

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Assessment of Development, Bureaucracy, Administration, Political Disorder and Military in Indonesian's Transition

Teuku Alfiady

Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science,
Malikussaleh University, Lhokseumawe, Indonesia

Zulham

Lecturer, Department of Political Science, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science,
Malikussaleh University, Lhokseumawe, Indonesia

Risna Dewi

Lecturer, Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social Science and Political Science,
Malikussaleh University, Lhokseumawe, Indonesia

Abstract:

The paper studies how far the change of the development of the bureaucracy, administration, military and politics in Indonesia. It is very hard to reform the existing of the state system, unless the role of military to be cut it off from it is multi function within the nation. The study is based on content analysis and library review. The study is finding that the deeply rooted impact of the New Order's political set up, made military still becomes a major problem for the development, bureaucracy, administration, social and political inclusion in Indonesia. Although, the military's existence was formally reduced but their involvement and activities in the country's agenda particularly in the conflicted areas go ahead. The problem of development, bureaucracy, administration, social and political inclusion in Indonesia can only be terminated by eradicating the role of the military in all sides, nationally and regionally, by focusing it only into safeguarding the nation from external violence over the territorial aggression.

Keywords: *Development, Bureaucracy, Administration, Military and Politics*

1. Introduction

In the mid-1980s, Indonesia's President Suharto and his military dominated 'New Order' (*Orde Baru*) regime were at the height of their power. Since the transfer of power in 1966 from the previous regime, the so-called 'Old Order (*Order Lama*) under Indonesia's first President Sukarno (Eklöf, 2003, p. 1). Suharto came to power in the confused and hitherto not fully explained aftermath of an abortive coup. Whether the events of 30 September/ 1 October 1965 were mounted by dissident soldier against President Sukarno, or with President's connivance against the army leadership remains to this day unsolved (Vatikiotis, 1998, p. 2).

Systematically, the authorities of the New Order regime dominated the political arena through brutal, cruel and unconstitutional methods. They do not value differences of opinion, criticism and do not want to hear the people's aspirations. The rise of people's resistance- that is of civilians – is greeted with intimidation, terror, arrests, jailing, bullets and even with slaughter. Newspapers, magazines, books and other tools of education that are critical and dare to differ from the point of view of the authorities are banned and closed down.

Journalist who do not favor one-sided reporting of the government's point of view are sent to jail. The working class, who are economically oppressed, are intimidated, terrorized and even killed. Peasants find it increasingly difficult to keep their land and defend their rights, as they are confronted by the military when they resist capitalist encroachment into their land. All these authoritarian strategies are employed, implemented, enacted and maintained with one aim in mind, to ensure the stability of capital accumulation (Hadiz & Bourchier, 2003, p. 180). The result of such kind military behavior pushed the people to the very critical situation, particularly after being intimidated by the military they have to leave the place where they resided. The Indonesian regional conflicts have been organized by the military smoothly for the purpose of their business and professional promotion.

2. Development, Bureaucracy, Administration, Political Disorder, Military and Social Inclusion

Together with the repression of opposition, social participation in the formal political structure was tightly restricted. To ensure the regime's stability the influence of the existing political parties was reduced drastically with the establishment of a governmental party, Golkar (*Golongan Karya*, or functional group), which all public servants were forced to join and support (Honna, 2009, p. 231).

Bureaucratically and administratively were limited to whole political and official activities. The tight-knit web of social organizations woven around all civil servants is designed to embrace all aspects of their lives. All civil servants are compulsory members of *Korpri*, the civil servant's organization, and such are expected to vote for Golkar (Vatikiotis, 1998, p.109). Politically and socially in the wake of New Order the Indonesian were excluded from freedom of expression and choice, all activities must be approved by the central government as well as military.

In order to consolidate Golkar's organization, the government issued a regulation in December 1969 according to which any functional group representative in the legislature affiliated with a political party would be replaced. This regulation also aimed at providing the impetus for the establishment of regional and local branches of Golkar. Moreover, the bureaucracy was mobilized in support of Golkar, and civil servants were pressed to sign declaration of 'monoloyalty' to the government, which implied support for Golkar. Although there was no formal prohibition for the majority of civil servants to be members of a political party, the government let it be understood that those who were party members were likely to be dismissed or would at the very least be unlikely to get promoted (Eklof, 2003, p. 50-51). The New Order was not only used the political tool to suppress the people but also intimidated them by losing their jobs in case of failure to support it is huge interests.

Separatist conflict, as well as inter-communal conflict has been haunting the country for decades. In particular, the province of Aceh and Papua have been prone to armed violence for more than 30 years (Heiduk, 2009, p. 295). The conflict between Indonesia and it is archipelago has caused to no exposure and access to overall social, political, economic and cultural opportunities are becoming the excluded from other provinces of the nation. It has been almost unidentified the situation of the conflict –how the problem is to be solved, where the negotiation would take place, and how the two parties are fighting without affecting the people in constant fear and terror without proper food, shelter and cloth.

Since mid 70s, the regional separation dispute has been emerging as a knotty problem in Indonesia, especially in the form of an Indonesian internal political system that dominated by central New Order military. Due to this, the social harmony and social settings have not only been messed up, but also creating problems in social inclusion. The first Internally Displaced (IDPs) emerged when the military began to use violence when carrying out search or sweeping operations on villages. The members of IDPs have since fluctuated, depending on the security situation (Kamaruzzaman, 2006, p. 260). Persons displaced from the place of origin have to face many problems relating to social, economic, cultural and other aspects. The rural areas, the places of origin of the overwhelming majorities of the Indonesian, have been under the hegemony of the New Order and on the other side under the pressure of Indonesian military, the principal party in the internal armed conflict resulted from the 'People's War'. As the armed conflict has escalated over years, people in rural areas have been compelled to leave their places of origin in fear of being killed, tortured, abducted and/or arrested by the parties in war, incidences that they have seen and heard in their vicinity.

The centered political system that adopted by Indonesian government in which there is no balance in wealth and power distribution between center government and the rest of the provinces. The disarray in Jakarta and the separation of East Timor have encouraged secessionist movements in the Economically strategic provinces of Aceh, Riau-which produces half of Indonesian's oil-and Irian Jaya (Papua), the source an estimated 15 percents of Indonesia's foreign exchange earnings. In tandem with secessionist threats, religious and ethnic violence has been escalating in central and eastern Indonesia. The growing sectarian violence and the demands of outlying islands for independence or greater autonomy are generating stresses that the Indonesian political system may not be able to withstand (Chalk & Rabasa, 2001 p. 27). As a result, many states in Indonesia have been growing tremendously demanding to be separated from Indonesia.

A large number of people, especially from the rural areas (conflicted areas) of Indonesia have been reportedly displaced due to the ongoing-armed conflict emerged especially after the end 90s and escalated unexpectedly after 2008 like in Papua, when the ever-hoped peace dialogue between the state and the rebels was broken. But it is thus convincingly suspected that the military does not only benefited from the communal violence but that is manipulated it in its own favor in the first place. In fact, the number of military's territorial unit was increased, rather than decreased, during the post-Suharto era (Honna, 2009, p. 238). The military's intention to gain advantages from the national and regional conflicts would lead society to the social disorder and would bring them to the national disintegration. The Indonesian military (TNI or Tentara Nasional Indonesia, formerly ABRI) once played a pivotal role in politics.....From 1998 when Suharto left office through the spring of 2004, both President Wahid and Megawati talked about curtailing the military's role in politics but it seemed that TNI was able to retain power both behind the scenes and through institutional means (Freedman, 2006, p. 92-93). While Wahid was confronting the military during the early months of 2000, the fragile political alliance that had backed him in the presidential election begun to crumble (Rourke, 2002, p. 360). None of the Indonesian leaders can confront the military directly. Yudhoyono, as an ex-army general who knows the organizational culture of the TNI, has not taken any significant steps to rejuvenate military reform (Honna, 2009, p. 241).

3. Conclusion

By the influence of the New Order's political culture, the military still becomes a major problem for the development, bureaucracy, administration, social and political inclusion in Indonesia. Although, the military's power was formally reduced but their involvement and activities in illegal business sort of illegal logging, forest burning particularly in the conflicted areas go ahead. The problem of development, bureaucracy, administration, social and political inclusion in Indonesia can only be solved by deleting the role of the military in all levels, nationally and regionally, by returning back them into their main objective of safeguarding the nation from external violence over the territorial sovereignty. Unless this national instability keeps always fighting against social, political and regional inclusion it is self. Reshaping the military doctrine and reintroducing them the important role of civil society in democratic

state. By reforming the role of military, it will affect all development, bureaucracy, administration of the country in to the betterment of the future.

4. References

- i. Chalk, Peter & Angel Rabasa. (2001). Indonesia's Transformation: and the Stability of Southeast Asia. Santa Monica: RAND. p. 27
- ii. Eklof, Stefan. (2003). Power and Political Culture in Suharto's Indonesia; The Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) and Decline of the New Order (1986-98). Denmark: NIAS Press Nordic Institute of Asian Studies. p. 1-50-51
- iii. Freedman, Amy L. (2006). Political Change and Consolidation: Democracy's Rocky Road in Thailand, Indonesia, South Korea, and Malaysia. New York: Palgrave Macmillan. p.92-93
- iv. Hadiz, Vedi R., & David Bourchier. (2003). Indonesian Politics and Society. London: RoutledgeCurzon. p. 180
- v. Honna, Jun. (2009). From dwifungsi to NKRI: Regime change and Political Activism of the Indonesian military. In Ufen, Andreas & Marco Bunte (Eds.), Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia. USA and Canada: Routledge. p.231-238-241
- vi. Heiduk, Felix. (2009). Two sides of the coin? Separatism and Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia. In Ufen, Andreas & Marco Bunte (Eds.), Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia. USA and Canada: Routledge. p. 295
- vii. Kamaruzzaman, Suraiya. (2006). Violence, internal displacement and its impact on the women of Aceh. In Coppel, Charles. A (Eds.), Violent Conflicts in Indonesia: Analysis, representation, resolution. USA: Routledge. p.260
- viii. Rourke, Kevin O. (2002). Reformasi. NSW: Allen & Unwin. p.360
- ix. Vatikiotis, Michael R.J. (1998). Indonesian Politics Under Suharto: The Rise and Fall of the New Order. New York: Routledge. p.360