

Unraveling The Tangled Threads in The Handling of Corruption Crime & Its Impact on The Effectiveness of The Criminal Justice System in Indonesia

Alfies Sihombing¹⁾ & Yeni Nuraeni²⁾

¹⁾ Universitas Pakuan Bogor, Indonesia, E-mail: alfies.sihombing@unpak.ac.id

²⁾ Universitas Pakuan Bogor, Indonesia, E-mail: yeni.nuraeni@unpak.ac.id

Abstract. *Handling corruption in Indonesia is a crucial issue that affects the integrity and effectiveness of law enforcement. Based on Law No. 31 of 1999 amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, corruption includes various acts that harm state finances, such as abuse of authority and bribery. Data from Transparency International shows that corruption remains a serious problem with Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index in 2023 scoring 34 out of 100. This research aims to provide academic insights and practical policy recommendations to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement and corruption eradication in Indonesia. The main focus of this research is on institutional reform, improving supervision, and strengthening accountability to strengthen the integrity of the criminal justice system and increase public trust in law enforcement institutions. This research uses a normative juridical methodological approach by utilizing various analytical techniques, including comparative, conceptual, and statutory approaches. This research shows that structural and procedural weaknesses in handling corruption in Indonesia, such as unclear legal definitions and weak institutional coordination, hinder the effectiveness of corruption eradication. Legal reforms, structural improvements, and strengthened oversight are needed to improve the justice system, build public trust, and support equitable social and economic development.*

Keywords: *Corruption; Effectiveness; Judicial; Reformation.*

1. INTRODUCTION

Corruption in Indonesia is a crucial issue that affects the integrity and effectiveness of law enforcement in the country. Corruption, defined as the abuse of public power for personal gain, has become one of the biggest challenges in the effort to realize a clean and authoritative government. Based on Law No. 31 Year 1999 jo. Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Eradication of Corruption, corruption in Indonesia includes not only the act of accepting bribes or gratuities, but also abuse of authority, embezzlement in office, and other acts that harm state finances or the state economy. These laws provide for a range of severe criminal sanctions against perpetrators of corruption, reflecting the state's commitment to eradicating corruption in all its forms (Harefa et al., 2024). Nonetheless, recent data from Transparency International Indonesia shows that corruption remains a

widespread problem, with Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index (CPI) in 2023 standing at 34 out of 100, indicating a high public perception of corruption in the public sector.

The impact of corruption on justice and public trust in the criminal justice system is significant. Corruption impedes the fair and equitable implementation of the law, as corrupt practices often lead to bias in the investigation, prosecution and court decisions. For example, the intervention of interested parties in the legal process, manipulation of evidence and bribery of law enforcement officials can result in criminals escaping the law or receiving lighter sentences. This violates the principles of substantive and procedural justice guaranteed by the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP). In addition, corruption in the criminal justice system also undermines public trust in law enforcement institutions. A survey conducted by the Indonesian Survey Institute in 2023 showed that only around 30% of the public believe that the criminal justice system in Indonesia is free from corruption, reflecting a crisis of confidence in the ability of these institutions to enforce the law fairly and indiscriminately (Sunggara et al., 2024).

The crime of corruption in Indonesia is defined and regulated in detail in Law Number 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption, which was later amended by Law Number 20 of 2001. Under this law, corruption includes a variety of acts that harm the state's finances or economy, such as abusing the authority, opportunity, or means available to him because of his position or position to obtain personal gain or other people or a corporation. Corruption also includes the act of receiving a gift or promise knowing that the gift or promise is given to do or not do something in his/her position that is contrary to his/her obligations. In addition, acts such as bribery, embezzlement in office, extortion, fraudulent acts, and conflicts of interest in procurement also fall under the category of corruption. The law stipulates strict criminal sanctions, including imprisonment, fines, and confiscation of proceeds of corruption, to provide a deterrent effect and ensure effective law enforcement against corruption (Pasmatusi, 2019).

Recent statistics show that corruption remains a major challenge in Indonesia. According to a report by Transparency International Indonesia, Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index (CPI) in 2023 stood at a score of 34 out of 100, placing the country at 102 out of 180 countries surveyed. This score indicates that public and international perceptions of corruption in Indonesia are still high, signaling significant problems in the management of government and public services that are clean and free from corruption. In addition, data from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) in the same year recorded an increase in the number of corruption cases handled, with more than 120 arrest operations (OTT) conducted and dozens of other cases under investigation and prosecution. KPK also reported that these corruption cases involved various layers of society, including high-ranking officials, regional heads, legislative members, and law enforcement officials, indicating that corruption has permeated various sectors and institutions in Indonesia (Marzuki, 2024).

The trends and patterns of corruption in Indonesia reflect a systemic problem that affects both the public and private sectors. In the public sector, corruption often occurs in the form of bribery, extortion and gratuities involving government officials and law enforcement officials. Typical examples include corruption in the procurement of goods and services, the granting of business licenses, and other public services. In the private

sector, corrupt practices often involve bribery to obtain contracts or licenses, tax evasion and manipulation of financial statements. Law enforcement agencies such as the police, prosecutor's office, and judiciary are also not immune to corrupt practices. Corruption cases involving law enforcement officials, such as evidence manipulation, evidence removal, and abuse of authority, create significant obstacles to effective corruption eradication and undermine public trust in the criminal justice system. Given these trends, there is an urgent need to improve oversight, transparency and accountability at all levels of government and the private sector to tackle corruption and strengthen law enforcement in Indonesia (Rosikah & Listianingsih, 2022).

Corruption has a very damaging impact on the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in Indonesia, especially in efforts to enforce a fair and transparent law. Corruption impedes the law enforcement process through various mechanisms, including bribery, graft, and abuse of power by law enforcement officials. These corrupt practices often lead to biased investigations, unobjective prosecutions and unfair court decisions. For example, when an investigator or prosecutor receives a bribe from a suspect or other interested party, they may cover up evidence, falsify facts, or even delay the legal process. This clearly violates the principle of due process of law stipulated in the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHAP) and violates the principles of justice guaranteed by the constitution and other laws, such as Law No. 48/2009 on Judicial Power (Saputra & Firmansyah, 2023).

Concrete examples illustrating the impact of corruption on the outcome of investigations, prosecutions and court decisions can be seen in various major corruption cases in Indonesia. One example is the e-KTP corruption case that involved a number of high-ranking officials, including members of parliament and a former minister of home affairs. In this case, it was revealed that a number of Ministry of Home Affairs officials and members of the House of Representatives accepted bribes to arrange the budget and contracts for the procurement of the e-KTP project, causing state losses of up to trillions of rupiah. The investigation of this case faced many obstacles, including attempts to obstruct the investigation and remove evidence. Prosecutions and trials were also affected by various attempts to avoid convictions, including strong political and power influences. As a result, some defendants received much lighter sentences than the public expected, undermining confidence in the criminal justice system's ability to deliver justice fairly and equitably.

The impact of corruption on the capacity of Indonesia's criminal justice system to apprehend, prosecute and rehabilitate offenders is significant. Corruption undermines the basic functioning of law enforcement agencies by reducing the resources available for investigations and prosecutions, as well as hindering the inter-agency cooperation necessary for effective law enforcement. When police, prosecutors or judges are involved in corrupt practices, they tend to focus more on personal gain rather than performing their duties professionally and objectively. This reduces the capacity of the criminal justice system to effectively apprehend and prosecute criminals, as many cases end up being dropped, convicted with lenient sentences, or never even make it to trial. In addition, corruption also impacts the rehabilitation process, as correctional institutions, which are supposed to be places to rehabilitate offenders, are often involved in corrupt practices, such as accepting bribes to provide special facilities to prisoners. Based on recent data from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) and annual reports from Transparency International Indonesia, corruption in the criminal justice system remains

a major challenge hindering legal reform and effective law enforcement in Indonesia (Dermawan et al., 2015). Therefore, efforts to combat corruption in the criminal justice system need to focus on improving transparency and accountability at all levels, from investigation to rehabilitation. Institutional reforms, improved internal and external oversight, and the provision of intensive ethics and legal training to law enforcement officials are important steps to reduce the impact of corruption and increase public confidence in Indonesia's legal system.

Weaknesses in Indonesia's criminal justice system are one of the main factors exacerbating corrupt practices. These weaknesses mainly lie in structures and procedures that are not fully effective in preventing and handling corruption cases. Structurally, Indonesia's criminal justice system, which consists of the police, prosecutors, courts and prisons, often lacks strong and independent oversight mechanisms. This allows for abuse of power, manipulation of evidence and bribery at every stage of the judicial process. Existing procedures are sometimes non-transparent and vulnerable to the intervention of interested parties. For example, the lack of clear standard procedures for handling corruption cases can result in unnecessary delays and the omission of important evidence, ultimately undermining efforts to enforce the law fairly and equitably (Hatta, 2008).

The lack of coordination between law enforcement agencies also worsens the handling of corruption cases in Indonesia. Police, prosecutors and courts often work separately and do not always coordinate well in handling corruption cases. This can result in overlapping authority, inefficiencies in investigation and prosecution, and loss of important evidence. For example, in some cases, there are reports that police investigations are not properly followed up by the prosecution, or court decisions are not based on properly collected evidence. This lack of coordination is also reflected in data from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) which shows that many corruption cases handled by law enforcement agencies do not reach the court stage due to disagreements between agencies or lack of strong evidence.

The inability of correctional institutions to rehabilitate offenders is also a serious problem that is exacerbated by the corrupt practices that occur within them. Correctional institutions in Indonesia, which are supposed to rehabilitate prisoners and return them to society as better citizens, are often a fertile ground for corrupt practices. Corruption in correctional institutions can take the form of bribery to obtain special facilities, preferential treatment, or even to unlawfully arrange parole. This not only undermines the goal of rehabilitation, but also reinforces the public perception that the criminal justice system in Indonesia is incapable of delivering true justice. Data from the Ministry of Law and Human Rights in 2023 revealed that more than 40% of correctional institutions in Indonesia suffer from overcapacity and lack of effective supervision, which is often a major trigger for corrupt practices within them.

This research has a significant contribution to the development of legal policy in Indonesia in both academic and practical contexts. In an academic context, this research provides new insights into the dynamics of power corruption in the criminal justice system and offers a theoretical framework that can be used to better understand this phenomenon. In a practical context, this research provides concrete policy recommendations to improve the effectiveness of law enforcement in Indonesia, including proposals for institutional reform, improving oversight mechanisms, and

strengthening accountability and transparency systems. These recommendations aim to strengthen the integrity and effectiveness of the criminal justice system in Indonesia, which will ultimately increase public trust in law enforcement institutions and help create a more just and transparent legal environment. The research also provides a basis for policymakers to evaluate and reform existing laws and regulations to better suit contemporary challenges in law enforcement and corruption eradication in Indonesia.

2. RESEARCH METHODS

This research uses a normative juridical methodology approach by utilizing various analytical techniques, including comparative, conceptual, and statutory approaches. The main information in this research is obtained from secondary data (Atikah, 2022). Data analysis was conducted using descriptive and qualitative methods, with the main focus on analytical descriptive specifications. The data collected is explained in detail to provide an in-depth understanding of certain legal phenomena in society, and then analyzed based on relevant legal principles (Muhammad Syahrur & others, 2022).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. The Structural and Procedural Weaknesses in Handling Corruption Crime

Corruption in Indonesia is one of the issues that most undermines the integrity and effectiveness of governance. Legally, corruption in Indonesia is defined in Law No. 31 Year 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, which was later amended by Law No. 20 Year 2001. Corruption includes various actions such as abuse of office, extortion in office, bribery, as well as abuse of authority that harms state finances or the state economy. This definition aims to cover various forms of corrupt behavior, which are not only limited to the receipt of money or goods, but also practices such as nepotism and collusion that can interfere with justice and public services (Pratiwi & Arifin, 2019).

In the Indonesian context, corruption is not only seen as a violation of the law, but also as a broad social and economic problem, affecting all aspects of people's lives. Corruption hinders economic development, increases social injustice, and decreases public trust in government institutions. Data from Transparency International in its Corruption Perception Index shows that Indonesia has consistently struggled to tackle corruption, with scores indicating that much work remains to be done to eradicate corruption. This reinforces the urgency and importance of continuous improvement in laws and regulations to effectively combat corruption. Consistent implementation of anti-corruption regulations, supported by strong oversight systems and institutional transparency, is considered key to building a cleaner and more accountable governance system (Simanjuntak et al., 2023).

Addressing corruption in Indonesia has deep significance in the context of social and economic justice. Corruption not only erodes economic resources, but also undermines the foundations of social justice, hindering the fair distribution of national wealth and placing a disproportionate burden on the most vulnerable groups in society. Based on Law No. 31 of 1999 amended by Law No. 20 of 2001 on the Eradication of Corruption, the Indonesian government recognizes that corruption is an extraordinary crime that requires special and coordinated handling. The economic impact of corruption is manifested through a decline in foreign investment, as corruption creates an uncertain

and risky business climate. According to data from Transparency International, Indonesia has gradually improved its ranking in the Corruption Perception Index, but there are still many challenges to overcome. Investor confidence is eroded when corruption is rampant, ultimately slowing economic growth and infrastructure development.

From a social justice perspective, corruption hinders equitable access to basic services such as education and health. For example, allocated funds for public facilities may be diverted for private interests, leading to social injustice and increasing social inequality. Failure to provide equitable basic services also leads to social discontent and instability, undermining the legitimacy of the government. Combating corruption, therefore, not only strengthens the economy but also builds a stronger foundation for social justice. Measures such as increased transparency, more effective law enforcement, and institutional reforms are crucial in the fight against corruption. Through effective tackling of corruption, Indonesia not only advances its economy but also ensures that such development takes place within an equitable and sustainable framework, benefiting the entire society (Hadi, 2010).

The purpose of analyzing structural and procedural weaknesses in the handling of corruption in Indonesia is to identify and understand the factors that hinder the effectiveness of the criminal justice system in fighting corruption. The analysis seeks to uncover how existing legal structures, operational procedures, and dynamics between law enforcement agencies contribute to the persistence of corruption and hinder transparency and accountability. The scope of this analysis includes a critical evaluation of relevant laws, such as Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption as amended by Law No. 20/2001, as well as other supporting regulations related to the criminal justice system. In addition, the analysis also involved examining the effectiveness of coordination between institutions such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the Police, and the Prosecutor's Office, as well as the oversight mechanisms implemented to ensure the integrity of the legal process (Megawati et al., 2024).

Drawing on data from Transparency International and local reports, Indonesia still faces major challenges in curbing corruption, reflecting the urgent need for legal and institutional reform. By focusing on these critical areas, the analysis aims to support the development of more effective strategies in the fight against corruption, through improving existing structures and procedures, and enhancing inter-agency collaboration in law enforcement. In the context of handling corruption crimes in Indonesia, one of the main challenges is the inadequacy and weaknesses in the applicable legal structure. Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, while providing a framework for the fight against corruption, still has a number of serious weaknesses. For example, the law lacks specificity in defining some forms of corruption, such as conflict of interest, which makes enforcement difficult. In addition, the law does not adequately address the problem of structured or systemic corruption involving networks of public and private officials.

Loopholes in the law are often exploited for abuse of power. For example, broad and multi-interpretive provisions can be used by powerful officials to avoid punishment or to abuse authority for personal or group benefits. This can be seen in many cases where officials use ambiguous policies or regulations to justify actions that actually violate basic anti-corruption principles. In addition, weak integration between law enforcement agencies exacerbates the situation, where a lack of standardization in prosecution allows

for different interpretations of the same law. Data from Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index shows that despite reform efforts, Indonesia is still perceived to have high levels of corruption. This emphasizes the need for in-depth revision of existing laws to make them more comprehensive, specific, and resistant to manipulation, as well as strengthening mechanisms that ensure consistent and fair law enforcement (Maringka, 2022).

In Indonesia, the fragmentation of law enforcement agencies poses a number of challenges in the fight against corruption, particularly in relation to overlapping authorities and conflicts of interest. Agencies such as the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), the police and the prosecutor's office each have powers that sometimes overlap with each other, often leading to coordination and efficiency issues. For example, the KPK has the authority to conduct investigations, investigations and prosecutions of corruption cases involving abuse of power that harm state finances. Meanwhile, the police and the prosecutor's office have similar powers in handling various types of crimes including corruption, which can result in duplication of effort and jurisdictional conflicts. Conflicts of interest and political influence also permeate the operations of these institutions. The involvement of political actors in the legal process can lead to interference in investigations and legal proceedings, resulting in decisions being made based more on political considerations than evidence and fairness. This political influence can reduce the independence of law enforcement agencies, undermine public trust and weaken law enforcement efforts (Haris, 2014).

Data from surveys and reports, such as Transparency International's annual report, show that corruption remains a major problem in Indonesia, often due to weak inter-agency coordination and political interference in the law enforcement process. The effectiveness of the reforms that have been attempted, including amendments to the KPK Law aimed at strengthening the institution, is often questioned. The reforms are considered by some as a step that could reduce the KPK's authority, as well as an example of how political influence can play a role in changing the direction of law enforcement policy in the country. In the process of investigating and prosecuting corruption in Indonesia, there are several significant obstacles that affect the effectiveness and efficiency of the law. First, evidence collection is often hampered by insufficient resources, limited access to financial information, and difficulties in obtaining cooperation from witnesses or other relevant parties. In addition, a banking system that is not fully transparent and the existence of excessive secrecy practices within government or private institutions can prevent investigators from accessing evidence that is crucial to building a case (Umam et al., 2020).

The prosecution of corruption crimes also faces challenges that are no less complex. Corruption cases often involve extensive networks and well-organized crime structures, making the legal process lengthy and time-consuming. The judicial system is sometimes slow in processing cases, from investigation to trial, adding to the complexity, with many stages and procedures that must be followed in accordance with Law No. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, as amended by Law No. 20/2001. Although these regulations are strict, in practice, there are often leaks and weaknesses in implementation that result in delays and delays in the resolution of cases. These two aspects, both in investigation and prosecution, reflect the urgent need for systematic reforms in the handling of corruption cases in Indonesia. Increased transparency, strengthened resources, and inter-agency coordination are some of the important steps

that must be strengthened to overcome these obstacles and improve the integrity and effectiveness of the criminal justice system in fighting corruption (Sunarso et al., 2022).

In Indonesia's criminal justice system, weak oversight mechanisms are often one of the key factors exacerbating the problem of corruption. Internal oversight within law enforcement agencies such as the police, prosecutors and the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK) is often ineffective due to overlapping organizational structures and a lack of transparency in their operations. For example, there is often a failure to identify and follow up on corrupt practices that occur within these agencies, indicating inadequacies in the internal oversight system.

On the other hand, external oversight, which should be conducted by independent institutions or through public mechanisms, has also been hampered. This can be seen from the lack of initiatives to conduct independent audits and comprehensive performance evaluations of law enforcement agencies. Law No. 15/2004 on Audit of State Financial Management and Responsibility should provide a strong basis for independent audits, but in practice, audits are often inconsistent and lack depth, resulting in low detection of corruption cases and weak follow-up. The lack of initiatives for performance evaluation of law enforcement agencies illustrates a situation where assessments of the effectiveness of legal proceedings are not conducted regularly or in depth. This results in limited opportunities for improvement and reform in the law enforcement system. These limitations also point to the need for reforms in the oversight system that not only include increasing the capacity and authority of oversight institutions, but also ensuring that they can operate independently and transparently, protected from political intervention and other interests that could lead to bias and corruption.

The lack of transparency in the judicial process in Indonesia is one of the fundamental weaknesses that hamper the effectiveness of law enforcement, especially in corruption cases. Transparency is an essential component of ensuring accountability and fairness in the legal system, but in practice, the public often faces obstacles in accessing relevant information about court proceedings. This limited access is due to various factors, including inconsistent internal policies of judicial institutions in providing public information and limited use of information technology. In addition, the court decision process is sometimes poorly documented. Important decisions affecting court outcomes may not be recorded in detail, or existing documentation is not uploaded in a publicly accessible system. This makes it difficult for stakeholders to monitor and assess the fairness of the decision-making process. According to Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure, every public body, including judicial institutions, is required to provide information relating to public activities to the public. However, the realization of this regulation is far from adequate, often due to a lack of infrastructure and a lack of awareness on the part of judicial institutions to implement such transparency (Fadilah et al., 2023).

This lack of transparency not only worsens public perceptions of the integrity of the justice system, but also reduces its effectiveness in fighting corruption. Data from various surveys and reports, including from organizations such as Transparency International, show that countries with higher levels of transparency in their justice systems tend to have lower levels of corruption. Thus, strengthening transparency and documentation in the judicial process is a crucial step that must be taken to improve the justice system

and increase public confidence in the judiciary in Indonesia. In Indonesia's criminal justice system, accountability in the handling of corruption cases is often hampered by two main problems: inconsistent case follow-up and disproportionate or ineffective sentencing. Consistency in the follow-up of corruption cases is often compromised by variations in handling by authorized agencies, which are influenced by political pressure, different institutional capacities, or limited resources. For example, in some cases, investigators may quickly bring a case to court, while other similar cases may be stalled with no clear explanation, reflecting a lack of uniformity in the application of the law (Suyatmiko, 2021).

Then, the problem of disproportionate or ineffective punishment is also a serious criticism in the corruption justice system. According to Law No. 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, as amended by Law No. 20 of 2001, penalties for corruption offenders can include imprisonment and fines. However, in practice, the penalties imposed are sometimes disproportionate to the level of financial loss caused by the corrupt act or the wider social impact. This is often due to inadequacies in the evidence or other factors such as deals to avoid harsher penalties. The effectiveness of penalties is often questioned, especially when corrupt offenders are quickly able to return to society or even to positions of power, which indirectly reduces the deterrent effect of such penalties. These weaknesses suggest that while Indonesia has a legal framework to address corruption, the implementation of these regulations still faces significant challenges. Improved oversight and evaluation mechanisms of the legal process against corruption, as well as reforms in the criminal justice system, are needed to increase accountability and ensure that sentences are not only fair and proportionate, but also effective in combating corruption (Danil, 2021).

Corruption has a particularly damaging impact on the criminal justice system in Indonesia, with far-reaching and profound consequences. First, corruption leads to an erosion of public trust in the legal system. When officials entrusted with safeguarding justice engage in corruption, the public loses confidence in the fairness and effectiveness of the legal system. This not only reduces the likelihood of cooperation with law enforcement, but also lowers compliance with the law as a whole. Furthermore, corruption has a significant negative effect on investment and economic development. Investors, both domestic and international, tend to avoid countries with high levels of corruption due to legal risks and great uncertainty. This has the effect of inhibiting economic growth, job creation, and improving people's welfare. Corruption leads to inefficient resource allocation and poor public financial management, eroding the foundations of a healthy economy. Corruption disrupts good governance. When officials manipulate the rules for personal or group gain, the decisions made often favor narrow interests over the public good. This results in ineffective and often harmful public policies, which negatively impact the quality of public services and social justice.

In an effort to address Indonesia's deep-seated corruption problem, legal and regulatory reform is a crucial first step. Legal simplification can effectively eliminate loopholes that are often exploited for corrupt practices. This involves revising and integrating existing regulations to create a more coherent and understandable legal system, thereby reducing opportunities for abuse of power. Strengthening anti-corruption laws is also crucial, which includes increasing sanctions and broadening the scope of acts considered corrupt, thereby increasing the effectiveness of legal action against corrupt actors. Furthermore, strengthening coordination between law enforcement agencies needs to

be improved through better cooperation mechanisms. This can be achieved by establishing clear joint working protocols between agencies such as the KPK, the Police, and the Attorney General's Office, to ensure efficiency and effectiveness in handling corruption cases. The integration of information systems and resources between these agencies will facilitate the exchange of information and accelerate the case handling process, while reducing the possibility of conflicts of interest and overlapping case handling.

On the other hand, improving oversight mechanisms and transparency is another important component of reform. Conducting more regular and systematic independent audits will help identify weaknesses and abuses in the system before they develop into larger corruption cases. Developing transparent and publicly accessible reporting and oversight systems is also crucial. This not only strengthens the accountability of government institutions but also increases public participation in government oversight, which in turn can help prevent corruption (Purba & Umar, 2021). In Indonesia's criminal justice system, various structural and procedural issues have long been an obstacle in the fight against corruption. Fragmented and overlapping legal structures between various law enforcement agencies, such as the KPK, police, and prosecutors, lead to inefficiencies and potential conflicts of interest. Inadequacies in regulation often provide loopholes for abuse of power, where perpetrators of corruption offenses can find ways to avoid punishment. Procedurally, constraints in evidence collection and lengthy legal processes reduce the ability to process corruption cases effectively and in a timely manner.

The urgency to improve Indonesia's legal and justice system is critical to ensure the effectiveness of the law and social justice. Structural improvements through reforms to laws and regulations will help eliminate loopholes and strengthen penalties for corruption. Faster and more efficient judicial processes, supported by strong and transparent oversight, will increase public confidence in the legal system. Data from Transparency International's Corruption Perception Index shows that Indonesia still has a relatively low score, indicating that corruption is still considered a major problem. This emphasizes the need for significant and immediate change. Therefore, it is important for all stakeholders, including the government, non-governmental organizations, the private sector, and the general public, to increase their joint commitment to the fight against corruption. This call for joint commitment is not just about increasing resources or revising laws, but also building a strong culture of integrity and transparency at all levels. Close cooperation between various institutions and active participation from the public will be key in creating sustainable and profound change for a fairer and more effective justice system in Indonesia.

3.2. The Corruption Eradication Strategy and Criminal Justice System Reform

Corruption is a very complex problem that has taken root in various aspects of Indonesian society. It is not just about the act of bribery, but encompasses a vast network, involving various parties ranging from high-ranking officials to the general public. Many factors influence the occurrence of corruption, including a complicated bureaucratic system, weak oversight, and a long-standing culture of corruption (Oktaviani et al., 2022).

Corruption in Indonesia has become part of the existing culture and system. Changing this established mindset and system takes time and consistent effort. Since the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK), various steps have been taken to eradicate corrupt practices. KPK, as the frontline in eradicating corruption, has carried out various efforts, both through prosecution and prevention (Jawa et al., 2024). In addition to arrest operations and prevention programs, KPK is also active in anti-corruption education, research, and cooperation with other institutions.

Operasi Tangkap Tangan (OTT) generally refers to the act of direct arrest of perpetrators of corruption crimes while committing illegal acts (Oktavianto & Abheseka, 2019). Although there is no law that explicitly regulates OTT, several relevant laws and regulations provide the legal basis for its implementation. Among these are the Criminal Procedure Code (KUHP), which regulates the definition of "caught red-handed", and Law No. 30/2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK Law), which grants special authority to the KPK to carry out corruption eradication actions, including OTT. In addition, various other implementing regulations, such as Government Regulations and National Police Chief Regulations, regulate in more detail the procedures for implementing OTT. It is important to remember that OTT is not the end goal in eradicating corruption, but rather a tool to achieve a greater goal, namely the systematic eradication of corruption.

On the other hand, corruption prevention programs also play an important role in combating corruption by preventing corruption through various efforts such as system improvement, increased transparency, and public education (Aiman, 2024). This program has a strong legal basis in legislation, including Law No. 28/1999 on Clean and Corruption-Free State Administration, and the KPK Law, which also regulates corruption prevention efforts. Periodic evaluation of the effectiveness of corruption eradication strategies, both repressive and preventive, is essential. This evaluation aims to provide a clearer picture of the successes achieved, obstacles faced, and corrective measures needed to improve the effectiveness of corruption eradication.

Operation Tangkap Tangan (OTT) has several advantages that make it effective in eradicating corruption. One of the advantages is its ability to provide a quick and tangible deterrent effect for perpetrators of corruption. When a public official is caught red-handed accepting bribes or committing other acts of corruption, it serves as a warning to other officials not to follow in the same footsteps (Krisdayanti & Putri, 2023). In addition, OTTs often uncover wider corruption networks. When a perpetrator is caught, further investigation may reveal the involvement of other parties in the act of corruption, allowing for a more thorough uncovering of corruption.

However, OTT also has weaknesses that need to be considered. One of the main risks is the possibility of abuse of power in its implementation. OTT can be used for political purposes or to bring down political opponents, which can undermine public trust in the integrity of corruption eradication efforts. In addition, OTT is reactive, only responding to corruption cases that have already occurred without directly addressing the structural root causes of corruption, such as weak bureaucratic systems, entrenched cultures of corruption, or inadequate oversight mechanisms (Sukananda & Destiana, 2019). Meanwhile, corruption prevention programs offer a more holistic approach with a focus on addressing the root of the problem. These programs focus on improving systems, increasing transparency, and educating the public. With this approach, corruption

prevention programs seek to prevent future corruption by addressing the underlying causes. The program is also designed for the long term, as system and culture change cannot happen in a short period of time (Wijayanti & Kasim, 2021). However, if done consistently, the results will be more sustainable and have a wider positive impact.

The weakness of corruption prevention programs is that the process takes a long time to see results. Changes in the system and culture of corruption cannot be achieved instantly, and the results of these efforts may not be immediately visible. In addition, the success of this program relies heavily on support from various parties, including the government, non-governmental organizations, and the general public. Without strong support from all relevant parties, this program will be difficult to succeed. Both OTT and corruption prevention programs play an important role in corruption eradication efforts. OTT provides a quick deterrent effect and helps uncover existing corruption networks, while corruption prevention programs focus on improving systems and culture to prevent future corruption (Fadhil, 2019). To achieve optimal results, these two approaches need to be implemented synergistically, with OTT being used to deal with corruption cases that have already occurred and corruption prevention programs to prevent the emergence of new cases. Evaluation of corruption eradication efforts shows that despite a decline in the Corruption Perception Index (CPI), Indonesia's position is still relatively low compared to other countries in the region. Public trust in law enforcement agencies, including the KPK, is still fluctuating, while the number of corruption cases revealed continues to increase without a significant decrease in the number of corruption cases themselves.

Institutional strengthening of the KPK is one of the crucial steps in the effort to eradicate corruption in Indonesia. One important aspect of this strengthening is the independence of the KPK. KPK must be free from political influence in order to work effectively and not be affected by the interests of certain parties. This independence ensures that the KPK can perform its duties objectively and without pressure from any party, so that it can act decisively in combating corruption (Riyadi et al., 2024). In addition, the KPK needs adequate resources to carry out its duties optimally. These resources include sufficient budget, competent experts, and sophisticated equipment. With adequate resources, the KPK can investigate, prosecute, and prevent corruption more effectively and efficiently.

Improving the legal system is also an important element in the fight against corruption. Revisions to laws relating to corruption crimes need to be carried out so that they remain relevant to the times. More effective and adaptive laws will support better corruption eradication efforts. In addition, more severe sanctions for perpetrators of corruption are also needed. More severe and certain punishments will provide a deterrent effect, thus preventing potential perpetrators from committing acts of corruption.

Stricter oversight is also key in preventing corruption. The role of civil society is very important in overseeing the running of the government. Civil society organizations can monitor the use of the state budget and report suspected corruption. In addition, the mass media also plays a role as a social watchdog that can expose cases of corruption and provide information to the public, thus promoting transparency. Regular and transparent financial audits also help prevent corruption by ensuring that the use of the budget is in accordance with applicable regulations (Nasir, 2024). These recommendations are important because they aim to prevent corruption through strengthening law enforcement agencies, improving the legal system, and increasing

supervision. With the implementation of these recommendations, it is expected that public trust in the government will increase, as the public will see the government's seriousness in eradicating corruption. Increasing public trust is an important step in supporting corruption eradication efforts, as without public support, these efforts will be difficult to succeed. Ultimately, this reform aims to build a better Indonesia that is free from corruption, more just, prosperous and democratic.

Early anti-corruption education is very important to instill awareness in the general public about the dangers of corruption and the importance of integrity. Through this education, people can better understand the negative impact of corruption and the importance of maintaining honesty in every aspect of life (Wijaya, 2020). In addition, education also plays a role in encouraging the public to actively participate in corruption prevention efforts, for example by reporting acts of corruption that they encounter. With active participation from the public, monitoring of corruption can be more effective. For law enforcement officials, continuous training is key to improving professionalism in handling corruption cases. Professional officers can conduct better investigations and law enforcement, thus providing a stronger deterrent effect on corruption perpetrators (Pahlevi, 2022). In addition, ethics and integrity training is essential to prevent corrupt practices among law enforcement officers themselves. With high integrity, law enforcement officers can set an example for the community and strengthen public trust in the legal system.

Education and training has an important role in transforming the entrenched culture of corruption into a culture of integrity. By understanding the dangers of corruption, people will be more vigilant and not easily trapped in corrupt practices. In addition, law enforcement officials who are professional and have integrity will strengthen the law enforcement system, making corruption more difficult to commit. This strengthening will create a more transparent and accountable environment, where acts of corruption can be prevented early on (Arfa, 2023). Combating corruption is a long-term struggle that requires a multi-dimensional approach. In addition to strong law enforcement, education and training also play a very important role in this endeavor. By providing proper education and effective training, we can create a generation that is more aware and concerned about corruption issues (Ramadhani & others, 2024). However, there are many challenges in implementing anti-corruption education and training programs. One of the challenges is the low level of public awareness about the dangers of corruption. Many people do not fully understand the negative impact of corruption, so they are less motivated to participate in efforts to eradicate corruption (Hambali, 2020). In addition, access to anti-corruption education is uneven across all levels of society, leading to gaps in understanding and participation. Lack of commitment from various parties is also an obstacle in the implementation of this education program.

To overcome these challenges, one solution is to integrate anti-corruption materials into the formal education curriculum. This way, anti-corruption education can reach more students from an early age. In addition, massive socialization campaigns through various media are also important to increase public awareness. Cooperation between the government, non-governmental organizations and the private sector in organizing anti-corruption education programs is also needed to strengthen the implementation of this program (Wirabhakti, 2020). Achieving a corruption-free Indonesia requires strong synergy from various parties. The government, law enforcement agencies, civil society and the private sector must work together effectively. By strengthening education and

training, we can build a generation that is more aware and concerned about corruption issues (Zuber, 2018). Through strong synergy, we can realize a corruption-free Indonesia, where integrity and transparency become the main foundation in every aspect of life.

4. CONCLUSION

Structural and procedural weaknesses in tackling corruption in Indonesia have made corruption a serious problem that undermines the integrity and effectiveness of governance. Although there are laws governing the fight against corruption, their implementation is still constrained by non-specific legal definitions, fragmentation of law enforcement agencies, as well as ineffectiveness in evidence collection and prosecution processes. In addition, weak coordination between law enforcement agencies and political influence also worsen the situation. Therefore, legal reforms, structural improvements, and strengthened oversight are needed to enhance the effectiveness of the justice system in fighting corruption, building public trust, and supporting more equitable and sustainable social and economic development.

5. REFERENCES

- Aiman, R. (2024). Hukum dan Korupsi: Tantangan dan Solusi dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Peradaban Journal of Law and Society*, 3(1), 16–30.
- Arfa, A. M. (2023). Memerangi Korupsi Melalui Pendidikan Anti-Korupsi: Membentuk Integritas, Kesadaran, Dan Kemampuan Kritis Dalam Masyarakat. *Jendela Pengetahuan*, 16(2), 128–142.
- Atikah, I. (2022). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Haura Utama.
- Danil, E. (2021). *Korupsi: Konsep, Tindak Pidana dan Pemberantasannya*. PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Dermawan, M. K., OLI, M. I., & others. (2015). *Sosiologi Peradilan Pidana*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Fadhil, M. (2019). Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi, Politik Hukum Antikorupsi Dan Delegitimasi Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Al Ahkam*, 15(2), 7–36.
- Fadilah, O. N., Hamzani, A. I., & Widyastuti, T. V. (2023). *Pengadilan Tindak Pidana Korupsi: Perbandingan Indonesia dan Rusia*. Penerbit NEM.
- Hadi, K. (2010). Korupsi Birokrasi Pelayanan Publik di Era Otonomi Daerah. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik LIPI*, 3(1), 51–70.
- Hambali, G. (2020). Evaluasi program pendidikan antikorupsi dalam pembelajaran. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 6(1), 31–44.
- Harefa, J. E., Pandia, E. V. A. P., Situmorang, A. S., & Rumapea, M. S. (2024). Analisis Perbandingan Penegakan Hukum Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia Dengan Singapura: Pendekatan Normatif Terhadap Kriteria Keberhasilan Penindakan Korupsi. *Ilmu Hukum Prima (IHP)*, 3(1), 97–109.
- Haris, S. (2014). *Masalah-masalah demokrasi dan kebangsaan era reformasi*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Hatta, M. (2008). *Sistem peradilan pidana terpadu*. Galangpress Group.
- Jawa, D., Malau, P., & Ciptono, C. (2024). Tantangan Dalam Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Usm Law Review*, 3(2), 1006–1017.
- Krisdayanti, A., & Putri, E. P. (2023). Implementation of Law Enforcement of Hand-Catching Operations (OTT) in Law Number 19 of 2019. *Clause (Journal of Constitutional Law, Administrative, Criminal and Civil Law)*, 2(1), 61–78.

- Maringka, J. S. (2022). *Reformasi kejaksaaan dalam sistem hukum nasional*. Sinar Grafika.
- Marzuki, I. (2024). Korupsi sebagai Kejahatan Serius: Evaluasi Peran Lembaga Anti-Korupsi. *Policy and Law Journal*, 1(1), 16–26.
- Megawati, M., Rahman, S., & Razak, A. (2024). Implementasi Fungsi Kepolisian Selaku Penyidik Tindak Pidana Korupsi. *Journal of Lex Philosophy (JLP)*, 5(2), 570–588.
- Muhammad Syahrur, S. & others. (2022). *Pengantar Metodologi Penelitian Hukum: Kajian Penelitian Normatif, Empiris, Penulisan Proposal, Laporan Skripsi dan Tesis*. CV. Dotplus Publisher.
- Nasir, C. (2024). Follow Up Report of Examination Result Of Supreme Audit Agency For State Financial Management: Tindak Lanjut Laporan Hasil Pemeriksaan Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan. *Al-Mahkamah: Jurnal Hukum, Politik Dan Pemerintahan*, 1(2), 1–25.
- Oktaviani, A. T., Prameswari, M., Maharani, N., Saputri, A. M. K. D., Putri, I. L., Sagita, A., Aryanty, Y. M., Ismiyati, E., Meliana, S. D., Rumah, P. P., & others. (2022). *Korupsi yang Membudaya di Indonesia: Buku Pendidikan Antikorupsi*. Penerbit Pustaka Rumah C1nta.
- Oktavianto, R., & Abheseka, N. M. R. (2019). Evaluasi Operasi Tangkap Tangan KPK. *INTEGRITAS: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 5(2), 117–131.
- Pahlevi, F. S. (2022). Strategi Ideal Pemberantasan Korupsi di Indonesia. *Al-Syakhsyiyah: Journal of Law & Family Studies*, 4(1), 44–44.
- Pasmatuti, D. (2019). Perkembangan Pengertian Tindak Pidana Korupsi Dalam Hukum Positif Di Indonesia. *Ensiklopedia Social Review*, 1(1).
- Pratiwi, A., & Arifin, R. (2019). Penegakan Hukum Korupsi Politik Di Indonesia Permasalahan Dan Isu-Isu Kontemporer. *Jurnal Hukum Mimbar Justitia*, 5(2), 144–163.
- Purba, R. B., & Umar, H. (2021). *Kualitas Audit & Deteksi Korupsi*. Merdeka Kreasi Group.
- Ramadhani, R. & others. (2024). Formation Of Anti-Corruption Character In The Younger Generation Based On Pancasila Ideology. *JURNAL SETIA PANCASILA*, 4(2), 40–48.
- Riyadi, I., Ahmad, S., Hakim, D., & Nababan, K. F. (2024). Penanaman Budaya Anti Korupsi Dalam Rangka Penanggulangan Korupsi Di Indonesia. *Mandub: Jurnal Politik, Sosial, Hukum Dan Humaniora*, 2(2), 153–166.
- Rosikah, C. D., & Listianingsih, D. M. (2022). *Pendidikan antikorupsi: Kajian antikorupsi teori dan praktik*. Sinar Grafika.
- Saputra, E. F., & Firmansyah, H. (2023). Politik Hukum dalam Upaya Pemberantasan Tindak Pidana Korupsi melalui Pembaharuan Pengaturan Tindak Pidana Korupsi sebagai Extraordinary Crime dalam KUHP Nasional. *UNES Law Review*, 6(2), 4493–4504.
- Simanjuntak, T., Panjaitan, D. P., & Efridadewi, A. (2023). Pengaruh Kebijakan Anti Korupsi Terhadap Petumbuhan Ekonomi di Negara Indonesia. *Causa: Jurnal Hukum Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 1(5), 51–60.
- Sukananda, S., & Destiana, C. D. (2019). Evaluasi Penegakan Hukum Tindak Pidana Korupsi Oleh Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) dalam Perspektif Sosiologi Hukum. *Evaluasi Peran Penegakan Hukum Oleh Lembaga Negara Penunjang (State Auxiliary Bodies)*, 7, 63–86.
- Sunarso, H. S., Sh, M., & Kn, M. (2022). *Viktimologi dalam sistem peradilan pidana*. Sinar Grafika.
- Sunggara, M. A., Meliana, Y., Hidayat, W. A., Nain, S., Fatma, M., & others. (2024). Dinamika Hukum Dan Korupsi Politik (Dampak Dan Tantangan Penegakan Hukum Di Indonesia). *Unizar Law Review*, 7(1), 35–48.

- Suyatmiko, W. H. (2021). Memaknai turunnya skor indeks persepsi korupsi Indonesia tahun 2020. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 7(1), 161–178.
- Umam, A. K., Mayasari, I., Wijanarko, A. A., Radhiansyah, E., Annas, F. B., Siraj, F. M., Idris, H. R., Chrisharyanto, H., Hendrowati, R., & Idris, I. K. (2020). *Tantangan Integritas Bisnis Tambang di Indonesia*. Universitas Paramadina.
- Wijaya, M. M. (2020). Sosialisasi Penanaman Mindset Pendidikan Anti Korupsi Pada Anak Usia Dini Berdasarkan Peraturan Walikota Bogor No. 28 Tahun 2019 Tentang Penyelenggaraan Pendidikan Anti Korupsi. *Pakuan Law Review*, 6(2), 123–146.
- Wijayanti, A., & Kasim, A. (2021). Collaborative governance strategi nasional pencegahan korupsi (Stranas-PK) di Indonesia: Sebuah studi literatur. *Integritas: Jurnal Antikorupsi*, 7(2), 291–310.
- Wirabhakti, A. (2020). Integrasi nilai anti korupsi dalam kurikulum sekolah dengan pendekatan komisi pemberantasan korupsi. *Jurnal At-Tadbir: Media Hukum Dan Pendidikan*, 30(2), 173–183.
- Zuber, A. (2018). Strategi anti korupsi melalui pendekatan pendidikan formal dan KPK (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi). *Journal of Development and Social Change*, 1(2), 178–190.