

Prosecute Rights as a Function in Law Enforcement on the Eradication of Corruption: Study in the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office

S. Sudirman*, Hambali Thalib**, Said Sampara**, Abdul Agis**

*Student of Postgraduate Doctoral Program in Legal Studies, Universitas Muslim Indonesia

**Lecturer of the Faculty of Law, Universitas Muslim Indonesia

Corresponding Author: S. Sudirman

ABSTRACT: This study aims to understand and analyze the functions and roles of the High Prosecutor's Office in law enforcement against corruption and find out what factors affect the function of the High Prosecutor's Office in law enforcement in eradicating corruption. When viewed in terms of its type, this research method is an empirical study with data collection techniques using questionnaires and interviews for primary data obtained from respondents who have been determined in the population. The secondary data is examining books and documents relevant to this research.

KEYWORDS: Attorney, Corruption Eradication, High Prosecutor's Office, Prosecute, State Officials.

Date of Submission: 06-01-2021

Date of Acceptance: 21-01-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Corruption that occurs in Indonesia is currently in a very severe condition, and deeply rooted in every aspect of the life of the nation and state. The development of corrupt practices from year to year is increasing, both in terms of the quantity of state losses as well as in terms of quality which are increasingly systematic, sophisticated and the scope has expanded in all aspects of public life.

Corruption is everywhere, even though all cultures are against corruption. No government system is not harmed by corruption and no religion that does not condemn corruption. Where and how to start eradicating corruption, when the deviation of power has penetrated systemically to all sectors at various levels, in an unsupportive political and bureaucratic environment. Therefore, Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 on Amendment to Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of the Criminal Act of Corruption (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 20 of 2001) was formed to further intensify the eradication of corruption, as stated in the General Elucidation of Law No. 20 of 2001 that corruption has occurred systematically so that it impacts state finances and violates socio-economic rights. Therefore, it takes an extraordinary way to overcome it.

Likewise, the Attorney General's Office has been given the function or role to handle the eradication of criminal acts of corruption, whose existence was strengthened by enacting Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2004 on the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 16 of 2004). Apart from being regulated in Law No. 16 of 2004, eradicating criminal acts of corruption is also found in various laws and regulations, such as Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 1981 on the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 8 of 1981), Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2019 on Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 19 of 2019), and Government Regulations.

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

1. What is the function of the High Prosecutor's Office in law enforcement to eradicate corruption?
2. What is the High Prosecutor's Office role in law enforcement to eradicate corruption in South Sulawesi?
3. What factors influence the High Prosecutor's Office function in combating corruption in South Sulawesi?

III. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

A. Theoretical Basis

1. Rule of Law Theory

The definition of the rule of law as a rule of law and statutory regulations also applies to all state institutions and instruments. The rule of law will also guarantee order and provide legal protection to the people. This is due to the reciprocal relationship between law and power.

The initial development of the rule of law was in the ancient Greek era. The idea of people's sovereignty grew and developed from the Roman tradition, while the ancient Greek tradition became the source of the idea of the rule of law (Asshiddiqie, 1994).

According to Aristotle, the concept of the rule of law is a state that guarantees justice for its citizens. Justice is a prerequisite for achieving a happy life for its citizens. As a foundation of justice, it is necessary to teach a sense of morality to every human being to become a good citizen. For Aristotle, who ruled in the state was not a real human being, but a just mind, while the real ruler was only the holder of law and balance (Kusnardi & Ibrahim, 1998).

According to Satjipto Rahardjo (2000), Indonesia's rule of law is a country that has a conscience or a country that cares (a country that has a conscience and compassion). The rule of law in Indonesia is not a country that stops carrying out various public functions, not a state based on its job descriptions, but a state that wants to realize the morals contained therein. The rule of law in Indonesia is more of a morality based state.

2. Purpose of Law Theory

In legal science literature, there are several theories about the law's aims, namely ethical theory, utility theory, and mixed theory. According to ethical theory, the law is solely for justice. The content of laws is determined by society's ethical awareness about what is fair and what is not. In other words, according to the theory of legal ethics, it aims to bring about justice (Apeldoorn, 2000).

According to utility theory, the law aims to bring about only useful things. The law aims to ensure happiness for as many people as possible. This theory was put forward by Jeremy Bentham, a legal expert from England in his book "An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation". Bentham was the leader of the "utility theory" sect of thought (Syahrani, 1999).

3. Theory of Legal Functions

The theory of the function of law in society can be seen from two sides: *first*, where society's progress in various fields requires legal rules to regulate it. Community development also attracts the legal sector; *second*, good law can develop society or direct community development.

According to Sjachran Basah (1997), the legal function can be divided into two parts, namely internal and external. The internal function is a function of statutory regulations. The external function is to function as a legal sub-system of the legal system in general, quasi-justification by the courts, where the judge is an extension of the state's hand.

4. Authority Theory

In-State Administrative Law, the authority has an important position and is a core concept of legal science. This is despite several existing criticisms related to the use of the principles of legality and democracy in the administration of state affairs, where government action must obtain the legitimacy of the people which is formally contained in specific legal grounds. Within this framework, as H. R. Ridwan (2016) concluded from several experts' opinion, the substance of the legality principle is authority, which is defined as the ability to take specific legal actions. Meanwhile, regarding the source and how to obtain it, authority is classified based on attribution, delegation and some experts adding one more classification: mandate.

5. Law Enforcement Theory

In the modern state constellation, the law can function as a means of social engineering (law as a social engineering tool). Roscoe Pound (1999) emphasized the importance of law as a means of social engineering, primarily through case resolution by judicial bodies which will produce jurisprudence. At the Indonesian context level, this legal function is interpreted by Muchtar Kusumaatmadja as a means of encouraging community reform (Kusumaatmadja, 1987).

According to Lawrence M. Friedman (1975), law enforcement's success always requires the functioning of all components of the legal system. The legal system in question consists of three components: the legal structure, the legal substance component and the legal culture component. The legal structure is the body, the framework, the eternal form of a system. The legal substance is the actual rules and norms used by institutions, facts, forms of behaviour and actors observed in the system. The culture or legal culture is the ideas, attitudes, beliefs, hopes, and opinions about the law.

B. Functions, Duties, and Authorities of the High Prosecutor's Office

The term function which in Latin "*functus*" comes from the verb "*fungtor*" which refers to a way to do (toparform), to administer. According to Sjachran Basah (1997), it provides an understanding of the function, namely; (a) function means duty; (b) function means the reciprocal relationship between part and all; (c) function means work or working.

So the term the function of this research is a reciprocal relationship between part and all of the High Prosecutor's Office's duties and authorities as a law enforcement agency to eradicate corruption. For more details regarding the duties and powers of the High Prosecutor's Office, the authors describe them as outlined in the laws and regulations that regulate, among others:

1. Law No. 16 of 2004

In line with the amendments the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as The 1945 Constitution), Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 48 of 2009 on The Judicial Powers (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 48 of 2009) and several new laws and the development of legal provisions for community life and government, Law No. 5 of 1991 was repealed by Law No. 16 of 2004, because it is no longer following the development and life of the community.

The Attorney General's Office as one of the law enforcement agencies is demanded to have a more role in upholding the rule of law, protecting public interests, upholding human rights, eradicating criminal acts of corruption, collusion and nepotism. Therefore, it is necessary to restructure the Attorney to adapt to these changes.

The Attorney General's Office as an institution of state power in the field of prosecution, in carrying out its functions, duties and authorities must realize certainty, order, justice and truth based on law. The Attorney must also heed religious and moral norms and explore human values and justice that live in society.

Based on Article 30 section (1) of Law No. 16 of 2004, regulates that in the field of crime, the Attorney has the following duties and authorities:

- a. prosecute;
- b. carry out judges' orders and court decisions that have permanent legal force;
- c. supervise the implementation of conditional criminal decisions, supervisory criminal verdict, and conditional release decisions;
- d. carry out investigations on certain crimes based on law;
- e. complete specific case files and for that purpose can carry out additional examinations before being delegated to a court which in its implementation is coordinated with the investigator.

2. Law No. 8 of 1981

Based on Article 1 point 6 of Law No. 8 of 1981, explain that:

- a. Public Attorney is an official who is granted authority by this law to act as a public prosecutor and to execute a court judgment which has become final and binding.
- b. Public Prosecutor is a public attorney granted authority by this law to conduct a prosecution and to execute the rulings of a judge.

From the provisions above, what is meant by "prosecution" is as based on Article 1 point 7 of Law No. 8 of 1981, explain that:

"Prosecution is an act of the public prosecutor to bring a criminal action before a competent district court in matters and by means regulated in this law with the plea that it be heard and decided upon by the judge at trial."

Based on the above provisions, the Attorney duties and authorities no longer need to be included in Law No. 16 of 2004, considering that the duties and authorities have been stipulated in Law No. 8 of 1981. However, according to the Public Prosecutor's authority, the investigator must write it down in a written notification to the accused before the trial.

C. Definition and Forms of Corruption Crime

1. Definition of Corruption Crime

According to Andi Hamzah (1991), "*corruption in the literal sense is rottenness, ugliness, crime, dishonesty, can be bribed, immoral, deviating from chastity, words that are insulting or slander*". Meanwhile, according to the Black's Law Dictionary, "*corruption is a vicious and fraudulent intention to evade the prohibitions of the law. The act of an official or fiduciary person who unlawfully and wrongfully uses his station or character to procure some benefit for himself or for another person, contrary to duty and the rights of others*". Furthermore, according to Transparency International, corruption is as the abuse of entrusted power for private gain. Corruption can take many forms and can include behaviours like:

- a. public servants demanding or taking money or favours in exchange for services;

b. politicians misusing public money or granting public jobs or contracts to their sponsors, friends and families;

c. corporations are bribing officials to get lucrative deals.

The definition of the criminal act of corruption has also been formulated in Article 2 section (1) Law No. 20 of 2001, regulates that:

“Anyone who illegally commits an act of enrichment of himself or another person or a corporation can harm the state finances or the state economy”

2. Forms of Corruption Crime

Corruption is included in a special crime, because it is not explicitly regulated in Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 1960 on Amendment of the Criminal Code (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 1 of 1960). In Indonesia, the eradication of corruption is regulated in Law No. 20 of 2001. Apart from special crimes, corruption is also classified as Extra-Ordinary Crime. The legal instruments for eradicating acts that lead to corruption are quite comprehensive. The instruments in the form of laws and regulations are intended to function and be optimized to prevent and overcome corruption crimes committed by bureaucrats and perpetrators who abuse their authority, opportunities and facilities, and existing infrastructure because their position can directly and directly harm state finances.

3. Unlawful Nature in Corruption Crime

The term against the law when translated in Dutch is *“wederrechtelijk”*. According to Pompe in Teguh Prasetyo (2018), *“against the law means against the law in a broader sense, not only against the written law but also against the unwritten law”*. The unlawful nature, as regulated in Article 2 section (1) of Law No. 20 of 2001. In this connection, according to Bambang Poernomo (1992), *“the nature of an act against the law has two dimensions, namely the nature of being against the formal law and the nature of being against the material law”*.

To violate the law formally is an act that is merely considered contrary to the law based on what is expressly written in statutory regulations, such as coercion. As for what is meant by being against the law materially is an act that is against the law even though it is not included in the statutory regulations, so that it can be interpreted as contradicting the statutory regulations or outside the statutory regulations.

The definition of material law as described above is divided into negative functions and positive functions. The teaching of material lawlessness in its negative function means acknowledging the possibility outside of the law to eliminate the prohibited nature of an act indicating a violation of the law.

4. Corruption Crime Classification

As has been stated in the previous section, the crime of corruption is increasingly widespread, detrimental to state finances, and a violation of the people’s social and economic human rights. So it needs legal certainty. This socio-juridical reason is one of the fundamental philosophical considerations in the formation of Law No. 20 of 2001.

If an investigation is carried out on the substance regulated in Law No. 20 of 2001, found as many as 36 types and forms of corruption. Among the 36 types and forms of criminal acts of corruption referred to, can be broadly classified into three typologies, including:

- a. The typology of corruption has political nuances;
- b. The typology of corruption has economic nuances; and
- c. The typology of corruption has administrative nuances.

Also, through Law No. 20 of 2001, the quality and stratification of corruption is increasingly being improved, from material crimes to formal crimes (Soesilo, 1991).

Referring to Law No. 20 of 2001, state financial losses or even the country’s economy are not a big enough problem. However, a substantial element of eradicating corruption is to restore the corruptors’ human nature so that corruption does not become entrenched and can be eradicated from this beloved country.

5. Characteristics of Corruption Crime

Insubstantial, everything has the characteristics of use as a differentiator from others. Likewise, the crime of corruption also has its characteristics, so that it is one of the considerations to be designated as a special crime. Corruption has the same impact as a person who is not corrupt, such as mal-administration or mismanagement, which is categorized as a general criminal act. Therefore, this equality requires an instrument that can prosecute perpetrators of general crimes that have the same effect as corruption.

The characteristics of a criminal act of corruption can help law enforcement officials carry out the role and function of eradicating corruption. Syed Hussein Alatas (1983), a sociologist of law, has worked hard to explore the various characteristics inherent in all forms and types of acts categorized as criminal acts of

corruption in Asia, including Malaysia and Indonesia. Furthermore, in his scientific analysis, he has formulated nine characteristics of corruption, namely:

- a. Corruption always involves more than one person;
- b. Corruption always carries the value of confidentiality;
- c. Corruption involves an element of obligation and mutual benefit;
- d. Corruptors always try to cover up their actions by taking cover behind legal justifications;
- e. Corruptors usually want firm decisions and can influence those decisions;
- f. Corruption always contains an element of fraud;
- g. Corruption always has a dimension of betrayal of trust;
- h. Corruption involves many contradictory functions;
- i. Corruption violates norms, rules and job responsibilities.

6. Legal Subjects or Perpetrators of Corruption Crime

Observing the formulation of Article 2 to Article 17 and Article 21 to Article 24 of Law No. 20 of 2001, then the perpetrator of a criminal act is “*everyone*” which means a person, individuals, or cooperatives.

According to Chidir Ali, Chidir (1979), “*the definition of a legal entity or corporation can be known from the answer to the question, what is a legal subject? The meaning of a legal subject is a human being, and everything is based on the demands of society’s needs which are recognized by law as supporting rights and obligations*”. This definition is exact for identifying legal entities.

Involvement of Civil Servants as based on Article 13 Law No. 20 of 2001, regulates that:

“Anyone who gives gifts or promises to a civil servant by considering the power or authority attached to his position, or by the giver of gifts or promises is deemed attached to that position”

Apart from Civil Servants, State Organizer can also become perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption, as based on Article 1 point 1 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 on the State Organizer who shall be Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 28 of 1999), regulates that:

“State Organizer are State Officials who carry out executive, legislative, or judicial functions and other officials whose main functions and tasks are related to state administration in accordance with the provisions of the prevailing laws and regulations.”

D. Corruption Law Enforcement

Corruption problems with complex backgrounds are accompanied by mistyping of documents, logic or form types with a growing *modus operandi*, and new patterns. The scope of corruption with a broad aspect of public life includes social, political, economic, cultural, defence and security institutions with predictions of past, present, and future dimensions related to legal integrity and legal stratification at all social institutions levels.

The success of law enforcement efforts against criminal acts of corruption should not be solely on the judiciary’s success or imposing as many corruptors as possible in prison. However, the legal system must be seen in a comprehensive manner, namely the extent to which the development of a system that is not corrupt. Because without systemic changes, law enforcement against criminal acts of corruption will only produce new corruptors. Therefore, establishing a transparent and democratic system will have a significant impact on efforts to limit opportunities for corruption by power holders to abuse their power in the future.

E. Legal Basis and Accountability for the Authority to Eradicate Corruption Crime

1. Source and Birth of Authority

The principle of legality (*legaliteitsbeginselen or wetmatigheid van bestuur*) is one of the main pillars of the rule of law. Based on these principles, that government authority derives from statutory regulations. In the administrative law literature, there are two ways to obtain government authority, namely attribution and delegation; sometimes it is also a mandate, positioned as a separate way of gaining authority.

Attribution refers to authority based on the provisions of constitutional law. Attribution is the authority to make decisions (*besluit*) that come directly from the law in a material sense. Another opinion states that attribution is the formation of certain powers and granting them to specific organs, which can form authority are organs that are given authority based on statutory regulations. Attribution is pleased with the transfer of new authority. While delegation is the delegation of governmental authority from one governmental organ to another, logically delegation is always preceded by attribution.

2. Abuse of Authority

The principle of legality in the rule of law is the basis for the legitimacy of government action. In other words, every State Organizer and Civil Servants must have legitimacy, namely the authority granted by laws

and regulations. Authority (*gezag*) itself, is the power that is informed from executive power or legislative power to certain people.

Sjachran Basah (1997) defines abuse of authority (*detournement de pouvoir*) is actions officials that are not in accordance with the objectives but are still in the context of statutory provisions. Meanwhile, arbitrary actions (*abus de droit*), namely actions of officials that are not in accordance with objectives outside the environment of statutory regulations.

3. Accountability Abuse of Authority

The State Organizer applies the principle of the rule of law about the use of power. The State Organizer's authority in a constitutional state that applies the legality principle in its constitution, based on Article 1 section (3) of The 1945 Constitution, regulates that "*Indonesia is a law-based state*". This provision implies that the state's administration must be based on law and guarantee citizens' fundamental rights. The legality principle is the basis for the legitimacy of the State Organizer's actions. In other words, every State Officials and Civil Servants must have legitimacy, that is, the authority granted by law.

Provisions on abuse of authority, as based on Article 3 of Law No. 20 of 2001, regulates that:

"Everyone who intends to benefit himself or another person or a corporation, misuses the powers, opportunities or means available to him because of his position which may harm the state finances or the state economy."

The concept of abuse of authority in the provisions of Article 3 of Law No. 20 of 2001 is only owned by the State Organizer because the authority in question is the authority that comes from statutory regulations (following the principle of legality).

F. Attorney General's Office as One of the Law Enforcement Elements

If State Officials' actions within the legal structure of the State are not determined based on existing laws and regulations, then this is considered a violation. In this case, it cannot be denied that their actions cannot be justified, whether they are executive, legislative or judicial actions.

One of the State Organizers authorized by law to carry out their duties and authorities is the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. This institution has a very significant role in building a better country, especially in law enforcement and more specifically, in the field of prosecution.

The Attorney General's Office exercises state power in the field of prosecution and other legal powers. Although the existence of the Attorney General's Office has not been explicitly stated in The 1945 Constitution, the Elucidation to Article 38 section (1) of Law No. 48 of 2009, explains that "*what is meant by "other agencies" include, among others, the police, attorney, advocates, and prisons*".

IV. DISCUSSION

A. The substance of the Function of the Attorney General's Office in Law Enforcement Against Corruption Crime

After the enactment of Law No. 16 of 2004, to strengthen the Attorney General's Office's role and function as a State Organizer with authority to exercise state power in the field of prosecution. This authority must be exercised independently, and apart from the influence of other powers.

In connection with the description above, the Attorney General's Office's existence as one of the law enforcement agencies is required to play a more significant role in upholding the rule of law, protecting public interests, upholding human rights, and eradicating corruption.

As described above, the Attorney General's Office has a strategic function in efforts to eradicate corruption through both repressive and preventive actions, both those carried out by the Attorney General's Office, the High Prosecutor's Office, and the District Prosecutor's Office have shown maximum results. One of its successes is that it has saved the State from losses due to corrupt behaviour.

To eradicate criminal acts of corruption in the regional scope, the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office has carried out the leading role and function, both through repressive and preventive measures. This can be seen from the results of the handling of corruption cases that were by the Attorney in the last three years in South Sulawesi Province and can be seen in the table below.

Table 1. Corruption Crime Case Resolved by the Attorney in the Last Three Years in South Sulawesi Province

Places	Years			Total	Percentage
	2017	2018	2019		
South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office	40	17	3	60	38,46%
Makassar District Prosecutor's	8	18	20	46	29,49%

Office					
Pinrang District Prosecutor's Office	3	5	6	14	8,97%
Palopo District Prosecutor's Office	1	3	5	9	5,77%
Bone District Prosecutor's Office	10	4	5	19	12,18%
Bulukumba District Prosecutor's Office	4	2	2	8	5,13%
Total	66	49	41	156	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on this data, Attorneys handled as many as 156 cases in the last three years in South Sulawesi Province. The details are South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 60 or 38.46% cases; Makassar District Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 46 or 29.49% cases; Pinrang District Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 14 or 8.97% cases; Palopo District Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 9 or 5.77% cases; Bone District Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 19 or 12,18% cases; and Bulukumba District Prosecutor's Office handled as many as 8 or 5.13% cases.

Based on this data, corruption cases handled by the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office experienced a decrease in cases. Because the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office always creates and runs programs based on role and function and duties and authorities. Thus, the handling of corruption crimes committed by the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office has been quite successful.

As for the obstacles so that the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office has not been maximal in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, namely:

1. State Officials

As State Officials, Public Attorneys' existence is not much different from other State Officials, both in departments and non-departmental institutions in Indonesia. However, amid the spirit of bureaucratic reform that is currently echoing throughout Indonesia's bureaucracy's ranks. Public Attorney is still conventionally doing activities. Simultaneously, the conventional method is one of the Public Attorney's pathological sources, especially in the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office.

Based on the research, Public Attorney in handling cases still uses conventional methods characterized by (a) bureaucratic; (b) centralistic; (c) hierarchical; and (d) Authoritarian. These four characters stem from the doctrine that the Attorney is one. The bureaucratic character demands that case handling be carried out in a strict, procedural, sequential, and tiered manner in various fields.

Public Attorney in investigating, examining, and prosecuting corruption crimes can be categorized in conventional ways based on bureaucratic characteristics. Of course, this does not provide space and time to show acceptance of new behavior, as is meant by bureaucratic reform, or according to Like Wilardjo, a resolution.

Formally, irregularities that occur at the Public Attorney in investigating, examining, and prosecuting corruption are not considered irregularities because they comply with procedures. For example, termination of examination formally stated in the investigation reports that there is not enough evidence for continuing the examining process. Furthermore, Attorney's leadership will approve the dismissal of the case so that this condition positions the Public Attorney only as State Officials in charge of administrative matters.

There is also a requirement for gratification at the prosecution stage so that the contents of the examination report are manipulative requirements. This is because petitum and posita are inseparable parts of the lawsuit filed by the Public Prosecutor to the Panel of Judges. On the other hand, this condition also describes that the Attorney's leadership in approving the proposed lawsuit submitted by the Public Prosecutor indicated irregularities where there was a proportionate distribution of bribes. Therefore, Public Attorney is only a tool to legalize abuse of power. There is no causal relationship between the severity of criminal charges and state losses caused by corruption cases.

Public attorneys in handling corruption cases have become a medium for commercializing policies, or in other words, policies have become commodities. The low budget exacerbates this situation for handling corruption cases, and the low operational costs of handling corruption crimes, which seem to have become moral legitimacy for Public Attorneys and Public Prosecutors with all their powers to take advantage of parties related to the cases being handled.

2. Independence

Attorney's position in the constitutional system is Public Attorney in civil and state administration cases and Public Prosecutor in criminal cases representing the state and society.

Position of attorney duties and authorities in the law enforcement system in Indonesia as based on Law No. 16 of 2004, contains an ambivalence where Attorney as State Officials within the scope of executive power, on the other hand as State Officials in the sphere of Judicial power.

Based on Article 1 section (4) of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2009 on the Court for Corruption Crimes (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 46 of 2009), regulates that “*Public Prosecutor is a Public Prosecutor as regulated in statutory regulations*”. From this provision, prosecutor authorities referred to in Law No. 8 of 1981, Law No. 16 of 2004, Law No. 19 of 2019 contradict each other. However, Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2009 on the Second Amendment to Law Number 14 of 1985 on the Supreme Court (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 3 of 2009), where the Supreme Court acknowledged all prosecution processes, both based on Law No. 19 of 2019 and Law No. 16 of 2004.

Based on the description above, the Public Attorney is still bureaucratic and not yet independent. In the theory of bureaucracy developed by Max Weber, it is stated that rational bureaucracy is a bureaucratic theory that arises based on the principles of legal authority, namely authority based on a belief in a legal system that is formed rationally by the State Organizer based on statutory regulations. Because obedience to this authority is impersonal (not related to personal), whoever holds the duties and authorities will be based on a legal system. All citizens must obey for the sake of the nation’s order and state (Setiyono, 2016).

B. The Duties and Authorities of the Attorney General’s Office in Law Enforcement No. 19 of 2019

Attorney General’s Office as the State Officials that controls the implementation of the duties and authorities of the High Prosecutor’s Office, especially those related to the role and function of investigations, examinations, and prosecution of corruption crimes, as based on Article 284 section (2) of Law No. 8 of 1981 in conjunction with Article 17 of Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 58 of 2010 on Amendment to Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 on Implementation of the Code of Criminal Procedure (hereinafter referred to as Government Regulation No. 58 of 2010).

Furthermore, based on Article 17 of Government Regulation No. 58 of 2010, regulates that:

“Investigation according to the special provisions for a criminal procedure referred to in specific Laws as referred to in Article 284 section (2) of the Criminal Procedure Code is carried out by investigators, attorneys, and other authorized investigating officials based on statutory regulations.”

To carry out the duties and authorities in the corruption investigation, they must coordinate with other agencies with the roles and functions to eradicate corruption.

1. Duties and Authorities of the Attorney General’s Office in Eradicating Corruption Crimes

Corruption is a special crime. Therefore, the one who handles the eradication of criminal acts of corruption is the Special Crime Attorney. As for the duties and authorities attorney in the special criminal sector as based on Article 21 section (2) of Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 29 of 2016 on Amendment to Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2010 on Organization and Work Procedure of the Attorney General’s Office of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as Presidential Regulation No. 29 of 2016), regulates that:

“The scope of the special crimes sector ... includes investigation, examination, pre-prosecution, additional examination, prosecution, legal remedies, implementation of judges and court decisions that have permanent legal force, examination and supervision of the implementation of conditional crimes, and conditional release decisions in cases special crimes and other legal actions.”

The Attorney General’s Office has the duties and authority to enforce the law in eradicating criminal acts of corruption. Although various other law enforcement State Officials also carry out law enforcement in corruption cases. In carrying out the duties and authorities in the law enforcement process, the Attorney General’s Office has a firm legal foundation, as stated earlier, is independent and free from intervention from any party. The Attorney General’s Office in carrying out the duties and authorities cannot be influenced by any State Organizer, including a person’s power, money, and social status. The results of the respondent’s assessment regarding the duties and authorities of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in the special criminal sector in eradicating corruption can be seen in the table below.

Table 2. The Duties and Authorities of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Optimal	57	95,00%
Less than optimal	3	5,00%
Not optimal	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 57 or 95,00% of respondents who state the duties and authorities of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in eradicating corruption have been optimal, and there are 3 or 5,00% of respondents who stated that they were less than optimal. Were not some respondents stated that it is not optimal.

One of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office successes is the excellent collaboration between the Public Attorney and the Public Prosecutor.

According to Andi Hamzah (2000), “*prosecution of the perpetrators of a criminal act cannot be separated from the investigation process so that the investigation and prosecution cannot be separated*”. Andi Hamzah’s opinion is fundamental, especially considering the prevailing laws and regulations in Indonesia.

Hierarchically, the High Prosecutor’s Office is under the Attorney General’s Office. This is none other than to increase further efforts to eradicate corruption. Thus, the High Prosecutor’s Office must work professionally as part of the criminal justice system without discrimination. The Public Prosecutor must prioritize the principle of equality before the law. The rule of law objectives can be achieved if the benefit, certainty, and justice for all parties.

2. Roles and Functions of the Attorney General’s Office in Eradicating Corruption Crimes

Attorney General’s Office’s role and function are getting stronger after the formation of Law No. 16 of 2004. So far, the Attorney General’s Office’s role and function in investigating corruption cases are only regulated in various other laws and regulations such as Law No. 8 of 1981, Law No. 19 of 2019, and several Government Regulations. Furthermore, the role and function of attorney in the special criminal sector as based on Article 22 of Presidential Regulation No. 29 of 2016, regulates that in carrying out the duties and authorities ... the Special Crimes Sector carries out the following functions:

- a. formulating policies in the scope of the special crime;
- b. implementing law enforcement in the scope of the special crime;
- c. coordination and synchronization of the implementation of policies in the scope of the special crime;
- d. implementing working relations with agencies/institutions both at home and abroad;
- e. monitoring, analysis, evaluation, and reporting of the implementation of activities in the scope of the special crime;
- f. implementation of other duties assigned by the Attorney General.

The Attorney General’s Office’s role and function are based on the duties and authorities, among others, as follows.

a. Investigation

Based on Article 1 point 2 of Law No. 8 of 1981, explain that:

“Investigation is a series of acts by an investigator in matters and by means regulated in this law to seek and gather evidence with which to clarify whether an offense has occurred and to locate the suspect.”

The investigating apparatus extending the duties in the investigation warrant, after receiving an order, immediately makes plans for an investigation while studying/understanding the results. Investigations are carried out to obtain supporting evidence to determine deviations that have occurred.

State Officials’ existence with their working mechanism is based on their respective legal bases as described above. In practice, it allows for overlapping powers, especially in cases related to criminal acts of corruption. Even if there is no State Organizer that integrates the division of authority in the investigation process, several law enforcement State Officials always coordinate and supervise each other, including the Police, Attorney, and the Corruption Eradication Commission.

The cases of corruption in the Province of South Sulawesi have begun to be minimized because the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office is actively carrying out roles and functions. The results of the respondent’s assessment regarding the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in the special criminal sector in eradicating corruption can be seen in the table below.

Table 3. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Optimal	56	93,33%
Less than optimal	4	6,67%
Not optimal	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 56 or 93,33% of respondents who state the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in eradicating corruption have been optimal, and there are 4 or 6,67% of respondents who stated that they were less than optimal. Were not some respondents stated that it is not optimal. The data above illustrates that the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office plays a vital role in eradicating corruption. This cannot be separated from the cooperation between the State Officials in law enforcement because apart from the Police Investigators, Public Attorney is also active in investigating corruption. In 2016, from several corruption cases handled by the Police, only a few were at P-21, and others did not get complete evidence. After Attorney was involved in the investigation process in 2017, 40 corruption cases were explicitly handled by the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office. Not to mention the corruption cases handled by the District Prosecutor's Office in each region in South Sulawesi Province. Thus, the Public Attorney in the District Prosecutor's Office and the Public Attorney at the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office have worked well together in eradicating corruption. This can be seen in table 1 above.

b. Prosecution

The Attorney General's Office's role and function in the judicial process are vital because one of its powers is the prosecution of cases that have been investigated by the police and delegated to the Public Attorney. Since the letter's receipt notifying the commencement of the investigation, the Public Attorney has appointed a Public Prosecutor to follow the investigation process. The coordination process between the Public Attorney and the Public Prosecutor is carried out intensively to aim that the investigation results meet the juridical requirements to proceed to the prosecution process in court. The Public Prosecutor has the authority to give instructions to investigators, as based on Article 138 of Law No. 8 of 1981, regulates that:

(1) A public prosecutor after having received the results of an investigation from an investigator shall promptly study and research them and within seven days shall be obligated to inform the investigator whether the results of the investigation are complete or incomplete.

(2) Where the results of the investigation are evidently incomplete, the public prosecutor shall return the dossier of the case to the investigator accompanied by instructions on what must be done to make it complete and within fourteen days after the receiving date of the dossier, the investigator shall be obligated to have returned the dossier of the case to the public prosecutor.

Article 139 of Law No. 8 of 1981, regulates that:

"After the public prosecutor has received or accepted the return of a complete investigation from the investigator, he shall promptly determine whether or not the dossier of the case has met requirements to be brought to court."

Article 140 section (1) of Law No. 8 of 1981, regulates that:

"Where the public prosecutor is of the opinion that a prosecution maybe conducted from the results of the investigation, he shall as soon as possible prepare a bill of indictment."

It is hoped that law enforcement against criminal acts of corruption can deter perpetrators. However, several laws and regulations contradict themselves, and the legal structure's condition is also inadequate. In that case, the objectives of the rule of law can be problematic. Not to mention if law enforcement is viewed from various aspects such as the number and understanding of law enforcement officers in implementing the law's substance, the level of welfare of law enforcement officers, and supporting facilities and infrastructure.

c. Examination in Court

The court is one form of law enforcement regarding legal certainty through decisions issued by independent, free institutions that are not influenced by other institutions outside the institution itself. Judgment is an art based on science. It is said that because a judge in examining a case does use not only intellectual intelligence but also uses his conscience. In law, the court is also called the art of being kind and obedient. So judges are not solely based on knowledge or applicable legal provisions but are motivated by conscience. According to Gustav Radbruch (1961), there are three basic ideas in deciding cases: legal certainty, legal benefits, and justice. Thus, the ideal judge's decision is a judge's decision, which contains three aspects.

Based on Article 1 section (1) of Law No. 48 of 2009, explain that:

"The Judicial Power is an independent power of the State to organize the judiciary to uphold law and justice based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, to implement the State of Law of the Republic of Indonesia."

Thus, the meaning of independent judicial power in this provision implies that judicial power is free from all interference outside the judicial power, except in matters regulated in The 1945 Constitution. Freedom to exercise judicial authority is not absolute because the judge must enforce law and justice based on the Pancasila so that decisions reflect a sense of justice.

Based on Article 10 section (1) of Law No. 48 of 2009, regulates that:

“The courts are prohibited from refusing to inspect, judge, and decide cases filed on the pretext of not having a law or less clear, but is obliged to check and put it on trial.”

C. Factors Affecting Role and Function of South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption

The legal system proposed by Lawrence M. Friedman (1975) regarding the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in eradicating corruption will very much depend on the factors that influence it. Soerjono Soekanto (2008) argues that these factors have a neutral meaning so that the positive or negative impact lies in these factors’ content.

1. Legal Factors

Louis Kaplow in Jonny Ibrahim (2009) argues that laws and regulations have several functions, including regulating human behavior. This is done to respond to someone’s negligence, which can cause harm to other parties. The law provides a balanced basis for the parties. Such arrangements can be found in contract law, business law, and corporate law. The law also establishes coherent and appropriate obligations with individual rights. Regarding the validity of statutory regulation, several principles aim to make the law have a positive impact. This means that laws can achieve their objectives so that they are effective.

To test the implementation of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in eradicating corruption means examining the impact of the role and function on each statutory regulation. The results of the respondent’s assessment of the effectiveness of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in the special criminal sector in eradicating corruption based on the legal factors can be seen in the table below.

Table 4. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption based on Legal Factors

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	57	95,00%
Less effective	3	5,00%
Ineffective	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 57 or 95,00% of respondents state the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office’s role in eradicating corruption based on legal factors have been effective, and there are 3 or 5,00% of respondents who stated that less effective. Were not some respondents stated that it is ineffective.

Based on the table above, it is illustrated that legal factors are one of the indicators that influence the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption. This is important to understand because of Law No. 8 of 1981 in line with Law No. 16 of 2004. As for the involvement of investigators from the State Officials who have the authority to conduct investigations such as the Police based on Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2002 on the State Police of the Republic of Indonesia (hereinafter referred to as Law No. 2 of 2002), the Attorney General’s Office based on Law No. 16 of 2004, as well as the Corruption Eradication Commission based on Law No. 19 of 2019.

Based on empirical data collected during the research, it is known that Public Attorneys have a role in implementing law enforcement, which aims to create a sense of justice, benefit, and legal certainty. In theory, legal factors influence the application and application of criminal procedural law principles in investigating criminal acts of corruption. It turns out that it intersects with efforts to achieve legal goals. Therefore, the presentation of data must be linked to the information that has been prepared by the respondent. Therefore, the existence of legal factors needs the attention of all respondents. Conversely, the respondent’s attention to the rule of law’s influence will be contained in the alternative answer choices given in the questionnaire list. Furthermore, it is necessary to realize how broad and complex the role and function of the Attorney General’s Office is as one of the State Officials with the duties and authorities to carry out investigations into criminal acts of corruption carried out as a Public Attorney based on Law No. 8 of 1981 and various other laws and regulations.

Furthermore, the Attorney General’s Office’s role and function are significant in law enforcement to eradicate corruption. Even though some laws and regulations regulate corruption eradication, such as Law No. 8 of 1981, Law No. 16 of 2004, Law No. 2 of 2002, Law No. 19 of 2019, Law No. 20 of 2001. Suppose the legal rules governing the process of investigating criminal acts of corruption are only regulated by one statutory regulation. In that case, there will not be too many perceptions developing about investigating corruption. Also, all law enforcement State Officials will become one language in investigating corruption crimes. Therefore,

based on the data obtained, it can be concluded that the legal factor dramatically influences the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in eradicating corruption.

2. Law Enforcement Factors

Law enforcement State Officials are community guides who must have specific abilities, according to the community's aspirations. They must be able to communicate with all levels of society. Apart from that, it can also carry out roles and functions based on duties and authorities. Furthermore, law enforcement State Officials must be able to involve community leaders to stimulate the participation of community groups at large. Law enforcement State Officials must also choose the right time and environment if they want to disseminate any new laws and regulations established by each State Organizer, and provide a good example (Soekanto, 2008).

One of the obstacles faced by the Attorney General's Office in developing professionalism to eradicate corruption is related to the quality and quantity of Public Attorneys and Public Prosecutors. However, Attorney still plays a role and function in investigating and prosecuting corruption crimes. Also, the authorized State Officials still feel that they lack a role according to Service Operational Standards, particularly in eradicating corruption. However, overall the role and function, the Attorney General's Office has maximized the duties and authorities. The results of the respondent's assessment of the effectiveness of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in the special criminal sector in promoting corruption based on the law enforcement factors can be seen in the table below.

Table 5. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in Eradicating Corruption based on Law Enforcement Factors

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	56	93,33%
Less effective	4	6,67%
Ineffective	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 56 or 93,33% of respondents state the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office's role in eradicating corruption based on law enforcement factors have been effective, and there are 4 or 6,67% of respondents who stated that less effective. Were not some respondents stated that it is ineffective.

Based on the table above, the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in carrying out the investigation's role and function is still guided by operational service standards. The South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office's ability, both in terms of quality and quantity, is one of the factors that determines the realization of law enforcement. This condition is in accordance with Satjipto Rahardjo's statement that the demands for professionalism and independence of State Officials are two things that are closely related. It is complicated to develop the professionalism of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office without independence.

The effectiveness of law enforcement in eradicating corruption is also influenced by the Attorney's behavior and personality, particularly the Public Attorney. The Public Attorney's personality dramatically determines the success of investigating criminal acts of corruption, with an educational background, working conditions in the office, daily interactions, family matters, and the Public Attorney's personality, which also affects the role and function of the Attorney.

3. Facility and Infrastructure Factors

Soerjono Soekanto (2008) classified facilities or infrastructure, including educated and skilled human resources, good organization, adequate equipment, and adequate finance. If these things are not fulfilled, then law enforcement will not be possible. According to Bambang Sutyoso (2010), the facilities and infrastructure factors are related to law enforcement officers' completeness or adequate physical facilities and infrastructure, especially modern technological devices in the context of legal dissemination, offsetting limited access for the public, and other facilities and infrastructure. The disruption of the law enforcement process at the Attorney General's Office was caused by an imbalance between human resources and infrastructure. If the situation lasts long enough, it can weaken law enforcement, especially in carrying out corruption eradication activities. The results of the respondent's assessment of the effectiveness of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in the special criminal sector in promoting corruption based on the facility and infrastructure factors can be seen in the table below.

Table 6. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption based on Facility and Infrastructure Factors

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	56	93,33%
Less effective	4	6,67%
Ineffective	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 56 or 93,33% of respondents state the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office’s role in eradicating corruption based on facility and infrastructure factors have been effective, and there are 4 or 6,67% of respondents who stated that less effective. Were not some respondents stated that it is ineffective.

The data above shows that the facilities and infrastructure factors influence the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption. Soerjono Soekanto (2008) said it is complicated to enforce the law if adequate facilities and infrastructure do not support it. Therefore, facilities and infrastructures such as operational costs and other supporting tools, namely computer technology, communication tools, and transportation, are no longer a problem for the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office.

4. Community Factors

Community involvement in the eradication of corruption is relatively new in the concept of modern law enforcement. Long before the concept of a state was present, individuals in society often held deliberations in responding to their social problems. Currently, public participation, especially in judicial administration, has been massive in several countries around the world. Also, because eradicating corruption is essential, the public is made aware again and intensified, with the intention that the community will take part in the corruption eradication program or be given space to eradicate criminal acts of corruption.

In today’s modern era, it has become a demand that society must always make public policies—the better the democratic climate, the better the quality of law produced in a country. There is a positive interaction between the traditional ethos and the political climate. The growth and development of corruption by State Organizers in a country correlates with the absence or ineffectiveness of social, political, religious, and legal controls. Thus, the public’s involvement in law enforcement in eradicating corruption in South Sulawesi Province is very influential because the public can provide information about criminal acts of corruption. The results of the respondent’s assessment of the effectiveness of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in the special criminal sector in promoting corruption based on community factors can be seen in the table below.

Table 7. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption based on Community Factors

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	56	93,33%
Less effective	4	6,67%
Ineffective	0	0,00%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 56 or 93,33% of respondents state the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office’s role in eradicating corruption based on community factors have been effective, and there are 4 or 6,67% of respondents who stated that less effective. Were not some respondents stated that it is ineffective.

Based on the table above, the public influences the role and function of South Sulawesi High Prosecutor’s Office in Eradicating Corruption because without public information, the Attorney will be minimal and slow in investigating corruption perpetrators. Therefore, society’s role is vital in eradicating criminal acts of corruption, either directly or indirectly. Corruption is detrimental to state finances or the country’s economy, which at the same time harms society. Thus, law enforcement efforts against criminal acts of corruption are unrealistic without involving the public. Based on Article 41 of Law No. 20 of 2001, regulates that “*the public can participate in helping efforts to prevent and eradicate corruption.*”

This provision opens opportunities for the public to provide a social role in law enforcement against criminal acts of corruption. In the sense that society has a social control function and is given the entrance to interact and collaborate with the State Officials of law enforcement to eradicate corruption.

The police are obliged to provide legal protection from threats such as violence or threats of violence from any party against the public involved in combating corruption. Without this guarantee, it is difficult to obtain maximum public participation in law enforcement efforts to eradicate corruption.

5. Cultural Factors

Law enforcement against criminal acts of corruption cannot be separated from the factor of legal culture as one of the legal sub-systems. The role and function of South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in Eradicating Corruption also depend on legal culture. According to Faisal Santiago in Satya Arinanto & Triyanti (2011), the law's effectiveness is determined by the effectiveness of the legal sub-system synergistically and integrally, supported by other socio-cultural factors. This means that the purpose of law for society's welfare will only be achieved if the legal structure, legal substance, legal culture, and socio-cultural conditions each contribute positively and effectively. Legal culture is part of the culture in general. The failure of any of the other legal sub-systems will cause the law to lose its meaning.

Many parties fully support State Officials in law enforcement efforts against perpetrators of corruption, even by imposing the heaviest legal sanctions to eradicate corruption. However, not a few parties try to obstruct law enforcement efforts for various reasons, the latter coming from parties who are members of corruption institutions or networks.

The results of the respondent's assessment of the effectiveness of the role and function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in the special criminal sector in promoting corruption based on cultural factors can be seen in the table below.

Table 8. The Role and Function of the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office in Eradicating Corruption based on Cultural Factors

Indicator	Frequency	Percentage
Effective	56	93,34%
Less effective	2	3,33%
Ineffective	2	3,33%
Total	60	100,00%

Data Source: Primary Data Processing, 2020

Based on the data above, 56 or 93,33% of respondents state the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office's role in eradicating corruption based on cultural factors have been effective. There are 2 or 3,33% of respondents who stated that less effective, and there are 2 or 3,33% of respondents who stated that ineffective.

Culture is one of the factors that influence the existence of corruption. When the socio-cultural values are firmly rejected, then corrupt practices will occur because there is no shame in the community concerned. This means that people will always try with various local wisdom so that other social principles prevent all forms of corruption. However, if society indirectly accepts corrupt practices as a new culture, even as a pattern of fulfilling life's needs, no matter how strong the State Organizer makes efforts to enforce the law, they will not eradicate corruption.

The legal system's quality as software and the legal structure as hardware is not a guarantee of eradicating corruption. The sociology of law study needs to explain why the application of law enforcing State Apparatus in eradicating corruption is against legal ideals (*iusconstituendum*). The judicial practice which contradicts the sense of justice has become a scourge in this country. For example, in the corruption case, the former Regent of Barru was sentenced to four years and six months at the first level, and at the court appeal levels, he got an acquittal. Based on this incident, there should be no more reason to release the perpetrator of corruption if he is proven to have committed a criminal act of corruption.

V. CONCLUSION

1. The substance of the Attorney General's Office's role and function in eradicating corruption is to investigate and prosecute perpetrators of criminal acts of corruption that are detrimental to the state.
2. The South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office role and function in eradicating corruption in South Sulawesi Province have been optimal, although several hindering factors still exist.
3. Factors affecting The South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office's role and function in eradicating corruption are legal factors, law enforcement factors, the facility and infrastructure factors, community factors, and cultural factors.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Adji, I. S. (2006). *Korupsi: Kebijakan Aparatur Negara dan Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Diadit Media.
- [2]. Alatas, S. H. (1983). *Sosiologi Korupsi: Sebuah Penjelajahan dengan Data Kontemporer*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- [3]. Ali, A. (2002). *Menguak Tabir Hukum: Suatu Kajian Filosofis dan Sosiologis*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
- [4]. Ali, C. (1979). *Yurisprudensi Indonesia tentang Hukum Pidana Korupsi*. Bandung: Bina Cipta.
- [5]. Amiruddin, A., et al. (2019). The Essential of Criminal Sanction Against Perpetrators of Corruption Committed by State Administrators in Indonesia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 24(9), pp. 34-48.
- [6]. Amos, H. F. A. (2007). *Katastropi Hukum & Quo Vadis Sistem Politik Peradilan Indonesia: Analisis Sosiologi Kritis terhadap Prosedur Penerapan dan Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [7]. Apeldoorn, L. J. v. (2000). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum (Oetarid Sadino, Trans.)*. Jakarta: PT. Pradnya Paramita.
- [8]. Arief, B. N. (2007). *Masalah Penegakan Hukum dan Kebijakan Hukum Pidana dalam Penanggulangan Kejahatan*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- [9]. Arinanto, S. & Triyanti, N. (Eds.). (2011). *Memahami Hukum: Dari Konstruksi sampai Implementasi*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [10]. As'ad, M. N., et al. (2020). The Properties of Law Enforcement of Narcotic Use of Criminal Acts for Children in South Sulawesi Province. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(2), pp. 09-26.
- [11]. Asshiddiqie, J. (1994). *Gagasan Kedaulatan Rakyat dalam Konstitusi dan Pelaksanaannya di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Ichtiar Baru Van Hoeve.
- [12]. Atmadja, A. P. S. (1986). *Mekanisme Pertanggungjawaban Keuangan Negara: Suatu Tinjauan Yuridis*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [13]. Bachmid, F., Sampara, S., & Husen, L. O. (2018). The Rights of the Constitutional Court's Decision on the House of Representatives' Representatives about the President's Prospective and/or the President's Vice Representatives According to the State Basic Law of the Republic of Indonesia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 23(10), pp. 43-61.
- [14]. Baharuddin, H. (2010). *Pemikiran Mengenai Hukum: Sebuah Refleksi Kritis*. Makassar: Nala Cipta Litera.
- [15]. Basah, S. (1997). *Ilmu Negara: Pengantar Metode dan Sejarah Perkembangan*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [16]. Bruggink, J. J. H. (2015). *Refleksi tentang Hukum: Pengertian-Pengertian Dasar dalam Teori Hukum (Bernard Arief Sidharta, Trans.)*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [17]. Budiardjo, M. (2010). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik (Revisi ed.)*. Jakarta: PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [18]. Fachruddin, I. (2004). *Pengawasan Peradilan Administrasi terhadap Tindakan Pemerintah*. Bandung: PT. Alumni.
- [19]. Fahmal, A. M. (2013). *Peran Asas-Asas Umum Pemerintahan yang Layak dalam Mewujudkan Pemerintahan yang Bersih*. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Total Media.
- [20]. Friedman, L. M. (1975). *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- [21]. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 27 of 1983 on Implementation of the Code of Criminal Procedure. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1983 Number 36, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3258).
- [22]. Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 58 of 2010 on Amendment to Government Regulation Number 27 of 1983 on Implementation of the Code of Criminal Procedure. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2010 Number 90, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5145).
- [23]. Hadjon, P. M., et al. (Eds.). (2011). *Pengantar Hukum Administrasi Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: UGM Press.
- [24]. Hamzah, A. (1991). *Perkembangan Hukum Pidana Khusus*. Jakarta: PT. Rineka Cipta.
- [25]. Hamzah, A. (2000). *Pengantar Hukum Acara Pidana*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [26]. Hasma, A., Husen, L. O., & Abbas, I. (2019). Implementation of Fulfilling Rights to Get Health Services in Community Institutions City Class I Makassar. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 24(1), pp. 70-80.
- [27]. Husen, L. O. (2005). *Hubungan Fungsi Pengawasan Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat dengan Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan dalam Sistem Ketatanegaraan Indonesia*. Bandung: CV. Utomo.
- [28]. Husen, L. O. (2019). *Negara Hukum, Demokrasi dan Pemisahan Kekuasaan*. Makassar: CV. Social Politic Genius (SIGn).

- [29]. Husen, L. O., et al. (2017). The Enforcement Of Ethics Of State Officials In The Indonesian Legal System. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 3(5), pp. 1684-1689.
- [30]. Ibrahim, J. (2009). *Pendekatan Ekonomi terhadap Hukum: Teori dan Implikasi Penerapannya dalam Penegakan Hukum*. Surabaya: Putra Media Nusantara.
- [31]. Indrayana, D. (2008). *Negeri Para Mafioso: Hukum di Sarang Koruptor*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- [32]. Kaligis, O. C. (2006). *Pengawasan terhadap Jaksa Selaku Penyidik Tindak Pidana Khusus dalam Pemberantasan Korupsi*. Bandung: PT. Alumni.
- [33]. Kamal, M. (2010). *Efektivitas Penyelenggaraan Kewenangan dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia*. Makassar: Pustaka Refleksi.
- [34]. Kusnardi, M. & Ibrahim, H. (1998). *Pengantar Hukum Tata Negara Indonesia*. Jakarta: CV. Sinar Bakti.
- [35]. Kusumaatmadja, M. (1987). *Fungsi dan Perkembangan Hukum dalam Pembangunan Nasional*. Bandung: Bina Cipta.
- [36]. Latif, A. (2005). *Hukum dan Peraturan Kebijaksanaan (Beleidsregel) pada Pemerintahan Daerah*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- [37]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1 of 1960 on Amendment of the Criminal Code. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1960 Number 1, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 1921).
- [38]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 1981 on the Code of Criminal Procedure. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1981 Number 76, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3209).
- [39]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5 of 1991 on the Attorney General's Office Republic of the Indonesia. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1991 Number 59, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3451).
- [40]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 28 of 1999 on the State Organizer who shall be Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 1999 Number 75, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3851).
- [41]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 20 of 2001 on Amendment to Law Number 31 of 1999 on Eradication of the Criminal Act of Corruption. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2001 Number 134, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4150).
- [42]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2002 on the State Police of the Republic of Indonesia. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2002 Number 2, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4168).
- [43]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 16 of 2004 on the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2004 Number 67, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4401).
- [44]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2009 on the Second Amendment to Law Number 14 of 1985 on the Supreme Court. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 Number 3, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 4958).
- [45]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 46 of 2009 on the Court for Corruption Crimes. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 Number 155, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5074).
- [46]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 48 of 2009 on The Judicial Powers. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2009 Number 157, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5076).
- [47]. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 19 of 2019 on Second Amendment to Law Number 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2019 Number 197, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6409).
- [48]. Manan, B. (2005). *Sistem Peradilan Berwibawa: Suatu Pencarian*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- [49]. Mertokusumo, S. (1981). *Meningkatkan Kesadaran Hukum Masyarakat*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- [50]. Mertokusumo, S. (1985). *Mengenal Hukum: Suatu Pengantar*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- [51]. Nurdjana, I. G. M. (2010). *Sistem Hukum Pidana dan Bahaya Laten Korupsi: Perspektif Tegaknya Keadilan Melawan Mafia Hukum*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [52]. Pasamai, S. (2011). *Sosiologi dan Sosiologi Hukum*. Makassar: PT. Umitoha Ukhuwah Grafika.
- [53]. Pasamai, S., et al. (2017). Factors Affecting the Protection of Indigenous Peoples' Rights under the National Agrarian Law System (Case Study in Central Sulawesi Province). *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 3(5), pp. 1958-1970.
- [54]. Poernomo, B. (1992). *Asas-Asas Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Ghalia Indonesia.
- [55]. Pound, R. (1999). *An Introduction to the Philosophy of Law*. New Jersey: Transaction Publishers.
- [56]. Prasetyo, T. (2018). *Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.

- [57]. Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 29 of 2016 on Amendment to Presidential Regulation Number 38 of 2010 on Organization and Work Procedure of the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia. (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2016 Number 65).
- [58]. Presidential Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 38 of 2010 on Organization and Work Procedure of the Attorney General's Office of the Republic of Indonesia.
- [59]. Radbruch, G. (1961). *Einführung in die Rechtswissenschaft*. Stuttgart: K.F. Kohler.
- [60]. Rahardjo, S. (2000). *Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [61]. Rahman, S., et al. (2020). The Independence and Accountability of the Judge's Decision in The Process of Law Enforcement in Indonesia. *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 25(1), pp. 26-44.
- [62]. Ridwan, H. R. (2016). *Hukum Administrasi Negara*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [63]. Sampara, S. & Husen, L. O. (2016). *Metode Penelitian Hukum*. Makassar: Kretakupa Print.
- [64]. Setiyono, B. (2016). *Birokrasi dalam Perspektif Politik & Administrasi*. Bandung: Nuansa Cendikia.
- [65]. Soekanto, S. (2008). *Faktor-Faktor yang Mempengaruhi Penegakan Hukum*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- [66]. Soesilo, R. (1991). *Kitab Undang-Undang Hukum Pidana (KUHP): Serta Komentar-Komentarnya Lengkap Pasal demi Pasal*. Bogor: Politeia.
- [67]. Sutyoso, B. (2010). *Reformasi Keadilan dan Penegakan Hukum di Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- [68]. Syahrani, R. (1999). *Rangkuman Intisari Ilmu Hukum*. Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti.
- [69]. Thalib, H. (2009). *Sanksi Pidana dalam Konflik Pertanahan, Kebijakan Alternatif Penyelesaian Sengketa Pertanahan di Luar Kodifikasi Hukum Pidana*. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- [70]. Thalib, H., et al. (2017). The Nature of Justice in Criminal Peneemby under the Minimal Limitation in Decision Judge of Corruption. *Imperial Journal of Interdisciplinary Research (IJIR)*, 3(9), pp. 147-154.

S. Sudirman, et. al. "Prosecute Rights as a Function in Law Enforcement on the Eradication of Corruption: Study in the South Sulawesi High Prosecutor's Office." *IOSR Journal of Humanities and Social Science (IOSR-JHSS)*, 26(01), 2021, pp. 23-39.