

Democracy In Indonesia's Cross-Standards

Lusia Indrastuti

Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Slamet Riyadi

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received Aug 25, 2022

Revised Aug 30, 2022

Accepted Sep 11, 2022

Keywords:

Democracy,
State Administration,
Indonesia;

ABSTRACT

Indonesia as a country with a democratic system. The government is administered by the people, for the people, and by the people. Indonesia has gone through multiple periods of democracy, and is currently in a period of transformation. The plurality of Indonesian society has a significant impact on the creation of political parties and favors the formation of a multi-party system in Indonesia. The presence of political parties as foundations of democracy or the execution of popular sovereignty are, of course, justified in a democratic state. General elections are used to carry out democracy when political parties are involved and positions of authority need to be filled.

ABSTRAK

Indonesia sebagai negara dengan sistem demokrasi. Pemerintahan diselenggarakan oleh rakyat, untuk rakyat, dan oleh rakyat. Indonesia telah melewati beberapa periode demokrasi, dan saat ini sedang dalam masa transformasi. Kemajemukan masyarakat Indonesia berdampak signifikan terhadap pembentukan partai politik dan mendukung terbentuknya sistem multipartai di Indonesia. Kehadiran partai politik sebagai landasan demokrasi atau pelaksanaan kedaulatan rakyat tentu saja dibenarkan dalam negara demokrasi. Pemilihan umum digunakan untuk melaksanakan demokrasi ketika partai politik terlibat dan posisi otoritas perlu diisi.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Lusia Indrastuti,
Fakultas Hukum
Universitas Slamet Riyadi,
Jl. Sumpah Pemuda 18, Kadipiro, Surakarta, Indonesia
Email: Lusia24.indrastuti@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

The polis, a key component of ancient Greek society, is where we may trace the origins of democracy. Ancient Greek culture was distinguished by the polis, an independent city-state. One of the several Greek polis that was frequently regarded as the hub of learning, Athens, where democracy first existed.

A majority vote in the ballot formed the foundation of the current form of administration in the Athens polis. Voting is used to decide on issues involving police life that are of public relevance. Unfortunately, the system was lost with the decline of ancient Greek civilisation. Greece's appeal as the cradle of civilization has faded. Europe soon experienced a challenging and protracted phase following the fall of the old Greek civilization. The dawn of a new era in Europe is giving democracy its breath back after a protracted period of burial. Reinesance is the rediscovery, birth, or reexamination of one's Greek ancestry. For the first time on the European continent, several of the writings of the ancient Greek philosophers were given significant consideration during this time. Similarly, Greek democracy has become an inspiration for many philosophers and thinkers; democracy is expanding further as a result of the Greek legacy and their struggle with the reality of

their times. We are familiar with names like John Locke, Roscoe, and Montesquieu. They made significant contributions to the formation of democratic theory, which was eventually embraced by many modern countries. However, we shall not go into depth about their reasoning. At this point, I will not go into detail on the evolution of democracy in Europe, particularly theoretically, because that is not our purpose.

Democracy, democracy is a government concept that is identical with population sovereignty. Where in the concept of democratic government placing the people as the holder of the highest power in the carry out the government of a country. Democracy is first of all an idea that presupposes that that power is from, by and for the people. In a more participatory understanding of democracy is even referred to as the concept of power from, by, for, and with the people. It means That power is basically recognized as coming from the people, and because of that it is the people who actually determine and give direction and actually organize the life of the state. Democracy adopted in Indonesia, namely democracy based on Pancasila, is still in the stage of development and regarding its properties and characteristics there are various interpretations and views. But can't the truism is that some of the essentials of constitutional democracy are sufficient clearly implicit in the 1945 Constitution which has not been amended. Alignment and independence of these three types of state institutions is needed so that these three state institutions can monitor each other and control based on the principle of checks and balances. The three types of state institutions are government institutions that have the authority to realize and exercise executive powers, judicial institutions that authorized to exercise judicial power and institutions representatives of the people (DPR, for Indonesia) who have the authority exercise legislative power.

In addition to legislative elections, many important decisions or outcomes, such as the presidential election of a country, are obtained through general election. General elections are not mandatory or must not be followed by all citizens, but by some citizens who have the right and voluntarily participate in the general election. In addition, no all citizens have the right to vote (have the right to vote). Sovereignty of the people is meant here not only in the sense of sovereignty to elect the president or members of parliament directly, but in a broader sense. A presidential election or parliamentarians do not directly guarantee the country as a democratic country because the people's sovereignty chooses themselves direct president is only a few of the many people's sovereignty. Although its role in the democratic system is not large, an election is often dubbed the party of democracy. This is the result of the old way of thinking from some people who are still too high to put a character idol, not a good system of government, as the queen's dream figure fair. Even though as good as a leader of a country, his life will be much shorter than the lifetime of a system that has been proven capable of building a country. Many democracies only granting the right to vote to citizens who have passed a certain age, e.g. 18 years of age, and who have no criminal record (e.g., prisoners or ex-convicts).

The term "democracy" comes from Ancient Greece which is expressed in Ancient Athens in the 5th century BC. The country is usually considered as an early example of a system dealing with law modern democracy. However, the meaning of this term has changed in line with time, and modern definitions have evolved since the 18th century, along with the development of "democratic" systems in many countries. Democracy occupies a vital position in terms of power sharing within a country (generally based on the concept and principle of the triad politica) with state power obtained from the people must also be used for the welfare and prosperity of the people. Kind of principle This trias politica becomes very important to be taken into account when historical facts record the enormous power of the government (executive) turned out to be unable to form a just and fair society civilized, even the absolute power of government often causes violation of human rights. Likewise, excessive power in other state institutions, For example, the excessive power of the legislature determines itself budget for the salaries and allowances of its members without care about the aspirations of the people, will not bring good for people. In essence, every state institution must not only be accountable (accountable), but there must be a formal mechanism that

accountability of each state institution and this mechanism is able to operational (rather than theoretical) limits the power of institutions the country.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The Method used is a case study method with a qualitative approach, which has the following characteristics: a) examines the interaction of events and processes, b) fully involves researchers, c) has a natural background, d) uses purposive samples, e) prioritizing the meaning behind reality, f) involving complex variables, and g) applying inductive analysis. Qualitative research according to Lincoln in Neuman (2003) is research that emphasizes the process and meaning of social reality that is not tested or measured strictly in terms of quantity or frequency. The focus of qualitative research is to explain how social phenomena are formed and given meaning.

With a qualitative descriptive naturalistic approach, this research is expected to be able to describe the actual situation in the field. Quantitative data is used as a support. Descriptive research according to Sugiyono (1999) is research conducted on independent variables, namely without making comparisons, or connecting with other variables. A study seeks to answer a question. Creswell (1998) defines qualitative research that relies less on sources of information, but carries the same ideas. Creswell emphasizes a "complex and holistic" picture, a reference to a complex narrative that invites the reader into the multiple dimensions of a problem or issue and presents it in its complexity (Emzir: 2012).

While the phenomenological approach aims to understand the phenomena that occur in the research subject, where the researcher will describe the research results in the form of words obtained during observations and interviews with a number of informants. With a phenomenological approach, according to Moleong (2007: 9) it is an attempt to understand the meaning of events and their relation to ordinary people in certain situations. This will help the researcher tap into the other person's point of view, and seek to understand why they are.

Meanwhile, case studies aim to understand meaning, investigate processes and gain deep understanding and understanding of individuals, groups and situations. According to Smith cited by Emzir (2012), case studies can be distinguished from other forms of qualitative research by the fact that they focus on a "single unit" or "a finite system".

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The growth of democracy in the revolutionary phase and pearlementary democracy was defined by a specific allocation of power following the release of the vice president's order No. X on 3 November 1945, which supported the formation of political parties. While the Prime Minister, Cabinet, and Parliament held the actual power of the government, President Soekarno was designated as the owner of symbolic and ceremonial authority. In politics and government operations, political parties are crucial players. In Indonesia's autonomous history, political forces and interests have competed with the greatest freedom. Political conflicts are marked by a tug-of-war between parties in the circle of power and political forces outside the sphere of authority, with the second party attempting to yank the first party from the circle of power.

Political engagement activities were rife at this time, especially through the political party channels that embraced the primordialist philosophy and values that were spreading across society, although only a small number of political elites were participating. Soekarno was dissatisfied at the moment with both the military's function and the president's issue, which was merely symbolic.

In the end, this mass was destroyed after going through conflicts between political parties and elites on the one side, and because of Soekarno's and the military's stance on the implementation of democracy on the other. The underlying disputes between the political party forces and Soekarno and the military, as well as each cabinet's incapacity to carry out its plans and prevent regional

splits, increased the differences among the political elites, suggesting an integral crisis and terrible stability. With the passage of the Emergency Law in 1957 and the realization of economic nationalism that resulted from this situation, guided democracy has now been established.

The Zaken Cabinet under Ir. Juanda was established on April 9, 1957, and on July 5, 1959, the Presidential Decree established this period of directed democracy. The role of the PKI and the Army considerably reduced the concentration of power in the hands of the president. The president has almost total authority over the political system and its superstructure. With tremendous intentions, the PKI started to consolidate its authority, which led to a coup by the PKI that ultimately failed at the end of September 1965 before being started by the masses of the New Order. The only democratic practices that were put into place during the new independence revolution were the operation of the independence revolution-supporting press and political discourse in parliament. Although there are few historical accounts of the growth of democracy during this time period, the fundamental principles were established at that time. First, the overall giving of political rights. Second, a president who could constitutionally assume dictatorial powers. Third, the Vice President's order made it feasible to create a number of political parties that later served as the cornerstone of Indonesia's party system throughout its political history.

The Provisional Constitution (UUDS), which served as the foundation for the second phase of Indonesian state administration, ran from 1950 to 1959. The zenith of Indonesian democracy occurred during this time because political life in Indonesia embodies nearly every aspect of democracy. An important part of the continuous political process is played by the parliament, which serves as the people's representative institution. The appearance of several motions of no confidence in the administration, which forced the resignation of the cabinet, served as a visual representation of the authority of parliament. There have been several instances of the cabinet collapsing throughout this time, which serves as a clear demonstration of how accountable incumbents and politicians are. There are around 40 parties that have been established with a high level of autonomy in the selection of management, party leadership, and followers. Parliamentary democracy failed due to three factors: (1) the predominance of sectarian politics, which had an impact on conflict resolution; (2) the socioeconomic foundation is still relatively flimsy; and (3) President Soekarno and the Army's shared dissatisfaction with the current political system.

President Soekarno has expressed his discontent with political parties ever since the conclusion of the 1955 general election. Political parties were heavily focused on their own ideological goals and neglected to consider the interests of national politics as a whole, which led to this. In addition, Soekarno said that the Indonesian nation's character, which was characterized by a spirit of kinship and collaboration, was incompatible with parliamentary democracy. The three primary political powers of the time, President Soekarno, the Indonesian Communist Party, and the Army set a very high bar for politics at the time. The combination of the party system and the creation of the DPR-GR are guided democracy's key characteristics. The legislative branch's function in the national political system has significantly diminished, as have fundamental human rights. The guided democracy era is also the height of the anti-freedom of the press sentiment, and the relationship between the federal government and local governments is increasingly dominated by the centralization of power. According to A. Syafi'i Ma'arif, guided democracy actually sought to establish Soekarno as the "father" of a sizable family known as Indonesia, holding consolidated control. The denial of democratic values, specifically absolutism and the concentration of power solely in the hands of the leader, was thus Soekarno's Guided Democracy's major flaw. Additionally, there is no opportunity for social control and legislative-executive checks and balances.

For a while or temporarily, the face of democracy goes through ups and downs in accordance with the evolution of the economic, political, and ideological levels. Political freedom was extremely high during the early years of the New Order administration. To reinforce the assertion that this democratic model is genuinely in line with the state ideology of Pancasila, President Soeharto, who succeeded Ir. Soekarno as the 2nd President of the Republic of Indonesia, introduced a distinct

type of democracy, namely the so-called Pancasila Democracy (Orba). It appears as though power will be handed to the influential members of society in no more than three years. As a result, there is a strong desire to support the new government reform initiatives among urban elites and sociopolitical organizations that are prepared for the 1971 general election. The gap between state power and society is becoming more apparent as a development. The New Order state presented itself as a powerful and relatively autonomous force, while society became progressively estranged from the sphere of power and the policymaking process. This condition is the result of (1) Golkar's total win in the general election, which provided the state with significant political legitimacy; and (2) the adoption of political regulations such as bureaucratization, depoliticization, and institutionalization; (3) a security approach is used; (4) state intervention in the economy and the market that allows the state to accumulate capital and economic strength; (5) the availability of sources of development costs, both from the exploitation of oil and gas as well as from non-oil and gas commodities and domestic taxes, as well as from foreign aid; and finally (6) the success of the New Order state in carrying out policies to meet the basic needs of the people in order to maintain the New Order state.

Sukarno, the Army, and the Indonesian Communism Party engaged in a political tug of war that culminated in the G-30-S/PKI uprising. The dominance of the president over the government, the limited impact of political parties, the rise of communism, and the expanding importance of ABRI as a sociopolitical force were all features of democracy throughout the Old Order period. M. Rusli Karim asserts that the bureaucratization and centralization of political decision-making, limitations on the roles and responsibilities of political parties, government involvement in political parties and public affairs, the floating period, the unification of state ideology, and the incorporation of non-governmental organizations were characteristics of the New Order regime. The following were some traits of the New Order period: First of all, the executive branch's power rarely changed hands. Second, all political hiring has ended. The general election is the third. The execution of state representatives' fundamental rights comes up at number four.

The new order finally lost its appeal after surviving for a while. The bulk of the populace no longer trusts the rulers. Suharto was finally toppled as a result of pressure from economic crises, natural disasters, numerous protests led primarily by students, and a number of other issues. As was the case with Pancasila, reform is a trend, and many public figures and politicians are trying to stake their claims to being reformers.

Blows new hope. Democracy appeared to be regaining its breath as freedom started to open up. Numerous parties participated in the first general election after the New Order, which frequently perplexed the electorate. Procedural political democracy is still evolving quickly nowadays. Indonesia's procedural democracy has evolved into a liberal democracy. Indonesia's economic system is evolving at the same time as its democracy is becoming more liberal. The nation is continually moving toward being an open market nation (or is being forced to). William Liddle, a well-known Indonesian author claims that "in fact, market capitalism and democracy cannot be separated like a baby and its bath tub. According to Liddle, a nation with a market capitalist economy is the only location where democracy can flourish".

In fact, it appears that since the conclusion of the Cold War, the democratic political system and the market capitalism economic system have emerged as the clear winners. The communist alternative, in particular communism, socialism, and all of its offshoots, seems to have lost its allure and vigor.

However, it is easy to observe that the fruits of our democracy today are still riddled with flaws. Especially if the topic at hand is the election. In fact, our elections have failed to bring forth the brightest people and place them in the appropriate positions. Many elected officials have been implicated in instances of corruption, collusion, and nepotism. One of the primary causes is undeniably the high cost of democracy. Election registration may be free, but campaign expenses and even image building to win over the public's compassion and secure the most votes can come

at a high cost. As a result, the disparity is even wider because elected officials frequently put return on investment first. They may even create a power circle by enticing friends, family members, and coworkers in an effort to gain long-lasting influence. On the other hand, the nation is being urged to continue opening up and evolving towards a market capitalism.

As a result of the reform measures that were executed in nearly every element of people's and state's lives that were previously implemented, the Republic of Indonesia has entered a new state of state life since the collapse of the New Order that corresponded with the fall of President Soeharto. Because it was regarded as the primary cause of failure in the order of state life throughout the New Order era, this reform agenda concluded with the alteration of the 1945 Constitution (the trunk). A change in the democratic model's implementation from the Pancasila Democracy model during the New Order era was a natural outcome of the amendments to the 1945 Constitution, particularly those that dealt with state institutions, especially the changes to the aspect of power sharing and the nature of the relationship between state institutions. There were various signs of democracy in Indonesia under the Habibie government. First, the press is granted freedom as a forum for the general people to engage in nationality and statehood. Second, the 1999 elections saw the introduction of a multiple-party system. Our nation implemented Pancasila democracy throughout this reform phase, which was obviously distinct from the new system and only vaguely resembling parliamentary democracy in 1950–1959. First, compared to earlier elections, those held from 1999 to 2004 were significantly more democratic. Second, power is transferred from the national government to local communities. Third, the process of picking political candidates to fill unfilled posts is public. Fourth, the most fundamental rights, including freedom of expression, can be ensured.

In the interest of efficiency and fair competition, privatization, deregulation, and subsidy reduction are highly supported, particularly by wealthy nations through donor agencies. The private sector, which is frequently a foreign private sector, is increasingly responsible for managing the government and natural resources, including those that affect people's livelihoods. Then, how can we restore our democracy? Hatta's ideas from "Our Democracy," in my opinion, should be re-elected right now. We shall create a better democracy thanks to Hatta's ideas. To meet the problems of a changing period, Pancasila democracy has been reinterpreted

IV. CONCLUSION

In its road toward democracy, Indonesia has gone through various phases and is currently going through a reform phase. The presence of political parties as foundations of democracy or the execution of popular sovereignty are, of course, justified in a democratic state. This is based on the indirect application of democracy through the holding of general elections to fill positions of authority in governments where political parties are allowed to run as candidates. Political parties serve as a vital link between the state government and its constituents, giving them a central and significant status and function in any democratic society.

References

- Adams Cindy, *Bung Karno Connecting People's Voice*, translated by Abdur Bar Salim, (Jakarta: Gunung Agung, 1984).
- Ahmad Syafii Maarif, *Islam in the Frame of Indonesia and Humanity*, (Bandung: Mizan, 2009).
- August Hans den Boef and Kees Snoek, *I Want to See It All Over; Essays and Interviews with Pramoedya Ananta Toer*, (Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu, 2008).
- C. Kortzen David, *The Post-Corporate World: Life After Capitalism*, translation by A. Rahman Zainuddin, (Jakarta: Obor, 2002).

- Deliar Noer, Mohammad Hatta Conscience of the Nation, (Jakarta: Kompas, 2012).
- Jenkins David, Suharto and the Barisan Jenderal Orba, translated by Harsutedjo, (Jakarta: Komunitas Bambu, 2010).
- John Rossa, The Pretext for Mass Murder: The September 30th Movement and the Suharto Coup, translated by Hensri Setiawan, (Jakarta: Hasta Mitra, 2008).
- Liddle R. William et al., Improving the Quality of Democracy in Indonesia, (Jakarta: PUSAD, 2012).
- Mohammad Hatta, For My Country Struggled and Thrown an Autobiography, (Jakarta: Kompas, 2011).
- _____, For My Country, Bukittinggi-Rotterdam Through Betawi A 111 Autobiography, (Jakarta: Kompas, 2011).
- Nugroho Noto Susanto, ed., Achieving National Consensus, (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1985).
- Perkins John, Confession of a Destroying Economist, translated by Herman Tirtaatmaja and Dwi Karyani, (Jakarta: Abdi Tandur, 2004).
- Plato, Apologia: Socrates' Speeches Immortalized by Plato. (Jakarta: BulanBintang, 1986).
- Kahar dan Adib Susila, Bung Hatta's Main Thoughts, (Yogyakarta: Buku Litera, 2012).
- Simon Petrus L. Tjahjadi, Intellectual Adventure, (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 2014)
- Vicker Adrian, History of Modern Indonesia, (Yogyakarta: Insan Madani, 2011).
- Wertheim W.F., Indonesian Society in Transition: Study of Social Change, translation Misbah Zulfa Ellisabet, (Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana, 1999).