

NEW STATE, OLD SOCIETY: The Practice of Corruption in Indonesian Politics In Historical Comparative Perspective

Wijayanto

Abstrak

Dengan menggunakan perspektif perbandingan sejarah, dan berdasarkan pada kasus korupsi di sektor perhutanan, artikel ini berargumen bahwa meskipun Indonesia telah berubah dari negara berstruktur otoriter menjadi negara yang berstruktur demokratis namun sikap (attitude) para pelaku (actors) dalam negara masih belum berubah. Mereka masih berlaku feodal sebagaimana halnya pada saat negara ini masih berbentuk kerajaan ribuan tahun silam. Karakter feodal inilah yang kemudian memberi justifikasi bagi tetap langgengnya tradisi korupsi pada sepanjang sejarah bangsa. Lebih jauh, watak feodal dan korup ini sesungguhnya bisa dilacak akarnya pada nilai-nilai yang terdapat dalam budaya Jawa sebagaimana diuraikan oleh Bennedict Anderson.

Kata kunci: sikap, pelaku, budaya jawa, korup

A. PENDAHULUAN

Indonesia has been one of the most corrupt countries in the world. According to the report from Transparency International, Indonesian score of Corruption Perception Index is still very low as clearly described in the bellow:

Table 1
Indonesia Corruption's Perception Index (CPI)

Years	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011
CPI	1.7	1.9	1.9	1.9	2.0	2.2	2.4	2.3	2,6	2,8	2,8	3,0

Source: Transperancy International Indonesia

Those bad score are very surprising since nowadays Indonesia has entered more than a decade reformation era marked by the fall of the authoritarian centralistic regime under the New Order. This fact has made the arguments that based on the structural variables as a basic explanation of corruption no longer acceptable. While these arguments said that corruption was caused by a highly centralized -governmental structure (Smith, 1971), the data shows us that corruption was still happening during the first decade of decentralization era. Moreover, there is a tendency that the trend of corruption even becomes worst and widespread and resulted in the well know term of "*korupsi berjamaah*" (It is a term which means doing corruption collectively as if it is a kind of religious practice).

Given the background I would like to analyze why the corruption is still happening although Indonesia has entered the new democratic and decentralized political system. Using the case studies of the practice of corruption in the forestry sector, I would like to argue that the basic cause of corruption lays on the attitude of the stakeholders in the political system which are corruptive and based merely on their own self interest. Furthermore, while the political system has changed from the centralized-authoritarian to the decentralized-democratic system, the attitude of the actors in the political system remains the same. Based on the cultural perspective, this corruptive attitude is justified by the Javanese culture which is then influencing the entire Indonesian's political system. Finally, based on the historical perspective, this corruptive attitude can be traced back since Indonesia was still under the

kingdoms political system and was shaped by the various kind of regime occupied Indonesia since the Dutch until the early Indonesia's independence.

Before discussing the practice of corruption in the forestry sector in the New Order and Reformation era, I will make it clear first about what that I mean by corruption. The next section I devote to explore the influence of Javanese culture to Indonesian politics in which the culture of corruption is inherent in it. I then provide a historical review on the practice of corruption in Indonesian politics since the kingdom era until the early Indonesian independence. Finally, I discuss about the practice of corruption in the forestry sector of two era's.

B. PEMBAHASAN

B.1. What is corruption?

Before addressing the questions above, I would like make it clear about what I define as a corruption. Referring to Smith (1971:21) the term "corruption" refers to the use of public resource for private purposes. Consequently, this definition covers not only conventional monetary, but also political and administrative corruption as well. An administrator who exploits his position to extract unofficial payments from investors (either foreign or domestic) is using a public resource –his official position, prestige, status, and/or authority- for personal profit. Likewise, an official who appoints family and friends to lucrative government positions regardless of their abilities is using a public resource for private gain.

Furthermore, corruption can be categorized in various other ways based on the scale, the method and the target of this practice (Smith, 1971, 22). In scale, corruption can arrange from the high level corruption such as large manipulation and descending money at the top until the low level one such as a gift of cigarettes. This scale can happen both within a single government organization and across various levels of the governmental system –national, provincial, city, region and village. In term of method, there are some officials who directly divert funds which are under their control, while other use their official authority to command unofficial payments from private parties seeking special privileges or governmental assistance. While the former is stealing and constitutes represents the loss of a different kind of resources, the latter is bribery and represents the loss of different kind of resources, the government's legitimacy, especially in the eyes of some critical elite groups such as professionals, academics, students, and civil servants. Finally, in term of targets, corruption can target on monetary, time, misuse of government authority or position and stealing equipment and other government's material.

B.2. Cultural Perspective on Practice of Corruption in Indonesia

B.2.a. Corruption in Javanese Culture

To understand about why the practice of corruption in Javanese Culture is acceptable, it can be explained based on how power was seen in Javanese culture. Referring to Anderson (1972, 22-23) power is seen as concrete, homogenous, constant and doesn't raise the question of legitimacy in Javanese culture. These concepts can be described as follows;

First of all, power is seen as concrete meaning that power exist independent of its possible users. It is not a theoretical postulate but an existential reality that is tangible, mysterious, and divine energy which animates the universe. Furthermore, power is manifested in every aspect of the natural world, in stones, trees, cloud, and fired but is expressed quintessentially in the central mystery of life, the process of generation and regeneration.

Second, power is homogenous meaning that all power is the same type and has the same source. Furthermore, power in the hands of one individual or one group is identical with power in the hands of any other individual or groups.

Third, power is constant meaning that the total amount of power within cosmos is remains fixed as the cosmos is neither expanding nor contracting. Even though the distribution of power in the universe may vary, its total quantity does not change as power simply exist, and is not the product of organization, wealth, weapon and anything else.

Finally, power does not raise the question of legitimacy. Meaning that power itself antecedes questions of good and evil since all power derive from a single homogenous source. Power is neither legitimate nor illegitimate.

The idea that power doesn't raise a question of legitimacy has the important implication to understand corruption. Since power doesn't raise a question of legitimacy, there is no idea of the abuse of power in Javanese culture. In term of corruption, it is absolutely acceptable for the ruler (king) to accumulate wealth for his own self, although it should belong to the people. There is no separation between the public and the private. Moreover, the prosperity of the kings was seen as the prosperity of the society. This treatment is also worked for the ruler in the lower level. If we follow the tale of *wayang*, one of traditional show in Javanese culture who is using puppets as the tools, we will see that all of the rulers in the story, whether he acts as the protagonists or antagonists, are the chosen by the God. They are placed in the high level of stratification in the eye of the God. Since they act as protagonist or antagonist is merely to serve the God will. They just act like what that God has directed.

Actually, the Javanese idea on power is only one aspect of Javanese world view on a good life (Suseno; 1997), since there are also so many other aspects as the part of Javanese world views. For the purpose of the thesis, I will only mention those that give legitimacy to the practice of corruption. One of the most important aspects is Javanese view in the harmony on cosmos. The Javanese believes that the nature of the universe is the order and harmony on cosmos; both in the macro and micro level.

Therefore, they believe that to create a good life they have to keep the cosmos in harmony and order. Furthermore, since they believe that the super natural sphere has a correlation with natural events, they believe that the social order is the reflection of order in cosmos. In this sense, a key right place is something very important. In the view of a Javanese, his well being depends upon his findings on his place and staying. Upon reaching one's place depends on the attainment of one's goals, the fulfillment of wishes and the satisfaction of interests. Choosing the wrong place automatically means that the cosmic harmony is disturbed. Within their world view, Javanese have every interest that everyone should take up their assigned place.

One of the positive signs of being at right place can be seen from the social. On the exterior social level, a condition of manifest harmony is the sign that everyone has found his place. Disorder or unrest in society implies a disturbance in cosmic harmony. Inversely, every disturbance in cosmic harmony implies a threat to society.

Furthermore, since they believe that social order and hierarchical were the reflection of order in cosmic, the Javanese always try to avoid conflict and maintain social order by means of respecting every one based on his place. In general, there are two stratification in Javanese, *the priyayi* (aristocrat; the ruling class) and *wong cilik*

(the ordinary people, the ruled). Furthermore, the hierarchy is also expressed through the language used by the Javanese. A Javanese will speak to the people in the lower or higher level with a different expression of language. The higher level or position to whom they are speaking, the more the language they use will express a respect and honor (Geertz,1989). Therefore, people in the low hierarchical level (*wong cilik*) will receive whatever treatment they get from the ruling class including the practice of corruption itself. They will appreciate it as it is. Questioning or protesting the treatment will result in the disharmony that they very much avoid. In another hand, since this hierarchical order was given by God, the people will always obey the rulers since they consider the ruler as chosen by God therefore the rulers will always do correct things for the whole society. Some scholars consider it as a patrimonialism relation (Geertz;1989, Crouch;1979, Schwarz;1994). This term refers to a relation between ruler and ruled as if a relation between father and son. Society is viewed as if it is a family with ruler as a father and people as a son. This term is a representation of two kinds of relations that traverse this nodal point: (1) that between fathers and sons as dominant and subordinate masculinities ordered around images of fatherhood and filiality, and (2) that of the political relation among father-rulers, conducted on the basis of their socially-recognized paternal status.

Finally, one of the most important ideas that legitimate the practice of corruption in Javanese culture lays on how the Javanese views on the family. Family has central point for a Javanese. They will live their life by using the family as the reference to see the world. A Javanese will act or behave in such manner that is acceptable for his family. A Javanese obtains his individuality from the family he lives in.

Since a very little child, a Javanese will be educated to be somebody who brings such a good thing to his family. A father, for instance, will teach his son that if the son getting adult he will be *orang* (a man). Meaning that the son will be somebody who can give a good name to the family. Furthermore, the father is also educated the son not to forget his family when he is already *orang* (a man).

In term of practice of corruption, it implies that if a Javanese becomes a ruler or whatever position in which he holds a position in the political system, he will not forget his family and giving a priority to his family. If he had a project to do, he will give it to the people who have the closest relationship with him in term of family. If he has an authority to decide for the recruitment of official's position, he will also give a priority to his family. Since, for a Javanese, giving a priority to the family is a kind of moral obligation. Family is the first place he obtains his position in the social order. It reflects the order in cosmic as given by the God. Therefore, respecting the family by giving a priority to the family will mean respect to the whole cosmic to create a harmony.

B.2.b. Java and Its Influence to Indonesian Politics

Java is the most heavily populated island in Indonesia, with 60 per cent of the population occupying only 7 per cent of the total land area. As the centre of colonial activity, by 1930 Java already had experienced a long period of agricultural intensification, construction of irrigation facilities, and development of the infrastructure for colonial economic activities, making it the dominant region in Indonesia.

The Javanese are the largest of Indonesia's 36 major ethnic groups. Their homelands are in the central and eastern parts of the island. The second largest

ethnic and linguistic group, the Sundanese, occupy the western part of Java. Because the post-Independence Indonesian government has not allowed the inclusion of an ethnicity question in the census, the total population by ethnic groups is not available. Hugo et al. (1987) estimated Javanese dominance in Indonesia by using the language spoken in the homes in the 1980 census data, which showed that 40 per cent of the Indonesians speak Javanese at home, and 58 per cent living in Java speak this language.

Population growth, leading to conversion of agricultural land to residences, reduced both the total area of land under cultivation on Java and the size of the average farm. At the same time, overinvestment in manufacturing drew people to seek non-agricultural, urban jobs. According to the World Bank (1988), the urban population is growing five times as fast as the rural population.

After the Indonesian independence, Java has been the central of Indonesian politics. Not only because of it is the island where the Capital City is located but it is also because of there are so many political elite from this island. Five of six Indonesian President ever is Javanese except Habibie which is the third president. During the Old Order, there were so many political leaders are sent from Java to the outer island by the central government.

The high role of Javanese became more crucial during the New Order. The central government appointed the local leader in the province, city and regency all over Indonesia from Javanese. Soeharto, the President of the New Order, used his power as the leader of the dominant party; Golkar, and as the highest general in army to appoint the leader. Golkar was directly linked to military, and control the national, provincial and district level assemblies. Although there were two main opposition parties –*Partai Persatuan Pembangunan* and the *Partai Demokrasi Indonesia*– these are strictly controlled and never won the election. In 1987, twenty one of Indonesia's twenty-seven governors were Javanese and are either active or "retired" generals or colonels. Many of the cabinet ministers have army backgrounds and are Javanese.

B.3. Historical Review on Practice of Corruption in Indonesia

Based on historical comparative perspective, the practice of corruption has colored Indonesian's politics throughout history, which is to say that while the political system is changed, the culture of corruption remains the same across the Indonesian history.

B.3.a. The Kingdoms-Feudalistic Era

Begin from hundred years ago, a period when Java was still split into some of feudalistic- kingdoms. There was a Mataram Kingdom, located near present-day of Yogyakarta, Airlangga Kingdom (1019) in East Java and Majapahit kingdoms (1350-1389). In this time period, the people were effectively ruled by aristocrats who, as the representatives of the kings, enjoyed patrimonial privileges not unlike those in feudal Europe. Here no distinction was made between the public and private affair. The king itself has a right to accumulate the prosperity (such as: money, gold, etc) as well as has many *selirs*. It is a name given to woman who becomes a servant for the king to function just like a wife, including sexual activities.

Furthermore, the king has a right to appoint his family to hold an important position in the kingdom.

B.3.b. The Colonial Era

The practice of corruption was also shaped during the colonial era. Prior to Dutch East India company offered Indonesians flagrant examples of corrupt behavior. In the words of Clive Day, the men of the Company were underpaid and exposed to every temptation that was offered by the combination of a weak native organization, extraordinary opportunities in trade, and an almost complete absence of check from home or in java. Officials become rich by stealing from the company. Some forms of theft came in time to deserve a less harsh name, as they were so current and open that they could be regarded as legal.

In the writing of Raffles and the numerous colonial reports cited by Day, it is clear that the demise of company rule and the arrival of the Dutch governor general at the turn of the nineteenth century resulted in an unavoidable widening illicit practices (Smith, 1970;23). As colonial regulation and control expanded, both European and native officials indulged in obvious abuses, enjoying not only the specified percentage which was their right, but also a portion of most resources passing through their hands. When traditional; services and payments due the native aristocratic officials had no alternative but to use illegal means if they wished to maintain the state of life to which they were accustomed. Other aristocratic Javanese bribed their way into remunerative positions dispensed by Dutch Officials. And with the expansion of Dutch taxation on the land and its produce, native officials as low as village headmen and their assistants took advantage of new opportunities for profiteering. In java, some *bekel* (tax farmers) raised twenty-fold what they paid to their superiors. Their devices for extortion were innumerable.

B.3.c. The Guided Democracy era

With the rise of nationalism and the achievement of an Indonesian state, claims to state resource became public claims and the private use of what were now “public” funds became “corruption.” Thus, the expansion of corruption in Indonesia, as in other new states, constitutes, in part, a new definition of corrupt practice rather than a change in traditional behavior. Smith quoted Wetheim that said that, “.....a kind of public conduct hitherto considered normal was now looked at with other, more critical eyes.”

Like what has been written by Smith (1993 : 25), the practice of corruption also occurred during the guided democracy period (1958-1965). This stems from revolutionary leaders’ perceptions of the function of the state. In nearly all cases, the government role in society –political, economic, and administrative – expanded very considerably. With this expansion came many new possibilities for corruption and bribery involving public official.

In the writing of Soe Hok Gie, one of the young main actor for the student movement to impeach Soekarno from his presidency, the practice of corruption done by Soekarno was one of the main reasons the student’s demonstration to impeach him took a place. Soekarno was seen as corruptive in his attitude by having so many wives around him and accumulating wealth in his palace. The practice of corruption was also seen from his intention to be a president a life time.

B.4. The Practice of Corruption in the forestry sector: New order and Reformation Era

In this part, I will present how the corruptive attitude of the political actors in the two regime has become the underlying factors that leads to one of the biggest problem in forestry sector which is deforestation.

As what that has been reported from several resources, is facing a serious problem of deforestation. The report from the Indonesian's Environment Forum (WALHI), for instance, shown that in the year 1997, Indonesia has lost 72% of its genuine forest. Furthermore, the speed of deforestation in the period 1985-1997 is 1.6 million acres a year. While in the period 1997-2000 the increasing number of the deforestation is 3.8 million squares a year. The official report from the Bureau of *Planology* of Forestation Department shows that in year 2000, there was 59,62 million squares of forest that was broken. The latest data reported by *World Resource Institute* published in 2002 shown that Indonesia is losing nearly 2 million ha of forest every year.

The data shows us that the deforestation is still happening and has not been solved although Indonesian's has moved from the centralistic and authoritarian era under The New Order (1967-1997) to the reformation era which is marked by democratization and decentralization.

Before going further, I want to make it clear first about what that I mean with the deforestation itself. Referring to **Sunderlin and Reksosudarmo (in Rosyadi, 2003, 41)**, there are five references to deforestation. *First*, it refers to just permanent, or both permanent and temporary removal of forest cover. *Secondly*, it refers the loss of forest cover all kinds of uses, or it refers to the loss of forest cover that will never again regenerate for timber production. *Thirdly*, it refers to the removal of forest alone or it refers as well to the loss of various kinds of forest attributes, such as density, structure and species composition. *Fourth*, instead of defining the term deforestation, some studies also refers to the one who removes the forest covers or that prevents the re-growth of the forest cover. *Five*, a view that points out that the agent of deforestation is most appropriately defined in terms of the ultimate designated use of cleared forest land instead of the action and intensions of those who actually clear the forest.

In this paper, for the purpose of this thesis, deforestation is defined as a process where the state forest trees are illegally felled by human activities. The term "illegal" refers to unintended forest feeling that is ethically bad because it leads to negative externalities such as landslide, flood and species extinction.

B.4.a. During Centralized-Authoritarian New Order

The corruptive attitude of the political actors in The New Order has become the underlying factors that leads to one of the biggest problem in forestry sector which is deforestation (Dauvergene, 1993; Santoso 1999; Barber; 2002; Rosyadi, 2003).

Dauvergne (1993) argued that much of the explanation on deforestation failed to comprehend the problem since it isolates different agents and underlying factors which contributes to deforestation and do not provide a broader context in which to understand the process which leads to deforestation. Furthermore, he argues that the process that leads to deforestation in Indonesia cannot be fully understood without examining how Indonesian politics and the attitudes of the decision makers, with support from the international system, shape and drive the various factors which contribute to deforestation. By focusing on these political forces, he argued that the vested interests which benefit from and which encourage and support activities has led to the deforestation itself. He stated that there were the working together between the president, the military and the private enterpreneurs to join in the illegal logging. This working together was possible as the decision making made by the president was based merely on the informal relationship such as age

and seniority, family ties, education, ethnicity and religion. This kind of attitude also shaped the structure of the new order political system.

In parallel, **Rosyadi and Sastranegara** (2003 : 107) argued that the ongoing problems of deforestation was rooted in the centralized forestry institutions established by the "New Order" Regime (1967-1997) to serve the interests of elite around the government. These elites consist of the politician, the military, the bureaucracy and the private enterprise. These groups had established a strong network, the so-called triangle of "corruption, collusion and cronyism".

During the New Order, in the name of development, the government pursued to push economic growth by whatever policy was necessary to be taken including exploitation of natural resources. In this time, the exploitation of forest was not an exception as revenues from forests were an important source of foreign exchange for the public budget as well as for the military and the political elite. Hundred of concession rights to forests exploitation were issued at the end of 1960s to military organizations, private enterprises, and bureaucrats close to the power and the government center.

Finally, they come to the conclusion that deforestation in Indonesia is an indication of an institutional crisis. Forest concessions that were given by the governments to its cronies had been misused to overexploit forest resources and led to deforestation. Such policies are closely related to the dominant role of the government that is assigned to control natural resource use by the formal laws. Unfortunately, the formulation process of various formal laws frequently bestows the central government a strong role in forest management but undermine customary laws and the livelihood of local communities. Structural adjustment program recommended by international donors also contributed to the deforestation process. Therefore, they suggest that demand for forestry reform should focus on institutional changes towards devolution in order to achieve sustainable forest management and to improve the people's welfare.

Talking in the same sense, on his analysis of the deforestation during the New Order, **Santoso (1999)** argued that the deforestation was caused by the incapability of the forestry regime, which was the state bureaucracy, to implement the rules it made. This failure was caused by the fact that it was undermined by particularistic interests.

Furthermore, he argued that the lucrativeness of forest exploitation businesses invited political penetration from the core of the state into the bureaucratic control of the ministry of forestry. In this case bureaucratic control was subject to political control that pursued rent seeking activities. So, on the one hand there was the institutionalization of extra-bureaucratic interests –represented by the channeling of the accumulation of funds from forestry exploitation to underfunded military organizations, whilst on the other, there was the constraints placed on the institutionalization of the forestry bureau-technocracy due to the incursion of the big business community. Apparently, the ministry of Forestry became the prisoner of its own fortunes.

The business community managed to establish an informal sphere of forestry governance within which rent seeking became normality, and which allow privately owned capital to be channeled to top-up the state's non budgeted activities. This explained in part, why under-funded ministry of defense and security was able to sustain its key role in controlling Indonesian political life for so long, namely since the establishment of the new order. The core of the problem was not a shortage of fund as such, but rather the attitude toward the use of readily available funds. The

technocratic idea of establishing a retention fund was subverted by the hunger for economic rents from forest exploitation.

Barber, et al, (2002:) argues that the roots of deforestation is in a corrupt political and economic system that regarded the natural resources, especially forest, as a source of revenue to be exploited for political end and personal gain. They argued that the country's growing wood processing and plantation crop industries proved lucrative over the years, and their profitability was used by the New Order regime as a means to rewards and control friends, families and potential allies. During more than 30 years of its ruling, the country vastly increased its out put

During the new order, the Indonesian political system used the centralistic pattern. Almost all of the decision making was made by the central government through a top down model. In this part, I will present that the attitude of the political elite in the central government that is corruptive and act based on individual interest has run the real day to day politics in Indonesia. It shaped how the process of government was done. Therefore, the formal government structure at the time explain only small part of how politics accurately works.

The formal government structure in Indonesia based on the 1945 constitution and subsequent legislation. The central government is located in Jakarta and there are three levels of local government; provincial, district and village. The national parliament is composed of two bodies : the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) and the legislative House of Representatives (DPR). In theory, the thousand-member MPR is the highest authority of the central government and elects the president and vice-president for five year terms. However, the MPR rarely mets and more than half members are appointed by the government. The DPR is composed four hundred elected members and one hundred members appointed from the armed forces. Most analyst consider it a politically weak body, since neither the president nor the ministers are members, while in practice legislation is initiated at the executive level. The president has direct power to the armed forces, he appointed ministers and governors, and proclaims laws. The bureaucracy provides technical advice to the ministers and they in turn advise the president. The courts deal with civil and criminal law do not rule on constitutional matters.

However, this formal structure explains only a small part of how politics actually works. The military, in fact, controls most aspects of the political structure, including the central government in Jakarta, the provincial governments in the outer islands, the bureaucracy and many of the state run companies. President Soeharto, a retired general from central Java, emerged as the most powerful political figure and establish his New Order government after the military deposed Soekarno in the mid-1960s. The bureaucracy is strongly influenced by the military, althoufht it does have some independence based on its exepertise. Around 60 percent of the senior officials in the central government ministries were directly connected with the military in the late 1980s, and all civil servants must join Golkar.

During Soeharto's rule, political decision making has gradually become more centralized in Jakarta, in the hands of the Javanese. Approximately 75 percent of the decisions making positions in the Indonesian military are now controlled by the Javanese. Centre of power outside of the government have been eliminated or appeased, and control over the central over the central government apparatus has been tightened. Although the majority of Indonesia's exporting oil, wood, tin, plantation corps come from the outer islands, the central government controls the profits. Many provinces in the early 1980s still depended on central grants for up to 90 percent of their revenues. The decision making is seen as the pure view of the

central government, revenues flow into the central government for only partial disbursement to the regions, and the perceptions of the central governments are translated into national program made applicable to all areas of the country.

Certain important cultural aspects shape how government decision making is made. Age and seniority are important determinants of the extent input decisions. Coupled with this is a general belief in consensus decision making, with open opposition to policies being socially incorrect. Consequently, decision making tend to be conservative, reflecting the status quo. Another important aspect of everyday decision making is the important of connections, including those based on family ties, education, ethnicity and religion. These informal relationships involve reciprocal favors.

Meanwhile, there was also a split in the army hierarchy between military managers, those in charge of trading enterprise and occupying high administrative post, and field officers with who provide security. Military managers must supply field officers with money, often obtained by corrupt means. A further element played important role here is the use of patronage to appease hostile, and potentially hostile, groups by distributing prestigious positions and material benefits to selected individuals.

B.4.b. During Decentralized-Democratic Government in The Reformation Era

In the reformation era which marked by the fall of the New Order regime after the retire of Soeharto from his presidency, Indonesia entered the new political system which by transforming it from the centralized-authoritarian regime into decentralized-democratic regime. Despite of this change, in term of deforestation, the roots of causes of the deforestation remain the same. McCarthy (2002; 868) argued that the roots of illegal logging can be found in the shifting economic and political interests of diverse actors at the district, sub district, and village levels. As these actors enter into exchanges and accommodations around logging, they create the de facto institutional arrangements governing timber operations.

Therefore, the different is that while in the new order, it is mainly the central government who enjoy the corruption, during the new era, the practice of corruption was primarily enjoyed by the local stakeholders which are local politician, local officials, private entrepreneur, village leaders and villagers (McCarthy, 2002, 879). Each of them takes a part to make the deforestation happen based on their interest. Officials exploiting their positions could generate significant rents, both for their own personal use and for political purposes. Key local politicians could increase their popular support by expanding district budgets to provide for projects and programs that offered opportunities to client and followers. At the same time, entrepreneurs and their agent could maintain timber operations by entering into exchanges that involved extralegal gifts and favors with certain local politicians and State functionaries. As these external networks entered the village arena, the pattern of the exchange needed to also accommodate customary (*adat*) assumptions and authority structures. In the face of external interventions backed by powerful district figures, rather than merely watching the depletion of local forests from the sidelines, community leaders choose to promise: loggers could cut in community forest territory by collecting funds for community purposes, at the same time extracting rent for their own benefit. In the face of severe fluctuation in the price of agricultural commodities, villagers were also attracted by short-term livelihoods that could be gained from the unsustainable mining of local forests. In this way, village actors enjoyed a portion of the flow of benefits gain from logging community territory.

Comparing the practice of illegal logging –one of the main cause of deforestation by human- in Kalimantan, Indonesia, Obidzinski (2002:2134) argued that while well entrenched networks of patronage and corruption remain, the decentralization process has blurred the distinction between “legal” and “illegal” logging by giving rise to locally sanctioned timber extraction. In other words, local government may officially legitimate timber extraction by issuing timber permits, however they do so without any due regard for sustainable development. Furthermore, the practice of illegal logging has been legalized by the regulation.

C. PENUTUP

Indonesia has been one of the most corrupt countries in the world. Based on the cultural perspective, this practice has been justified by the value inherent in Javanese culture, especially in the idea that power is neutral and doesn't raise any question of legitimacy, meaning that there is no idea of abuse of power in Javanese. This idea gives legitimacy to whatever practice done by the king or those who hold the power. Actually, this idea is part of the Javanese view about the world and about a good life. Furthermore, there are also any other idea which gives a legitimacy to the practice of corruption such as; a moral obligation to obey the family (an idea which implies to the practice of nepotism), the idea that hierarchical order in society is given by God in which a Javanese must obey in order to protect social harmony, therefore the ruled class (*wong cilik*) may not questioning or protesting whatever practice done by the ruler including corruption. This kind of relation between the ruler and the ruled in is then well known as patrimonialism.

Meanwhile, these values in Javanese culture are then influencing the entire Indonesian politics since Java is the centre of Indonesian politics since the colonial era until the period when Indonesia declared its independence. Beside a centre of Indonesian politics, the Javanese are the main actors in the Indonesian politic since the Old Order of Soekarno until the New Order of Soeharto. Especially during the 32 years of New Oder, Soeharto used a kind of policy which made the influence of Javanese in Indonesia politics much stronger by appointed the leader for the many of the whole province, city and regency in Indonesia from a Javanese. In another hand, Java has been the most with multiethnic and populated island in Indonesia which is more than fifty percent Indonesian population lives in this island.

Based on comparative historical perspective, the practice of corruption has been occurred since Indonesia was still in the form of feudalistic kingdom. Since the time, the value that legitimizes the practice of corruption has been inherent within it. As the consequence, the king was considered as has a right to accumulate around himself such wealth and prosperity as well as appointed his family to be the part of the rulers. The practice was shaped by the Dutch during the colonial era in which the Dutch in working together with the local (*pribumi*) aristocrat s were doing such practice of corruption. Furthermore, the practice of corruption was also occurred massively during the Old Order of Soekarno.

Based on the case study on forestry sector which is the deforestation caused by the illegal logging is the problem, we can see that the practice of corruption is remains the same. The change in the political system from the authoritarian-centralized regime during the New Order to the Decentralized-Democratic doesn't government doesn't does not mean the practice of corruption to be minimized.

In summary, while the state and form of Indonesian political system has changed over time, the society remains the same. It is a society who holds such

culture that legitimizes the practice of corruption within its selves. It is, then, what I call as the new state with the old society.

DAFTAR RUJUKAN

- Adams, Julia. 2006. *"The Rule of the Father: Patriarchy and Patrimonialism in Early Modern Europe."* Working paper. Russell Sage Foundation.
- Angelsen, Arild. 2000. *Shifting cultivation and "deforestation": A study from Indonesia*. Michelsen Institute, Fantoft, Bergen, Norway
- Anderson, Benedict. R. O'G. 1972. *Java in Time of Revolution : Occupation and Resistance*. Itacha and London : Cornell University Press.
- . 1972. *The Idea of Power in Javanese Culture*. In *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*. Itacha, New York : Cornell University Press.
- . 1983. *Old State, New Society : Indonesia's New Order in Comparative Historical Perspective*. The Journal of Asian Studies, Vol.42, No.3 (May, 1983), 477-496
- Barbier, Edward B. et. al. 1995. *The Linkage between Timber Trade and Tropical Deforestation in Indonesia*. Cambridge, Blackwell Publish Ltd.
- Benda, Harry J. and Joan Bastin. 1968. *A History of Modern South East Asia: Colonialism, Nationalism and Decolonization*. USA : Prentice Hall International.
- Brown, David, et.al. 2002. *The State of the Forest: Indonesia*. English : World Resource Institute.
- Bryan, Raymon L, et al, 1993. *Introduction : forest Transformation and Political Ecology in South East asia*. Global Ecology and Biogeography Letters, Vol.3, No. 4/6, The Political Ecology of South East Asian Forests : Transdisciplinary Discourses. (Jul. – Sep. – Nov., 1993), pp. 101-111
- Crouch, Harold. 1979. *Patrimonialism and Military Rule in Indonesia*. *World Politics*, Vol. 31, No. 4. (Jul., 1979), pp. 571-587.
- Dauvergne, Peter. 1993. *The Politics of Deforestation in Indonesia*. A Paper Presented at SEADOC seminar for the Centre for Southeast Asian Research, University of british Columbia, January 27, 1993
- Geertz, Clifford. 1989. *ABANGAN, SANTRI, PRIYAYI Dalam Masyarakat Jawa*. (Translated from : The Religion of Java.) Jakarta : Pustaka Jaya.
- . 1956. *The Development of the Javanese Economy*. Massachusets: Massachusets Institute of Technology.
- Gie, Soe Hok. 2005. *Zaman Peralihan*. Jakarta : Gagas Media
- Huntington, Samuel P. 1968. *Political Order in Changing Societies*. Massachusets : Yale University.
- Kartodihardo, Hariadi. 1999. *Belenggu IMF dan World Bank : Hambatan Struktural Pembaharuan Kebijakan Kehutanan di Indonesia*. Bogor:Pustaka Latin.
- Kummer, David M. and B.L. Turner II. 1994. *The Human Causes of Deforestation In South East Asia*. BioScience, Vol. 44, No.5, Global Impact of Land-Cover Change. (May, 1994). Pp 323-328.
- McCarthy. John F, 2002. *Turning in Circles: District Governance, Illegal Logging, and Environmental Decline in Sumatra, Indonesia*. Society and Natural Resources. Asia Research Centre, Murdoch University, Murdoch, Western Australia and Vollenhoven Institut Leiden, The Netherlands.
- Ribot, Jesse C, Arun Agrawal and Anne M. Larson. 2006. *Recentralizing While Decentralizing: How National Governments Reappropriate Forest Resources*. World Development. Vol.3. Issue 11. November 2006, Pages 1864-1886. *Rescaling Governance and the Impacts of Political and Environmental Decentralization*
- Rosyadi, Slamet. 2003. *Community-Based Forest Management in Java, Indonesia : The Issue of Poverty Alleviation, Deforestation and Devolution*. Postfach 4403;Wissenschaftsverlag Vauk Kiel KG
- Rosyadi, Slamet and Moh. Husein Sastranegara. 2003. *Deforestation in Indonesia : Institutional Crisis and Demand for Forestry Policy Reform*. In *Sustainable Development: Socio-Economic and Environmental Problems Focused on Indonesia Cased*. Gottingen: Cuvillier Verlag
- Smith, Theodore M. 1971. *Corruption, Tradition and Change*. Cornell University Press.
- Santoso, Purwo. 1999. *The Politics of Environmental Policy Making in Indonesia : A Study of State Capacity, 1967-1994*. Doctoral Thesis, Department of Government, London School of Economics and Political Science, University of London.
- Schwarz, Adam. 1994. *A Nation in Waiting: Indonesia in the 1990s*. Boulder, CO.: Westview Press.
- Setiawan, Bhakti and Sudharto P Hadi. 2007. *Regional Autonomy and Local Resource Management in Indonesia*. Asia Pacific View Point vol. 48 no.1 April 2007

Suseno, Franz Magnis. 1997. *Javanese Ethics and World-View: The Javanese Idea of The Good Life*. Jakarta : PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

----- . 1983. *Etika Jawa Dalam Tantangan : Sebuah Bunga Rampai*. Jogjakarta : Kanisius

Theobald, Robin. 1990. *Corruption, Development and Underdevelopment*. Durham: Duke University

Quimpo, Nathan Gilbert. 2007. Trapo Parties and Corruption. *KASAMA* Vol. 21 No. 1 / January-February-March 2007 / Solidarity Philippines Australia Network