INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL FOR INNOVATIVE RESEARCH IN MULTIDISCIPLINARY FIELD ISSN: 2455-0620 Volume - 7, Issue - 3, Mar – 2021
Monthly, Peer-Reviewed, Refereed, Indexed Journal with IC Value: 86.87 Impact Factor: 6.719
Received Date: 26/02/2021 Acceptance Date: 13/03/2021 Publication Date: 15/03/2021

INDEPENDENCE OF THE CORRUPTION ERADICATION COMMISSION (CEC) BETWEEN OPPORTUNITIES AND CHALLENGES AND ITS IMPLICATIONS TOWARD THE ERADICATION OF CORRUPTION IN INDONESIA

[1] Muhammad Ridwan Lubis, [2] Yasmirah Mandasari Saragih
[1]Law Faculty, Universitas Muslim Nusantara Al-Washliyah, Medan, Indonesia
[2]Law Study Program, Social Sains Faculty, Universitas Pembangunan Panca Budi, Medan, Indonesia
Email - [1] muhammadridwanlubis76@gmail.com, [2] yasmirahmandasari@gmail.com

Abstract: *The toughest problem faced by the nations in this world after being released from physical colonization was to maintain and fill the joints of the State's life by still putting the law as the commander, one of which was to enforce the law in the field of corruption. And the way to enforce the law could not be separated from efforts to strengthen the institution or the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC). The CEC had to be isolated from forms of affiliation that could undermine its authority and independence. It could be in the form of strengthening the regulation and institutional of CEC itself. And the issue that stuck out this time as an effort to destroy the power of CEC was the controversy of the revision of Law No. 30 of 2002 concerning on CEC, it could be seen from the substance. If the revision was an attempt to weaken the CEC, this was much unapproved. There were five crucial issues which were feared to be included by the House of Representatives (HR) in the draft of revised law of CEC. Namely the limitation of wiretapping authority, the establishment of Supervisory Board of CEC, the elimination of prosecution authority, the tightening of collective-collegial formulas, and arrangements regarding to the execution of the duties of the leader if he was unable to attend. Although the CEC leadership was strong, but if the institution was weakened, it would be a toothless tiger. However, if the revision was actually to strengthen the role of the CEC, the public would strongly agree. CEC's authority in terms of tapping should be maintained, because therein laid its power. Corruption was an extraordinary crime; it needed the extraordinary handling and ways of preventing and eradicating them. If the authority was eliminated, then the role of CEC would be very weak. Moreover, corruption was getting more sophisticated in its mode and manner.*

Key Words: *Independence, Eradication, Corruption.*

1. INTRODUCTION:

Currently the Government of Indonesia had made various efforts to eradicate corruption and saved the State's finances. Various legislative products, institutions and special teams had been set up by the government to combat corruption to its roots in order to save the economy and state's finances. In the era of new order (period of 1971-1999) enacted Law No. 3 Year 1971 on the Eradication of Corruption in which the formulation of corruption refered to the articles in the Criminal Code and its formulation using formal offense. As the executor of the Law, the OPSTIB team was formed according to Presidential Instruction No. 9/1977, but the performance of OPSTIB team was vacuum, and in 1999 the State Administration of Wealth Monitoring Commission / SAWMC was established by Presidential Decree 127/1999. And during the era of reformasi (period of 1999-2002), law no. 3 of 1971 was no longer appropriate with the development of legal needs, then the Law no. 31 of 1999 was ratified and amended by Law no. 20 of 2001 on the Eradication of Corruption as a refinement of the formulation of corruption Act no. 3/1971 (active corruption and passive corruption). Affirmation of the formulation of corruption with formal offenses and broaden the understanding of civil servants.

In addition, Law no. 28, was born in 1999 on the Implementation of the clean state, free of corruption, collusion and nepotism. Beside the law enforcement by the Police and the Attorney General's Office, in order to accelerate the eradication of corruption, the Combined Corruption Eradication Team / CCET was established by government regulation no. 19/2000. Because the government agencies that handled corruption crimes had not functioned effectively and efficiently in combating corruption, thus the Corruption Eradication Commission was established by Law no. 30 of 2002.

In the context of law enforcement against corruption, Indonesia had established a special court of criminal offense under Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Corruption Eradication Commission as set forth in Articles 53 to 62. The establishment of a corruption court created a separate issue, since Law Number 31 Year 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption did not mandate the establishment of a special court of corruption, but it mandated the establishment of an independent commission to eradicate corruption (Article 43 paragraph 1). Then Law No. 30 of 2002 on the Corruption

Eradication Commission was issued as the legal basis for the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission, shortened to CEC.

2. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is a normative legal research, namely legal research conducted by examining library materials or secondary data. In normative research, the data collection tool is document study. The object of research is corruption in Indonesia. The data collection technique used in this research is document / literature study related to the corruption law and corruption case studies that have occurred in Indonesia.

3. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. The Authority of Criminal Acts of Corruption by CEC

Achievement of corruption that had been achieved by Indonesia was not only a direct disadvantage for economic growth and distribution of national development, but also had a negative impact on the entry of foreign investment into Indonesia. Foreign investors and even donor agencies from developed countries often used survey results from international agencies, such as IT and PERC as reference investment decision making. The Failure to handle corruption by the government also faded the image and dignity of the nation in international world. Therefore, serious regulation and government effort in handling corruption were needed (Tuanakotta, 2007).

The existence of the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) as an anti-corruption institution was expected to suppress and systematically reduce corruption in Indonesia. Government's regulation and strategy and public support in eradicating corruption were expected to become KPK's ammunition in acting and working effectively in eradicating corruption. One other important thing, one other important thing, society had to be sensitive and involved in social control (Alatas, 1987).

The authority to investigate and find out corruption cases in Indonesia lied not only on the CEC. Currently in Indonesia, there were police and prosecutorial agencies that had the same authority in terms of investigation of corruption cases. Prosecutors even had the authority to prosecute in court. The spread of authority in a number of judicial institutions in Indonesia had certain consequences that could have both positive and negative implications. Positive implications included that corruption cases could be quickly addressed without having to wait for action from a particular institution (Hamzah, 2002).

Negative implications of the overlapping authority in Indonesia included that often different interpretation of a corruption case occured. Each institution, such as the CEC, the prosecutor and the police often had different perceptions in prosecuting perpetrators of corruption, for example, the prosecution proposed by each institution in the judiciary was not the same. Each had its own argumentation so that sometimes judicial rulings in the judiciary over corruption cases were relatively less objective and did not satisfy the sense of justice in society (Utomo, 2008).

Actually with the authority attached to both agencies to investigate the crime of corruption had advantages and weaknesses, the authority to investigate to the Attorney itself was based on the provisions of Article 25 of Law no. 31/1999 on the Eradication of Corruption "Investigation, prosecution and examination in Court proceedings in cases of corruption must take precedence over other matters for immediate settlement".

Relating to the article in particular "for the immediate settlement" of the cases of corruption itself, with the authority of the inquiry attached to the prosecutor was expected to accelerate the handling of corruption cases, because the Prosecutor as the Public Prosecutor had to understand correctly about the case he handled directly from the investigation, so he also understood what was needed in the prosecution later based on the investigation conducted, where it was also to address Article 110 paragraph (1) and Article 138 paragraph (2) of the criminal procedur code, namely:

1) Article 110 Paragraph (1) of the Criminal Procedure Code "In case the investigator had completed the investigation, the investigator should immediately submit the case file to the prosecutor".
2) Article 138 Paragraph (2) of the criminal procedure code "In the event that the results of the investigation were incomplete, the prosecutor returned the case file to the investigator accompanied by instructions on things to be completed and within 14 days from the date of receipt of the file, the investigator had to have resubmitted the file of the case to the public prosecutor ".

It was very confusing to determine the authority of corruption case investigation in any one agency, because each agency that had the authority to investigate must have its strength and weakness, but given that the country was also very concerned about the certainty of legislation, of course the habit of investigating authority of this corruption case needed to be overcome, because at any time overlap between the Attorney and the Police Office in handling the investigation of a corruption case could be occured, or on the contrary, they handed each other the handling of the case, if it did so, instead of solving the problem, it would inhibit the handling (Diansyah et al, 2011).

Corruption was not a trivial matter, corruption could tackle, affect, and harmed the joints of the country's economy, but there was still custom arrangement as we encountered as above. Of course, theres should be certainty on the authority of the investigation, such as the certainty of investigative authority attached to the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC), where there was certainty of qualification of authority to investigate the stages of handling other corruption cases. Similarly, regarding the authority of the investigation that was in the Attorney and the Police, it was better not to have any overlapping authority as today, recalling that this country was a country that did not neglect a legal certainty.

The Corruption Eradication Commission had duties as stipulated in Article 6 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, as follows:

1) Coordinate with agencies authorized to commit criminal acts of corruption.
2) To supervise the authorized entity to eradicate corruption; the authorized entity should include the Supreme Audit Board, the Financial and Development Supervisory Board, the State Administration's Wealth Inspection Commission, the inspectorate on the Department or Non-Departmental Government Institution.
3) Investigate, inspect and prosecute corruption.
4) Undertaking acts of prevention of criminal acts of corruption.
5) Monitoring of State administration.

b. The Strategy and The Effort of Corruption Eradication in Indonesia

In general norm in society and specific norm such as legislation, the term of corruption had various definitions. This distinction of definitions caused different legal and social implications in society. An act of corruption that harmed the state's finances might be socially considered by society as a fair and non-infringing act. This was because the views and understanding of a society against corruption were different from other people. Therefore, a society could assess an act including in the practice of corruption, but not so with other communities, especially in a permissive and patronialistic society.

Usually a corruption case involved two parties, namely the apparatus (which accepted the bribes) and the citizen (who gave the bribes). However, in the eyes of the law, embezzlement was also an act of corruption, although this type of corruption did not involve the citizens directly, because the embezzlement was only done by one party, namely the apparatus. Embezzlement was one form of corruption and abusement of power that became the mode of corruption in the most corrupted countries, involving the holders of monopoly rights. The most obvious case of embezzlement was in the form of protecting their business interests by using political power.

In some other countries the mode was like trying to nationalize foreign companies, property rights and monopoly rights, and distributed them to groups that closed to power. However, in reality the existence of this legal instrument did not necessarily facilitate law enforcement. The problem of stagnant of corruption eradication in Indonesia turned out to be more complex, namely not only concerning the content of policy and the regulation of legislation governing the eradication of corruption itself, but also other factors that directly influenced the chain of policy formulation itself. Strong political will need to be the foundation for corruption eradication policies to have sufficient and effective legitimacy, but unfortunately the political will was still weak. This was indicated when law enforcement of corruption involving elite and big names would be very difficult (Hamzah, 2002).

1) Strategy and Effort of Approach through Legal Culture

According to Mahfud MD related to the eradication of corruption, that: "Indonesia was destroyed by corruption, a lot of corruption because the judiciary was corrupt, and the world of justice is difficult to clean without any extraordinary way. Now many law enforcement officers in the regions had made the instruction to hunt corruptors as an ATM or an effective new money-picking tool. Many law enforcement officers then extorted officials in the area by threatening to be prosecuted due to alleged corruption." (Mahfud, 1999).

This legal culture aspect had a very important role in the enforcement of criminal acts in Indonesia (Soekanto, 1992). According to Lawrence M. Friedman explained about the concept of legal culture was the attitude of man to the law and the legal system of belief, value, thought, and hope. In other word the legal culture was (Ali, 2003) social moods and social forces that determined how the law was used, avoided or abused, in the absence of cultural / legal culture, the legal system itself was powerless.

This element of legal culture included opinions, habits, ways of thinking, and how to act good leadership. In this case such as presidents, State administrators, officials of the State apparatus, as well as from law enforcement officers should give an example not to violate the rule of law such as doing criminal acts of corruption, and then the legal culture would help to reduce corruption.

This was because Indonesian people liked to follow or imitate what their leader did. Without legal culture then the legal system would lose its power as Lawrence M. Friedman said: "without legal culture, the legal system is meet-as dead fish lying in a basket, not a living fish swimming in its sea". The description of the legal culture in the elements of the legal system was that like a machine that produced something, the legal substance was like the product produced

by the machine, and the legal culture was anything or anyone who decided to run the machine and limited the use of the machine (Hartanti, 2007).

Concerning to legal culture, the steps taken to support the reform of the legal system and politics were translated into the awareness raising program of law and human rights. This program was aimed to cultivate and improve the level of legal awareness and human rights of the community including the state organizers so that they not only know and realize their rights and obligations, but also able to behave in accordance with the rule of law and respect for human rights. The program was expected to realize the implementation of a clean state and provided respect and protection of human rights.

Strategy (grand design) in improving the character of legal culture was through legal counseling activities drawn up with reference to the strategic plan set by the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights and work programs of the National Legal Development Board, which was adapted to the development of community dynamics and advances in information technology. Implementation of its activities was more by using new innovations and modern communication media including electronic media, print media and other media, including in techniques and methods of legal counseling.

The legal materials that were presented include laws and regulations at the Central and Regional level and legal norms. The legal material was based on evaluation results, legal issues, state interests, and community needs. Every year, the priority of legislation and legal norms was made as the subject matter of Legal Counseling.

Based on the Strategic Plan of the Ministry of Justice and Human Rights mentioned above that the Legal Counseling Center in improving the culture of public law set the policy direction as follows: (BPHN, 2010)

a) Educating and civilizing the law in general which was addressed to the whole community including the organizers of State and law enforcement officers, in line with the direction of the President of RI, that all state officials are responsible for the dissemination of law to all levels of society so that the public understands the law as a whole which was directly a preventive step in order to avoid violation of law. The violations of the law that occured due to weak dissemination and legal counseling and it becamea a part of the responsibility of state organizers.
b) Increasing the use of more modern communication media in the implementation of dissemination and legal counseling, including electronic media, print media, and other media that supported the acceleration of dissemination, knowledge, understanding and comprehension of law.
c) Improving coordination in implementing socialization of law nationally, patterned and well structured by utilizing all supporting infrastructure such as active participation of society, electronic and non electronic media and other channels such as utilization of information technology and so on.
d) Law enforcement action should be accompanied by preventive efforts in the form of socialization of legal products, because the function of law was beside the creator of order, also must be able to provide protection for the people to obtain justice and not to suffer. Therefore legal counseling should receive serious attention.

2) Action Strategy to Save the Assets of proceeds of Corruption

State losses due to corruption were still not covered and public unrest was still high toward law enforcement on criminal acts in Indonesia. Criminalization was one of the most important legal elements in criminal law enforcement. The criminal law without associating it with criminalization was like a toothless tiger. Penalty by the court was a legitimate endeavor, which was based on the law to impose sorrow or suffering on a person convicted of a criminal offense. Criminalization itself was a social order associated with, and always reflects, the value and structure of society, thus representing a symbolic reaffirmation of a violation of a "collective conscience", borrowing the terminology of Emile Durkheim (Harkrisnowo, 2003).

The issue of asset recovery to minimize state losses was a factor that was not less important than the efforts to eradicate corruption, besides sentencing the perpetrator with the severest punishment. Measures to minimize the loss of the country should not only be done from the beginning of the case with freezing and seizure, but it was also absolutely necessary through cooperation with other countries where the proceeds of crime were in place. Therefore, the law enforcement orientation regarding the return of this asset needs to be sharpened, especially in cooperative relations with other countries either through the exchange of financial intelligence information facilitated by the central reporting and transaction analysis (CRTA), coordination with the Corruptor Hunt Team, as well as mutual legal assistance cooperation between our government and the government of other countries (Atmasasmita, 2008).

Basically the return of the assets of the proceeds of crime was not always fixed on the assets of the proceeds of corruption. In the Criminal Code itself the asset seizure was legalized by Article 39 paragraph (1) of the Criminal Code which stated that the goods belonging to a convicted person obtained from a crime or intentionally used to commit a crime could be confiscated. Thus, it was concluded that the return of assets with deprivation could be applied in all criminal offenses in the Criminal Code, especially the crimes against objects (Atmasasmita, 2008).

The repatriation of losses from corruption seemed impossible because of the huge amounts of material and immaterial losses. In addition, another obstacle was the process of tracking and investigation of corrupted assets was

the biggest challenge in the legal action of criminal acts of corruption. Discussing about the outcome will never be finished because evil will always exist in the world as long as life exists in the world, but it would be better if the community would be able to understand and took into account the assessment of corruption so as to reduce the losses caused by the criminal act of corruption.

3) Bureaucratic Reform Strategy

The challenges faced by CEC at the same time were an opportunity and momentum to improve solidity and build consolidation of all social resources owned by KPK and anti-corruption movement. The CEC and the social network of corruption eradication had the opportunity to "pause", undertook deep reflections to review and calculate all of its strategic programs to deal with a more systematic "invasion" using various means, including existing legal channels.

The "worst" situation that CEC would face was the "collapse" of the institution because it was considered to be no longer feasible, not longger getting public trust, and no longer getting political support. The destruction of Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) could be begun by bringing Bibit-Chandra case to the court. Destruction or the existence of "worst" would happen because CEC resources would lose their spirituality and also splitted and could no longer optimally perform their functions, duties and authority for the interest of eradicating corruption.

The process in court was indeed very potential to be misused by various parties who did not fully want the existence of CEC by "exploiting" and "discredit" the image and honor of CEC institution. In short, CEC will be made to get distrust from its primary users, the public and the justisiabel. CEC was deemed no longer appropriate to be an icon of reform because it was equally bad with other law enforcement agencies. The situation would be used as the basis of legitimacy to deconstruct the existence of CEC as a triger mechanism in eradicating corruption within the whole system of law enforcement related to the eradication of corruption.

c. The Independence of CEC

As mandated in Article 15 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning the Corruption Eradication Commission, the Corruption Eradication Commission was obliged:

1) To provide protection to witnesses or reporters who submit reports or provide information about the occurrence of criminal acts of corruption;
2) To Provide information to the public who needed or provide assistance to obtain other data related to the results of the prosecution of criminal acts of corruption that it handled;
3) To compile an annual report and submit it to the President of the Republic of Indonesia, the House of Representatives of the Republic of Indonesia, and the State Audit Board;
4) To Uphold the Oath of Office;
5) To carry out its duties, responsibilities and authorities based on the principles referred to Article 5.

Law Number 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption was guided by Law No. 3 of 1971 on the Eradication of Criminal Acts of Corruption, which the law has been replaced because it was not relevant and effective with developments in preventing and combating corruption. In Article 43 paragraph (1) of Law Number 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption that there was a formula which mandated the establishment of Corruption Eradication Commission, that: "Within no later than 2 (two) years since this Law comes into force, the Corruption Eradication Commission is established."

Where in Article 43 paragraph (2) of Law Number 31 of 1999 on the Eradication of Corruption, the role of coordination and supervision of CEC institutions contained : "The Commission as referred to in paragraph (1) had the duty and authority to coordinate and supervise, including conducting investigation and prosecution in accordance with the provisions of applicable laws and regulations."

The regulation of CEC's duty in coordination and supervision was regulated in Article 6 of Law Number 30 of 2002 concerning on the Corruption Eradication Commission, that the Corruption Eradication Commission had a duty:

1) Coordination with the authorized institutions to eradicate corruption;
2) Supervision toward authorized institutions to eradicate corruption;
3) Conducting investigations, and prosecutions of corruption;
4) Conducting actions to prevent corruption; and
5) Monitoring of State administration.

The core of independence for the CEC was the CEC's ability to behave objectively in formulating its own policies without being influenced by "outside". This outside interest was generally perceived as the political interests of the ruler. Independence could not always be achieved by relying only on the legal framework that stipulated that the

KPK was established by a special law which provided "facilities" of independence well. Many cases in some countries that CEC remained successful and independent although it was still responsible to the president or head of government, as happened in Singapore and Hongkong (Muladi, 2006).

The independence of the KPK was more judged by : (i) The availability of a transparent mechanism to assess the performance of the CEC concerned, so it could keep its function unbiased, (ii) The selection of CEC leaders used a democratic, transparent and objective procedure, (iii) Selected CEC leaders were known as people with good integrity and have been tested. All the KPK members who had proven their independence could give excellent results in eradicating corruption in their country (Nugroho, 2007).

CEC as a new state institution was expected to restore the image of law enforcement in Indonesia. The high burden of existing institutions required a new institution as a supplement that was filled with professional human resources with a good track record. For the sake of achieving optimal public services for the community, the government considered that it was necessary to establish a new institution, in this case the workload of the police and the prosecutor was considered too much so that many arrears arised case. As a step of state adjustment to the development of the state administration system and the demands of the change of the state administration system, the state was forced to reform in various lines, including institutional reform. Some non-structural institutions were formed to accommodate this, including the enforcement of the rule of law, the improvement of court image (Hartanti, 2007).

The development of certain governmental authorities held by government organizations was increasingly complex, so it was no longer possible to be regularly managed within the organization concerned. In order to implement good governance then there was an idea believed that the establishment of additional institutions that were non structural would be more open opportunities in an effort to apply the principles of good governance. It was important to realize that the establishment of the Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) was based on the assumption that corruption in Indonesia was considered as an extraordinary crime (Djaja, 2009).

4. CONCLUTION:

The Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) was a constitutional state institution although it was not mentioned clearly in the constitution of the state, namely the 1945 Constitution. The KPK was formed by looking at the nature of the corruption itself, which was an extraordinary crime, so that an independent institution was needed to combat corruption in Indonesia. The background of the establishment of the CEC was not due to a rigidly defined constitutional design, but rather to the incidental issues within the state and the common will of the Indonesian people to combat corruption.

The position of CEC as one of the new state institutions was independent and free from any influence of power, it is intended that in eradicating corruption, KPK did not get intervention from any party. The establishment of the KPK was also the answer to the ineffectiveness of the performance of law enforcement agencies so far in combating corruption, which seemed protracted in the handling and even indicated there was an element of corruption in the handling of the case.

REFERENCES:

1. Alatas, Corruption: Nature, Cause and Function, Jakarta, LP3ES, 1987.
2. Ali, Achmad, The Fall of Law in Indonesia (Cause and Solution), Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta. 2003.
3. Atmasasmita, Romli, Legal Assessment, Criminalization, Asset Returns, International Cooperation in the United Nations Convention, Jakarta: National Legal Development Board, Department of Justice and Human Rights, 2008.
4. BPHN, Ministry of Justice and Human Rights of the Republic of Indonesia, Seminar Report on Building a Community Conscious and Intelligent on Law Starting from Early Age, Jakarta, BPHN, 2010.
5. Diansyah, Febri et al, Corruption Eradication Improvement Research Report through Coordination Function and Corruption Eradication Commission (CEC) Supervision, Indonesia Corruption Watch, Jakarta, 2011.
6. Djaja, Ermansjah, Combating Corruption with CEC: Normative Juridical Study Law No.31 of 1999 junto Law No.20 of 2001 Version of Law No.30 of 2002, 2009.
7. Hamzah, Andi, Comparison of Corruption Eradication in Various Countries, Jakarta, PT. Sumber Ilmu Jaya, 2002.
8. Harkrisnowo, Harkristuti, Reconstruction of the Criminal Concept: A Lawsuit Against Litigation and Criminal Proceedings in Indonesia, delivered in Oration at the Inauguration Ceremony of Permanent Professor in Criminal Law Sciences at the University of Indonesia law faculty at UI Convention Center, Depok, 2003.
9. Hartanti, Evi, Corruption Crime, Second Edition, Sinar Grafika, Jakarta, 2007.
10. Mahfud MD, Political and Legal Struggle in Indonesia, GamaMedia, Yogyakarta. 1999.

11. Muladi, "The Concept of Total Enforcement in Combating Corruption in Political Legal Framework", Paper presented in the forum of coordination and consultation in the framework of intersification of corruption eradication, Jakarta, November 8th, 2006.
12. Nugroho, Hibnu, Integralization of Corruption Inquiry in Indonesia, Media Prima Aksara, Jakarta, 2012.
13. Soekanto, Soerjono. Legal Awareness and Legal Compliance. Rajawali, Jakarta. 1992.
14. Tuanakotta, M. Theodorus (Forensic Accounting and Investigative Audit) Jakarta, Lembaga Penerbit FE Universitas Indonesia, 2007.
15. Utomo, Sulistyo, Overlapping Authority of Corruption Crime Investigation, Warta Hukum Edition: August-September, Education and Training Center of Law Faculty of Law Universitas Islam Indonesia 2008.