ATLANTIS PRESS

Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, volume 383

2nd International Conference on Social Science (ICSS 2019)

Comparison of Authority of Criminal and Commission of Eradication of Corruption in Handling Corruption in Indonesia

Yoan Barbara Runtunuwu
Legal Studies Program
Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Manado
Manado, Indonesia
yoanruntunuwu@unima.ac.id

Delbert Mongan
Legal Studies Program
Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Manado
Manado, Indonesia
delbertmongan@unima.ac.id

Henry Lumenta
Legal Studies Program
Faculty of Social Sciences, Universitas Negeri Manado
Manado, Indonesia
henrylumenta@unima.ac.id

ABSTRACT - Indonesia as a Law country that has democracy in it there are three major institutions, namely the Legislative Law-Making Agency, the Institution that runs the Executive Government, and the Penal Institution violating the Judicial Law. The existence of these three institutions on the journey of the Indonesian Administration greatly influences the development of Indonesia. From the three institutions, the Judiciary Institution has a very important role in contributing to the running of clean governance based on the laws made and agreed upon by the people's representatives. The Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia is a state institution formed with the hope of increasing efforts to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. This commission works based on Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, Principle in the implementation of the tasks of the Republic of Indonesia Corruption Eradication Commission, namely legal certainty, openness, accountability, public interest, and proportionality. The Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia positions itself as a trigger for other officials and institutions for the sake of the running of a good and clean government in the Republic of Indonesia, in carrying out the institutional tasks of the Corruption Eradication Commission. Maximum Corruption; in the discussion the author will make a comparison between the authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia and the authority of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia, and the effect of accelerating the eradication of corruption in Indonesia.

Keywords: Comparison of the Authority of the Prosecutor's Office, KPK, Acceleration of Handling Corruption Cases.

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia as a Unitary State has laws or regulations starting from the center to the regions, in its implementation it has the basis of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which were born and developed based on the experiences of the lives of all the people of Indonesia since ancient times ; in subsequent developments Indonesia in implementing Law Enforcement established institutions which acted as Law Offenders in order to achieve security and order and legal certainty, namely the Indonesian National Police, the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General's Office, and Justice.

The beginning of the term Prosecutor's Office had existed since the days of the East Java Hindu kingdom, in the Majapahit Kingdom known as Dhyaksa, Adhyaksa and Dharmadhyaksa referring to positions, certain positions and were state officials when Hayam Wuruk ruled Majapahit Kingdom, the Dhyaksa were led by Adhyaksa as the most High who oversees and leads the Dhyaksa. The Attorney General's Office functioned during the Dutch occupation as in the Herziene Indlands Reglement and Wetboek Van Strafrecht, experienced an increase in the authority of almost everything. The Prosecutor's Office as the only Prosecutor's institution was more functioned during the Japanese occupation where the presence of the prosecutor's office began at the level of the District Court, High Court, Supreme Court. Regarding the Law on Prosecutors, the first fundamental change began on June 30, 1961, beginning with the government ratifying Law Number 15 of 1961 concerning the Provisions of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, a second change During the New Order there was a new development involving the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia contained in Law Number 5 of 1991 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. The third change since the Reformation Order along with the development of the Indonesian nation with the demands of development was the birth of Law No. 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. [1][2]

That which is the hope of the continuation of National Development in the future is influenced by Peace, Justice and Strong Institutions. These expectations can be achieved by rapidly reducing the practice of corruption and bribery in all its manifestations. Therefore law enforcement factors through eradicating corruption are the key to the implementation of sustainable development in Indonesia. Corruption behavior occurs in almost every joint and the elements are all related to the administration in an institution in a country, corruption that has occurred widely, not only detrimental to

state finances, the complexity of corruption problems coupled with the linkages of various corrupt actors make a different approach in overcoming the problem of corruption that occurs in various countries of the world more specifically Indonesia.

Under Law No. 30 of 2002, the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia was mandated to become a coordinating institution. A joint agreement was made between the Prosecutor of the Republic of Indonesia, the Republic of Indonesia Police and the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia concerning Optimization of Corruption Eradication signed on March 29, 2012 (Number: KEP: 049 / A / JA / 03/2012, Number: B / 23 / III / 2012, Number: Spj39 / 01/03/2012). Although it has a mutual agreement, the Indonesian National Police and the Indonesian Corruption Eradication Commission remain in trouble due to the interference between the two institutions [3].

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The method used in normative legal research or literature study by explaining history and conducting comparisons, using primary and secondary data base materials, the primary and secondary data materials cannot be separated from legal developments that occur in various circles within society, then use the positivist approach where the cause determines the impact; starting with collecting data provided by government or private institutions related to eradicating corruption and its development, then analyzing primary and secondary data to produce data describing matters that affect relations between law enforcement agencies, the theory used is institutional theory , corruption, this research method analyzes the relationship between institutions in combating corruption, this study has a main focus by paying attention to the comparison of authority between the two law enforcement agencies starting from history, developments, strategies to resolve corruption cases, to the expansion of authority by the state in accelerating handling corruption cases.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Eradicating corruption throughout the world, inseparable from institutional factors as an organization for law enforcement officers is thus strongly related to the establishment of institutions that have to do with law enforcement; behind the formation of law enforcement agencies, starting from the history of its formation, in each country has a different history, including the rampant acts of corruption which are the source of the problem of the slow development of all aspects of a country's life. So that the existence of state institutions especially in the field of law enforcement is expected to solve the problem of corruption that occurs in a country.

a. History and Institutional Concepts

State institutions are not concepts that terminologically have single and uniform terms. In the English literature, the term political institution is used to refer to state institutions, whereas in the terminology of the Dutch language there is the term staat organen. Meanwhile Indonesian uses the terms state institutions, state bodies or state organs. In the Big Indonesian Dictionary, the word "institution" is defined as the origin or the future (which will become something); original form (appearance form); reference, bond; agency or organization that aims to conduct an investigation or conduct a business; established behavior patterns consist of structured social interactions.

The Presidential Decree in its development was followed by the birth of Law No.15 of 1961 of the State Gazette of 1961 No. 254 concerning the Principles of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia which has now become Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, although in its opinion the Prosecutor's Office it is not a "government tool" but a "state instrument" but in its translation implicitly illustrates that the Prosecutor's Office is not part of the judicial power organs, as the president has appointed the Minister / Attorney General as a member of the cabinet. Seeing the conditions that developed at that time, it was clear that the separation of the Prosecutor's Office from the Court institution and placed directly as part of the cabinet under the president, was inseparable from the attraction of political interests. In an atmosphere of guided democracy, all state power, on the basis of the interests of the revolution, is placed under the authority of the ruler. This can also be clearly seen by giving the status of the Minister to MPRS functionaries and the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court. Especially with regard to court institutions, with the enactment of Law No.19 of 1964 concerning the Basic Provisions of Justice, the position of the Court which should be independent and free from party interference is unclear. According to article 3 of the law, organizational, administrative and financial courts are under the authority of the government, namely the Department of Justice, Ministry of Religion and Departments within the Armed Forces. Furthermore, according to article 19, for the sake of the revolution, the honor of the State and the Nation or the urgent public interest, the President may participate in or intervene in court matters. The relationship between the function of prosecution and power at that time was further aggravated by the tension between law enforcement agencies, especially the Police and the Attorney General's Office related to the configuration of relations between the two in the criminal justice system. Inevitably, in the end the tension between the two institutions that were supposed to work together ultimately led to efforts to get closer to the center of power to get political support for their respective positions.

The independence of an institution is the main thing, observing the existence of the Prosecutor's Office becomes

the main thing before we really reach institutional authority, the existence of the Prosecutor's Office as a Prosecution agency until the President's Administration, Joko Widodo and his Cabinet of Work, is still doubtful, as evidence since Law No.5 of 1991 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia has the consequence that it no longer mentions the Prosecutor's Office as a "state instrument" but calls it a "government institution" that carries out state power in the prosecution of the power and law enforcement agencies. is a decline of the Attorney General's Office as a law enforcement agency, thus there has been an important shift in looking at the position of institutions from "state instruments" to "government tools" that view is followed by Law Number. 16 of 2004 article 2 paragraph 1 states that the Prosecutor's Office is a government institution that carries out state power in the field of prosecution and other authorities under the law. In other words, the position of the Prosecutor who is institutionally under executive power but carrying out duties and functions that are part of the judicial power clearly raises its own problem in placing the position of the Prosecutor in the administrative system in Indonesia and especially in the world of law enforcement in Indonesia. The problem becomes increasingly interesting considering Chapter IV Article 38 paragraph 1, 2 and 3 of Law Number 49 Year 009 concerning Judicial Power, it can be concluded that in addition to the Constitutional Court there are other bodies whose functions are related to the judicial authority including the Indonesian National Police, Attorney General's Office The Republic of Indonesia and other bodies are regulated in the law, the existence of these provisions cannot be separated from the provisions of Article 24 paragraph 2 and 3 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia which implicitly regulates the existence of the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia in the constitutional system related to judicial power.

The future development of the Republic of Indonesia's Attorney General's Office as a law enforcement agency is very necessary to strengthen the constitution, because it relates to the independence of the implementation of basic tasks and functions, because it affects the authority and acceleration of case handling in all aspects, in line with that there is an opinion among Indonesian legal experts including lecturers , from the author namely Prof. Dr. Donald Rumokoy, SH, MH, once the Dean of the Law Faculty of Sam Ratulangi University in Manado and the Chancellor of Sam Ratulangi University in North Sulawesi in Manado now as (Professor of the Law Faculty of Sam Ratulangi University), expressed his opinion in the Focus Group Discussion held throughout the Indonesian Prosecutor's Office cooperating with state universities, related to the institutional strengthening of the Republic of Indonesia Prosecutor's Office "as a permanent institution, it is fitting for the Prosecutor of the Republic of Indonesia and the Attorney General to be regulated in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. there should be a guarantee of the independence of the Prosecutor's Office, so that it cannot be easily influenced by executive interests ". The following opinion was given by Prof. Dr. Mahfud, M.D. (State Administrative Law Expert) "the explicit mention of the Prosecutor's office in the constitution is considered important. In addition, in the constitution, it should also be emphasized that the Prosecutor's Office is an independent state law enforcement institution as an investigator and public prosecutor. "Another opinion conveyed by Prof. Dr. Iskandar, SH, MH (Professor of the Faculty of Law at the University of Bengkulu): "In order for the position to get strong legitimacy, the Prosecutor's Office must be regulated and explicitly stated in the 1945 Constitution, so that it can guarantee the implementation of good, independent and professional duties and functions. state equipment whose function is to determine the implementation of power in the field of justice, the duties and authority of the Prosecutor (Prosecutor) with regard to the exercise of power in the judiciary ". With the explanation above, according to the author, the need for strengthening the constitution is very necessary for the Republic of Indonesia Prosecutor's Office, considering that it is closely related to the legitimacy and authority that will and will be given to the Republic of Indonesia Attorney's law enforcement agencies because trust can be built starting with institutional strengthening through the constitution as the opinion of experts.

The various conditions that occur in the Attorney At the time of the Reformation amid the incessant spotlight on the Indonesian government and existing law enforcement agencies, especially in handling Corruption Crimes; entering the period of reform of the Law on Prosecutors also underwent changes, namely by the enactment of Law Number 16 of 2004 to replace Law Number 5 of 1991. The presence of this law was welcomed by many because it was considered as an affirmation of the existence of an independent Prosecutor's Office and free from the influence of the government, or other parties.

C. Authority of the prosecutor's office of the Republic of Indonesia and obstacles in handling cases of corruption

Law No. 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia, Article 2 paragraph (1) affirms that "the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia is a government institution that carries out state power in the field of prosecution and other authorities under the law". Prosecutors as controlling the case process known as Dominus Litis, have a central position in law enforcement, because only the Prosecutor's institution can determine whether a case can be submitted to the Court or not based on legal evidence according to the Criminal Procedure Code.

As the person of Dominus Litis, the Prosecutor's Office is also the only implementing agency for the executive decision of the ambtenaar executive. Thus, the new

Prosecutor's Law is seen as more powerful in establishing the position and role of the Prosecutor of the Republic of Indonesia as a state government institution that carries out state power in the prosecution, starting with the law, the implementation of state power carried out by the Prosecutor's Office carried out independently. This affirmation is contained in Article 2 paragraph (2) of Law No. 16 of 2004, that the Prosecutor's Office is a government institution that carries out state power in the field of independent prosecution, with the understanding that in carrying out its functions, duties and authorities regardless of the influence of government power and other power influences. This provision aims to protect the prosecutor's profession in carrying out duties professionally. The Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia has regulated the duties and authorities of the Prosecutor's Office as stated in Article 30 as follows: (1) In the criminal field, the Prosecutor's Office has the duty and authority:

a. Prosecuting;
b. Carry out the determination of judges and court decisions that have obtained permanent legal force;
c. Supervise the implementation of conditional criminal decisions, criminal supervision decisions, and conditional decisions;
d. Carry out investigations on certain criminal acts based on the law;

(1) Completing certain case files and for that can carry out additional checks before being delegated to a court which is coordinated with the investigator.

(2) In the field of civil and state administration, the Prosecutor's Office with special powers can act both inside and outside the court for and on behalf of the state or government.

(3) In the field of public order and peace, the Prosecutor's Office also organizes activities:

a. Increasing community legal awareness;
b. Safeguarding law enforcement policies;
c. Safeguarding circulation of printed goods;
d. Supervision of the flow of beliefs that can endanger the community and the state;
e. Prevention of abuse and / or blasphemy of religion;
f. Research and development of criminal statistics law.

Whereas Article 31 of Law Number 16 Year 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia 04 affirms that the Prosecutor's Office may request a judge to determine a defendant in a hospital or mental care place, or other appropriate place because the person is unable to stand alone or caused by things that can make others happy, environment or himself. In addition Article 32 of Law Number 16 of 2004 concerning the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia stipulates that in addition to these duties and authorities in the law, the Prosecutor's Office can be assigned other duties and authorities under the law, then Article 33 stipulates that in carrying out their duties and authorities, The Prosecutor's Office fosters cooperative relations with law and justice enforcement agencies and state agencies or other agencies, then Article 34 stipulates that the Prosecutor's Office can provide legal considerations to other government installations, during the reformation the Prosecutor's Office received assistance with the presence of new institutions to share roles and responsibilities . Furthermore, the presence of new institutions with specific responsibilities should be seen as positive as the Prosecutor's partner in fighting corruption. Previously, law enforcement efforts carried out against criminal acts of corruption often faced obstacles. This was not only experienced by the Prosecutor's Office, but also by the Indonesian National Police and other agencies, including the following problems:

1. The perpetrator gets protection from the corps, boss, or friends;
2. The modus operandi that is classified as sophisticated;
3. The difficulty of gathering various initial evidence;
4. The object is complicated, for example because it relates to various regulations;
5. Management of human resources;
6. Differences in perceptions and interpretation among existing law enforcement agencies.
7. Psychological and physical terror, threats, negative reporting, even kidnapping and burning of law enforcement houses
8. Inadequate facilities and infrastructure

That the power of efforts to eradicate corruption has been carried out since the establishment of various institutions, however, the government has remained under the spotlight from time to time since the Old Order regime. The old Corruption Act is Law Number. 31 of 1971, is considered to be less toothed, so it is replaced by Law Number. 31 of 1999. The Law stipulates reversed evidence for perpetrators of corruption and also the imposition of more severe sanctions, even the death penalty for corruptors. Later this Law was also seen as weak and caused the escape of corruptors due to the absence of Transitional Rules in the Law. The polemic about the authority of prosecutors and police in investigating corruption cases also cannot be resolved by the Act.

As a result of not maximizing law enforcement, the Number Law was born. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission in its explanation explicitly stated that law enforcement and the eradication of corruption carried out conventionally have been proven to experience various obstacles. For this reason, an extraordinary law enforcement method is needed through the establishment of a state body that has broad, independent authority, and is free from any power in eradicating corruption, given that corruption has been categorized as extraordinary crime. Thus, the Act Number. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission

mandates the establishment of a Corruption Criminal Court that has the duty and authority to examine and decide on corruption. As for the prosecution, it was submitted by the Corruption Eradication Commission consisting of one Chairperson and four Deputy Chairpersons, each of whom oversaw four fields, namely Prevention, Enforcement, Information and Data, Internal Supervision and Complaint of the community, from the four fields, the law tasked with carrying out investigations and prosecutions, investigating staff taken from the Indonesian National Police and the Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Indonesia; while specifically for prosecution, personnel taken are functional officials of the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General's Office, in the presence of the Corruption Eradication Commission, marking fundamental changes in criminal procedural law, including investigations of corruption in Indonesia.

d. History and Development of the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Repuplic of Indonesia

That the corruption eradication commission was formed based on Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, judicially the reason for the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission could be seen in the General Explanation of Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission which said as follows: Indonesia has become widespread in society. Its development continues to increase from year to year, both from the number of cases that occur and the amount of state financial losses and in terms of the quality of criminal acts carried out increasingly systematically and scope that enters all aspects of people's lives. The increase in uncontrolled corruption will bring disaster not only towards the life of the national economy but also in the life of the nation and state in general. Extensive and systematic corruption is also a violation of social rights and economic rights of the people, and because of that all corruption can no longer be classified as ordinary crime but has become an extraordinary crime. Even so, in its efforts to eradicate it can no longer be done in an ordinary way, but it is demanded by extraordinary methods.

Based on the provisions of Article 43 of Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended by Act Number 20 of 2001, the special agency, hereinafter referred to as the Corruption Eradication Commission, has the authority to coordinate and supervise, including conducting investigations, , and prosecution, while regarding the formation, organizational structure, work procedures and accountability, duties and authority and membership is regulated by law.

This Act was formed based on the provisions contained in the Act above. At present the eradication of criminal acts of corruption has been carried out by various institutions such as the prosecutor's office and the police and other bodies relating to the eradication of criminal acts of corruption. overlapping authority with these various agencies.

The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission in conducting investigations, investigations and prosecution of corruption includes corruption that:

a. involving law enforcement officials, state administrators, and other people who are involved in criminal acts of corruption committed by law enforcement officials or state administrators;
b. get attention that is troubling the community; and / or
c. concerning state losses of at least Rp.1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

In the process of forming the Corruption Eradication Commission, it is no less important that human resources will lead and manage the Corruption Eradication Commission. This law provides a strong legal basis so that human resources can be consistent in carrying out their duties and authorities in accordance with the provisions of this Act.

In addition to ensuring the strengthening of the implementation of their duties and authorities, the Corruption Eradication Commission can appoint Advisory Teams from various fields of expertise whose duty is to provide advice or consideration to the Corruption Eradication Commission. As for the institutional aspects, the provisions concerning the organizational structure of the Corruption Eradication Commission are regulated in such a way as to enable the wider community to participate in the activities and steps taken by the Corruption Eradication Commission, and the implementation of public campaign programs can be carried out systematically and consistently. The Corruption Eradication Commission can be overseen by the wider community.

In carrying out the duties and authorities of investigation, investigation and prosecution, the Corruption Eradication Commission in addition to following the procedural law stipulated in the applicable laws and regulations and Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption Crimes as amended by Act Number 20 of 2001 concerning Amendments to Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning Eradication of Corruption Crime, also in this Act the separate procedural law contains special provisions (lex specialis). In addition, to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of law enforcement against corruption, this Law regulates the establishment of a court of corruption in the general court environment, which was first formed within the Central Jakarta District Court.

The court of corruption has the duty and authority to examine and decide cases of corruption committed by the panel of judges consisting of 2 (two) District Court judges and 3 (three) ad hoc judges. Likewise, in the process of examination both at the appeal level and at the cassation level, it was also carried out by a panel of judges consisting of 2 (two) judges and 3 (three) ad hoc judges. To ensure legal certainty, at each level of examination the time period is

determined strictly. In order to realize the principle of proportionality, this Law also regulates the provisions for rehabilitation and compensation in the event that the Corruption Eradication Commission performs its duties and authority in contravention of this Law or applicable law.

e. The authority of the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia

That aside from the reasons for the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission in Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission in article 3, it is stated that the Corruption Eradication Commission is a state institution that in carrying out its duties and authorities is independent and free from any influence The task of the Corruption Eradication Commission is as follows:

Article 6

The Corruption Eradication Commission has the task:

a. coordination with agencies authorized to do so eradication of criminal acts of corruption;
b. supervision of agencies authorized to do so eradication of criminal acts of corruption;
c. conduct investigations, investigations and prosecutions against criminal acts of corruption;
d. take precautionary actions against corruption; and
e. monitor the administration of the government country.

Article 7

In carrying out the coordination task as referred to in Article 6 letter a, the Corruption Eradication Commission is authorized:

a. coordinating investigations, investigations and prosecutions criminal acts of corruption;
b. establish reporting systems in eradication activities criminal acts of corruption;
c. request information about action eradication activities criminal corruption to related agencies;
d. carry out hearings or meetings with agencies authorized to eradicate acts criminal corruption; and
e. request reports from relevant agencies regarding prevention of action criminal corruption.

Article 8

(1) In carrying out the supervisory duties as referred to in Article 6 letter b, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to conduct supervision, research, or review of agencies that carry out their duties and authorities relating to the eradication of criminal acts of corruption, and agencies that carry out public services.
(2) In carrying out the authority as referred to in paragraph (1), the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to also take over investigations or prosecutions of perpetrators of corruption committed by the police or prosecutor's office.
(3) In the event that the Corruption Eradication Commission takes over the investigation or prosecution, the police or prosecutor's office must submit the suspect and all case files along with evidence and other documents required within a maximum of 14 (fourteen) working days, from the date the Commission requests are received Corruption Eradication.
(4) Submission as referred to in paragraph (3) is carried out by making and signing the minutes of submission so that all duties and authorities of the police or prosecutor's office at the time of submission are transferred to the Corruption Eradication Commission.

Article 9

The takeover of investigation and prosecution as referred to in Article 8, is carried out by the Corruption Eradication Commission on the grounds:

a. public reports regarding corruption are not followed up;
b. the process of handling corruption in a protracted or delayed manner without justifiable reasons;
c. the handling of criminal acts of corruption is intended to protect the perpetrators of actual corruption;
d. handling corruption is an element of corruption;
e. obstacles to handling corruption due to interference from the executive, judiciary, or legislature; or
f. other conditions which, according to the police or prosecutor's office, are handling corruption crimes that are difficult to carry out properly and can be accounted for.

Article 10

In the event that there is a reason as referred to in Article 9, the Corruption Eradication Commission informs the investigator or public prosecutor to take over the criminal act of corruption that is being handled.

Article 11

In carrying out the tasks referred to in Article 6 letter c, the Corruption Eradication Commission has the authority to carry out investigations, investigations and prosecution of corruption that:

a. involving law enforcement officials, state administrators, and other people related to criminal acts of corruption committed by law enforcement officials or state administrators;
b. get attention that is troubling the community; and / or
c. concerning state losses of at least Rp. 1,000,000,000.00 (one billion rupiah).

Article12

(1) In carrying out the tasks of investigation, investigation and prosecution as referred to in Article 6 letter c, the Corruption Eradication Commission is authorized:

a. tapping and recording conversations;

b. ordered the relevant agencies to prohibit someone from traveling abroad;
c. request information from a bank or other financial institution about the financial condition of a suspect or defendant being examined;
d. order banks or other financial institutions to block accounts suspected of being the result of corruption belonging to a suspect, defendant or other related party;
e. instruct the leader or superior of the suspect to temporarily dismiss the suspect from his position;
f. request data on the wealth and tax data of the suspect or defendant to the relevant agencies;
g. temporarily suspend financial transactions, trade transactions and other agreements or revocation of licenses, licenses and concessions that are carried out or owned by suspects or defendants which are allegedly based on sufficient initial evidence relating to the criminal acts of corruption being examined;
h. request assistance from Interpol Indonesia or other state law enforcement agencies to conduct searches, arrests, and seizure of evidence abroad;
i. ask for help from the police or other relevant agencies to carry out arrests, detention, searches and seizures in cases of corruption that are being handled.

Article13

In carrying out preventative duties as referred to in Article 6 letter d, the Corruption Eradication Commission is authorized to carry out preventive measures or efforts as follows:

a. register and check reports on state administrators' assets;
b. receive reports and determine the status of gratuity;
c. organize anti-corruption education programs at every level of education;
d. design and encourage the implementation of a socialization program to eradicate corruption;
e. conduct anti-corruption campaigns to the general public;
f. conduct bilateral or multilateral cooperation in eradicating criminal acts of corruption.

Article 14

In carrying out monitor duties as referred to in Article 6 letter e, the Corruption Eradication Commission is authorized:

a. conduct an assessment of the administrative management system in all state institutions and the government;
b. advise the leaders of state institutions and the government to make changes if based on the results of the assessment, the administration management system has the potential for corruption;
c. report to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the People's Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia, and the Supreme Audit Agency, if the recommendations of the Corruption Eradication Commission regarding the proposed changes are not heeded

f. Comparison of the Authority of the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General's Office with the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia

Taking into account the authority granted by the state to the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia, so much authority was given to the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia, both in terms of Preventive and Repressive. but that becomes a fundamental difference if the author tries to compare the authority of the Republic of Indonesia Attorney General's Office with the Corruption Eradication Commission of the Republic of Indonesia, especially in supporting the acceleration of the settlement of corruption cases, for the Corruption Eradication Commission, in addition to the amount of state losses in resolving corruption cases in Article 11 of Act Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission.

IV. CONCLUSION

Institutional and authority issues continue to be the spotlight and serious discussion of the Indonesian people when resolving the problem of handling cases of corruption is never finished and fulfills a sense of justice in society, along with the increasingly difficult community to obtain facilities and cost of living, in various aspects, while state administrators in the whole institution, under the auspices of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution enjoy unlimited facilities so that it becomes a fundamental difference in creating a gap between the rich and the poor, the steps taken are Preventive and Repressive supervision by the Prosecutor of the Republic of Indonesia and the Corruption Eradication Commission , The Republic of Indonesia Police and other related institutions, in fulfilling the aspirations of the community regarding escorting state finances to achieve Social justice for all Indonesian people in all aspects of ideology, politics, social culture and defense, security. Thus justice and prosperity are the ideals of all Indonesian people.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thank you to the Chairperson of the Faculty of Social Sciences, Manado State University for agreeing to carry out the research plan, and to the Unima leadership who provided research funding so that this article could be completed.

REFERENCE

[1] Presiden Republik Indonesia, 'UNDANG-UNDANG REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR 15 TAHUN 1961 TENTANG KETENTUAN KETENTUAN POKOK KEJAKSAAN REPUBLIK INDONESIA', 1961. .

[2] P. Indonesia, *KEJAKSAAN REPUBLIK INDONESIA*. 2004.

[3] U.-U. Nomor, 'Tahun 2002 Tentang Komisi Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi', *URL http//www. sjdih. depkeu. go. id/fulltext/2002/30Tahun2002UU. htm*, 30AD.

[4] T. Marianne, 'Kamus Hukum Belanda-Indonesia'. Jakarta: Djambatan, 2002.

[5] H. Kelsen, *Pure Legal Theory; Basics of Normative Law as Descriptive-Empirical Law*. Jakarta: JAKARTA RIMDI PERS, 1995.

[6] Indonesia, *Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*. Japenpa, 1945.