

Corruption Degrades the Government Ethics

By

Abdul Nadjib

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia
Email: anadjib.salatti@gmail.com

Oemar Madri Bafadhal

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

Abdul Halim

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Sriwijaya, Palembang, Indonesia

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the impact of corruption in degrading government ethics. The rational nature of the individual will lead him to prioritize the applicable norms so that the relevant individual is more critical of all actions carried out. In this regard, individuals will carefully consider whether their actions will cause harm or benefit the other party. This research applied a qualitative descriptive approach. Researchers attempted to describe, analyze attitudes, perceptions, and thoughts about corruption in relation to local government ethics by conducting a literature review, including library sources that have relevance values. The results of this study indicate that Corruption degrades the ethics of government at least due to 3 (three) corrupt behaviors, including political corruption, bureaucratic collusion, and coercive factors from excessive and extreme social structures.

Keywords: Corruption, government ethic, bureaucracy

1. Introduction

One of the long-standing issues in Indonesia today is the prevalence of corruption. Corruption happens at practically every level of government, from the national to the regional to the local. Almost every time we receive news in the media or on social media, there are federal, regional, and local authorities involved in corruption by authorized officials, such as police, prosecutors, or the Corruption Eradication Commission (called as KPK). In 2020, Transparansi International (TI) published Indonesia's Corruption Perception Index (CPI), which received a score of 37/100 and ranked 102 out of 180 nations polled. This score has declined by three points from 2019, and it now stands at 40/100. In terms of Indonesia's CPI score, 2019 represents the best accomplishment in the recent 25 years. Indonesia is ranked fourth in Southeast Asia, behind Singapore, Brunei Darussalam, and Malaysia. The Philippines, Thailand, and Timor Leste are ranked below Indonesia. Such conditions are inconsistent with Indonesia's categorization as a religious country that values ethics in government management. KPK reported that there were 114 regional heads involved in rasuah cases from 2004 to 2019. In detail, 73 people or 64% were regents, 25 people or 24% were mayors, and 16 people or 22% were governors, while the number of corruption cases by region in 2004 - 2019 consisted of 846 cases spread across: Central Government (359 cases), West Java (101 cases), East Java (85 cases), North Sumatra (64 cases), DKI Jakarta (61 cases), Riau and Riau Islands (51 cases), Central Java (49 cases), Lampung (30 cases), Banten (24 cases), and South Sumatra, East Kalimantan, Bengkulu and Papua (22 cases).

According to Sina(2008),the impact of acts of corruption, among others, can damage the order or norms in society, cause community suffering in the economic, legal and political sectors, destroy the national economy, increase poverty rates, soar prices of goods, and decline in public services.So, that acts of corruption are seen as extraordinary crimes. At present, the practice of corruption is increasingly widespread, not only limited to the officials concerned, but also by cronies and families. This means that corruption has occurred in the executive, legislative, judicial and private circles of power, because this practice no longer recognizes the boundaries.

One of the factors that causes corruption among the government is the erosion of government ethics among officials and the ranks of the government itself. This violation of government ethics has made Indonesia not free from corruption. But the hope and pressure of the public to create a government or country that is free from corrupt practices is getting stronger. Various laws and regulations show a political desire to uphold the ethics of state officials. Starting from the philosophy of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia; TAP MPR No. XI/MPR/1998 regarding the Implementation of a Clean and Free State of Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism; Law Number 28 of 1999 regarding the Implementation of a Clean and Free State from Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism and Law Number 43 of 1999 concerning Amendments to Law no. 8 of 1974 concerning the Basics of Employment (LN No. 169 and Supplementary LN No. 3090); then Law no. 32 of 2004 regarding local government which was updated with Law No. 3 of 2005 and Law no. 12 of 2008 related to local government; and PP No. 60 related to Civil Servant Discipline. Unfortunately, the laws and regulations that contain the ethical provisions of the state officials concerned are actually ignored by the officials concerned with unlawful acts, for example corruption by abusing authority, alliances to enrich individuals, inefficient management of state finances, actions that cause state financial losses, thus disrupting the provide public services and development.

The lack of government ethics carried out by public officials and a bureaucracy that lacks transparency, does not heed obligations for the interests of the people and serves their personal life, abuses authority against the law as exemplified earlier, are the reasons for the emergence of legal cases of corruption from the central, regional to regional levels and rural area.Literally, corruption is rotten, ugly, depraved, dishonest, can be bribed, has no morals, deviates from chastity. Benny Susetyo said, why is corruption seen as a culture? Because corruption is often left unchecked. When talking about culture, it is a value. This value is embedded, for example a culture of community service or hard work. Culture as a value system and the value system being formed is a positive not a negative one. So, it can be said that basically corruption is not culture but against culture.

Indonesia is a cultured country with noble values based on the values of Pancasila. The foundation of this philosophy is then very thick with the good personality of the community. Pancasila is a noble guideline made by the founders of the nation who is very concerned about the values, norms, and morals of the Indonesian nation. As has been explained that the ethics of government in Indonesia is derived from the cultural values and religious values of the Indonesian people which aim to regulate people's behavior in everyday life. In relation to the embodiment of government ethics, which has been described above, but in the administration of government, there are still many government officials and their staff who have not practiced these ethics in the life of society, nation and state.

There are many crucial cases in Indonesia that reflect the erosion of government ethics by corrupt behavior among state officials at the central and regional levels. Lately, the Indonesian people are not in harmony with their identity as a virtuous nation as stated above, the image of the nation as a great nation has faded, acts of corruption committed by political elites, state officials and the general public have tarnished the face of the country. According to Harkrisnowo(2002), the perpetrators of corruption are not just anyone because they have access to launch corruption, by abusing their authority, opportunities and facilities. State officials at the center and regions who were caught in the hands of the KPK's Sting Operation in 2020 were carried out 10 times, 2019 with 21 times, and in 2018 there were 30 OTTs, and 2017 with 19 OTTs.

Indonesia is often shown with the behavior of public officials who are very far from the ethics that are upheld by the nation. Corruption behavior mainly does not reflect his attitude and behavior as a public official, who prioritizes only enriching himself and abusing his office authority. Corruption in Indonesia, especially among state officials, is rampant, and they show this behavior without shame, and often when seen on television the corruptors smile and even look like they feel relaxed and ordinary even though they are wearing orange vests and handcuffed.

As revealed by Suwarno Yoseph (2019, cited in Nur & Ningsih, 2019) that perpetrators of corruption in Indonesia are generally not deterred and tend to want to do it again. It can be seen from the inspection of the Directorate General of Corrections at the Ministry of Law and Human Rights conducted at the Sukamiskin Prison in July 2018, found various kinds of items that should not be in the cell. These items such as; TV, refrigerator, stove, air conditioner, microwave, some money and even the convicts changed the atmosphere of the cell to be like a private room and put luxury items into it. This is what Suwarno Yoseph later revealed that corruption convicts are not deterred from being punished because they enjoy luxurious facilities, there are no restrictions and even tend to be free to make transactions and go in and out of prisons.

Meanwhile, Nadjib(2020) state that corruption occurs because of the clientelism habitus that inhibits some people from accessing social capital. On the other hand, clientelism also encourages people to use their social capital with the aim of getting the desired feedback. In other words, corruption committed by public officials in the regions can be caused by the use of social capital for negative purposes. In another study, Nadjib(2020) shows that religiosity cannot completely prevent an apparatus from committing a criminal act of corruption. The practice of corruption by the state apparatus is more dominant due to social pressure, a supportive system, and an organizational culture that allows (providing opportunities), in addition to the greedy attitude of the perpetrators. The use of social capital for the negative purpose of corruption by public officials and the powerlessness of religiosity to restrain public officials from committing corruption indicate that government ethics has been eroded by other interests for public officials. Based on the explanation in question, the author wishes to express his thoughts with the title "Corruption Degrades the Government Ethics".

2. Research Methodology

This study applies a qualitative descriptive approach (qualitative descriptive research). Researchers attempt to describe, analyze attitudes, perceptions, and thoughts about corruption in relation to local government ethics by conducting a literature review, namely library sources that have relevance values so that they get descriptions, expressions,

and explanations of the objects studied (Bogdan & Sari, 1982). Nawawi & Martini (1994) mentioned that descriptive method was a method that described a certain object or event based on the reality that was seen and as it should be, which was then drawn general conclusions based on the reality concerned. Meanwhile, Sugiyono (2008) stated qualitative research method was a research method based on post-positivism philosophy which was commonly used for research in natural conditions where the researcher was the key instrument. The technique of collecting qualitative data was carried out descriptively, it was the data in the form of categorized symptoms or other forms such as documents, observations, field notes, and photos during the research (Sarwono, 2006). To complement the data and information from the literature, this study also conducted in-depth interviews with 8 key informants from the bureaucratic apparatus, and the community in Muara Enim Regency and Palembang City, South Sumatra Province. The collected data and information were then analyzed according to research problems until it showed three corrupt behaviors, including political corruption, bureaucratic collusion, and coercive factors from excessive and extreme social structures.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 The Concept of Government Ethics

In Latin “ethica” means civilized, behavior, moral, and in Indonesian “Etika-Etik-Etis” means: behavior, procedures, manners, morals, morals; while ethics is often used in legal language, including: norms, rules, regulations. From an etymological point of view, the word ethics comes from the Greek, “Etos” which means moral character or customs. Among the branches of philosophy that are limited by moral values regarding things that are allowed or not, good or bad, worthy or not, on a person’s behavior (Krisyanto, 2008). Ethics seeks truth and as philosophy seeks the deepest (right) fame. The task, especially ethics, is to find a measure of whether a person’s behavior is good or bad. Ethics will look for which individual actions are good (Zubair, 2010). Based on the Encyclopedi Britanica, ethics is defined as moral philosophy, it is a systematic study of the basic nature of the concept of good, bad, must, right and other values. Frankin revealed that ethics is ethics as a branch of philosophy, it is moral philosophy or philosophical views related to morality, moral issues and moral considerations (Zubair, 2010).

Of the various concepts related to ethics, it can be classified into 3 types, including:

- a) Which emphasizes the historic aspect: where ethics is considered as a branch of philosophy that discusses the issue of whether or not a person's behavior is good or bad.
- b) Which explains descriptively: ethics is considered as a science that discusses the issue of whether or not a person's behavior in the lives of others. This concept does not look at the reality that there are various norms because there are inequalities in time and location, so that ethics is a descriptive science and tends to be sociological.
- c) Which focuses on the nature of ethics as a normative science and leads to philosophy, in which ethics is considered as a normative, evaluative science that only gives good or bad values on a person's behavior. In this case there is no need to show the reality, it is enough to provide information, suggest and reflect. From this concept, ethics is classified as a discussion that is informative, directive and reflexive.

Government ethics is a subset of ethics in general, while ethics is very broad (Krisyanto, 2008:11). Ethics as a branch of philosophy. The task, especially ethics, is to find a measure of whether a person's behavior is good or bad. Ethics will look for which individual actions are

good (Zubair, 2010). According to Haryatmoko (2011), ethics is more interpreted as a reflection of whether it is good or not, right or wrong that must be carried out or how to do what is good or right. While the opinion of Bertens (2013), ethics is moral. Ethics relates to an action that can be carried out or not. Ethics does not depend on the presence or absence of others. Ethics tends to be absolute. Ethics makes a person to think and act carefully by paying attention to whether or not the actions are carried out. Ethics is called absolute meaning that ethics does not provide space to reduce its meaning from an act that is carried out. By prioritizing the good side, individuals can carry out ethical actions so as not to cause harm to others. Praja (2003) emphasizes that ethics is fundamental, namely critical nature. Ethics requires that individuals have a rational attitude to norms. The rational nature of the individual will lead him to prioritize the applicable norms so that the relevant individual is more critical of all actions carried out. In this regard, individuals will carefully consider whether their actions will cause harm or benefit the other party.

If ethics are used as the basis for acting, the individual concerned will take steps not to cause harm to other parties. So, ethics is not an abstract thing and can be rationalized so that in essence it is not difficult to implement but can be seen as complicated because individuals carry out other offers that tend to be profitable for him even though it has to cause harm to other parties. In ethics, it is generally known as conscience. According to Bertens (2013), conscience is an institution within the individual that gives judgments regarding the morality of individual actions. Disobeying one's conscience means destroying one's personal integrity and betraying the innermost dignity of the individual. Conscience is also defined as moral awareness, an institution that makes individuals aware of good or bad things (morally) in individual behavior (Bertens, 2013). Based on the individual's conscience, the related individual seems to have received demands from him who judged that an action was appropriate or not carried out. If the demands from within for success lead to positive things, it will have a positive impact on the behavior of the individual concerned. The individual concerned can maintain and maintain his integrity and not tarnish the innermost dignity of the individual. For example, in the context of corruption, if his conscience leads to a positive direction that corruption tarnishes his personal integrity and causes harm to others, then the individual concerned will actually block himself from carrying out corruption. Thus, an understanding of the right conscience can lead individuals to carry out ethical principles correctly, including public ethics for public leaders, especially regional heads who are often the central figure and exert influence over a region.

Public ethics focuses on standards in determining a good deed or not in public service. According to (Haryatmoko, 2011), the goal of public ethics is to ensure the integrity of officials in public services. Haryatmoko also added that public ethics requires 3 competencies of public officials, including technical competence, ethics and leadership (Haryatmoko, 2011). If public ethics is understood by every public leader, it is the regional head, then actions that violate ethics, for example corruption, can at least be minimized, especially not carried out by regional heads. There should be ethical competence contained in public ethics as a demand for public leaders or regional heads so that the integrity of regional heads is always maintained in addition to the technical competencies that must be possessed.

Government ethics relates to the main things that must be done by public officials and government officials. So that in government ethics, it discusses the behavior of government administrators, especially in using power, authority and the legitimacy of power related to good or bad behavior (Zuhro, 2010). The basic argument why ethics of governance is important gets attention in developing efficient, sensitive and accountable government. Based on Agus Dwiyanto (2006), the problems that occur in government in the future will be more complex.

The increasing modernity of society has led to a variety of public problems that are more and more complex and must be resolved by the government. Moreover, the current fact is that Indonesia is undergoing a new normal and disruption era that is full of uncertainty. Actually, public officials must continue to maintain their authority and good government reputation with daily performance and behavior by preventing their personalities from disgraceful actions that cause harm to society and the state. So that ethics must be obeyed by public officials and apparatus in essence as an effort to form morality as the basis for doing and behaving in living together, especially in the administrative profession environment (Zuhro, 2010).

Degradation is a decrease in degree, rank, and position. According to Daryanto(2014), degradation is a decrease in quality and a decline in position. As for the degradation which is interpreted as a decrease in quality or moral damage. Based on Widjaja (cited in Jahroh, Windi Siti & Nana Sutarna, 2016) morals are good teachings related to actions and behavior (morals).

Based on the opinion concerned, the conclusion is that the degradation of government ethics is a decrease in awareness in the behavior of public officials based on existing rules, rules, values as a result of the lack of awareness of obeying the law, while the law is contained in one's heart in the form of value.

There is a tendency for government ethics to continue to decline in quality or degradation between years. In all moral aspects, from attitude patterns, mindsets and patterns of action, some public officials tend to violate or negate government ethics. Unfortunately, this ethical degradation seems to have been released from the spotlight and is allowed to continue from time to time without any correction efforts from internal or external government in the region. For the public official concerned, it seems as if everything is going well and there are no moral and ethical violations.

3.2 The Concept of Corruption and Its Impact in The Regions

The origin of the word corruption from Latin is *corruptio*, in English it is corruptio or corrupt, and in Dutch it is corruptie. The word corruption in Indonesian refers to the Dutch language (Hamzah, 1991). Corruption according to the KBBI is misusing state money, companies, for personal interests or other parties. The definition of corruption based on the United Nations Convention Against Corruption (UNCAC), it is the United Nations Convention Against Corruption, explains that corruption crimes take the form of giving bribes (bribery), embezzling public money (embezzlement of public funds), abusing authority and influence (trading in influence), concealment and laundering of proceeds of corruption, money laundering and illicit enrichment (Badjuri, 2011).

Corruption is an extraordinary crime that harms the democratic process, social and economic rights of the general public. The problem of corruption in Indonesia is everywhere and widespread, and we can find it in government and non-government institutions (private companies). Corruption in government institutions will harm state finances and make people miserable. If corruption occurs in private companies, it will have an impact on the destruction of the company and also create misery for the people (Sosiawan, 2019). According to theory, the effects of corruption include destroying societal norms, hindering state development, suffering in the economic, administrative, legal and political sectors, the economic destruction of a country, increasing poverty in society, increasing prices, and decreasing public trust in the state authorities. Therefore, corruption is called an extraordinary crime (Sina, 2008).

In this regard, John Girling (1997), reveals that corruption is the culmination point of the process of systemic collusion between the actors of political institutions (both politicians

or bureaucrats) and economic actors (private sector) which tends to be continuous so as to form a dilemmatic condition (reconfusion) in define 'public' and 'private' scope boundaries. The word collusion in question can be interpreted as a secret agreement for the benefit of two parties which is generally illegal or forgery. It means, collusion is a precondition for the emergence of corruption because collusion is generally rationalized so that the system that has been formed continues to run both in the public and business sectors.

As a supporting tool in knowing the types of corruption patterns, it is based on the typology expressed by Hussein(1986) who develops and identifies corruption from its minimalist-looking meaning into a number of types, including:

1. Transactive corruption, it is corruption that shows a reciprocal agreement between the giver and the recipient for mutual benefit, both of which are actively involved in carrying out the relevant action.
2. Extortive corruption, it is corruption that includes a certain form, it is the party who gives is required to give bribes to avoid losses that threaten personal, interests, people or something he values.
3. Investive corruption, it is corruption that includes product offerings that are not directly related to certain benefits obtained by the giver, in addition to the desired benefits obtained in the future.
4. Nepotistic corruption, it is corruption in the form of special treatment for partners or those who are closely related to occupy public positions. This means preferential treatment with all forms that are contrary to existing rules or regulations.
5. Autogenic corruption is corruption that is carried out by a person because of the opportunity to benefit from knowledge and what he understands on something that only he knows.
6. Supportive corruption, it is corruption that leads to the establishment of conducive conditions to provide protection and defense related to corruption.
7. Defensive corruption is an act of corruption that is forced to be carried out to defend itself from extortion.

KPK is a special independent institution to eradicate corruption. KPK has extraordinary powers (superbodies) so that it can uncover dirty-deviuous acts, and can break through the very strong defenses of corruption actors. KPK was formed based on Law no. 30 of 2002 which aims to increase effectiveness and efficiency in eradicating corruption. In carrying out its duties, the KPK does not only eradicate corruption, but also carries out investigations, investigations, and prosecutions for corruption crimes and monitors the implementation of the state government. The duties of KPK under the law include coordinating and supervising agencies that have the authority to carry out corruption crimes, investigate, prosecute and prevent corruption, and monitor the implementation of state government(Sosiawan, 2019). In addition, the authority of KPK is to coordinate investigations, investigations, prosecutions for criminal acts of corruption, report activities and provide information related to eradicating corruption, conduct hearings with authorized agencies, and request agency reports in preventing corruption. Based on the duties and authorities of the KPK, the KPK is the spearhead in eradicating corruption (Badjuri, 2011).

The steps of KPK in tackling corruption in Indonesia is through the Sting Operation (called as OTT). OTT is a secret KPK operation to catch corruption crimes based on data collection based on a long process. OTT is based on the implementation of wiretapping for a certain period of time. The results of wiretapping are the initial evidence of a criminal act if the evidence is compatible with one another (Oktavianto & Abheseka, 2019). Handling corruption cases from 2005 to 2017 there were 77 cases in the establishment of the KPK, in which there were 19 cases and named 72 people as suspects with various suspect profiles. The suspects come from various professions such as law enforcement officers, members of the legislature, and regional heads (Hikmawati, 2018).

The legal basis for regulating the authority to conduct the OTT is based on Law no. 8 of 1981 related to the Criminal Procedure Code. The Criminal Procedure Code itself is the basis for carrying out operations to arrest perpetrators of corruption directly. The Criminal Procedure Code, the Law, KPK, and the Corruption Law do not discuss OTT, but arrests. The Criminal Procedure Code discusses arrests due to detention and searches related to human rights that affect the life of the person and his family. There are two types of arrests, including being caught red-handed or not. Getting caught is not the same as OTT. OTT does not begin with research activities, whereas if it begins with research, it is called arresting (Hikmawati, 2018).

The impact of the KPK sting operation (OTT) which was widely disseminated by the mass media had a negative impact on employees. KPK OTT has a direct impact on staff and employees, it is decreased work spirit and motivation. In addition, other impacts reduce work ethic, lack of confidence, cause shame, are not productive in carrying out their duties and responsibilities as employees in the agency. The public's perception of corruption by regional heads is similar to the perception of employees towards their leaders who are entangled in corruption cases, even more so those who are affected by the KPK OTT. From the results of a simple and limited survey in pre-research conducted by the author on employees in a local government in South Sumatra whose regional heads are affected by the KPK OTT, it shows that 71% of employees deeply regret the occurrence of corruption in their institutions, 21% do not care, and the remaining 8% can accept or understand the occurrence of the corruption case. Even the KPK OTT which was spread widely and massively by the mass media has caused shame, irritation, fear, lowered work ethic, growing mutual suspicion, lack of confidence, and is counterproductive in carrying out the duties and responsibilities that are held as employees in the agency. This is even more so for local governments who have been known for their achievements and received many awards from various aspects. The KPK OTT incident has caused demotivation among employees and reduced the performance of the local government as a whole.

3.3 Corruption Degrades Government Ethics

According to Nichols (2009) "corruption causes severe damage to society". Corruption increases child and infant mortality, distorts the role of government, reduces funding for health and education, increases military spending, distorts markets, depreciates national currencies, and slows long-term domestic and foreign investment. The social effects of corruption can include a decrease in the legitimacy of governments, especially democratic governments, and may lead to rebellion by undemocratic leaders. Businesses are affected by increased costs, decreased administrative support, and decreased ability to enforce agreements.

Corruption has negative implications and carries a very big danger that is detrimental to human survival, both those related to social, economic, political, cultural, bureaucratic, and individual aspects themselves. The danger of corrupt behavior in a country is often likened to people like the danger of cancer that resides in a person's blood, so the patient must regularly go to the hospital to carry out "dialysis" consistently and continuously, if he wants to survive. So, if corruption occurs mushrooming and rampant in a society, it is almost certain that the condition of the community will become a chaotic society, the law does not have a deterrent effect so that it is unable to protect rights and uphold justice, and the social system built is not good either. If it is like this, in the next stage, it will bring up egocentrism (self interest) and even selfishness so that the victorious in power and the weak will be oppressed.

Based on data released by the Ministry of Home Affairs, there are at least 343 regional heads involved in legal cases either at KPK, the police, or the prosecutor's office. The majority of cases are due to dishonesty and trust in managing regional finances. As of December 2015, there were 343 people who served as mayors, regents, governors involved in legal cases both at the police, prosecutors and KPK. Based on the information above, research was conducted on the analysis of a number of factors causing corruption that was masterminded by regional heads. The findings are that the factors that cause many regional heads to be involved in corruption cases are due to the hegemony of power, lack of transparency and accountability, policy discretion, and other supporting factors such as the high cost of direct post-conflict local elections, lack of competence in managing regional finances, lack of understand the laws and regulations, and often misunderstand the concept of culture.

Fundamentally, the actual acts of corruption committed by elite government officials and their employees in our country, are evidence and manifestations that the government in carrying out the wheels of government does not heed the existing government ethics. In carrying out their duties, government ethics should be the basis of thought and action for the apparatus that administers the government. Because, if the elite government officials and their employees do not heed the ethics of government, it will almost certainly have an impact on the pain of elements of the government bureaucracy. Some of the impact of the problems caused, among others, the occurrence of corruption, collusion, nepotism everywhere due to monopoly of power, policy discretion, weak transparency and accountability.

When the wheels of government have been infected with the virus of corruption, collusion, and nepotism, this in turn will create new problems in the government bureaucracy. For example, the government will lose efficiency in carrying out its duties as a public servant, the socio-political ethics will die, and the government's authority will collapse. It is at this point that it can then be said that the implications of acts of corruption for the running of the government can degrade the ethics of government.

Heeding or obeying government ethics by public officials and government officials will almost certainly have positive implications for the administration of government. In other words, government ethics that are adhered to seriously and consistently in the government bureaucracy will have a positive impact on the implementation of government at the central, regional, sub-district, and even rural levels. On the other hand, in running the government there will be problems, obstacles and unhealthy when the behavior of government officials and officials deviates from ethical values.

Corruption is a moral and legal problem that not only causes financial losses but also damages all aspects of life, including cultural and political life. The most frequently asked question is “What kind of corruption are we trying to prevent and eradicate?” The question relates to the problem of the definition of corruption. In fact, corruption has many definitions, and each definition has its own advantages and disadvantages. For example, showing that (1) the definition of corruption from a moral perspective will be “incompatible” if it turns out to cause social benefits; (2) the definition of corruption in the legal perspective may change according to the political interests of the authorities; (3) The definition of corruption in the perspective of social science will be "chaotic" if it is disturbed by the moral aspect, because social science only focuses on behavior.

As a concrete example of an indication of the degradation of government ethics is what is commonly called political corruption. A concrete example of this type of politics is corruption in the procurement of goods, services and trade, which are usually strongly influenced by factors of interest and power, which can win companies that have political access to political officials.

Political corruption is defined as corruption committed by public officials at the center or in the regions. Alkostar (2011) states that political corruption can occur because the perpetrators have political power, by abusing authority, facilities or opportunities to enrich or benefit themselves, other parties or corporations. Political corruption is more dangerous than ordinary corruption, because political corruption is an act that violates people’s human rights. The stakeholders of political corruption are the people. The rest, Artidjo said that from a juridical point of view, the wealth that was corrupted was the wealth of the state, while in general, political corruption robbed the people of their strategic rights.

To overcome political corruption, the government has done many things such as bureaucratic reform, anti-corruption campaign, improving employee welfare, increasing supervision, improving the moral character of officials, imposing sanctions on corruptors, etc. But this effort was not carried out and still has a positive correlation with a decrease in the number of perpetrators of corruption. Gaps can still be manipulated or systemic conspiracy by the authorities.

Power still tends to be seen as a tool to earn non-halal income. Other factors that cause corruption are “aji mumpung”, uncontrolled power, low commitment of officials to build a clean government, implementation of transparency is just a formality, limited access to information, the power of influence of the mass media, NGO activists, and anti-corruption activists can still be found. addressed and cannot penetrate the gates that are the root of corruption. The question related to the increasing number of perpetrators of corruption is why in preventing and suppressing corruptors tends to be ineffective? Political corruption is still difficult to overcome because of structural problems. Political corruption is the “use of power by government officials to benefit his or her illegitimate personality” or Political corruption means the abuse of political power by government leaders to extract and collect for their personal enrichment and take politically corrupt steps to maintain their power.

So, political corruption is the behavior of officials who violate official authority. From this point of view, political corruption is closely related to the process of selecting regional heads, for example elections with high political costs and only based on money to beat their rivals. The elected regional heads will be forced to collect the power of money not only to recover capital but also to try to earn money for their future political investments. They benefit financially from project commissions, permits, and deductions from operating cost activities,

or by engineering costs. In this state, power is practically uncontrollable. They can harness potential power for financial gain.

Another factor is the result of collusion between the bureaucracy and the regional head. In Indonesia, the authority of the bureaucracy is in the hands of regional heads. As executives, they must be loyal to their regional heads. What is meant by loyalty is being able to carry out all orders, either officially based on the authority they have, or other instructions that are tailored to the request. For example, if a regional head requests a budget from the APBD for a certain agenda, even though it is contrary to existing provisions, it must still be done. This mode is often used to realize the will or interests of the regional head. Another way is to impose certain projects in the name of the public interest, even though there is actually a hidden interest for political networks within political officials.

Another factor that also strengthens the assumption that corruption degrades government ethics is the cause of the “coercive element”. The fact shows that corruption is rampant because of coercion by excessive or extreme social structures, among others, in the form of internal and external social pressures. These three factors, in the form of political corruption, bureaucratic collusion and coercive elements, are the reasons why government ethics are ignored by state officials. In fact, government ethics are principles and basics that must be heeded and carried out by elite public officials and government staff so that the government bureaucracy can run healthy and stable. Heeding or obeying government ethics by public officials and government officials will almost certainly have positive implications for the administration of government. In other words, government ethics that are adhered to seriously and consistently in the government bureaucracy will have a positive impact on the implementation of central government at the regional, sub-district, and even rural levels. But on the contrary, the implementation of government will be problematic, experiencing obstacles and unhealthy when the behavior of officials and officials deviates from ethical values. This shows that corrupt behavior, on the other hand, also degrades government ethics.

4. Conclusion

Corruption acts are all actions carried out by individuals, groups, or legal entities that are contradictory to ethics and law and in which there are elements of enriching individuals or groups that are detrimental to state finances, harm people's welfare, and disrupt the stability of the country's economy. Meanwhile, government ethics is a basic principle that must be fulfilled by the government and all its employees. Government ethics guides every elite government official and state apparatus to have an attitude of trustworthiness, honesty, willing to serve, possess and set an example, have a big soul, be humble (low profile), not arrogant, and ready to resign at any time from his position when he is guilty and his policies. morally detrimental to the people. Corruption degrades the ethics of government at least due to 3 (three) corrupt behaviors, including political corruption, bureaucratic collusion, and coercive factors from excessive and extreme social structures.

References

- Alkostar, A. (2011). *Keadilan Restoratif*. Kompas.Com.
- Badjuri, A. (2011). Faktor-faktor yang berpengaruh terhadap kualitas audit auditor independen pada kantor akuntan publik (KAP) di Jawa Tengah. *Dinamika Keuangan & Perbankan*, 3(2).
- Bertens, K. (2013). *Etika*. Kanisius.

- Bogdan, R. C., & Sari, B. K. (1982). *Qualitative Research for Education: An Introduction to Theory and Methods*. Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- Daryanto. (2014). *Pembelajaran Tematik, Terpadu, Terintegrasi*. Gava Media.
- Dwiyanto, A. (2006). *Mewujudkan Good Governance Melalui Pelayanan Public*. UGM Press.
- Hamzah, A. (1991). *Korupsi di Indonesia dan Pemecahannya*. PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Harkrisnowo, H. (2002). Korupsi, Konspirasi dan Keadilan di Indonesia. In *Jurnal dictum LeIP* (1st ed.). Lentera Hati.
- Haryatmoko. (2011). *Etika Publik*. PT.Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Hikmawati, P. (2018). Operasi Tangkap Tangan Dalam Penanganan Kasus Korupsi (Arrest Hand Operation In Handling Corruption Case). *Negara Hukum: Membangun Hukum Untuk Keadilan Dan Kesejahteraan*, 9(1). <https://doi.org/10.22212/jnh.v9i1.998>
- Hussein, S. A. (1986). *Sosiologi Korupsi Sebuah Penjelajahan Dengan Data Kontemporer*. LP3ES.
- Jahroh, Windi Siti, A., & Nana Sutarna. (2016). Pendidikan Karakter Sebagai Upaya Mengatasi Degradasi. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Inovasi Pendidikan Inovasi Pembelajaran Berbasis Karakter Dalam Menghadapi Masyarakat Ekonomi ASEAN*.
- John Girling. (1997). *Corruption, Capitalism and Democracy*. Routledge.
- Krisyanto, E. (2008). *Etika Politik Dalam Konteks Indonesia*. Kanisius.
- Nadjib, A. (2020). How Social Capital Works: The Role of Social Capital in Acts of Corruption. *International Journal of Psychosocial Rehabilitation*, 24(3), 2424–2433. <https://doi.org/10.37200/IJPR/V24I3/PR201890>
- Nawawi, H., & Martini, M. (1994). *Penelitian Terapan*. Gajahmada University.
- Nichols, P. M. (2009). Multiple Communities and Controlling Corruption. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88(S4), 805–813. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-009-0320-9>
- Nur, S. M., & Ningsih, R. (2019). Korupsi Mendegradasikan Nilai Etika Pancasila. *Forum Ilmiah*, 16(3).
- Oktavianto, R., & Abheseka, N. M. R. (2019). Evaluasi Operasi Tangkap Tangan KPK. *INTEGRITAS*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.32697/integritas.v5i2.473>
- Praja, S. J. (2003). *Aliran-aliran filsafat dan etika*. Kencana.
- Sarwono. (2006). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif dan Kualitatif*. Graha Ilmu.
- Sina, L. (2008). *Dampak Dan Upaya pemberantasan serta pengawasan korupsi di Indonesia*.
- Sosiawan, U. M. (2019). Peran Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Dalam Pencegahan dan Pemberantasan Korupsi. *Jurnal Penelitian Hukum De Jure*, 19(4), 517. <https://doi.org/10.30641/dejure.2019.V19.517-538>
- Sugiyono. (2016). Memahami Penelitian Kualitatif. *Bandung: Alfabeta*.
- Zubair, A. (2010). *Kuliah Etika* (1st ed.). Rajawali Pers.
- Zuhro, R. S. (2010). Good governance dan reformasi birokrasi di indonesia. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 7(1).