999 tended to justify the spirit of freedom inappropriately. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption was regarded as the identity that impeded development, was deceiving, was as the enemy of society, was anti-Pancasila, and the 1945 Constitution of Indonesia in a pseudo way. It is lexically unclear what is meant by all the jargon. The ambiguity of the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption as in Law Number 31 of 1999 does not justify the elements of the conduct of

public officials who did not do what they promised in the political campaigns after they ruled.

The derived meaning of corruption of Law Number 31 of 1999 is explained as follows: corruption impedes development and harms state finance and the national economy; corruption breaks the oath and promise of the state administrators; and corruption is categorized in the scope of obstruction of justice. The derived meaning of corruption as in Law Number 20 of 2001 widens the scope of meaning of malicious intention existing in Law Number 31 of 1999, including social and economic rights. The malicious intention of corruption defined as conduct harming the state finance/national economy is further extended in meaning to the conduct that also violates the constitutional right of the people of economic and social rights. Meaning corruption in non-governmental organization (NGO) Transparency International, corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. Such abuse may happen on the level of day-to-day administration and public service (petty corruption) or on the high level of political office (grand corruption). On one hand, it is restricted to state finance/national economy. On the other hand, the restriction of economic and social rights of the people does not apply, and there is no concept of formulation of the articles regarding the restrictions and scopes of economic and social rights.

The derived meaning of corruption as intended in Law Number 20 of 2001, on one hand, leans more to law and seemingly avoids varied interpretations, and, similarly, it does not imply any clear scope of formulation of the meaning of corruption that violates the economic and social rights of the people. The economic rights of society that have widely become the fundamental spirit have led to the likelihood of multi-interpretations and legal uncertainty of the whole formulation of the norms. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in law Number 20 of 2001 reflects the spirit of revenge among regimes. Re-enforcing Law Number 3 of 1971 to handle corruption cases before Law Number 31 of 1999 is an obvious manifestation of the vigor of revenge among the regimes. The retroactive nature of Law Number 20 of 2001 does not find any legitimation stated either explicitly or implicitly except for the jargon implying that the reform era is undoubtedly the best of all the eras of new order and old order, as implied in the explanation.

The derived meaning of corruption in Law Number 20 of 2001 can be summarized as follows: extension of the meaning of corruption conduct within the scope of violations of economic and social rights of the people; all the corruptive conduct as in Law Number 3 of 1971 is to be re-enforced for the corruption taking place before the enforcement of Law Number 31 of 1999; considering criminal offenses committed in official positions as governed in Penal Code as corruption; and the absence of the formulation of the norm regarding the definition of corruption that violates the economic and social rights of the people.

The derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption in the old order era erases the malicious intention of corruption. The privatization process or individualization of the conduct that has been performed by corruptors that should bear the malicious intention of

corruption in the public sphere is reduced to the civil meaning of debt-related matters. The malicious intention of corruption is no longer measured according to common values in the context of the core value of the people that strongly adhere to the principle of value judgment. The malicious intention of corruption is regarded as not more than a bad faith of corruptors individually by overlooking the main principle of the malicious intention of corruption that can lead to the instability of state finance and development. The derived meaning of corruption during the era of the old order referred to the open-tolerant principle by accommodating the will of corruptors after they were caught having committed corruption. The meaning of malicious intention and non-malicious intention of corruption lies in the capacity of the corruptors to willingly return the embezzled money to the state through the committee of debt collectors. The open-tolerant principle in the malicious intention of corruption seems to have lost its power of certainty and justice although it is impossible to ensure whether the corruptors have the good faith to return the money. There is no time limit regarding when corruptors should return the money and what legal consequences may arise if the corruptors fail to do the good faith.

The derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption in the era of the new order stood on the principles of the development of the universe. The meaning of corruption was seen as hampering development, harming state finance, and spoiling stability. Corruptors were restricted to state administrators of all levels and scopes of power. The doctrine of servants of the state labeled all state apparatuses and it became the symbol of integrity of the state apparatuses. The corruptors and the malicious intention of corruption were only addressed to weak state apparatuses. Political, cultural, economic, and social factors determined the justification of the malicious intention of corruption in the era of the new order. The culture of submission of the state apparatuses was no longer measured with the standard of primary tasks or functions, but rather with the standard of symbolic benefits of the materials to the superior. The procedures of appointing and dismissing state apparatuses were not measured by achievement standards and prestige of dedication and loyalty to the state, but rather with the standard of “inscribed tribute” submitted to the superior. The derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption referred to the principle of the size of the derivation of “inscribed tribute”. The principle of the integrity of state apparatuses in the doctrine of “achievement, dedication, loyalty, blameless act (PDLT)” became a murky limit of assessment of the integrity of state apparatuses symbolically. Another reason for emphasizing a broad and complex integrity framework (rather than a narrower spectrum of corruption) is the diversity and complexity of corruption. A broader framework is also useful for considering what contributes to the protection of integrity and the prevention of integrity violations, such as corruption 26.

The derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption in the era of reform follows the era of the new order. In the reform era, the subjects of corruptors are no longer limited to state apparatuses but they have also included non-state apparatuses if it involves the loss of state finance/ national economy. The malice act in a position as regulated in the Penal Code and the violations of socio-economic rights of the people in the era of the old order are not regulated, while those of the reform era are. The expansion of individual subjects and private corporates also serves as a distinguishing feature of the meaning of

malicious intention of corruption during the reform era. The spirit of freedom transcends the limit, becoming an open space for whoever expects to give an interpretation of the malicious intention of corruption. The derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption in written laws is often overshadowed by the era of freedom that transcends the limit and it sometimes goes “wild” in giving justification of which action is considered to carry the malicious intention and which one is not. The derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption is often formulated “in an open space” with the “embedded message” of the power of certain parties partially. The trial process with the authority to give the meaning of malicious nature is constitutionally “snatched” by extra judicial partial power, making the formulation and the consideration to justify the meaning of malicious nature no longer reflect the crystallization of values and ideology of the state, but it tends to represent a murky reflection of will and the aspect of the power of certain parties. The “embedded message” of the parties that hold power and authority replaces the “embedded message” of the value and ideology of the state in formulating and determining the meaning of the malicious nature of corruption in the reform era.

The connection of the derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption in the old order, new order, and reform lies in the interpretation of authority and particular power (state apparatuses and/or person and/or private corporates). The written norm (das sollen) that should serve as the basis to determine the derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption is controlled by the power and authority of the state and/or a person or private corporates (das sein). The written norms that serve as the fundamental of the derived meaning of the malicious intention of corruption have lost their substantive spirit. Just legal certainty for the derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption in the era of the old order, new order, and reform seems to work as a narrative illusion that is banal and it only creates the sensation of corruption eradication.

The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in the era of the old order erased the meaning of malicious intention of corruption. Corruption is supposed to represent lexical identity as a crime contravening positive values and public morality that are reduced to bad faith in the scope of civil individual matters. Corruptors are regarded as debtors owing money to the state and they are required to pay off the debts to the state. The lexical identity implying that corruptors represent and are aware of the malicious intention of their conduct that causes the financial loss of the state was erased by the will and capacity to return the money to the state according to good faith. The intention of corruptors (mens rea) is not within the context of bad faith, but corruptors clearly carry malicious intention that is against the moralistic values of the public. The sanction may involve the hostage of a corruptor who fails to return the stolen money within a certain period (gijzeling), and this sanction is purely related to civil matters.

The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption of new order considered that the malicious nature of corruption contravened the ideology of the development of the universe. Corruptors were seen as interrupters of economic development. State apparatuses committing corruption should no longer be regarded as the “servants of the state”. The integrity of state apparatuses is embedded in state apparatuses skillfully “serve” their boss. The state apparatuses that were previously defined as “public servants” are reduced in meaning to “the servants of the boss”. The state apparatuses not capable or not having any will to serve their boss may be lexically labeled as “standing against the boss”. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption is often linked to standing against and disobeying the superior. The malicious nature of corruption that is against the law is compared to the conduct of standing against the boss. The lexical identity of corruption has been enacted in the will of the doctrine of the development of the universe that fits the taste of the boss.
The principle of “we know it” in the jargon of “as long as the boss is happy” has been referred to as the standard in determining the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in the era of the new order.

The lexical identity of corruption in the reform era is seen as an enemy of the society, hampering the development and a tendency of anti-Pancasila and anti-Constitution. The moral values of the people, Pancasila, and the 1945 Constitution have been reduced and inappropriately referred to by elites of the state and/or private power outside the state to establish a lexical identity of corruption with whoever is expected. The misuse of identity and the pure identity of the state by authorities and certain power in every person and/or corporates as corruptors has become the standard of new ways in the era of reform. The meaning of reform of lexical identity of the meaning of corruption has transformed into a new shape of structured, systematic, and massive distribution of corruption practices. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption is not restricted but structured through the justification in the systematic formulation of norms and these norms can be performed by all people, including persons or corporates. The reform is like a toll highway to help blur the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption within the establishment of permissive culture. The reform that expects to see the existence of a clean and corruption-free government has been impeded by the erosion of a permissive culture that has been crystalized into the shield protecting from the malicious intention of corruption from socio-economic, legal, and social perspectives.

The connection of the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in the era of the old order, new order, and reform era meets at the point where power, elite authorities of the state, and/or private entities exist to negatively label individuals and/or corporates that are deemed to “interrupt” their will and interest. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption shifts to prerogative rights of power and authority of the state intertwined with private power. The lexical-semantic of meaning of corruption in the era of the old order, new order, and reform has been misused to produce the label of malice to the persons concerned. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption is distributed at a particular “cost” in a free market where authorized elites and certain powers act as “brokers” that determine the value of “stocks as tribute” that must be included in the transaction of the “exchange” of freedom.

### 3.2 Legal Policy of Anti-Corruption Supervisor Design

The establishment of administrative regulations for the performance of state functions and the provision of public services is another important anti-corruption administrative and legal form. These legal acts are used in executive authorities to detail the procedure for carrying out actions and decisions made by executive authorities and their officials in the course of carrying out state functions. Certain administrative regulations are directly related to the exercise of executive authorities’ anti-corruption powers. The most important category of administrative law is the form of public administration. When considering the activities of executive authorities, the category of administrative and legal form of public administration, which has its own distinguishing features and can also be classified for a variety of reasons, must be applied. Understanding the content of management forms in the practical activities of executive authorities enables public administration to be more
efficient and cases of corruption on the part of officials to be eliminated. This includes the commitment decision acts of corruption or refrain from corruption by cultivating the desire to do so anti-corruption values such as honesty, discipline, responsibility, hard work, simplicity, independence, fairness, and courage must be applied as well as concern. A person's intention not to commit corrupt acts by implementing anti-corruption values can be influenced by his or her perception of happiness and satisfaction with life or welfare. As a result, one method of preventing and eliminating corruption in Indonesia is to implement the principles of accountability and transparency in governance administration. The lack of post-reform government commitment to bureaucratic reform is comparable to the lack of government commitment to eradicating corruption, which has become an acute disease in the Indonesian government bureaucracy thus far. Poorly implemented governance leads to ineffective decisions, whether they are related to costs, resources, or budget allocations. Of course, this will have an impact on the economy and development. As a result, governance is a critical issue that influences economic development and various anti-corruption measures. As a result, oversight of governance implementation is required.

Legal supervision is the supervision exercised by the judiciary. Supervision is intended to determine whether or not the government's legal actions are in accordance with the applicable legal norms (rechtmatigheid or on rechtmatigheid). Furthermore, there is political oversight, which is carried out by the people's representative bodies against the government in the exercise of government power. In this case, supervision is meant to determine whether the use of government authority is consistent with the will of the people. Furthermore, citizens can exercise oversight over the administration of government.

### Table 1. Corruption Perception Index of Southeast Asian Countries in 2020 and 2021

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>2020</th>
<th>2021</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Singapura</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Timor Leste</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Vietnam</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The failure or weakening of the State Administrative Law allows the bureaucracy and state officials to engage in corrupt practices. As can be seen, the Corruption Perceptions Index (IPK) released recently by Transparency International (TI) states that Indonesia's GPA is 37 in 2020. It has dropped by three points since 2019. In this case, a higher IPK score indicates that the country is free of corruption. On the other hand, the lower a country's CPI score, the worse the country's handling of corruption. Indonesia is currently ranked 102 out of 180 nations. We can see that throughout 2020, Indonesia will be experiencing a corruption crisis within the bureaucracy.

According to these figures, China's corruption index fell from 41 to 39 in 2018, but then began to rise again from 2018 to 2021. In 2018, it was 39, in 2019, it was 41, in 2020 it was 42, and in 2021 it will be 45, a significant increase. Corruption is also an important cause of poverty. Corruption is also one of the gravest challenges to Chinese society. China's anti-corruption campaigns began with the publication of the document Regulations of the People's Republic of China on the Punishment of Corruption in April 1952. In 2012,
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new anti-corruption requirements were issued by the Communist Party of China (CPC), leading to significant anti-corruption achievements. One of the key measures is the system of central discipline inspections that aims to crack down on "tigers and flies," as corrupt officials are typically called. Corruption among Chinese officials is also thought to be a major issue for the country’s long-term prosperity, social stability, and the legitimacy of the ruling Party. The Central Commission for Discipline Inspection (CCDI) began dispatching central discipline inspection teams to government entities across the country in 2013. As a natural experiment, consider China's large-scale anti-corruption actions since 2013 and define a binary variable (Policy) to represent policy shock. Since then, the central discipline inspection system has become increasingly important in the fight against corruption. The CPC's focus on the capital market is indicated by its inspection of the China Securities Regulatory Commission (CSRC) by the seventh central inspection steam in October 2015.

China's anti-corruption campaign has increased profitability and investment in innovation, particularly among firms that are vulnerable to expropriation, points out that since anti-corruption strengthens the enforcement of formal rules and higher-level directives, the "clean" officials become afraid of doing their daily jobs through informal practices that would otherwise help overcome the pathology of formal procedures. Particularly vulnerable to anti-corruption investigations is the work of public good provision, which frequently involves frequent state-business collaboration. The anti-corruption campaign should be closely linked to environmental performance. China's promotion system (a tournament-style promotion system) appears to facilitate corruption. This study uses China, the world's largest developing country, to demonstrate the critical role of anti-corruption in corporate environmental performance, emphasizing the practical importance of political construction in ecological environmental governance. vice versa.

Corruption persists in the majority of the world's countries today. Corruption exists in all countries, regardless of how advanced their social and economic systems are, and it is also a significant impediment to democratisation and good governance. Corruption is

becoming more prevalent in Indonesia. Following the Soeharto era, the anti-corruption program aimed to improve transparency and governance\textsuperscript{41}.

Chart 3. Anti-Corruption Behavior Index (IPAK) for Indonesia, 2012-2021

Then, in relation to the Indonesian Anti-Corruption Behavior Index (IPAK), there is a fluctuating trend that tends to increase from 2012 to 2021. IPAK is used to assess public openness to anti-corruption behavior. Indonesia's IPAK fell to 3.66 in 2018. The Indonesian IPAK then increased to 3.70 in 2019. IPAK in 2020 is 3.84, and IPAK in 2021 is 3.88. The government has played a role in developing policies contained in laws and regulations related to anti-corruption efforts, such as Law No. 30 of 2002 establishing the Corruption Eradication Commission. Law Number 20 of 2001 Amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 Concerning the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption and Law guides the formation of KPK-related laws. No. 28 of 1999, relating to an administration free of corruption, collusion, and nepotism.

According to Law No. 30 of 2022, the Corruption Eradication Commission is an independent state institution that is not influenced by other powers. KPK has been given authority to prevent and prosecute criminal acts of corruption. For a long time, the Corruption Eradication Commission has been involved in the prevention and eradication of corruption cases. According to the 2012-2018 KPK annual report, there is a new pattern of behavior in which the most corrupt institutions tend to be Ministries and Institutions in 2009-2016, while the most corrupt institutions have moved to become district and city governments in 2017 to 2020. One of the changes in this pattern is the central government's widespread implementation of fiscal decentralization in order to maximize the role of regional autonomy and the independence of regional development. Meanwhile, based on the type of case, bribery cases were the most frequently handled by the KPK from 2010 to 2020. This is closely related to fiscal decentralization, which causes regions to manage the

procurement of government goods and services independently. The proclivity for bribery to occur is extremely vulnerable to winning government project tenders.

Corruption thrives in places where institutions are of poor quality. This is due to the fact that poorly designed or poorly implemented institutions influence a society's incentive system and, as a result, shape individuals' behaviors, leading them to engage in corrupt activities. Corruption increases firms' costs both directly through the payment of bribes and indirectly through the induced uncertainty, which is a major source of transaction costs. Corruption imposes enormous costs on businesses and the societies in which they operate; it is also a complex problem that defies simple solutions. Because most corruption crimes are committed by bureaucrats, the role of local government bureaucracy is very strategic. As the quality of government bureaucrats improves, so will public awareness. Corruption and public mismanagement have been identified as relevant factors that may reduce growth, foreign investment, government legitimacy, and even political stability.

Adoption of anti-corruption business models, in particular, is tightly linked to each national legislation and integrated into their corporate governance system via a specific compliance program involving both internal actors, such as the board of directors (BoD) and internal auditors, and external actors, such as stakeholders. In order to avoid bribery and establish a good corporate governance model, companies and their key internal actors must first avoid bribery, are tasked with proactively managing anti-corruption principles and disclosure, ensuring corporate sustainability.

Thus, results should serve as a useful integrated sustainable corporate governance model to prevent corruption on the basis of a corporate sustainability system and a specific compliance program.

Good governance principles such as accountability, transparency, and law enforcement can limit opportunities for corruption, making anti-corruption efforts more effective. A lot of people around the world, including the world of the world of the world of the world. The rule of law is required for good governance, and good governance is required for the rule of law.


board and management, and paying attention to corporate sustainability. Corruption must be combated holistically, involving all relevant parties - including government officials, the private sector, and the community - and employing both preventive and punitive measures. According to the OECD Principles of Corporate Governance (2015), corporate governance is aligned with the company’s strategic direction, with a focus on "effective monitoring of management by the board, and the board's accountability to the company and the shareholders." The OECD defines corporate governance as "promoting transparent and fair markets and the efficient allocation of resources," while also emphasizing the role of stakeholders in corporate governance. Corporate governance and national anti-corruption legislation are the two main pillars of modern businesses operating in a complex environment. On the one hand, sustainable corporate governance aims to achieve a well-functioning Board of Directors in order to facilitate decision-making in the company regarding sustainable external changes and corporate sustainability. Of course, the paradigm of legal positivism still dominates law enforcement today, and in order to implement the values of justice, it is necessary to fix the paradigm in law enforcement, which is not only a paradigm of positive law in law enforcement.

Corporate anti-corruption efforts can be viewed as a subset of corporate social responsibility (CSR). Some aspects of corporate governance, such as the CSR board committee and government ownership, have a positive impact on CSR reporting. The presence of a committee demonstrates a company's concern for its social and environmental actions, as well as its reputation. Corporate governance has a moderating effect on some cultural influences, such as limiting the negative effects of power distance (significantly lower quality reporting). These findings have implications for developing and implementing global reporting standards (for example, the GRI standards), as they highlight the significance of cultural differences that may impact cross-country comparability. Culture may influence how these guidelines and standards are implemented in practice, while good corporate governance, particularly from CSR committees, may mitigate some of the negative cultural effects. To achieve good governance, each stakeholder must work together to eliminate corruption as effectively as possible. Coordination and collaboration in the fight against corruption in Indonesia can take the form of a penta helix collaboration. Penta helix Collaboration is a model of collaboration that includes elements of government, the private sector, academia, the community, and the
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media. In order to eradicate corruption, each stakeholder's role and collaboration must be expanded once more.

4. Conclusion
The derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption in the old order, new order, and reform era gradually reduces the meaning of malicious nature from the perspective of public morality and the ideology of the state. This shift of meaning departed from “privatization” of the meaning of public morality of corruption to the event of civil and private matters in the era of the old order. Furthermore, the derived meaning of malicious intention of corruption that involved the doctrine of “nationalization” during the new order was to justify the integration of “obedience” of state apparatuses. In the reform era, the meaning of corruption has been reduced through the spirit of “liberalization” of public will to cover the promises made. The lexical identity of the meaning of corruption in the era of the old order, new order, and reform is made to “tie” power and the authority of opposition. In the era of the old order, the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption was to give tolerance to the opposition committing corruption (debtors). In the era of the new order, the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption was referred to as an effort to apply repression to stop the opposition, while the reform era indicates that the lexical identity of the meaning of corruption is more used as the propaganda of illusion that embraces opposition.
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