

Purwo Santoso
Gadjahmada University, Indonesia.
purwo@gmail.com

Thick Individuality Within Thin Sense of Public Confusion within the Battle Against Corruption

<http://dx.doi.org/10.18196/jgp.2013.0024>

ABSTRACT

Various concepts, models or theoretical frameworks are on offer, to frame the public in fighting against corruption in Indonesia. They include: bureaucratic reform, good governance, civil society engagement etc. In response to the failure to bring corruption-free status, experts unnoticeably tend to blame public officers instead of ensuring the accuracy and the reliability of the framework. This reflective literature review reveals such tendency. To begin with, it maps out the logical basis of each approach, particularly in conceptualizing the 'public', the 'private', and their relationship. The reliability of the approaches will emerge as we link the conceptualization with real life the public or socio-cultural context. The review reveals that analysis on corruption and its imperative are ideologically driven, and hence, suffers from ideological bias. It obsesses with altering the behaviour of public officers, which inevitably entrapped with particular set-up. As liberal discourse take place in non-liberal institutional set-up, the public fail to comprehend the nature of the problems and the solution on offer. Instead of setting up context-specific agenda, public a dragged on various forms of reform such as granting political rights, enhancing civil society, articulate more autonomy and alike. As overwhelming individual within the battles against corruption overloaded with asserting of more public role, they encountered with difficulty in setting the boundary between the public and the private. As Indonesia has been endowed with different institutional set-up in governing public affairs, corruption-free public governance remains elusive. This is because the reforms dismantle the existing

powerbase, which actually is vital for winning the fight against corruptive system

KEYWORDS: public, private, corruption

A. INTRODUCTION: CONFUSION WITHIN THE FIGHT

This paper aims to uncover the logical framework, which politically structures the reform within public organization, with special reference to the fight against corruption in Indonesia. It departs from a proposition that the fight against corruption is a discourse-driven process. Therefore, scrutinizing concepts, models or theoretical frameworks, which are on offer to inspire the fight against corruption in post-Soeharto Indonesia, is important. The discourse, for sure has not been neutral. It, for example, embodies public anger or attempt to distance from the so-called corruptive practices. This apparent from the way the fight corruption was articulated. The Post-Suharto era has been characterized by the strongly articulated pledge to battle corruption as something that considered to plague the previous regime. This is pretentious given the fact that none can dismiss the fact that public itself is participant of so-called corruptive practice.

As the reform agenda becomes public, it is important to bear in mind the way the idea of public has been understood and shared. As public organization reform articulate the idea of bureaucratic reform, good governance, enhancement of civil society in fighting against corruption etc.; it is important to recognize that a particular definition of public were introduced and articulated. Previously, the

idea of public primarily refers to what the government does. Public more or less equivalent with what the state does. As public discourse on corruption gaining more popularity, new genre of public come to prominence. Public, in this regard refers to issues which are beyond any individual capacity to deal with. Certainly, public is not merely leave to the government or the state, but also the business of every individual.

What really matter in this review is that the fighting against corruption no longer an exclusive government agenda. It, to some extent even implies that the hard-core of the public is the non-state's actors which push forward agenda of ensuring government institutions do their job properly. The prevalence of the new genre of public allows particular way of constructing corruption and the way to fight against it. Moreover, state's bureaucracy in Indonesia since then on has been widely considered as part of the previous authoritarian regime, which inherits rampant practices of corruption. At the same time, state bureaucracy keep reproducing the old idea of the public. The fight against corruption apparently carries confusion or tacit disagreement on the meaning of public. The confusion is difficult to grasp as it compass the interlinking notion embodies within the idea of reform. What lie behind the idea is he presumptions of liberal democracy, which has been widely adopted by the scholars in the post-Suharto era.

That further confusion hides even deeper confusion, which even more difficult to assess and accept. For example, the discourse indicate strong optimism on the workability of programs like 'good governance' and 'bureaucracy reform', 'decentralization' and 'public private partnership' and alike. They are derived from the discourse on

primacy of liberal democratic order. Their implementation has been long enough to be observed; and yet the further the reform goes, the more frustration the analyst be. The status corruption-free country is remote still. Various measures initiated as parts of those programs turn out to render the situation worse as corruption practices become more rampant, sophisticated and systematic. It involve broader segment of the society, not only the bureaucracy.¹

The current situation described above attracts curiosity from the author. Indonesian case becomes more interesting as the public opinion; both in Indonesia and globally, are divided between two main camps. On the one hand, the discourse in Indonesia articulates the seemingly best practice of transition toward liberal democracy. It produce a sense of pride, given the country has been having long history of authoritarian rule with huge and diverse population, albeit they are predominantly Moslems.² On the other hand, there is also wide public scientism that within the prominent of discourse on the primacy liberal democratic order, the country has experiencing the growing rampant and systematic practices of corruption.³ Interestingly, so prevalent explanation has been on the failure to comply with the discourse of the primacy of liberal democracy, instead on questioning the prevailing framework. The lack reflective discourse within the reform, allows the activists who advocate the idea of corruption-free Indonesia misjudge what has been happening. The imposition of contextually ungrounded discourse allows the likely misplace reform to take place.

The divided opinion on the reform process in post-Soeharto Indonesia, basically, represents to confusion on how the situation is perceived and

what the most appropriate measure that should be taken is. The confusion evolved around the issue of despite the facts that various reform measures have been taken and legally enforced the bureaucracy in Indonesia by many standards is by far severely plagued by corruption.

B. UNCOVERING THE UNDERLYING FRAMEWORK

The process of designing the reform agenda in Indonesia has been largely influenced by large groups of intelligentsia circles in Indonesia. Large part, if not larger, of the pro-democracy groups that play prominent role in ending the rule of the New Order regime mostly came with strong academic backgrounds, either as students; experts; researchers; and scholars. Besides the World Bank and International Monetary Fund with their adjustment package delivered as aid for Indonesia to deal with the Asia economic crisis, these people are some of the main conduits that introduce and endorse the adoption of new ideas such as good governance and new public management wrapped in the larger issue of democratization. Unfortunately, there has been a growing tendency among these circles that instead of ensuring the accuracy and the reliability of the framework through re-examination and adjustment, experts unnoticeably blame public officers in responding to the apparent failure of the reform framework.⁴ Such tendency hides the elusive fallacy of rather put the blame on the realities, instead of the theories, when they do not fit to each other.

Their confusion in understanding corruption, this regard is a matter of framework, instead of practices. Given the prevalence of the confusion, the more appropriate question is not, "What else

should we do to generate more effective bureaucracy reform in Indonesia?". It instead, is "What else have we not done to generate more effective bureaucracy reform in Indonesia?"

The later represents the desperation felt by many people who have much concern on the reform process in Indonesia. It is obvious that almost every single prescription of political liberalization have been adopted and incorporated into Indonesia's formal-political structure. In the case of the implementation of decentralization policy, another top priority in reform agenda, the World Bank has dubbed the transformation Indonesia it as "Big Bang Decentralization".⁵ Decentralization, in this regard, is an attempt to bring the government closer and even easily controlled by individuals. It departs from presumption that, the effectively control of government by the individuals would enhance the effectiveness, efficiency and transparency and accountability of the bureaucracy. However the studies by the proponents of the framework reveals this policy largely fails to achieve its intended and asserted goals. Some analysts suggest that decentralization is a new fertile soil for corruption practices.⁶ Obviously, decentralization, which meant to be the solution eventually, reveals itself as problem. At issue here is that, decentralization in its essence might be neutral idea, but the way decentralization has been operationalized and implemented has been problematic. It takes for granted that individuals or societal groups are resilient with their anti-corruption ethic, and at the same time, the government is inherently corrupt.

The idea of corruption-free bureaucracy has been a recurrent political discourse in Indonesia. However, it signifies different meanings in different regimes as they are derived and closely related

with each regime's projected socio-political structure. This is so with the ruling regime in post-Soeharto Indonesia. It is this logic that comes into play in constructing the particular socio-political projection that this article aims to address specifically. The projection of a particular socio-political structure is understood as a process of construction of reality through the process of signification.⁷ Examining the underlying logic that underpin the construction of post-Soeharto Indonesia, specifically the ideal state's bureaucracy, requires particular set of methods that may enable us to gain the required data. Thus, it is necessary to describe the nature of the analysis presented in this article and how it is carried. The term "logic" here is used to denote certain way of thinking. There have been a great number of studies on this issue within reform or democratization in Indonesia context. However, the distinctive feature of the study presented in this article is in its specific focus that rather intended to answer the "how" than "what" question.⁸

On the specific case of bureaucracy reform in post-Soeharto Indonesia, the analysis presented in this paper focuses on how state's bureaucracy is understood to required reform and certain reform measures become necessity to be taken". In short, the analysis here deals more on the epistemological aspect than the ontological one of the object analysed. By doing so, the analysis here is more to deontologise the object analysed since its analysis is based on the proposition that the existence of the object analysed emerge through certain process of social construction. For example, bureaucracy reform, though through different terms, becomes a policy agenda both under the New Order and the current democratic regimes in Indonesia.

However, in each of those regimes, bureaucracy reform signifies different projection of ideal bureaucracy and also different reform measures and programs.

Last but not least, the analysis presented in this article also aims to offer alternative perspective for bureaucracy reform in the midst of confusion and desperation to accomplish the reform agenda in Indonesia. In doing so, it is necessary to venture beyond the confusion mirrored by the divided opinion toward the performance of reform in Indonesia after more than a decade mentioned above. Thus, through the reflective analysis in this paper, this study aims to critically obtain knowledge that differs with the currently dominant constructions of bureaucracy reform as social realities.

The nature of this analysis and how it is carried is based on the work of Niels Arkerstorm Andersen. The analysis on the epistemological aspect of the object analysed, he describes, differs greatly from the analysis on ontological aspect. He used the term of Discursive Analytical Strategy to describe the specific analysis such as presented in this paper. The features of how this discursive analytical strategy is utilized in this article has been mentioned above, but their general description were in contrast with the conventional analysis is shown in the Table 1.

From the confusion which embedded within the reform, in this regard is due to the tendency to apply reform as a method, as oppose to new decision emerged from deployment of analytical strategy.

C. THE REFORM: THE MOBILIZATION OF BIAS

The discourse of bureaucracy reform in post-Soeharto Indonesia emerged based on the preposi-

TABLE 1. METHOD VERSUS ANALYTICAL STRATEGY⁹

METHOD	ANALYTICAL STRATEGY
Observation of an Object	Observations of observations as observations
The goal is to produce true knowledge on certain object	The goal is to question certain presupposition, to deontologise
What rules and procedures needed to produce scientific knowledge?	Which analytical strategies will enable us to obtain knowledge, critically different from the existing system of meaning

tion that under the previous regime it functioned more as an instrument to serve the interest of the ruler instead of the public of citizens. Intertwined with other sub-structures of power relations, based on traditional charismatic, legal, rational, and technical efficiency, Dwight Y. King the New Order regime in Indonesia as a bureaucratic authoritarian regime.¹⁰ This has been alleged as the main factors for the corruption of Indonesian bureaucracy.

Under the ruling regime of post-Soeharto Indonesia, the bureaucracy is intended to be placed rather to serve the public of citizens instead of the ruler. It is no longer positioned as an entity above the general public and dictates it on what to do and how to it. On the contrary, it is positioned below the general public and serves the function to serve what the general public considers as good and it also subjects to the general public's scrutiny.

However, this is not the first time bureaucracy reform has been heard as a public discourse and policy. Previously, under the New Order regime, we may also heard a discourse of bureaucracy reform under the term "pemerintahan yang bersih dan berwibawa" – *clean and respectable government*. This discourse also refers to some measures of eradicating corruption practices within the state's

bureaucracy machineries; repositioning and revitalisation of state's bureaucracy in order to enhance its efficiency. Another term commonly used since around 1988 to denote the bureaucracy reform in Indonesia was "deregulasi dan debirokratisasi" or de – regulation and de – bureaucratization.

However, these ideas of bureaucracy reform under two different regimes signify different meanings. We shall examine them in the following part of this article. First, we shall examine the underlying propositions on which each of these ideas of bureaucracy reform is based. New Order and post-Soeharto regimes each projects different socio-political structure of Indonesia. This is obvious in the construction of the structure of relationship between the state and the society.

The New Order regime positioned the state at the top or as the leader who shall clear the path for the rest of the society to follow in order to reach the ultimate goal of economic development. This regime positioned the state and its bureaucracy as well as the embodiment of the general will of the public that was considered, due to their ignorance or underdeveloped mind, inaccessible for most of the individual or partial elements that comprised that public.

Under the New Order regime this projection of the reality of Indonesia as a nation-state entity was also accompanied by the myth of economic development. It ended up to certain practice that is described as “state-led economic development” that on its turn significantly defined the role and function served by the Indonesian bureaucracy. Under the claim of the state, coterminous with the ruling regime as the embodiment of the general will accessible only to it, the ideal bureaucracy was projected to be one that was able to serve the function as the state’s machinery to implement its development policies and to pursue and ensure that the intended goals are achieved.¹¹

The need to enhance the efficiency of bureaucracy machinery under the New Order regime came into consideration for the decision makers at that time as a necessity due to the changing configuration of global economy-politic configuration such as the demise of the Communist block accompanied by the heightened interest from the global market to make investment in developing countries such as Indonesia. Simultaneously, the development policy in Indonesia was also undergoing a critical shift from previously relied on the oil export revenue boosted by the oil boom to foreign investment to finance its development project, besides the ever present source of foreign loan and credit. The bureaucracy reform is intended to enhance its efficiency to attract investment and to ensure that their interests are well served in Indonesia.¹²

Under the regime that replaces the New Order regime, this projection has been almost totally dissolved and reversed. Under the notion of good-governance, the state no longer enjoys central and privileged position as every decision made by the

state is required to be consulted and approved by many other non-state actors. This notion becomes the new regime in post-Soeharto Indonesia. The bureaucracy is put in different position here as its function now focuses on the public service delivery.

As non-state actors are given broader opportunity to be more active in the decision-making and policy process, the adoption of this regime has been followed by various attempts to empower the non-state actors to participate in those processes. These attempts are dubbed through various terms such as “bottom-up public policy making”; “public participation”; “civil society empowerment” etc.¹³

Each notion of bureaucracy reform under those two different regimes in Indonesia turns out to follow the larger projected socio-political structure by each regime. Normatively, bureaucracy is claimed to be a state’s machinery that its sole and ultimate purpose is to serve and ensure the fulfilment of public needs. However, as described above, the differences of the notions of ideal bureaucracy and, thus, the necessary measures to be taken for bureaucracy evolve around the differences on the notion of what public is and how it relates the state.

The New Order regime projected the state, as the embodiment of the general will of the public in the sense similar to the right-Hegelian notion. The state represents not only the sum interest of the individual or partial parts that comprise the public but, furthermore, the collective interest of those elements as a collectivity. This collectivity can only be comprehended by and through the state. Thus, serving the state will can only carry serving the public general.

On the contrary, under the ruling regime in post-New Order Indonesia, the public and the

individual and partial parts that comprise it are considered as an entity that is capable to think and act rationally. This rationality is not bounded to merely their individual or partial rationality, but this is capable to be expanded to construct the collective public rationality comprehensible only to the state under previous regime. The state, and bureaucracy as well, serve only to facilitate the process of constructing this general will by ensuring that every actors comply with the existing and commonly accepted rules and implement the commonly approved and decided general will as policies. This is a much narrower role in comparison with one they served under the previous regime. This notion is obviously based on the notion of liberalism in its substance where the individual freedom and its rational capacity are given primacy.

Along the course of its history as a modern nation state, it turns out that Indonesia has been entrapped in the confusion and extreme swing between two extreme poles of these two notions of public. She took the liberal stance in during the period between the 1950 until the then President Soekarno made his presidential decree in July 5, 1959. From then on, under the Soekarno's Guided Democracy and Soeharto's New Order the Indonesian public is structured based on the notion of the public as a collectivity. Then, after the fall of the New Order, Indonesia returns to embrace the liberal notion.¹⁴

D. WHO ARE THE PUBLIC: THE UNDERLYING CONFUSION

The recurrent extreme swing from one extreme to the other in defining Indonesian public presents chain effects that one of them leads to confusion

of battling corruption as part of the bureaucracy reform we are facing today. The question at hand here is not which one is the true notion of public. It is more complex than merely the either or question. As the following section of this article will discuss, the specific socio-cultural context of Indonesia has also been another determining factor that the adoption of either of those notions of public needs to consider and adjust to. It is also noteworthy that those two notion are not totally mutually insulated. Each adopts some notions from the others in their logical and operational frameworks.¹⁵

The specific socio-cultural context in Indonesia has been a factor frequently mentioned but rarely seriously discussed in the issue of bureaucracy reform especially battle against corruption. Most existing literatures focus on the hijacking of the democratic regime by the local elites utilizing cultural arguments¹⁶; the reluctance or incapacity among the bureaucrats to comply with the stated reform agenda; and the consolidation of new oligarchies under the cloak of democratic regime in post-Soeharto Indonesia.¹⁷

In fact, a clear-cut, well-defined and commonly accepted nationwide notion of publicness is barely exist. It does not mean that it is totally absence. In facts, there have multiple notions of publicness each cross cutting to each other but none has been broad enough to cope the culturally diverse Indonesian communities as an entity of nation. Since the first establishment of Dutch Colonial Rule, the entity closest in the term of political structure and size of territory to a modern state that cover the nowadays Indonesia as a whole, the modern state has been built on top and co-exist with the pre-existing socio-political structure.

Thus, it is not surprising to find that besides the commonly stated national identity as Indonesians, the very same persons may also identified itself as Moslems, Christians, Javanese, Acehnese, and many others. These identities could also be combined with almost unlimited possible permutations. The Moslems, Christians, Acehnese, etc. each basically signifies certain distinct construction of public based on a specific and distinct logic of its own. One's identity in a certain period of time is a resultant of the over determination of these various structures of publicness that structure him/her.¹⁸

The situation described in the last two paragraphs hardly fits the projection of Indonesian society as consisted of a group of individual with strong sense and consciousness of common national identity and of their status as citizens entitled to certain rights that the state is obliged to fulfil. It also does not fit with the projection of Indonesia as a total unity of its various comprising elements as projected by the Soekarno's Guided Democracy and Soeharto's New Order. In fact, the emergence of Indonesian nationalism and the establishment of Indonesia nation – state saw this paradox of multiple publicness is left unresolved and termed in somehow loose but capable enough to describe the bound that put various elements of Indonesia together as a nation in the national motto of: *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* or Unity in Diversity.

Meanwhile the motto has been appropriate to describe the nature of Indonesian nationality or publicness; it also presents a perennial challenge to actualise the ideal contained in the motto into ever changing specific socio-cultural context. It is in responding to this challenge that Indonesia has been facing confusion in defining how they should

perceive the Indonesian public and through what means. The various regimes that once ruled and is ruling Indonesia are entrapped in somehow similar situation of entrapment. Those regime have a common tendency that is to search for paradigms that may help them to respond the challenge presented by the specific socio-political context they are facing or once faced.¹⁹

Just as the previous regime it replaces that tries to incorporate the diverse existing socio-cultural context coercively into its developmental project, the current regime of post-Soeharto Indonesia also finds itself entrapped in the complexity of diverse socio-cultural context that its paradigm is barely able to cope with. The existing formal-state structure to which the position of citizenship and public of citizens belongs to as one of its elements hardly stands above various other forms of publicness. The corrupt practices in many cases emerge as resultant of the interplay among these various forms of publicness that simultaneously structures one's way of thinking and behave.

For example, there are cases of public or bureaucracy officials who has been alleged or legally sentenced of guilty for corruption practices from the legal – formal point of view, are still regarded highly socially by their fellow members of either ethnic or other primordial groups. For most cases it turns out that those officials channel some of the benefits of their corrupt practices to the resource pool of the primordial group he/she is affiliated.

Simultaneously, appealing to the common identities, especially primordial one has been proven to be quiet effective to mobilize political support in post – Soeharto Indonesia. This pattern is best illustrated by the explosion of numbers of autonomous region, especially district, in Indonesia

within the period of ten years since the implementation of decentralization policy in 1999. Many of these cases of the establishment of new district, and more among the proposed new district, are based or at least incorporated ethnic or other primordial identity issue.²⁰

On the other hand, the particular public to which a public official is affiliated with also expects the discussed official to favour their particular interest over the interest of other groups. On its turn, by giving favour and benefit to this particular public, the official is able to enhance its social position among the other members of the group. In time of need, this social capital could be transform into political capital.

Thus, in the case of corruption practices among the rank and file of state's bureaucracy it is understandable that one's involved have been overloaded with various structures of publicness that "struggles over his/her soul". Here, the boundaries between public and private becomes blur and makes way for the practices of abuse of power and corruption.

The point here is that the liberal paradigm's assumption of conscious and rational individual capable of making decision and to take responsibility of the decision he or she makes is hardly find in Indonesia socio-cultural context. Most of Indonesians still perceives themselves as part of a larger community and give meaning to its existence based on the collectivity of the community he or she is affiliated. On the other hand, this collectivity is also by way far from the Indonesia as a totality projected by the previous regimes of Soekarno's Guided Democracy and Soeharto's New Order.

The measures currently taken to battling corruption still largely presuppose that the basic assump-

tion of liberal paradigm exist in Indonesia. These measures are mostly legal – formal in its nature, such as the establishment of Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi – KPK or Indonesian Commission for Corruption Eradication and promulgation of legal and technical instrument for bureaucracy reform²¹. While these are necessary measures, they alone are far than sufficient to carry effective bureaucracy reform.

The attempts mentioned above should simultaneously work with the attempt to construct conscious and knowledgeable public of citizens. While many civil society actors have engaged in such activities, the complexity of the notion of publicness often miss in the discourse and advocacy of civil society empowerment. It turns out that with the advent of democracy in its liberal sense as the hegemonic regime in post-Soeharto Indonesia, the absence of the *demos* or public of citizens has invited the *ethnos* to fill the void.²² Without this, the bureaucracy reform would be merely legal-formalistic and self-referring since there is no outside pressure power that structure bureaucracy to reform itself in certain ways.²³

E. CONCLUSION

As pointed above one of the main sources of confusion and thus stagnation in the attempt to bring reform among the Indonesian bureaucracy is the ambiguity of the notion of publicness the bureaucracy is projected to serve. However, the review above points out that defining and managing the public in Indonesia is a matter more complex than merely either or question.

Hirschman argues that merely clinging onto certain paradigms turns out to be a hindrance to build understanding upon the situation at hand.

This does not mean that paradigms and theories should be abandoned altogether as new knowledge never emerges from a vacuum. However, Hirschman offers an alternative he dubs 'cognitive style'. This refers to critical attitude toward the adoption and implementation of certain paradigm and open-mindedness to new kind of thinking when the situation demands.

The author has been engaged in probing the possibility of knowledge-based governance as an alternative to institutionalize the notion of publicness in Indonesia. This notion is based on the author experience and few recent studies on several policies area, where the state-society relations are based on mutual need to learn from each other to gain new knowledge necessary to cope with the situation at hand. The most recent study author conducted focuses on the practices of this model of governance in disaster management in the case of Mount Merapi Eruption and Earthquake in Yogyakarta and its adjacent areas. The author is fully aware that this notion still needs further and more comprehensive studies; the author cannot disregard the promising potentials of this notion as an alternative solution to break the stagnancy in Indonesian bureaucracy reform.

(FOOTNOTES)

¹ See Is, Bakarudin, "Korupsi APBN: Kolusi Penguasa dengan Pengusaha – Corruption on National Budget Fund: Collusion between Ruler and Businessmen", <http://birokrasi.kompasiana.com/2011/05/19/korupsi-apbn-kolusi-penguasa-dengan-pengusaha/>

² See for example World Bank, 2003, "Decentralizing Indonesia: A Regional Public Expenditure

Review", East Asia Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit. (Report No. 26191 – IND). The situation of the currently still on going wave of protest demanding more democratic politics and transition to democracy in some Arab Countries are frequently compared with the situation in Indonesia and its experiences in transitional period. See for example Kurtlanzick, Joshua, "Middle East revolutions only aspire to Indonesia's success", *The National*, February 20, 2011.

³ See Nordholt, Henk Schulte and Garry van Klinken (eds.), 2007, *Politik Lokal di Indonesia* (trans. *Renegotiating boundaries local politics in post-Suharto Indonesia* by Bernard Hidayat), Jakarta: KITLV and YOI; see also Robison, Richard and Vedi Hadiz, 2004, *Reorganizing Power in Indonesia: the Politics of Oligarchy in the Age of Markets*, RoutledgeCurzon. Though the issue presented in this paper lean more toward the later opinion regarding the reform in Indonesia, it does not pretend to discount the merit of the measures taken since 1998 to transform Indonesia toward more democratic country. On the contrary, this paper intends to contribute in this process by offering alternatives to further the democratization in Indonesia by analysing and identifying the possible obstacles and opportunities as well on how to reach the ultimate goal of the reform in Indonesia.

⁴ It is easy for us to find in Indonesia's mainstream media, scholars point their finger toward the reluctance of the state's bureaucracy to commit themselves to reform. In some other also commonly heard comments, this is articulated in different manner mentioning the moral degradation, especially among the Indo-

nesian public officials, as the main cause of the failure of reform agenda, including battling corruption.

- ⁵ World Bank, 2003, "Decentralizing Indonesia: A Regional Public Expenditure Review", East Asia Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit. (Report No. 26191 – IND)
- ⁶ Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2004, *Laporan Akhir Tahun 2004: Otonomi Daerah Lahan Subur Korupsi – Annual Report 2004: Local Autonomy a Fertile Ground for Corruption*, ICW.
- ⁷ Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, 2001 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London: Verso, first published 1985, p. 105 and 107. See also Jorgensen, Mariane and Louise Philips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: Sage Publications, pp.8-9 and Celik, Nur Betul, "The Constitution and Dissolution of Kemalist Imaginary" in Howarth, David; Alleta J. Norval; and Yanis Stavrakakis (eds.), 2000, *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*, UK: Manchester University Press, p.194
- ⁸ Andersen, Niels Arkerstrom, 2003, *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*, UK: Polity Press, p. xiii
- ⁹ Ibid., p.xiii
- ¹⁰ King, Dwight Y., "Indonesia's New Order as a Bureaucratic Polity, A Neopatrimonial Regime or A Bureaucratic – Authoritarian Regime: What Differences Does It Make?" in Anderson, B.R.O.G. and Audery Kahin (eds.), 2010, *Interpreting Indonesian Politics: Thirteen Contributions to the Debate*, Singapore: Equinox Publishing PTE. Ltd
- ¹¹ McVey, Ruth T., 1977, "The Beamtenstaat in Indonesia" in Anderson, B.R.O.G. and Audery Kahin (eds.), 2010, *Interpreting Indonesian Politics: Thirteen Contributions to the Debate*, Singapore: Equinox Publishing PTE. Ltd
- ¹² See Robison, Richard, 1986, *Indonesia: the Rise of Capital*, Asian Studies Association of Australia, p. 383. See also Prasajo, Eko and Teguh Kurniawan, *Reformasi Birokrasi dan Good Governance: Kasus Best Practices dari Sejumlah Daerah di Indonesia*, paper presented in the 5th National Symposium of Jurnal Antropology Indonesia, Banjarmasin, 22 – 25 July 2008 for the similar and contemporary of bureaucracy reform case in South Korea.
- ¹³ See Hanif, Hasrul, *Governing Through New Social Myth: Discursive Formation of Local Welfarism in Decentralised Indonesia*, Thesis Submitted to Human Rights and Democracy in Southeast Asia (HARD-SEA) Studies, Graduate Program of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University in Completion of a Master Degree in Political Science December 2009 for a study on the transformation of regime at the local level in the Regency of Purbalingga. See also Jaweng, R.E. et.al. 2012, *Jalan Panjang Pemberantasan Korupsi: Peran Kemitraan Dalam Menjembatani Negara dan Masyarakat*, Jakarta: Kemitraan – Partnership, pp. 13 – 18.
- ¹⁴ See Santoso, Purwo and Joash Tapiheru, *The Footprints of Reform in Indonesia: the Absence of Public*, paper presented in the "Seminar Nasional Asosiasi Ilmu Politik Indonesia – AIPI XXIV", Bandung, May 23 – 25, 2012. Similar pattern also found in the transformation of Indonesian politics on the issue of the structure of relations between the national and local

- governments. See Santoso, Purwo, 2012, *DPRD: Simpul Kedaulatan Melalui Policy Making*, Laporan hasil kajian Pembahasan Kedudukan, Fungsi dan Peran DPRD dalam Revisi Undang-undang No. 32/2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah untuk Asosiasi DPRD Kota Seluruh Indonesia (ADEKSI).
- ¹⁵ See Stone, Deborah, 1997, *Policy Paradox: the Art of Political Decision Making*, Norton, Chap. 1.
- ¹⁶ For example see Hidayat Syarif, "Shadow State? Bisnis dan Politik di Provinsi Banten – Shadow State? Bisnis and Politics in Banten Province" and Aragon, L.V. "Persaingan Elit di Sulawesi Tengah – Elite Competition in Central Sulawesi" in Nordholt, et,al (eds.), op.cit.
- ¹⁷ For example Robison and Hadiz, op.cit.; see also Aspinall, Edward and Gerry van Klinken (eds.), 2011, *State and Illegality in Indonesia*, Leiden:KITLV Press
- ¹⁸ See Jorgensen and Philips, op.cit.
- ¹⁹ Hirschman, Alberto O., "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding" in *World Politics*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Apr., 1970), pp. 329-343, Cambridge University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009600>, Accessed: 25/11/2012 22:00
- ²⁰ The decentralization assessment in Indonesia by Asia Foundation in 2004 shows that since the initiation of decentralization policy in 1999, ethnicity has been the third mostly used main argument for the establishment of new autonomous regions, either provinces or districts/ municipals by 15% (other main arguments are more equal distribution of economic development by 34%; geographical consideration – 26%; political preference – 12%; public service and other argument – 6% each; and welfare argument 1%) Asia Foundation, *Indonesia Rapid Decentralization Appraisal 5* – November 2004, Asia Foundation, p.20. There have been many more since then.
- ²¹ The most recent is the Grand Design for Bureaucracy 2010–2025. Reform decreed as Presidential Decree No.81/2010
- ²² Mann, Michael, 2005, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*, Cambridge University Press, p.3. See also Samadi, W.P. and Warouw, Nicholas (eds.), 2010, *Building – Democracy on the Sand: Advances and Setbacks in Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: PCD Press
- ²³ Santoso and Tapiheru, op.cit.

REFERENCES

- Andersen, Niels Arkerstrom, 2003, *Discursive Analytical Strategies: Understanding Foucault, Koselleck, Laclau, Luhmann*, UK: Polity Press, p. xiii
- Anderson, B.R.O.G. and Audery Kahin (eds.), 2010, *Interpreting Indonesian Politics: Thirteen Contributions to the Debate*, Singapore: Equinox Publishing PTE. Ltd
- Asia Foundation, *Indonesia Rapid Decentralization Appraisal 5* – November 2004, Asia Foundation
- Aspinall, Edward and Gerry van Klinken (eds.), 2011, *State and Illegality in Indonesia*, Leiden:KITLV Press
- Grand Design for Bureaucracy Reform 2010 – 2025 decreed as Presidential Decree No.81/2010
- Hanif, Hasrul, *Governing Through New Social Myth: Discursive Formation of Local Welfarism in Decentralised Indonesia*, Thesis Submitted to Human Rights and Democracy in Southeast Asia (HARD-SEA) Studies, Graduate Program

- of Political Science, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Gadjah Mada University in Completion of a Master Degree in Political Science December 2009 for a study on the transformation of regime at the local level in the Regency of Purbalingga.
- Hirschman, Alberto O., "The Search for Paradigms as a Hindrance to Understanding" in *World Politics*, Vol. 22, No. 3 (Apr., 1970), pp. 329-343, Cambridge University Press, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2009600>, Accessed: 25/11/2012 22:00
- Howarth, David; Alleta J. Norval; and YanisStavarakakis (eds.), 2000, *Discourse Theory and Political Analysis: Identities, Hegemonies and Social Change*, UK: Manchester University Press, p.194
- Indonesia Corruption Watch, 2004, *LaporanAkhirTahun 2004: Otonomi Daerah LahanSuburKorupsi – Annual Report 2004: Local Autonomy a Fertile Ground for Corruption*, ICW.
- Is, Bakarudin, "KorupsiAPBN: KolusiPenguasadenganPengusaha – Corruption on National Budget Fund: Collusion between Ruler and Businessmen", <http://birokrasi.kompasiana.com/2011/05/19/korupsi-apbn-kolusi-pengusaha-dengan-pengusaha/>
- Jaweng, R.E. et.al. 2012, *JalanPanjangPemberantasanKorupsi: PeranKemitraanDalamMenjembatani Negara danMasyarakat*, Jakarta: Kemitraan – Partnership
- Jorgensen, Mariane and Louise Philips, *Discourse Analysis as Theory and Method*, London: Sage Publications
- Kurtlanzick, Joshua, "Middle East revolutions only aspire to Indonesia's success", *The National*, February 20, 2011.
- Laclau, Ernesto and Chantal Mouffe, 2001 *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards a Radical Democratic Politics*, London: Verso, first published 1985, p. 105 and 107. See also
- Mann, Michael, 2005, *The Dark Side of Democracy: Explaining Ethnic Cleansing*, Cambridge University Press
- Nordholt, Henk Schulte and Garry van Klinken (eds.), 2007, *PolitikLokal di Indonesia* (trans. *Renegotiating boundaries local politics in post-Suharto Indonesia* by Bernard Hidayat), Jakarta: KITLV and YOI
- Prasojo, Eko and TeguhKurniawan, *ReformasiBirokrasi dan Good Governance: Kasus Best Practices dariSejumlah Daerah di Indonesia*, paper presented in the 5th National Symposium of JurnalAntropology Indonesia, Banjarmasin, 22 – 25 July 2008
- Robison, Richard and VediHadiz, 2004, *Reorganizing Power in Indonesia: the Politics of Oligarchy in the Age of Markets*, RoutledgeCurzon
- Robison, Richard, 1986, *Indonesia: the Rise of Capital*, Asian Studies Association of Australia
- Samadi, W.P. and Warouw, Nicholas, 2010 (eds.), *Building – Democracy on the Sand: Advances and Setbacks in Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: PCD Press
- Santoso, Purwo and JoashTapiheru, *The Footprints of Reform in Indonesia: the Absence of Public*, paper presented in the "Seminar NasionalAsosiasiIlmuPolitik Indonesia – AIPI XXIV", Bandung, May 23 – 25, 2012
- Santoso, Purwo, 2012, *DPRD: SimpulkanKedaulatanMelalui Policy Making*, LaporanhasilkajianPembahasanKedudukan, Fungsi dan Peran DPRD dalam Revisi Undang-

undang No. 32/2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah untuk Asosiasi DPRD Kota Seluruh Indonesia (ADEKSI).

Stone, Deborah, 1997, *Policy Paradox: the Art of Political Decision Making*, Norton

World Bank, 2003, "Decentralizing Indonesia: A Regional Public Expenditure Review", East Asia Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit. (Report No. 26191 - IND)

World Bank, 2003, "Decentralizing Indonesia: A Regional Public Expenditure Review", East Asia Poverty Reduction and Economic Management Unit. (Report No. 26191 - IND)