The Legislative Function of the House of Representatives to Prevent and Eradicate of Corruption

Jaidun

jaidundoktor@gmail.com

Universitas Widya Gama Mahakam Samarinda, Indonesia

Article Info

Received: 2023-06-25
Revised: 2023-11-30
Accepted:2023-12-30

Keywords:
Legislative function; house of representatives; preventing; eradicating; corruption crime

Abstract

The House of Representatives through its legislative function can renew or replace the existing Law on the eradication of corruption with a new Law on the prevention and eradication of corruption that is effective and radical in preventing and eradicating corruption. The establishment of laws to prevent and eradicate corruption is a mandate of the people that must be realized by the House of Representatives through the legislative function, in order to realize the welfare and intellectual life of the nation, while law enforcement officials are unable to prevent and eradicate corruption, due to the principle of legality and the mentality of law enforcement officials. Legally, preventing and eradicating corruption must have a legal basis that is made and stipulated by the House of Representatives together with the President. The establishment of the Law on the prevention and eradication of corruption must be able to ensnare the perpetrators (corruption) and cause a long-term deterrent effect and potential perpetrators (corruptors) who want to commit corruption crimes think long to commit corruption crimes (deterrent effect). If this legislative function is not used to form effective and radical corruption prevention and eradication laws, it will lead to public distrust of the House of Representatives. This can lead to an increase in the crime of corruption in the management of state finances.

1. Introduction

The Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI Tahun 1945)

regulates the existence of the House of Representatives (DPR) as a state institution in implementing the sovereignty of the people, including through 3 (three) main functions, namely the legislative function, budget function, and supervisory function.

The legislative function can be used by the House of Representatives (DPR) to prepare legal instruments or laws as a tool to enforce the law, to realize legal certainty, justice, and benefit, including preventing and eradicating criminal acts of corruption, even through the legislative function of the House of Representatives (DPR) can discipline state administrators, including the President as head of state and head of government to prevent early corruption crimes that harm state finances.

The provisions of Article 70 paragraph (1) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia number: 17 of 2014 concerning the Consultative Assembly of the People, the House of Representatives, the House of Regional Representatives, and the Regional House of Representatives, emphasize that the legislative function is carried out as a manifestation of the DPR as the holder of the power to form laws.

Legislation is an activity of political institutions, so it must also be studied and dissected about the actors holding these roles. The study of politics in the legislative process helps understand the extent to which rationality is used as a foothold in making decisions among various political choices (Marzuki 2007). The political decision of politicians to form a law is one of the political choices to form a country with an anti-corruption character. The commitment to prevent and eradicate corruption ideally starts from the political behavior of members of the House of Representatives (DPR) personally and institutionally. Eradication of corruption can be done in 2 (two) ways, namely (1) preventing corruption and (2) eradicating corruption.

Prevention and eradication of corruption in the rule of law must be based on the principle of legality, the institution that creates or forms legal instruments is the House of Representatives (DPR) as the legislator with the approval of the President (Government). This is by the formulation of Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which emphasizes that the House of Representatives holds the power to form laws. This means that these 2 (two) state institutions have absolute power in determining and/or issuing legal provisions (Laws) as a tool to realize the state's goals, namely advancing the general welfare and intellectual life of the nation.

The establishment of an effective law to prevent and eradicate corruption is a mandate of the people, how can this country realize the welfare and intellectual life

of the nation, while law enforcement officials find it difficult to prevent and eradicate corruption, due to legality issues and the mentality of law enforcement officials. Legally, preventing and eradicating corruption must be based on adequate legal instruments and be able to ensnare the perpetrators (of corruption) so that it has a long-term deterrent effect, where future corruption criminals (corruptors) can get a deterrent effect.

The law-forming organ is not simply seen as a law factory (law factory), but rather a field where various interests and forces in society are competing, so the law-forming organ reflects the configuration of forces and interests in society. (Rahardjo 2002). The House of Representatives (DPR) is a representative institution that carries out the rights and interests of the people so legal products must describe the configuration and interests of the people. The configuration of people's interests includes how to effectively prevent and eradicate corruption crimes, because in essence, corruption crimes harm the rights and interests of the people, as a result, the government has difficulty in realizing the welfare of the people.

The literal meaning of corruption is rottenness, ugliness, crime, dishonesty, can be bribed, deviation from purity, words that are insulting or slanderous, and bribery, in the Indonesian language the word corruption is a bad act, such as embezzlement of revenue, bribe money and so on. Then the meaning of the word corruption has been accepted in the Indonesian language treasury in the big Indonesian dictionary, namely cheating in performing obligations as an official. (Ahmad 1996). The perpetrator (corruptor) who commits the crime of corruption, because of his crime, has unconsciously positioned himself as a human being who is despicable, rotten, dishonest, dirty, cheating, cheating, and eating illegal money. Therefore, enforcement in the context of eradicating corruption must be strict and indiscriminate.

Article 2 paragraph (1) of Law number 31 of 1999 concerning criminal acts of corruption states that every person who unlawfully commits an act of enriching himself or another person or a corporation that can harm state finances or the state economy.

Article 3 of Law No. 31/1999 on the crime of corruption, states that every person who to benefit himself or herself or another person or a corporation, abuses the authority, opportunity, or means available to him or her because of his or her position or position, which may harm the state finances or the state economy.

The crime of corruption is an act that destroys the order of life of the nation and state, including destroying the future of the people, because corruption

essentially deprives the people of their rights, deceives the people, and neglects the people, resulting in poverty and even bankruptcy.

Allah Subhanahu wa ta'ala said:

> "..And do not eat of the wealth among yourselves using unlawful means, and do not bribe the judges with it, so that you may eat of the wealth of others by way of sin, knowing that you have no right to do so..." (Q.S. Al-Baqarah: 188)

It does not mean that they do not know that corruption is strictly prohibited by Islamic religious norms and applicable legal norms, but that these criminals take advantage of the opportunity to commit acts of corruption in the opportunity to manage state finances. The crime of corruption is not a trivial matter, but a big matter that threatens the life of the nation and state, even the state can go bankrupt because of corruption. Therefore, the House of Representatives (DPR) is institutionally responsible for the existence of criminal acts of corruption that continue to occur today in this country, because the House of Representatives (DPR) together with the President based on power can stop all forms of crime and/or criminal acts of corruption through the Legislation they make. Legal instruments made by the President and the House of Representatives (DPR) ideally can enforce by preparing law enforcement officials who are professional, independent, and free from the influence of power and politics.

The current law on the eradication of corruption is not radical enough to prevent and eradicate corruption crimes that have continued to occur since the reformation was rolled out until now corruption crimes have not stopped, but continue to occur and harm state finances, so it is necessary to reform the law on the eradication of corruption.

The House of Representatives (DPR) through its legislative function (the function of forming laws) can amend improve and/or replace the Law on the eradication of corruption that is more effective and radical in preventing and eradicating corruption. If this legislative function is not used by the House of Representatives (DPR) to form an effective and radical law on corruption eradication, it will lead to public distrust of the House of Representatives (DPR) and will lead to an increase in corruption crimes in the management of state finances.

2. Research Method

The research used is normative juridical research. Normative juridical research is research conducted by examining library materials or secondary data. The nature of this research is descriptive-analytical, namely describing in a complete, detailed,

clear, and systematic manner the results of research in the form of a research report as a scientific work linked to legal theories and practices related to the implementation of the legacy function of the House of Representatives (DPRD) in preventing and eradicating corruption crimes.

3. Results and Discussion

The existence of the legislative function of the House of Representatives (DPR) is to prevent and eradicate corruption.

The crime of corruption in Indonesia is getting worse and spreading in various lines of government, causing public concern about the destruction of the state order, if it is not immediately addressed professionally and radically in an effort to save the country from destruction due to corruption. The crime of corruption can certainly damage the mentality of the nation's children, causing great losses for the survival of the people, making it difficult to realize the state's goals as mandated in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (UUD NRI Tahun 1945), namely to protect the entire nation of Indonesia and to advance the general welfare and intellectual life of the nation.

Referring to the mandate of the preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, it can be emphasized that state administrators are charged with the responsibility of realizing the welfare and educating the nation's life, where the government and the House of Representatives (DPR) must ensure through instruments of power the welfare of the community and ensure that people can complete proper education. One of the effective ways to realize the welfare of the people is to prevent and eradicate corruption crimes, including corruption in the world of education and corruption crimes in the management of state finances, because it is the people who bear the burden of suffering.

Corruption is a violation of people's rights, both economic and social. Corruption is no longer classified as ordinary crime but has become an extra-ordinary crimes. Likewise, corruption in Indonesia has been classified as an extraordinary crime (Listianingsih 2016). The people are always the victims of corruption crimes, their rights are deprived by criminals with ties in managing state finances by abusing power (abuse of power), using all kinds of methods to take money belonging to the people entrusted to them to be managed which should be managed professionally and accountably.

The crime of corruption is always related to the position and abuse of power by an authorized official according to a statutory regulation

regarding what is meant by abuse of authority there is no further explanation in the law. Authority is only owned by personal legal subjects and not by bodies or corporations. Authority is closely related to the position or position held by a person, which means that in disguise

The legal subject of this person does not apply to everyone but only applies to people who have certain positions or positions or people who have certain personal qualities (Adami Chazawi 2017).

Stakeholders of power are very close to the crime of corruption through policy because in power there is great authority to regulate and control state finances, it can be said that there are no corruption crimes in a government institution, apart from those who are in the circle of power and/or other parties who have a relationship in the context of managing state finances.

According to the Black Law Dictionary: "Corruption is an act committed to obtain some benefit that is contrary to official duties and other truths. An act of an official or trusted person which unlawfully and wrongfully uses some advantage for himself or others contrary to official duties and other truths" (Cahaya 2011). There is no crime of corruption but intends to gain personal, family, group, or crony benefits and such actions are contrary to the truth, even though they are aware that power and position are a mandate that must be accounted for religiously, morally, and legally.

Preventing and combating corruption

Preventing corruption and eradicating corruption is the responsibility of state administrators because state administrators have the power and authority to regulate the order of state administration, state apparatus, and law enforcement apparatus. Preventing corruption and eradicating corruption can ensure a good and clean government. Prevention and eradication of corruption use legal instruments. Meanwhile, it is the House of Representatives (DPR) that makes and stipulates the anti-corruption legal instruments with the approval of the President.

The failure or success of a country, in the context of realizing good and clean governance, depends on the President as the head of government and the House of Representatives (DPR) as the legislator, because the source of the destruction of a country, the emergence of poverty and rampant unemployment, is due to the wrong governance of the state and state finances. This boils down to the weak legal instruments governing the prevention and eradication of corruption, in addition to the damaged and rotten mentality and morality of the enforcement apparatus.

About efforts to eradicate corruption, Ermansjah Djaja said that efforts to eradicate corruption that have not run as expected are related to prevention efforts which also do not meet public expectations. Indonesian positive law has regulated efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption, namely in the Criminal Code (KUHP), which was later enacted in an urgent situation Law No. 24 of 1960 concerning Investigation, Prosecution and Examination of Corruption Crimes which was later replaced by Law No. 3 of 1971. Then, there was a development regarding the crime of corruption involving organizers and entrepreneurs, the Law was deemed no longer appropriate so Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption replaced the previous Law. Then, the law was amended again, and passed Law No. 20 of 2001 concerning amendments to Law No. 31 of 1999 concerning the Eradication of Corruption (Djaja 2008).

Referring to the theory above, it can be emphasized that the regulation of the anti-corruption law already exists in the Dutch Criminal Code (KUHP), then it was renewed 4 (four) times until the anti-corruption law is still in effect, namely Law number 20 of 2001 concerning the eradication of criminal acts of corruption. Legal reform, in this case, the anti-corruption law, has not brought significant changes to the eradication of corruption in Indonesia. This requires political action to be taken by the House of Representatives (DPR) to prepare the formation of an anti-corruption law that is radical and has a deterrent effect on perpetrators and potential perpetrators who intend to commit corruption crimes.

The God of Representatives (DPR) in its position as a lawmaker can carry out the legislative function to form a new anti-corruption law, to answer the challenges of the nation's future and the demands of the public as the owner of people's sovereignty, where corruption crimes in Indonesia continue to occur, without the state being able to prevent and eradicate them. The important issue in terms of the occurrence of corruption is from the aspect of prevention, not relying on prosecution alone because prosecution and prevention are 2 (two) different things, although both are included in the scope of the anti-corruption law. Prevention is preventing (preventive) before the crime of corruption occurs, meaning that state money has not yet been taken by corrupt thieves, but the state has managed to save the state's money, while prosecution as common knowledge is to arrest and take action against perpetrators who have committed acts of corruption because they violate the law to take responsibility for their actions, but at least state money has been used/utilized or even had time to do money laundering (money laundry), so that the state is still

disadvantaged, and the people become victims.

The policy of eradicating corruption is a positive legal policy, which in essence is not merely the implementation of a law that can be carried out in a normative juridical and systematic, dogmatic manner. In addition to the normative juridical approach, criminal law policy also requires a factual juridical approach which can be in the form of a sociological, historical approach, and even requires a comprehensive approach from various other disciplines and an integral approach to social policy and national development in general (Arief 2005). If the Indonesian state does not immediately reform the current anti-corruption law, then it is likely that corruption crimes will continue until the country is destroyed and bankrupt. Therefore, it takes the political will of the power holders, in this case, the House of Representatives (DPR) and the President to immediately save this country from destruction and catastrophe.

The existence of the legislative function of the House of Representatives (DPR) is to prevent and eradicate corruption.

The state constitution mandates the House of Representatives through the legislative function to form laws, especially anti-corruption laws, where corruption crimes continue to occur and are difficult to stop, so it is necessary to reform the law on eradicating corruption.

The provisions of Article 20 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, states that the House of Representatives has the power to form laws, paragraph (2) Every draft law is discussed by the House of Representatives and the President for joint approval.

The House of Representatives (DPR) has great power according to the constitution, in terms of forming laws, including the Law on the prevention and eradication of corruption. The current corruption eradication law must be reformed, and the House of Representatives (DPR) has the power to amend any law, including the current Corruption Act.

The main problem in making efforts to reform anti-corruption laws depends on the political will of the House of Representatives (DPR) and strong support from the President. If these two state institutions (the President and the DPR) have the same perception in raising the country, saving and protecting the entire nation from the threat of corruption crimes, then the legal reform of the Anti-Corruption Law will be realized.

According to Sri Soemantri, from the provisions of Article 5 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution which states that the President holds the power to form laws, it can be interpreted that the initiative to draft laws comes from the

President (Soemantri 1974). In connection with the formation of the Act, M. Solly Lubis emphasized that in addition to showing the initiative to draft laws, the substance of Article 5 paragraph (1) also describes the position of the President and the DPR in the formation of laws. The position of the DPR is not above the President or below the President, but equal to work together in the formation of laws (Lubis 1989).

The House of Representatives (DPR) and the President in the Indonesian constitution have an equal position and are partners in managing and controlling the state, including in terms of forming laws, both state institutions have the same right of initiative in proposing Draft Laws that will be included in the list of national legislation programs (prolegs) as the initial stage of forming laws until they get joint approval to be stipulated as laws.

Legislation is a decision of a state institution or government institution that is formed based on attribution and delegation. The attribution of authority in the formation of legislation, which is given by the Constitution and/or law to a state institution, in this case, the president, will be attached continuously. With this authority, the president can initiate independently to propose the formation of laws and regulations at any time necessary, following the limits of authority granted by the Constitution and/or laws. This is as explained, concerning the provisions of Article 5 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution (Yuliandri 2010). Based on the authority of attribution and delegation, the President and the House of Representatives (DPR) can each initiate the formation of laws, including the formation of anti-corruption laws.

Based on the description above, it can be emphasized that the existence of the legislative function of the House of Representatives (DPR) can initiate or use the right of initiative to form or reform the Law on combating corruption.

The concept of preventing and combating corruption in Indonesia

The crime of corruption in Indonesia has entered the category of concern, the people will bear a heavy burden to pay thousands of trillions of state debts, where the management of state finances sourced from state debt has the potential to be misused/corrupted.

According to data from the Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Indonesia, the position of Indonesian government debt until the end of December 2022 reached Rp. 7,733.99 trillion with a debt-to-GDP ratio of 39.57% (CNBC, Indonesia January 18, 2023). State debts or corruption crimes both create suffering and poverty for the people, the people are charged with paying state debts, in addition to the physical and mental suffering caused by corruption crimes. The crime of corruption is difficult to eradicate completely and

effectively unless it is done radically by preparing a radical anti-corruption law, a radical law enforcement apparatus, and state financial auditors and auditors of the personal wealth of state apparatus, state civil apparatus, and law enforcement apparatus who are also radical.

According to Kartono, corruption is the behavior of individuals who use authority and position to gain personal gain, harming the public interest and the state. So corruption is for personal gain, mismanagement of power, for personal gain, mismanagement of the sources of state assets by using authority and formal powers (e.g. because of law and force of arms) to enrich oneself (Kartono 2003). Corruption crimes against state finances are always committed by unscrupulous and despicable powerholders, taking advantage of opportunities or potential weaknesses in legal arrangements, in the context of legal instruments governing corruption crimes against state finances, this is one of the easy ways to become a land of corruption to extract state finances for personal or group interests.

The problem of corruption crimes is not solely the fault of the perpetrators (corruptors). The perpetrators (corruptors) are wrong, but there is also a very fundamental weakness, namely the weakness of legal instruments that regulate the origin or source of personal wealth of state officials and officials. law enforcement officials and state civil servants. So that there is a regulation regarding the origin or source of personal wealth of officials, state officials, law enforcement officials, and state civil apparatus.

Uncovering corruption crimes committed by law enforcement officials, in terms of receiving bribes from defendants or suspects has been difficult for anyone to uncover, unless there is a legal instrument that regulates the obligation of the legal apparatus, state apparatus, and state civil apparatus to prove with the principle of reverse proof related to the origin and/or source of wealth obtained. including commissioners and investigators, public prosecutors, and judges from the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK).

Law number 20 of 2001 concerning the amendment to Law number 31 of 1999 concerning the eradication of the crime of corruption as referred to in the dictum weighing, that the crime of corruption which has been widespread, not only harms state finances, but has also violated the social and economic rights of the community at large, so that corruption needs to be classified as a crime whose eradication must be carried out extraordinarily.

The dictum considering the reform of the Law on the eradication of corruption above can be emphasized, among others, namely:

a. The crime of corruption is widespread. This proves that corruption

crimes are difficult to eradicate quickly, accurately, and at low cost. It is difficult to eradicate corruption by relying solely on law enforcement officials, because law enforcement officials enforcing the law have the potential to act arbitrarily (selectively) depending on a situation and/or circumstances, in addition to the potential for bribery or buying and selling cases between suspects/defendants and unscrupulous law enforcement officials.

b. Not only is it detrimental to state finances, it is also a violation of human rights. Corruption crimes certainly harm state finances, when state finances are harmed, it is the people who suffer the most and are miserable, even falling into poverty. Therefore, the crime of corruption is categorized as a violation of human rights. The problem is that in the existing Law on the Eradication of the Crime of Corruption, no article regulates that the crime of corruption is also a violation of human rights.

c. Its eradication must be carried out extraordinarily. The eradication of corruption in an extraordinary manner must be based on an extraordinary anti-corruption law, including preparing legal instruments that regulate reverse proof. Reverse proof means proving that wealth comes from lawful sources, and proving that it is not the result of corruption crimes.

The crime of corruption is a crime that can no longer be tolerated, if left with existing legal instruments, the state and the people have the potential to fall apart, therefore appropriate legal instruments, fast and low cost must be prepared immediately to prevent the occurrence of criminal acts of corruption. Prevention is the main step, then taking firm action, because the action is a legal event that has occurred, meaning that there has been a loss of state finances or in other words the perpetrator (corruption) has had time to enjoy and even launder money. Meanwhile, prevention is carried out based on indications or suspicions about the existence of unusual assets belonging to officials, state officials, state civil servants, and law enforcement officials by applicable legal provisions.

The House of Representatives (DPR) in its position as a legislator can use its legislative function to form or reform the new Law on the eradication of corruption, this is important to save the nation and the benefit of the nation, realize welfare, and educate the nation's life.

According to Jimly Asshiddiqie, the first function of the People's Representative Council is the function of legislation or regulation. This

regulatory function (redeemed functi) concerns the authority to determine regulations that bind citizens with legal norms that are binding and restrictive (Asshiddiqie 2006). If the House of Representatives (DPR) has a strong political commitment to prevent and eradicate corruption, there is nothing difficult to do in this country, because the state guarantees the constitutional rights of the House of Representatives (DPR) to form laws. However, the problem is that in terms of forming the law, it depends on the political will of the House of Representatives (DPR) to use the legislative function.

Jimly Asshiddiqie stated that it is the government that knows the most about the need to make legislation because the government bureaucracy has the most information and expertise needed for this. Therefore, about the regulation of this matter under the 1945 Constitution the old provisions of Article 5 paragraph (1) can be said to be appropriate, it is only a matter of increasing the control function of the DPR over the implementation of government tasks (Asshiddiqie 2004).

Referring to Jimly Asshiddiqie's opinion, it can be emphasized that the Government and the House of Representatives (DPR) are aware of the weaknesses in the context of eradicating corruption because they control a lot of information about corruption crimes in state institutions or other institutions, including at the local government level. The public is shown the arrest of perpetrators (regents, mayors, governors, village heads, Supreme Court judges, lawyers, etc.) who commit corruption crimes. This proves that the Law on the Eradication of Corruption is unable or failed to prevent and anticipate corruption crimes.

Based on the description and explanation above, it can be emphasized that the concept of prevention and eradication of corruption in Indonesia can be explained as follows:

a. First concept: Prevention of corruption. Prevention of corruption must be based on reverse proof, where state officials and law enforcement officials are required to prove the origin of the source of wealth to a specially formed institution/agency in charge of calculating or auditing the assets of state officials, government officials, and law enforcement officials, not just reporting wealth as has been done so far, but the origin of the source of wealth is audited independently by a body/institution specially formed for that so that the true origin of wealth can be known, whether the wealth is obtained lawfully or unlawfully. If unable to prove and/or explain based on data and facts regarding the origin of the source of wealth and it is proven that part of the wealth cannot be legally accounted for, then the excess wealth,

excluding salaries, must be returned to the state and the perpetrators dealt with legally.

b. Second concept. Establish an institution or agency tasked with auditing the origin of the assets of state administrators and law enforcement officials and their family members and carried out every three months.

c. The third concept is: Eradication of corruption crimes. Conduct law enforcement efforts on suspected corruption based on written reports from the results of audits of the assets of state administrators, and law enforcement officials, in addition to taking action against perpetrators (corruption) based on public reports or sting operations.

4. Conclusion

Based on the description of the discussion and analysis above, the author can conclude that the House of Representatives (DPR) has a legislative function (the function of forming laws) to form laws, including forming new laws regarding the prevention and eradication of criminal acts of corruption to prevent and eradicate criminal acts of corruption effectively and adequately. The legislative function of the House of Representatives (DPR) determines the success or failure of law enforcement officials in preventing and eradicating corruption and/or in the context of state administration that is free from corruption to realize a just and prosperous society. The establishment of a new law on the prevention and eradication of corruption is carried out based on reverse proof, in which state administrators and law enforcement officials are required to prove the origin of the source of assets to a specially formed institution/agency that has the task of calculating or auditing the assets of state administrators, government officials, and law enforcement officials, not just reporting assets as has been done so far, but the origin of the source of assets is audited independently by a body/institution specially formed for that so that the origin of the assets of state administrators and law enforcement officials can be known.

The author suggests that the House of Representatives (DPR) as the holder of the mandate of the sovereignty of the people who has the function of legislation take the initiative to form a new law on the prevention and eradication of corruption with the main focus on prevention and eradication by using the principle of reverse proof for state administrators, state officials and law enforcement officials on the origin of their assets, not obtained from corruption crimes.

References

Adami Chazawi. 2017. Hukum Pidana Korupsi Di Indonesia (Depok: Rajawali

Pers)
Ahmad, Hamzah dan ananda santoso. 1996. Kamus Pintar Bahasa Indonesia (Surabaya: Fajar Mulia)
Arief, Barda Nawawi. 2005. Bunga Rampai Kebijakan Hukum Pidana (Bandung: PT. Aditya Bakti)
Asshiddiqie, Jimly. 2004. Format Kelembagaan Negara Dan Pergeseran Kekuasaan Dalam UUD 1945 (FH UII Press)
———. 2006. Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara (jakarta: kepaniteraan Mahkamah Konstirusi RI)
Cahaya, Surachmin dan Suhandi. 2011. Strategi Dan Teknik Korupsi (Jakarta: Sinar Grafika)
Djaja, Ermansjah. 2008. Memberantas Korupsi Bersama KPK (Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi Di Indonesia) (Bandung: PT. Rafika aditama)
Kartono, Kartini. 2003. Patalog Sosial (Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada)
Listianingsih, Chatrina Darul Rosiikah dan Dessy Marliani. 2016. Pendidikan Anti Korupsi Kajian Anti Korupsi, Teori Dan Praktek (Jakarta Timur: Sinar Grafika)
Lubis, M. Solly. 1989. Landasan Dan Teknik Perundang-Undangan (Bandung: Mandar Maju)
Marzuki, Laica. 2007. 'Membangun Undang-Undang Yang Ideal', Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia, 4 no. 2
Rahardjo, Sutjipto. 2002. Sosialogi Hukum, Perkembangan, Metode Dan Pilihan Masalah (Surakarta: Muhammadyah University Press)
Soemantri, Sri. 1974. Tentang Lembaga-Lembaga Negara Menurut UUD 1945 (Alumni)
Yuliandri. 2010. Asas-Asas Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undangan Yang Baik (Gagasan Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-Undang Berkelanjutan (Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Pesada)