



Received: 28-05-2023
Accepted: 08-07-2023

ISSN: 2583-049X

Rightly Understanding and Responding to Corruption as Human Rights Violation

¹Dr. Gunardi Endro, ²Dr. Astrid Meilasari-Sugiana

¹ Faculty of Economics and Social Sciences, Universitas Bakrie, Jakarta, Indonesia

² Department of Political Science, Universitas Bakrie, Jakarta, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: **Dr. Gunardi Endro**

Abstract

Corruption is often explained as acts causally related to the plethora of human rights violations. Such an explanation aims at mobilizing the public to develop an opposition attitude against it. However, an emphasis on the causal aspect of corruption can lead to exaggerated responses that are counterproductive since not all corruption cases deserve

the same response. This article conceptually accentuates the moral aspect of corruption before its causal aspect and highlights it to ensure of its nature as a violation of human rights. The causal aspect is featured subsequently to ensure right responses according to the classification of the violations.

Keywords: Corruption, Moral Aspect, Casual Aspect, Human Rights, Violation

1. Introduction

A widely discussed global topic of the last two decades, corruption besets public and private governance with far reaching consequences beyond state control. Arising due to the spread of moral crisis, widespread acts of corruption lead to civil loss and thus require initiatives for prevention and mitigation. The NGO Transparency International (TI) published its yearly Corruption Perception Index for countries which have been monitored since 1995, whereas international organizations such as the World Bank and the International Monetary Fund (IMF) have begun the discussion on corruption within formal settings in its yearly meetings starting in 1996 and 1997. Laws and conventions were set forth to discipline corrupt officials and mitigate acts of corruption within national, regional and international scales. These acts include the US Foreign Corrupt Practice Act (1977), the Inter American Convention against Corruption (1996), EU Convention on the Fight against Corruption (1997), OECD Convention on Combating Bribery (1997), The Council of Europe's Criminal Law Convention on Corruption (1999) and United Nations Convention against Corruption (2003) (Boersma 2012) ^[6]. Nonetheless, efforts at eradicating corruption through laws and international conventions remain ineffective and require concerted action through alternative institutionalized platforms within culture and social landscapes.

In contrast, human rights issues have received far more attention and undergone vast development at the global scale much earlier. Since the United Nations General Assembly enacted the Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948, along with the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR) and its operational protocols in 1976, international collaborations and efforts for the protection of human rights have increased significantly. The United Nations established various organizations for monitoring and investigating the compliance of member countries which actively participate in ratifying the covenant. These organizations, among others, include The Human Rights Committee, The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, The Committee against Torture, The Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination, as well as The UN Human Rights Commission which operates based on Universal Periodic Review and ad hoc procedures for distinct and specific needs (Boersma 2012) ^[6]. The investigative report prepared by United Nations acts as moral and political pressures for member countries. Interestingly, human rights violations are often caused or precipitated by corruption (Boersma 2012) ^[6]. And this provides an impetus for associating and correlating corruption with human rights violations in anticorruption efforts. Hence, corrupt officials are expected to undergo trials both for corruption under criminal law and for violating human rights. Along with adequate public monitoring and public participation methods, the multiple charges imposed are expected to increase momentum and strengthen citizen's awareness and participation in supporting the anticorruption movement.

Nonetheless it seems not right to conclude that corruption is necessarily associated with human rights violations based solely on the frequency of atrocities conducted by perpetrators. Since acts of corruption are varied in nature, and quite often involves

both the public and private sectors. The concept of human rights itself is dynamic and multi-dimensional, while the underlying reasons which underbelly its enforcement and implementation are various in different countries. Corruption, when perceived through a certain lens, can be classified as a violation of human rights since it incorporates human rights atrocities. However, premature and hasty conclusions based on limited evidence may lead to exaggerated mistranslation that is counter-productive for eradicating corruption. Investigating the concept of corruption as a violation of human rights requires a meticulous, careful and comprehensive approach, and only through its paradigmatic deconstruction, the correlation between corruption and human rights violation will become evident.

2. The Paradigmatic Meaning of Corruption

Corruption was initially defined within the context of politics whereby collective (public) needs come across individual (private) needs. Contrary to actions for protecting collective needs, corruption erodes public trust, prioritizes private gains over public needs and leads to common loss. Through time, the meaningful construction underlying the concept of corruption evolves into two different paradigms, i.e., the paradigm focusing on the corrupted side (the corrupted-unit understanding of corruption) and the paradigm centering around the corruptor (the corrupting-unit understanding of corruption) (Endro 2007) ^[15]. The former is encompassed within the Republican theory of contemporary political thought, whereas the latter stems from the development of liberal political thought. Both possess noteworthy strengths and limitations for due consideration.

The paradigm which focuses on the corrupted side takes root from Aristotle's writing on corruption entitled *De Generatione et Corruptione* (On Generation and Corruption). Aristotle believes that corruption involves the 'perishing' (annihilation) process which is in complete opposition to the 'becoming' (generation) process. In the political context, individuals within collectivities are teleologically responsible for establishing solid nation states, but corruption threatens a nation state's existence through the dismantling and disintegration process which it conjures. Factionalism is the most dangerous form of corruption as it leads to national disintegration and utter destruction (Buchanan 2004; Dobel 1978) ^[8, 14]. According to the Republican theory of contemporary political thought, corruption is an antithesis to sound politics, a pathology which destroys the political edifice of a nation (Shumer 1979; Buchanan 2004) ^[24, 8]. Hence, corruption is perceived to have a systemic and systematic role which damages the political edifice of a nation. The focus of attention in this understanding of corruption is on the systemic and systematic damage affected by the acts of corruption rather than on the nature of the action itself. Investigations of atrocities conducted by corrupt officials are performed if actions impair and damage the nation's political edifice. Sound political climate and sustained momentum for the anticorruption movement are enabled through collective responsibility of cognizant and participating members of society. Hence, all citizens are required to actively participate in building a nation's sound political culture whilst placing collective needs above private interests.

Although the perspective which emphasizes the corrupted side can explain the systemic aspects of a case involving

corruption, a single act of atrocity, which may have similar damaging effects as that of the acts of perpetration towards the system, may elude investigation since by evidence it has not been proven damaging to the system. Nonetheless, if left idle, a single act of atrocity conducted by public official can spread to others while damaging the system and rendering prevention measures obsolete. In the effort to prioritize public over private needs, this conceptualization of corruption may also be biased and unevenly conjured, providing legitimacy for public officials to intervene in the private affairs of its citizens to establish an ethically sound political culture. Suspicions and mistrust thus envelope the citizens of a nation since corruption is considered to be inherently derived from the uninhibited private domains of individual citizens.

The articulation of corruption which emphasizes the corruptor (the corrupting-unit understanding of corruption) has its roots in Thomas Hobbes's writings which counteract Aristotle's teleological philosophy. In his work entitled *Leviathan*, Hobbes noted that man is inherently selfish and very much inclined to prioritize his private interests over public needs, thus rendering conflicts among individuals inescapable and intractable. Nation states are founded based on consensus or social contracts among citizens to protect and fulfill individual needs. Holders of the state's power, public officials, receive the legitimacy of all citizens to exercise their power in accordance with standards agreed upon for the benefit of all citizens. Corruption is then articulated as actions taken by public officials that are incongruent with standards formulated for the execution of power. Hence corruption is identified through its incongruence with agreed upon standards as opposed to being associated with systemic patterns of behavior which contribute to the destruction and disintegration of nation states. The focus in this understanding of corruption is on individual acts of corruption as opposed to corrupt behavior patterns. Nonetheless it is not easy to agree on a single and universal definition of corruption since interpretations of the standards being referred to are multiple and varied. Through its political and economic prowess, however, The World Bank is able to enforce its definition of corruption accepted by many, and the definition is: "the abuse of public power for private gains" (World Bank 1997) ^[29].

However, an issue in associating the concept of corruption with perpetrators/corruptors is the over connotation with private interests. Public interest is merely the aggregation of private interests, whereas private interests propel conflicts among individuals in an effort to attain place, power and position. Predispositions towards suspicion and mistrust are thus targeted towards public officials since corruption is perceived to originate from the public domain and become irrepressible in the hands of public officials. The presupposition underlying suspicion and mistrust is reflected in the Actonian principle affirmed by many whereby power tends to corrupt and absolute power corrupts absolutely. Over identification with private interests and the conflicts they entail leads to the understanding that the moral dimension found within the concept of corruption is not of necessity. Regardless of its ethical relevance, an atrocity will simply be classified as an act of corruption if it violates political contracts (standards). Hence, corruption may become expansively unattended, persistent, systemic and enculturated without the weight of the slightest ethical consideration.

To resolve the emerging problems with regard to both the concept which focuses on the corrupted side (the corrupted-unit understanding of corruption) and the concepts which emphasizes the corruptor/perpetrator (the corrupting-unit understanding of corruption), an alternative consideration to corruption is hereby presented, emphasizing the debates underlying the concept of integrity, namely an understanding of corruption based on integrity (the integrity-based understanding of corruption). In this understanding, corruption is placed in its direct opposition to integrity. If integrity is a virtue that mobilizes man to actively participate in the full functioning of each of his power for protecting the common good, then corruption is a violation of entrusted power through the manipulation of the common good for particular interests (certain private interests) (Endro 2007)^[15]. This definition of corruption requires enactment of the three theses below.

a.) Corruption Does Not Necessarily Involve Dichotomy between the Public and Private Domain

Corruption does not solely take place in the public domain when strategic positions within the public domain are abused for private gains. Corruption can occur within private sectors alone without involvements of public officials. Scandals involving multinational corporations which rock the global economy in the beginning of the twentieth century are one example. In the scandals, business leaders abused the trust endowed by the public with regard to transparency and equity involving transactions in the stock and financial market for private gains, leading to the economic crisis which puts society at large at a loss. Massive globalization and recent market deregulation leads to increased potential for the abuse of power within the private sector. Therefore, World Bank's definition of power is rendered obsolete, fails to suffice and requires expansion to encompass both the public and the private sectors.

b.) Corruption Necessarily Involves the Role Held by Corruptor in an Institution That Is Then Corrupted

This thesis affirms corruption as a manifestation of institutional decay resulting from internal factors, meaning that within a community that is institutionally corroborated, a community member is given the authority by others to carry out stipulated roles for the common good but decides to abuse his authority for private gains. Misuse of power and authority degrades the institutionalization process and its goals, and the institution itself is therefore abused and debased. Institutions are degraded from within due to the corrupt/abusive conducts of its members. Based on this thesis, the scope of behavioral conducts which can be categorized as corruption becomes very expansive. Paradigmatically, corruption includes incidence when a boxer accepts bribes from a gambler to loose in the fight, incidence when a witness is deceitful in court, incidence when a lecturer plagiarizes others' work (Miller 2011)^[23], and incidence when a husband cheats on his wife.

c.) Corruption is Necessarily a Moral Issue

Since corruption is essentially misuse/abuse of power/authority and the authority is related to the entrusted responsibilities endowed by society, corruption is thus considered immoral. The justification stems from the understanding that power is substantiated from the relations of trust among individuals in society. The underlying

substantiation is corroborated through Franco Crespi's model of power whereby power is composed of three dimensions, namely the subjective dimension (first dimension), the intersubjective dimension (second dimension) and the structural-objective dimension (third dimension) (Crespi 1992)^[10]. The first dimension involves the capacity of the power holder as a man of free will in making decisions and actions, the second dimension involves the capacity to form social networks among individuals, whereas the third dimension is associated with the inherent ability of individuals to assume roles within the social structure (community). Hence, the legitimacy underlying power bases can be categorized into three different facets, namely self-worth and self-confidence (the first dimension), trust endowed by other individuals (the second dimension), and trust within communities generally referred to as endowed responsibilities (the third dimension). The legitimacy given by others as stipulated within the second and third dimension is based on expectations where power is utilized for the common good. Hence, power must be executed not only based on self-determination but also based on others' trust. Any abuse/misuse of power necessarily involves degrading the trust of others or degrading others' existence, and hence corruption is necessarily immoral.

An understanding of corruption that is based on integrity emphasizes corruption as degradation of institutions from within through the immoral enactment of power regardless of the type of institution, whether public or private. This conceptualization of corruption conforms to the definition of corruption by Transparency International (TI), namely that "Corruption is the abuse of entrusted power for private gains" (https://www.transparency.org/cpi2011/in_detail). There are two facets to this definition of corruption which cannot be ignored, namely the moral standpoint and the causal standpoint. The moral standpoint is associated with the abuse/misuse of entrusted power endowed to corruptors, whereas the causal standpoint is found within the potential for institutional decay due to the transgressions by corruptors/perpetrators. Institutional decay occurs since the common good which functions as the edifice in founding the institution is degraded. The motivation underlying corruption is self-interest, whether it is the perpetrator's self-interest or the interest of certain groups. The technical underpinning of corruption requires enduring trust from others during the process (other than the perpetrator), hence corruption usually occurs behind closed doors (clandestine). The implications/consequences can be very devastating to others both material and non-material wise. One devastating loss stemming from acts of corruption which is currently being highlighted is violation of human rights.

3. On Human Rights

Unlike the investigation of the meaning of corruption by highlighting the lure of private benefits over collective (institutional) interests, efforts at deciphering the concept of human rights are generally based on the spirit to disclose the degradation of fundamental individual needs on behalf of securing collective interests. Since collectivity is impossible in the absence of individuals, fundamental individual needs as reflected within the concept of human rights must be upheld and guaranteed should institution as a form of collectivity endures. Hence nation states, entities with sovereignty and authority over individual citizens, have the

responsibility to respect, promote and protect individual human rights. In practice, the responsibilities belonging to nation states are stipulated within legal frameworks which are binding. Through the stipulation of The Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR) in 1948 by all UN member countries, reverence to human rights and its protocol requires no further debate. An issue which remains to be resolved is the substantial contents of human rights requiring adoption, publicity and protection by each nation state. Issues relating to the substantial contents of human rights color the dynamics of its historical chronicles until the present.

Reverence to human rights becomes the entry point for understanding the substantial contents of human rights. In its foundation is the need for everyone to respect others as a human being, identifying and treating others as a human being just like himself (Dillon 2018) ^[13]. It is here that the universal nature of human rights is affirmed. When one is aware of the freedom in judging others and all that occurs external to himself, aware that he is a subject of judgment and evaluation, such awareness has to be transmitted to the claim that others also act as subjects and sources of judgments and evaluations just like himself. Since each source of judgment (valuation) is invaluable, each subject as the source of judgment has absolute and equal value. Thus, due to the inherent humanness in each person, everyone has equal dignity and rights. Each person has the same right to be treated equally as a subject with the freedom to judge and evaluate. Each person has equal rights to act as subjects in shaping judgments and life goals. The person's position as a subject is the fundamental aspect of man and his existence. It is this fundamental aspect which legitimizes the emergence of the concept of human rights and through the concept of human rights, this fundamental aspect of man has to be protected (Cruft, Liao & Renzo 2015) ^[11]. Man should not be treated as the object of arbitrary goals, neither the goal of other man within his social relations nor the collective goal which is etched and legitimized by the nation state acting as the guardian and protector of its people. Freedom and equality are the core principles within the concept of human rights.

The rights embodied within legal frameworks suggest the ways in which nation states are obliged to promote and protect principles relating to freedom and principles relating to equality. Nevertheless, ideological debates emerge questioning the priority among the two principles. Other debate emerge concerning the impacts of tradition and local culture which brings with them the issues of whether human rights are relative and the issues of priority scale for the rights enclosed in legal frameworks. Though human rights theoretically have to be perceived from a comprehensive and indivisible standpoint, its practice requires considerations involving the scales of priority and the impacts of local culture (Griffin 2001) ^[17]. The impacts of local culture are manifested when each right is defined and contained in the legal framework. With regard to priority scale, it is here recommended to divide human rights into three categories based on their proximity for the protection of man as subject in shaping values and life goals.

The first classification of human rights encompasses rights required by individuals in their private domain for living among members of society. The failure to acquire these rights will lead them to **an immediate cessation as subjects** in shaping values and life goals. This first classification

encompasses the right to live, personal safety and liberty (Article 3 UDHR), freedom from enslavement (Article 4 UDHR), freedom from cruelty and torture (Article 5 UDHR), freedom of thought, conscience and religion (Article 18 UDHR), freedom of speech and expression (Article 19 UDHR), and freedom from arbitrary arrest, detention and exile (Article 9 UDHR). Violation of rights within this classification stems from intentional and direct acts with no adequate underlying reason.

The second classification of human rights includes the rights essential for individuals in their social relations within the community. The failure to acquire these rights result in reducing their possibilities as subjects in shaping values and life goals. Fulfillment of the second human rights classification is a prerequisite, both materialistically and non-materialistically, for the **sustenance of individual man in their status as subjects** in shaping values and life goals. This second category covers, among others, the right to recognition as a person before the law (Article 6 UDHR), rights to freedom from discrimination (Article 2, 7 and 10 UDHR), rights to a fair trial (Article 11 UDHR), rights to mobility and residence (Article 13 UDHR), rights for property ownership and freedom from arbitrary deprivation of property (Article 17 UDHR), rights to freedom from violence and abuse within the family and the private domain (Article 12 UDHR), rights to work and to a fair working environment (Article 23 and 34 UDHR), rights to an adequate standard of life and the highest standards of health (Article 25 UDHR), and rights to social security (Article 22 UDHR). Violation of rights within the second classification is usually supported by no adequate reason that is associated with customs, traditions, culture and/or false perception of the common good.

The third classification of human rights includes the rights required by individuals in their collective relations in society. Failure to acquire these rights results in diminishing their space as social agents to actively engage and participate in the community. The failure reduces their **efforts to increase capacities as subjects** in shaping values and life goals. This third classification includes the right to freedom of peaceful assembly and association (Article 20 UDHR), the right to participate in public services (Article 21 UDHR), the right to participate in labor unions ((Article 23 UDHR), the right to education (Article 26 UDHR), and the right to participate in the life and culture of the community and protection for contributing to science, literature and the arts (Article 27 UDHR). Violations of rights within this third classification are usually due to ideological reasons and are rationally open to debates and disagreements.

The above classification of human rights provides an illustration of the magnitude of degradation due to violations that may take place. In general, the degradation due to human rights violations in the first category is perceived to be more serious and severe than those in the second and third categories. This is due to its direct nature and the absence of ways to prevent and mitigate them should they have effectively taken place. Human rights violations in the second and third categories are usually done through manipulation of social relation and legal device that can reduce individual's capacity but still leave sufficient time for him to find alternative social relation or other collective device in order to retain him as determinant of his life goals. A person whose right to an adequate life is violated,

for example, may seek improvements in living standards by aligning his social relations with wealthy families in order to subsist. Hence, based on the classification of human rights principles, systemic and/or systematic actions that are considered a violation of human rights can be evaluated from the degree of degradation resulting from the violations. An example is one that involves human rights violation stemming from acts of corruption.

4. Corruption as a Violation of Human Rights

Many social circles consider corruption as a severe form of human rights abuse and/or human rights violation based on the myriad negative impacts resulting from corruption that are identifiable through observations/investigations by United Nations organizations and through research in various discipline of sciences. The problem is that the consequences of corruption identifiable within a specified period of time are not all negative in nature. Although corruption may entail negative consequences, the degree of degradation it causes are varied and contingent upon the type of corruption. There are even acts of corruption that do not warrant denigration and condemnation. The following three cases are illustrative of the above. The first involves a judge who accepts bribes in order to place the perpetrator in a favorable position during trials in the court. The second involves an anti-violence activist who bribes police officers to stop them torturing the suspect during interrogation. The third involves an investor who offers little money to the slow and unresponsive government officials in order to hasten investment permits which have significant impacts on local economic growth within the community. Based on the implications which it entails, the first case clearly involves acts of corruption which violate a person's right to a fair trial (Article 11 UDHR), hence fit for condemnation. But acts within the second case, although categorized as corruption, prevent a person from the loss of right to freedom from cruelty and torture (Article 5 UDHR). Corruption within the second case can be classified as corruption for a noble cause (Miller 2011) ^[23] and therefore is unfit for condemnation. The third case is often incorporated as an example of the positive impact of corruption in improving bureaucratic inefficiencies (Leff 1964; Huntington 1968; Lui 1985) hence, should it be righteous and proper, it is also unfit for condemnation. Therefore, prematurely concluding that the myriad negative effects of corruption signify severe forms of human rights violations fit for condemnation is misleading and incorrect. Enforcing such conclusion without adequate explanation may lead to exaggerated impression that is counterproductive for the anti-corruption movement.

Explanations relating to corruption and human rights violations must be theoretically ingrained as opposed to being concluded based on the number of factual data of its negative implications. The right explanation is offered by applying the integrity-based understanding of corruption. Based on this understanding, corruption is fundamentally perceived as having moral aspect and causal aspect. Since various implications of corruption cannot properly define the relation between corruption and human rights violation, the right explanation must rely rather on the moral aspect than the causal aspect of corruption. Corruption must be seen primarily from the moral standpoint. As an abuse of power entrusted to corruptors, corruption is necessarily an immoral act. As an abuse of power, corruption can be

regarded as an act which to some extent is a betrayal of the trust of other individuals, degrading the individuals from their status as subjects of judgment and evaluation, so that corruption can always be interpreted as a violation of human rights. While it is true that not all human rights violations are acts of corruption, as not all human rights violations involve trust among individuals (genocide, for example, is not a betrayal of trust), corruption is necessarily a human rights violation to some extent. Hence from the moral standpoint, corruption is necessarily a violation of human rights.

The next question is, as a human right violation, how harmful is an act of corruption? To answer this question, the causal standpoint must be applied. Many people distinguish corruption by its opposing forms: grand corruption versus petty corruption, a single act of corruption versus a systemic-systematic behavior of corruption, public sector corruption versus private sector corruption, political corruption versus economic corruption, and by its types: bribery, embezzlement, trade in influence, role abuse, patronage, nepotism, etc. (Boersma 2012) ^[6]. Such distinctions are of little help in identifying the degree of human rights degradation it may cause. Following the integrity-based understanding of corruption, the degree of human rights degradation can be discerned by evaluating how corruption destroys institutions from within, destroys the process and purpose of institutions, or in other words by evaluating how the common good that underlies the endowment of trust to corruptors does not materialize.

Due to its direct opposition to integrity, corruption does not only destroy local institutions such as corporations and nation states but also damages larger institutions such as the community of overall human beings. Since corruption diminishes the capacity of local institutions, contributions from local institutions to materialize the common good of the larger institutions would also be undermined. From the causal standpoint, corruption would ultimately destroy institutions of humanity. The degree of human rights degradation caused by corruption can be identified through its direct impacts on the institutions of humanity (direct violations) that characterize violation of human rights in the first classification and through its indirect impacts on the institutions of humanity (indirect violations) that characterize violation of human rights in the second and third classification. The 'sum' of both the direct and indirect effects would give the total degree of human rights degradation caused by corruption.

It is not easy to establish the scale of human rights degradation as a basis for 'quantifying' the level of human rights violations. However, if it is deemed reasonable, the question concerning the extent of any human rights violation and the comparison between one offence and other offences finds a better answer. Adopting the risk priority calculation model employed extensively in industrial management practices (McDermott *et al.* 2009), a formula for estimating the level of human rights violations is proposed as follows:

$$\text{LHRV} = \text{S} \times \text{O} \times \text{D}$$

Where:

LHRV= the level of human rights violation

S=the degree of human rights degradation caused by corruption (severity score)

O=the frequency of corruption incidences (occurrence score)

D=the degree of difficulty in detecting corruption cases (detection score)

The degree of human rights degradation caused by corruption (the severity score) refers to the priority scale associated with the classification of human rights in three groups described earlier; each group may be given a range of scores proportionally. The frequency of corrupt incidences (the occurrence score) refers to a classification in which the highest score denotes a systematic-systemic corruption whereas the lowest score denotes a single act of corruption. The degree of difficulty in detecting corruption cases (the detection score) refers to the hidden nature of corrupt incidences, the more hidden the more difficult to detect thus the score increases. Since every corrupt incidence usually involves direct violations as well as indirect violations of human rights, the estimation level of human rights violations is the sum of the estimation level of direct violations and the estimation level of indirect violations. The embezzlement of corporate money committed by directors of a corporation, for example, can be seen as a direct human rights violation of shareholders (direct trusts) as well as indirect human rights violations against workers in connection with the reduced ability of the corporation to provide proper salaries to its workers.

Thus, although it is undeniable that corruption is a violation of human rights, the estimation of the level of violation provides information on whether an occurrence involving corruption deserves condemnation or not. The judge who accepts bribes to make a decision in favor of the briber in a court case is obviously worth a reproach, because the LHRV-score must be sufficiently high. The anti-violence activist who bribes the police officers to stop them torturing the crime suspects during the interrogation process does not deserve a reproach, because the LHRV-score must be very low or even negative. Similarly, the investor who grants little money to bureaucratic officials who are sluggish in their services so that they are eager to speed up investment permits which have significant impacts on local economic growth may not be too reproachful, because the LHRV-score is low. Consideration of the estimate levels of human rights violations will generate the right attitude that should be taken against an incidence of corruption, avoiding exaggerated impression that is counterproductive for the anti-corruption movement.

5. Conclusion

The integrity-based understanding of corruption offers an accurate understanding of corruption as an act of human rights violation. The moral aspect of corruption coincides with the moral aspect of human rights violation, meaning that corruption is an act done by the perpetrator which, to a certain degree, degrades those entrusting people from their status as subjects of judgments and life goals. Corruption is conceptually understood as a violation of human rights. Meanwhile the causal aspect of corruption correlates to the fact that corruption destroys local institutions from within and therefore degrades humanity. Based on its causal aspect, the degree of human rights violation for a single incidence of corruption can be calculated, enabling community members to make informed decisions over the proportional subsequent course of action to be taken. An

accurate understanding of corruption as human rights violation, along with its proportionate response, becomes a solid foundation for the corruption eradication movement.

6. References

1. Harwell, Emily, and Le Billon, Philippe. Natural connections: Linking transitional justice and development through a focus on natural resources. In *Transitional Justice and Development: Making Connections*, Pablo de Greiff and Roger Duthie (eds.) (New York: International Center for Transitional Justice), 2009.
2. Aristotle. *Ethica Nichomachea*. In the Works of Aristotle: Translated into English by W.D. Ross (ed.) W.D. Ross, 1st edition (London: Oxford University Press). 1915; 9.
3. Aristotle. *Politica*. In the Works of Aristotle: Translated into English by Benjamin Jowett, ed. W.D. Ross, Rev (ed.) (London: Oxford University Press). 1921; 10.
4. Aristotle. *De Generatione et Corruptione*. In *The Works of Aristotle: Translated into English by Harold H. Joachim* (ed.) W.D. Ross, 1st edition (Oxford: Clarendon Press). 1930; 2.
5. BHW. Human Rights. In the *New Encyclopaedia Britannica*, 15th ed. 2010; 20:656-664.
6. Boersma, Martine. *Corruption: A Violation of Human Rights and a Crime under International Law?* School of Human Rights Research Series V56 (Maastricht: Intersentia), 2012.
7. Braband, Jens. Definition and Analysis of a New Risk Priority Number Concept. In C. Spitzer *et al.* (eds.), *Probabilistic Safety Assessment and Management, 2006-2011* (London: Springer-Verlag), 2004.
8. Buchanan, Bruce. *The Moral Physics of the Body Politic: Changing Contours of Corruption in Western Political Thought*. In *Proceedings of the Australian Political Studies Association Conference* (University of Adelaide) September-October 2004, 2004.
9. Corradetti, Claudio (ed). *Philosophical Dimensions of Human Rights: Some Contemporary View* (Heidelberg-London-New York: Springer), 2012.
10. Crespi, Franco, *Social Action and Power* (Blackwell, Oxford-UK, Cambridge-USA), 1992.
11. Cruft, Rowan SM, Liao, Renzo M. *Philosophical Foundations of Human Rights* (Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press), 2015.
12. Bona DI, Gianpaolo A, Silvestri A, Forcina, Petrillo A. Total efficient risk priority number (TERPN): A new method for risk assessment. In *Journal of Risk Research*, 2017. Doi: 10.1080/13669877.2017.1307260
13. Dillon, Robin S. Respect. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2018. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/respect/> (Accessed on April 10, 2018).
14. Dobel J, Patrick. *The Corruption of a State*. In *The American Political Science Review*. 1978; 72(3):958-984.
15. Endro, Gunardi. *Integrity in Economic Life: An Aristotelian Perspective*, Ph.D. Thesis. National University of Singapore, 2007. <http://scholarbank.nus.edu.sg/handle/10635/13107>.
16. Fraj, Salma H, Lachhab A. *Relationship between Corruption and Economic Growth: The Case of Developing Countries*. In *International Journal of*

- Economics, Commerce and Management. 2015; 3(9):862-875.
17. Griffin, James. First Steps in an Account of Human Rights. In *European Journal of Philosophy*. 2001; 9(3):306-327.
 18. Hobbes, Thomas. *Leviathan*, Andrew Crooke at the Green Dragon, London, 1651.
 19. Huntington, Samuel P. *Political Order in Changing Societies* (New Haven: Yale Univ. Press), 1968.
 20. Leff, Nathaniel H. Economic Development through Bureaucratic Corruption. In *American Behavioral Scientist*, 1964, 8-14.
 21. Lui, Francis T. An Equilibrium Queuing Model of Bribery. In the *Journal of Political Economy*. 1985; 93(4):760-781.
 22. Mcdermott, Robin E, Mikulak RJ, Beauregard MR. *The Basics of FMEA*, 2nd edition (New York: Productivity Press), 2009.
 23. Miller, Seumas Corruption. In *Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, 2011. <https://plato.stanford.edu/entries/corruption/> (Accessed on April 10, 2018).
 24. Shumer SM. Machiavelli: Republican Politics and Its Corruption. In *Political Theory*. 1979; 7(1):5-34.
 25. Transparency International, https://www.transparency.org/cpi2011/in_detail
 26. United Nations. *Universal Declaration of Human Rights (UDHR)*, 1948.
 27. United Nations. *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR)*, 1966.
 28. United Nations. *International Covenant on Economic, Social & Cultural Rights (ICESCR)*, 1966.
 29. World Bank. *World Development Report: The State in a Changing Society*, World Bank, Washington DC, 1997.