

The Integrity of the Public Prosecutor in Law Enforcement Within Pancasila Characteristic

Fernando

Research and Development Center Attorney General's Office Republic of Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: ricercatorelegale@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

An important feature of a legal system is the prosecution of crime by the public prosecutor, who is the main advocate of applying the law according to social norms. In carrying out its strategic role, it turns out that there are several practical problems related to its capacity and ability to carry out functions in accordance with the principles adopted in the rule of law. Not only does this matter for technical expertise, knowledge, and implementation of the law, but also for the integrity of a public prosecutor. However, integrity does not only refer to law enforcement that emphasizes legal aspects, but to morality and upholding norms that govern society. This paper explains that these morals and rules are actually contained in Pancasila as the source of all sources of law in the Indonesian rule of law. Therefore, to build the integrity of the Public Prosecutor, it is necessary to prioritize the role of Pancasila in order to realize justice that is not only legal justice, but also justice that respects human equality. Law enforcement must reflect the values of virtue in society, so things that pollute it must also be removed. To enforce the law appropriately, it must comply with what society expects from laws, and it must have to be fair because justice is the fundamental goal of all laws.

Keywords: *Integrity, Public Prosecutor, Rule of Law, Pancasila*

1. INTRODUCTION

The Prosecutor's position and fundamental duties differs significantly from one legal system to the next. It varies greatly from country to country, but it is usually inherent in the position of the Public Prosecutor that he or she has a lot of power and authority. In instance, depending on national legislation, the Public Prosecutor may take a greater or less active role in real criminal investigations, and as a result, their respective relationships with police and investigators may vary. Public prosecutors play a significant part in the entire criminal justice process in many nations, and in many cases, they are the primary prosecutor. When it comes to investigations performed by the police or investigators, the Public Prosecutor has the power to set priorities, as well as to determine which cases will be submitted to the criminal court and which cases will not be prosecuted.[1] In this case, the Public Prosecutor serves as the chain of command for the criminal justice administration of a legal system (dominus

litis).

It must be acknowledged that the Public Prosecutor in Indonesia's present legal system is not yet perfect enough to be called the dominus litis of criminal justice cases. Even when compared to the Netherlands, which (still) retains its criminal law system, Indonesia's Public Prosecutor's position and power in the administration of criminal justice are significantly diminished and trailing behind. The Criminal Procedure Code, which is hailed as a "masterpiece" due to its functional differentiation idea, does not reflect the regulation of the Public Prosecutor's position as a dominus litis in handling cases.

Along with the question of "power" in the national legal system in carrying out this (ostensibly) strategic role, there are also practical concerns about a Public Prosecutor's competence and ability to carry out his duties in line with the implicit norms of the rule of law. This issue has also garnered international attention, as stated in the introduction to the Guidelines on the Role of Prosecutors produced at the Eighth United Nations Congress

on the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders, held in Havana, Cuba, from 27 August to 7 September 1990, which emphasized the importance of the State "ensuring that Public Prosecutors have the necessary professional qualifications.". Capacity and ability of a Public Prosecutor are strongly linked to not just technical competence, understanding, and application of the language of the law, but also to the Public Prosecutor's integrity in carrying out their jobs as one of the key components of the Indonesian rule of law.[2] In a nation that follows the idea of the rule of law, one of the most important assets is the ability of the rule of law to sustain a democratic life based on the protection of human rights. If he is weak, it is almost likely that life in the nation would be chaotic and that human rights will be violated. The rule of law necessitates the existence of an institution or legal framework with integrity in order to be able to sustain and ensure the passage of national and state life on the basis of the rule of law. The legal framework is a system known as criminal justice, in which the Public Prosecutor plays a significant role as a key participant.[3]

One of the problems is that the rule of law has lately started to be distorted, as if it were just about legality or about providing legal certainty for the sake of legal certainty. In reality, the rule of law is not just about legality or the formation and implementation of rules and regulations, but it is also about the necessity to be able to enforce social standards when they are violated. The rule of law is not the same as the rule of law, and as a result, "law enforcement" cannot be associated only with "law enforcement," but must also enforce the norms that govern society as a whole.

As a State of Law, Indonesia's supreme source of law is the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD 1945), although Pancasila is the source of all legal sources. Pancasila is designated as the source of all sources of state law in line with the fourth paragraph of the 1945 Constitution's Preamble. Pancasila's status as the state's foundation and ideology, as well as its intellectual foundation, ensures that the material substance of laws and regulations does not clash with the ideals inherent in Pancasila. Thus, discussing the integrity of a law

enforcement, especially the Public Prosecutor, cannot be divorced from the practice of Pancasila's principles.

From this vantage point, the author wishes to demonstrate that the Public Prosecutor's integrity is not limited to his competence and ability to apply the text's contents to the law, but also to his application of Pancasila principles in carrying out his duty in the criminal justice system. This paper uses the term Public Prosecutor rather than Prosecutor because, in Indonesia, the Prosecutor is not only charged with the authority to conduct prosecutions and court decisions (execution), but also with the responsibility to conduct investigations and investigations mandated by several laws. Thus, in this article, the term "Public Prosecutor" refers only to the prosecutor as an official empowered to conduct prosecutions.

As a result, this article focuses only on the idea of the Prosecutor's integrity as a Public Prosecutor within the context of the Pancasila State Law. This is because the Prosecutor's function as a Public Prosecutor is the most critical in the criminal justice system. According to the author, addressing the Public Prosecutor's integrity touches on a broader range of legal problems than just analyzing the Prosecutor's role in prosecuting corruption offenses. This article will demonstrate that the Public Prosecutor's integrity, driven by Pancasila's ideals and principles, may really promote the rule of law, not simply the integrity of expressing the law's language. The analysis descriptions and discussions in this paper were derived from research conducted using normative juridical methods and a concept and comparison approach in order to provide descriptions and prescriptions on how to strengthen the Public Prosecutor's integrity in the State of Pancasila Law.

2. METHODS

The type of research used by the authors in this study is a type of juridical-normative research. The research approach in this study is a statutory and concept approach. The juridical-normative research method is research in which the objects are statutory regulations and library materials.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. *The State of Law of Pancasila*

Throughout history, the concept of the rule of law has evolved in lockstep with historical events. The idea of the rule of law may be classified according to whether it is known as *Rechtsstaat* in Continental European nations or as the Rule of Law in Anglo-Saxon countries, including the Commonwealth.[4] History has shown that the notion of *Rechtsstaat* is in direct (revolutionary) contrast to the ideas of Hegelianism, which is characterized by absolutism, while the Rule of Law evolves in an evolutionary manner, which is reduced to the common law legal system.[5]

The implementation of the rule of law idea cannot be divorced from the concept of *Rechtsstaat* and the Rule of Law throughout its growth. The idea of *Rechtsstaat* subsequently impacted the legal systems of a number of other nations, including Indonesia. In the 1945 Constitution (pre-amendment), the term "Indonesia is a nation based on law (*Rechtsstaat*)" expressly states that "Indonesia is a country based on law (*Rechtsstaat*)". The word *Rechtsstaat* is well-known in Continental European nations, and it was used by Immanuel Kant, Paul Laband, Julius Stahl, and Fichte, among others, to describe a legal system based on the rule of law. According to the ideas advanced by Julius Stahl in Jimly Ashiddiqie, a *Rechtsstaat* must have at least four foundations, which are as follows: the protection of human rights (*grondrechten*), the division of powers (*scheiding van machten*), government based on laws (*wetmatigheid van bestuur*), and the existence of a state administrative court (*administratieve rechtspraak*).[6]

Indonesian literature uses a variety of terminologies. For example, Notohamidjojo said: "With the development of the fundamental concepts articulated in the constitutions of the nineteenth century, the phrase Rule of Law (*Rechtsstaat*) also arose." *Rechtsstaat* is also known as the "State of Law".[7] In the same vein, Sumrah in Azhari stated: "What we have known for a long time is the definition of *Rechtsstaat* or the State of Law, or to guarantee the terms in the

Elucidation of the 1945 Constitution, a state founded on legal principles." [8] From these two perspectives, it is clear that *Rechtsstaat* is synonymous with the State of Law.

Similarly, the Rule of Law has the same meaning as the State of Law, as Sunaryati Hartono said in Azhari, when she stated: "In order to establish a State of Law that is fair for all parties, the enforcement of the "Rule of Law" must be understood materially." Furthermore, Sudargo Gautama observed that there were striking parallels between the Rule of Law and the rule of law, which he stated in the following sentence: "...and if we do so, we find that the rule of law places a restriction on the state's authority over people. The state does not have omnipotence and does not act randomly in its actions. Legislation places restrictions on the activities of the state against its own people. This is referred to as the Rule of Law by jurists in the United Kingdom.[9] According to the legal authorities, the idea of the Rule of Law is theoretically the same as the concept of the State of Law, or *Rechtsstaat*, in that it is based on the same principles.

The term "Rule of Law" did not become widely used until the nineteenth century, owing to the works of English constitutionalist Albert Venn Dicey, who defined what it meant in free democracies. According to Dicey, the Rule of Law is comprised of three inextricably linked components:[10] To begin, no one should be penalized until a pre-established law is violated, and the courts are the ideal venue for determining whether a breach happened. As a result, the Rule of Law is incompatible with the ruler exercising wide, arbitrary, or discretionary authority. Second, all individuals are equal before the law, which means that rulers (save the monarch) do not have special immunity and must answer for their acts in court. Thirdly, it is a collection of legal safeguards that safeguard people from the acts of arbitrary rulers, with the courts empowered to serve as guardians of these safeguards. Yunas summarizes the components of Dicey's Rule of Law idea as supremacy of law, equality before the law, and a constitution founded on human rights.[11]

According to Anthony Valcke, the short phrase Rule of Law is often used to denote the presence of sound governance in a nation. In nations that have chosen free and democratic systems of governance,

the Rule of Law is seen as a fundamental condition for economic and social growth, as well as the presence of a clean and democratic form of government. The Rule of Law has evolved beyond just discussing law, as it did at its inception, but has become more ubiquitous and is strongly linked with economic, social, and good governance growth in a rule of law system.[10] As a result, good governance reflects the Rule of Law that exists within a State of Law, which is a characteristic that has recently begun to be pursued in Indonesia.

Formally, the words *Rechtsstaat* and Rule of Law may be used interchangeably with the term rule of law, since all three terms refer to the same thing, namely the avoidance of absolute authority in exchange for the acknowledgment and protection of human rights. The distinction is in the material meaning or substance of the three words, which is determined by a nation's historical context and manner of life.[12] Meanwhile, Asshiddiqie uses the word *nomocracy* to refer to the rule of law's equivalence. He stated that, in addition to being linked to the concepts of *Rechtsstaat* and the Rule of Law, the ideas, ideals, and concepts of the State of Law are also related to *nomocracy*, which derives from the Greek term's *nomos* and *cratos*. *Nomocracy* is comparable to the term's *demo* and *cratos* or *kratien* in a democracy. *Nomos* translates as "standard," while *kratos* translates as "strength." The norm or rule is the determining factor in the exercise of authority. Thus, *nomocracy* is associated with the concept of the rule of law or the supremacy of the law.[13]

What about Indonesia, then? The 1945 Constitution Amendment does not declare that Indonesia adheres to the *Rechtsstaat* idea, but rather translates it into the concept of the rule of law. Thus, does this imply that Indonesia shifted from *Rechtsstaat* to Rule of Law after the amendment? Mahfud M.D stated that the 1945 Constitution's Preamble and clauses comprise the whole of Indonesian legal politics. The preamble and articles of the 1945 Constitution include the aims, foundations, legal ideals, and fundamental standards of the Indonesian state, which must serve as the goals and foundations of Indonesian legal politics. The preamble and articles of the 1945 Constitution include unique characteristics drawn

from the Indonesian nation's beliefs and culture, which were inherited by the Indonesian nation's forefathers. By examining these two criteria, it becomes apparent that the idea of the Indonesian State of Law since independence has not been *Rechtsstaat* or the Rule of Law, but rather the concept of a new State of Law based on the beliefs and philosophy of the Indonesian nation's noble life. The new idea is the State of Pancasila Law as a crystallization of beliefs and a philosophy of life that is imbued with the Indonesian nation's lofty ethical and moral values, as expressed in the preamble and indicated in the 1945 Constitution's articles.[14]

Pancasila is both the fundamental norm (*grundnorm*) of the Indonesian state and the ideal of Indonesian state law (*rechtsidee*) as a normative and constitutive belief system.

According to Hans Kelsen, a standard is legitimate if it is established by authority with the intent of standardizing it. This authority is derived from higher-status standards. The connection between norm validity and norm formation competency therefore results in a sequence of norm hierarchies culminating in the fundamental norm. A norm is classified as a fundamental norm if its existence and truth value are assumed and cannot be retrieved.[15] Fundamental standards provide as legitimacy or legal force for the acts of the first lawmakers. Fundamental standards are what establish the validity of a country's first constitution.[16]

Pancasila as a system of ideas that is both normative and constitutive, serving as the basic and ideal condition underlying all positive laws and constitutive in that it guides the law toward the desired outcomes. Pancasila thus became the central concept of the state's fundamental norms (*staatsfundamentalnorm*) by being included into the 1945 Constitution's preamble. According to Hans Nawiasky in Jazim Hamidi, *staatsfundamentalnorm* is the overarching foundation for a constitutional legal system. A law is enacted based on the constitution, granting the power to enact regulations.[17] Nawiasky then advanced the idea of *stufenbau der rechtsordnung*, according to which norms are built around the state's fundamental norms (*staatsfundamentalnorm*); state fundamental rules (*staatsgrundgesetz*); formal law (*formell gesetz*); and

implementation rules and autonomous rules (*verordnung en autonome satzung*).

The concept of the State of Law Pancasila is the main feature and distinguishes the Indonesian legal system from other legal systems, which in relation to the literature on the combination of more than one choice of community values is referred to as prismatic choice, which in the legal context is referred to as prismatic law.[14] The following are the features of the State of Law of Pancasila:

1. Close kinship

Individual rights (including property rights) and human rights are recognized in the family state, but national interests (shared interests) continue to take precedence over individual interests. This is consistent with the social ideals of the Indonesian people, which are community-oriented, but also with the transition of Indonesian society toward modernity, namely *patembayan*. This is in striking contrast to the Western notion of the rule of law, which places a premium on individual liberty, and the socialist-communist definition, which places a premium on shared or community interests. The Pancasila state seeks harmony and balance between individual and national (society) interests by allowing the state to interfere for as long as required to create national and state life according with Pancasila ideals.

2. Legal certainty and justice

Due to its prismatic nature, the concept of the State of Due to its prismatic nature, the concept of the State of Pancasila Law in legal activities, both in their formulation and implementation, is achieved by combining several elements contained in both the concept of the Rule of Law and the rule of law, namely the principles of balancing legal certainty and justice, as well as other legal concepts and systems, for example, the common law system.

3. Religious

When it comes to the connection between the state and religion, the Pancasila Law State idea is neither secular nor religious, as in theocracy or the concept of Islamic *noocracy*. Pancasila Law is a notion of the state imbued with divinity, in the sense that national and state life are centered on the Supreme Deity, and it grants people the ability to adopt faiths and beliefs according with their individual views.

Since a logical result of this prismatic option, both atheism and communism are prohibited, as they reject believing in a single God.

4. Combining the use of law as a tool for social change with the use of law as a reflection of society's culture

By combining these two ideas, Pancasila's state law aims to maintain and reflect the values that exist within society (living law), as well as to positivize the living law in order to promote and guide society toward growth and advancement in line with Pancasila's principles. Indonesia must adhere to the concept of "*Bhinneka Tunggal Ika*" (different but still one) while developing a national legal system, which means that although it must adhere to the idea of legal unity, it must also consider the universal elements of any difference.

5. Neutral and universal

The basis for developing and enacting national laws should be neutral and universal legal principles in the sense that they should satisfy the fundamental requirements, namely Pancasila as a cohesive and unifying force; values that are acceptable to all interests and do not take sides with particular groups or groups; prioritization of "*gotong royong*" (working together to achieve the desired result) and tolerance; and common vision.

3.2. The Public Prosecutor's Integrity Against Pancasila

A fascinating fundamental issue regarding integrity is its meaning. In general, the idea of 'integrity' has gained prominence in government and governance studies, as well as in real policymaking at all levels. In legal terms, integrity seems to be restricted to the attitude, behavior, and conduct of law enforcement officials who are not corrupt, involved in conspiracies, or engaged in nepotism. Integrity is therefore exclusively linked with clean public services, such as those designated as a Corruption-Free Zone (WBK) or a Clean Serving Bureaucratic Zone (WBBM), indicating that the unit and its workers are dedicated to providing acceptable and corruption-free services. The issue is this: Can a government official or employee with integrity offer adequate public services and is devoid of corruption?

While it is a requirement for a Public Prosecutor to be free of corruption, what about fulfilling the Public Prosecutor's services? What standards are used when they are confined to dealing with parties involved in the case? The most critical issue is: What does it mean to act with integrity in the capacity of Public Prosecutor? If you examine the terms and explanations of Law No. 16 of 2004 governing the Prosecutor of the Republic of Indonesia (Law No. 16 of 2004), we will notice that there is not a single word "integrity" in the text. The new term integrity appears in the Regulation of the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia No. Per- 014/A/JA/11/2012 concerning the Prosecutor's Code of Conduct, but it does not define the term and instead lists the conducts that the Prosecutor is prohibited from engaging in while performing his duties.

It is difficult to translate the abstract concept of integrity into normative texts, however the following explanations give a good overview:

1. Integrity demands a person to adhere to accepted ethical ideals and to continuously follow the norms of conduct established in his or her presence.[18]

2. The beliefs and ideals shown by an individual are subjectively assessed and serve as the foundation for evaluating whether the individual is regarded to have integrity.[18]

3. Personal integrity often refers to a person adhering to his or her own standards, beliefs, and values, while moral integrity relates to how the conduct conforms to the observer's criteria. Integrity encompasses more than knowledge or reliance; it also encompasses a morally acceptable set of logical standards.[19]

4. Integrity is determined by a person's responsibilities and commitments in interpersonal interactions. Honoring and fulfilling pledges, following through on commitments, and telling the truth when it may be difficult to communicate are all examples of behaviors that exemplify integrity, since integrity is the congruence of one's words and deeds.[20]

According to these arguments, the integrity framework is extremely broad and complicated (as opposed to a more limited spectrum of corruption),

since it deals with a wide range of occurrences and therefore is more comprehensive. If we want to understand the causes of integrity breaches (including different kinds of corruption) and the efficacy of anti-corruption and integrity measures, we must first understand what such policies are. Bribery, fraud, intimidation, and discrimination, among other things, may be produced by differences in the qualities of the people involved, variations in the features of the organization (culture and structure), and differences in the characteristics of the environment. The wider framework is also important for considering what contributes to the protection of integrity and the prevention of integrity breaches, such as corruption. The wider framework is also important for considering what contributes to the protection of integrity and the prevention of integrity breaches, such as corruption.[21]

The bottom line is that integrity refers to the moral character of conduct shown throughout the process of operating the government, rather than the substance of choices or the societal consequences of such actions. This is concerned with moral characteristics, the core of what is good or evil, and is done so by referring to "legitimate" moral standards and norms in the eyes of the general population. As a result, addressing integrity cannot be divorced from debating morality, which is a fundamental part of integrity. Public prosecutors are obliged to maintain the highest level of honesty in all areas of law enforcement, including the legal aspects of their cases. On the other hand, he is also expected to have a high level of moral integrity in terms of his own conduct. Morality is imperative- categorical in nature, which implies that it does not include any conditions or consequences that must be fulfilled by someone in order for him to be morally justified in doing.[22] The issue is that morality is distinct from legality, which is an imperative-categorical standard in which compliance with or non-compliance with the law may have specific repercussions.[22]

As Fernando Manullang pointed out, some jurists, as well as the vast majority of the public, continue to think that legal certainty is a way of satisfying the public's need for fairness. Because of this, jurists think that stating the contents of the law will give legal certainty, despite the fact that legal certainty does not solely stem from what is set down

in the law itself. Real legal certainty, including legality, must be backed up by ethical legitimacy in order to be effective (morality). As a result, legal certainty must be restored to what has been accepted by the community and is a representation of the general will of the people. The foundation is contractual, but it is a communal contract in the sense that it serves as the basis and the bond for all of the people who participate in it. As a result, what is in the law (law) should be considered in the context of the current situation.[23]

Finally, in many instances, the Public Prosecutor was forced to choose between his personal integrity (as law enforcement) and his moral integrity. Personal integrity, according to Becker, relates to an individual's adherence to his or her own norms, beliefs, and values, while moral integrity refers to how an individual's conduct complies to the criteria of observers (others including society). This is why the Public Prosecutor, in carrying out his duty, prefers to behave with personal integrity (legality), which is often seen inconsistent with the standards (e.g., fairness) of the community's laws. Because this continues to occur, a stigma develops in the society that whatever the Public Prosecutor does is always seen to violate the sense of justice. This stigma often manifests in society without an awareness of the legal-normative factors that underpin the Public Prosecutor's ability to intervene in a case.

Of obviously, this cannot continue. There has to be a shift in the way the Public Prosecutor is built and shaped. more in keeping with social standards. This is because the public prosecutor's moral integrity also has a significant role in determining the level of welfare and pleasure in a community. Of course, under the Pancasila Law State, the criterion for community members desiring success are the Pancasila principles. Pancasila is an ethical and moral instrument that seeks to improve the quality of state administration and to promote law enforcement procedures that are transparent and fair, thus ensuring legal certainty, justice, and communal benefits.[24]

According to Friedman's view, the public prosecutor is the vanguard of law enforcement that adheres to social standards. This component of the legal structure affects the direction of the Indonesian state, which Pancasila seeks, since the authorization

of the legal content and legal culture is also contingent on the Public Prosecutor's honesty in enforcing the law. According to Eugen Ehrlich, the development of a law is primarily determined by the sound of the legislation's language, jurisprudence of court judgments, and publications on legal science, but also by the rules that exist in actual society (living law), as well as the standards embodied in the majority of people's aspirations, rather than simply the norms defined and enforced by public authorities.[25]

The legal framework is the most important component of the legal development system that Pancasila aspires to, since the most important aspect of law enforcement is defined by the conduct of people, both individually and collectively, as well as by the behavior of institutions. To begin to build the integrity of the Public Prosecutor, it is necessary to align it with the spirit of the nation's soul, which is founded on the Pancasila principles. This will undoubtedly give direction and advancement in the development of law that is sought by the community, resulting in the law being the sole soul/breath of the community in carrying out all of its operations, since it begins with the soul of the community itself and progresses from there.

Thus, to develop a Public Prosecutor with integrity and justice in accordance with Pancasila's expectations, it is necessary to prioritize law enforcement that is always focused on promoting dignity, peace, prosperity, and the dignity of all people by living the Pancasila's second principle, in order for law enforcement to be realized collectively, because the law is, at its core, for humans. The Public Prosecutor's enforcement of the law should not be based solely on the text of the law, without developing the soul, morality, and conscience of the community to see the law and the soul of the community growing within the community, as stated in the first principle of Pancasila, which states that religious values and beliefs are the primary elements of the Public Prosecutor to protect their integrity.

Pancasila's role in establishing the prosecutor's office's integrity is to explore, appreciate, and appreciate the values embedded in the nation's soul in order to realize justice that is not only legal justice but also justice that respects human equality and unifies the spirit and soul of the Indonesian

nation as the Indonesian state's goals. Specifically, contributing to the organization of a global order based on social fairness. Additionally, factors that taint the Public Prosecutor's enforcement of the law (corruption, collusion, and nepotism) must be eliminated, since the law has a moral component. As a result, the law must represent the virtuous ideals prevalent in society. This is critical because the public knows that legal certainty does not just mean implementing the law's provisions. It also requires discernment in eliciting a sense of fairness.[23] This is consistent with Magnis-Suseno's that the concept of the rule of law is founded on the conviction that state authority must be used in accordance with sound and equitable legislation. Thus, the notion of the rule of law has two components: first, that the connection between the governed and governed is not based on power, but on objective standards that likewise bind those in authority. Second, the objective criterion requires that the legislation not only satisfies the criteria officially, but can also be argued against legal concepts. All state activity is predicated on the law, and the law itself must be fair and justifiable. It is just because it complies with society's expectations of the law and is good since the fundamental aim of every legislation is fairness.[26]

4. CONCLUSION

Despite its legal status as a State of Law, Indonesia is not a nation that conforms strictly to the concepts of *Rechtsstaat* and the Rule of Law. Pancasila, being the wellspring of all sources of law, is the distinguishing feature of the Indonesian state of law. Pancasila has a set of principles or values, and the creation and implementation of laws and regulations must be guided by these principles or values. In order to maintain the life of the nation and state under the Indonesian rule of law, the integrity of the Public Prosecutor is required. This integrity is not only about the capacity and ability to voice the text of the law or to put forward the legality aspect for the sake of legal certainty, but it is also about the ability to protect the rights of the public and to protect the interests of the public. Legal certainty is not limited to the realm of the law. Legal certainties, including legality, must be backed up by ethical

legitimacy in order to be effective (morality). The integrity of the Public Prosecutor is also concerned with morals and the ability to comprehend the laws that govern daily life in society. Consequently, law enforcement carried out by the Public Prosecutor must place a high priority on his integrity in accordance with the principles of Pancasila, both to preserve his personal integrity and to meet the expectations of the public for the existence of fair law within the Indonesian rule of law. In addition to elevating the authority of the Prosecutor's Office as an institution that protects the rights of all Indonesian people, having a Public Prosecutor who is committed to the values of Pancasila will also mean taking an active role in carrying out legal development as aspired to by the Indonesian people.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to thank Attorney General's Office Jakarta, for providing the need to publish this Article

REFERENCES

- [1] P. J. P. Tak, "The Relationship between Public Prosecutors and the Police in the Member States of the Council of Europe," *Comp. Law Rep. Conf. Prosec. Gen. Eur. 6th Sess.*, 2005.
- [2] L. T. Tambun, "Jokowi: Prosecutors' HR Capacity Must Be Relevant to the 4.0 Industrial Revolution." <https://www.beritasatu.com/nasional/709357/jokowi-kapasitas-sdm-Kejaksanaan-harus-relevan-dengan-revolusi-industri-40>.
- [3] A. Ali, *Revealing Legal Theory and Judicial Theory*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Group, 2012.
- [4] Sumrah, *Human Rights Enforcement as Seen Through the Lens of Indonesia's Rule of Law Implementation*. Bandung: Alumni, 1970.
- [5] P. M. Hadjon, *Legal Protection for Indonesian People*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu, 1987.
- [6] J. Ashiddiqie, *Indonesian Constitution and Constitutionalism*. Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2005.
- [7] O. Notohamidjojo, *The Meaning of the Rule*

- of Law. Jakarta: Badan Penerbit Kristen, 1970.
- [8] Azhary, *The Indonesian Rule of Law: A Normative Legal Examination of Its Components*. Jakarta: Penerbit Universitas Indonesia, 1995.
- [9] S. Gautama, *Understanding of the Rule of Law*. Bandung: Alumni, 1983.
- [10] A. Valcke, *The Rule of Law: Its Origins and Meanings (A Short Guide for Practitioners)*. ME Sharp Publishing, 2012.
- [11] D. N. Yunas, *The Conception of the Rule of Law*. Padang: Angkasa Raya, 1992.
- [12] M. T. Azhari, *The Rule of Law: An Examination Of Its Fundamental Principles Via The Lens Of Islamic Law, Its Application In The State Of Medina, And Its Current Status*. Jakarta: Prenada Media, 2003.
- [13] J. Asshiddiqie, *Post-Reformation Indonesian Constitutional Law Principles*. Jakarta: Bhuana Ilmu Populer, 2008.
- [14] M. M. M.D, *Constructing Legal Politics Observance of the Constitution*. Jakarta: Pustaka LP3ES, 2006.
- [15] R. Muttaqin, *The Pure Theory of Law. Translated in Indonesian*. Bandung: Nusa Media, 2014.
- [16] Somardi, *General Theory of Law and State*. Jakarta: Bee Media Indonesia, 2007.
- [17] Jazim Hamidi et al., *Teori dan Politik Hukum Tata Negara Cetakan ke-1*. Yogyakarta: Total Media, 2019.
- [18] C. Caldwell, *Leadership, Ethics, and Trust*. Newcastle: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2018.
- [19] T. E. Becker, "Integrity in Organizations: Beyond Honesty and Conscientiousness," *Acad. Manag. Rev.*, vol. 23, no. 1, 1998.
- [20] R. Priya, "Law of Three Stages: The Corner Stone of Auguste Comte's," *YourArticleLibrary*, 2015. <https://www.yourarticlelibrary.com/sociology-discourse-in-law-enforcement-a-critical-examination-of-legislation-and-legality/>
- [21] L. W. J. C. Huberts, "Integrity: What it is and Why it is Important," *Public Integr.*, vol. 2018, 2020.
- [22] S. P. L. Tjahjadi, *Immanuel Kant's Ethics and Categorical Imperatives*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius, 1991.
- [23] F. M. Manullang, "A Legal Certainty Discourse in Law Enforcement: A Critical Examination of Legislation and Legality," University of Indonesia, 2014.
- [24] L. O. Dedihasriadi, "Pancasila as a Volkgeist: Self- Integrity and Justice in Law Enforcement," *Udayana Master Law J.*, vol. 9, no. 1, 2020.
- [25] E. Ehrlich, *Fundamental Principles of The Sociology of Law*. London: Routledge Taylor & Francis.
- [26] F. Magnis-Suseno, *No Title*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 1994.