The Claim to Bureaucratic Neutrality in Indonesian Politic

Sholih Mu'adi
Faculty of Social Political Science,
University of Brawijaya,
Malang
dr.sholihmuadi@gmail.com

Abstract
The objective of paper was to describe and to review the claim to bureaucratic neutrality in the politic. Method of paper was the review of literatures or theories. It was said that the progress of a nation was determined among others by the capacity of bureaucratic officers to implement their duty and function, or by being public servant to serve communities in professional and accountable ways. Public was properly served by bureaucratic officers, and as a consequence, bureaucratic officers had positioned themselves as civil servant or public servant to the public. The performance of bureaucratic officers was influenced by what communities expected from them because trustworthiness of bureaucratic officers was determined by the trust given by communities to them. The advanced countries lived with this trust in serving the communities and in giving efforts to produce clean, accountable and transparent bureaucracy. Bureaucracy was the front-guard of the governance, and it is required to be professional and not easily captured by political interest. Therefore, bureaucracy was expected to show the ideal posture of public expectation. Political liberalization was a product of political reformation. In other sides, it tempted bureaucracy to play in the political realm or to create a room for the politicization of bureaucracy.
Keywords: *Demand, Neutrality, Bureaucracy, Public and Politic*

1. INTRODUCTION

Bureaucracy concept was given by V. De Gourney (1900) [1]. A letter was dated on 11 July 1764 written by Baron de Grim [2], and it explained Gourney's idea about the self-service government.

Bureaucracy idea was not new. It was a mistake if we assumed it as new. The complaint against government was not new, but it was as old as the government itself. Machiavelli (1991) [3], for instance, in his advice to the prince, suggested the prince to appoint the competent officers and give them good salary to keep them from quoting additional income.

Since the emergence of Gourney's idea, the term "bureaucracy" was widely adopted in political case in Europe in 18th century. The original root came from French word *Bureacratie*, but it was adopted quickly by German with similar meaning, in the word *bureaukratie*. Bureaucracy indeed developed dramatically after the period of Gourney.

Bureaucracy and politic were the inseparable sides of the coin. Bureaucracy and politic were two institutions with different characters but each was complement to other. These two different characteristics gave positive action to each other, thus creating a synergy. The problem was its susceptibility to the dishonesty [4]. Syafuan Rozi said that the bureaucracy was the discretion or power usurped through struggle by various departments of the government and their branches for their self-interests or on behalf of citizenship. Distinctive marker of bureaucracy was that it was a stratified institution, with skill-based recruitment, and impersonal characteristics. Politic was an attempt to make regulations to be well accepted by the most citizens to brought communities toward a harmonic life.

As said by Guelermo O'Donnel [5], the State had emerged as a political strength that was not only self-reliant in organizing its supporters including elites, factions, or civil communities, but also stood as the dominant power to deal with them. Bureaucratic Authoritarian was created to conduct a strong supervision against civil communities, precisely to prevent the mass of people from creating the excessively active engagement into a politic such that the acceleration of industrialization was not disturbed (Guelermo O'Donnel in Muhammad AS Hikam [6], Journal of Political Science No.8, AIPI LIPI Jakarta, 1991:68).

Fred W Rigg [7] in *Bureaucratic Polity* and Gualermo O'Donnel in *Bureaucratic Authoritarian* asserted that in certain communities, bureaucracy still remained under the political control of the ruler because the ruler still expected to obtain political legitimacy from bureaucracy structures. Rigg added that bureaucracy collaborated with government power. O'Donnel's model showed that bureaucracy not only collaborated with government power but also engaged into almost all fields of activities. National engagement was not only apparent in formal politic field, but it had spread into social, cultural and economical activities, including ideology.

However, if current phenomenon was understood, then bureaucracy and politic were complex issues accessed only by people with ranks, and it must be difficult for "lay persons" to access the issues. It was ironic if a bureaucratic politicization provided bureaucracy only beneficial to few peoples, and treated bureaucracy as personal goods. Bureaucracy as a formal organization system was firstly introduced by Max Weber [8] in 1947. Max Weber defined bureaucracy as "*ideal type of organization*" with the following characteristics:

1. There was the division of jobs, and the relation between discretions and responsibilities, that all lines were defined clearly.
2. The office was organized in hierarchy comprising of a set of commands.
3. Managerial officers were appointed with technical qualification determined by education and test.
4. Regulations and arrangements were oriented toward the accomplishment of assignments.
5. The relationship between managers and employees in the nature of impersonality.
6. Employees were oriented toward career with proper salary.

Government bureaucracy was often called *officialdom* or the kingdom of officers, meaning that officers would have clear and definite jurisdictions, have *official duties* (tasks and responsibilities), have clear line of discretions, respect a hierarchy as the manifestation of powerful authority, and receive salary income based on their skill and competence, and also could obtain benefits based on skill, competence, and rank hierarchy and its communication process in the written and formal documents (Miftah Thoha, 2007)[9]. Government bureaucratic officers were the center of any community issues because communities were greatly relying on bureaucracy officers for their wellbeing, not the reverse. Government bureaucracy was indeed a big power more, and it was evident in a country that underwent a developmental progress. Bureaucratic privilege as the kingdom of officers brought with it a risk, called bureaucratic politicization. Bureaucratic politicization was

International Journal of Management and Administrative Sciences (IJMAS)
(ISSN: 2225-7225)
Vol. 4, No. 03, (53-64)
www.ijmas.org

not a new problem in the bureaucracy of Indonesia because it was also faced by the colonial government (Miftah Thoha, 2003). Bureaucratic politicization can grow continuously because bureaucrats was thirsty of power and following their ego to engage more and more within political issues and to keep their existence within bureaucratic environment.

I. The Concept of Bureaucracy and Politic

Bureaucratic politicization was inevitable. One reason was that bureaucratic neutralization had not been created especially when certain ranks were filled. The relationship between bureaucracy and politic was a hot topic to discuss. The journey from Old Order to New Order was colored with "love" and "hate". It ruined the relationship of Soekarno and Hatta due to their disagreement. Hatta wanted to develop a professional bureaucracy to fulfill the independence, but Soekarno insisted on creating a bureaucracy with the involvement of political movement.

Bureaucracy was viewed as a machine to achieve development goals, but as the Old Order declined, the format of relationship between bureaucracy and politic started to change, and its consequence was the arise of political party with the validation of multi-party system which implied that Indonesia would silently implement parliamentary principle, by which the presidential system of Indonesia would be required to accommodate partisan members into the cabinet.

Bureaucracy was a main device for development. In some countries, it played important roles and had strategic positions. Bureaucracy also conquered many aspects of livelihood such as marriage, business, and death. Communities cannot escape from bureaucracy, and thus, it led to greater dependence of them on bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy took a grip over the access to natural resource, budget, staff, and projects, and also took a command over the access to knowledge and information that others did not have. Bureaucracy played important role in the formulation, implementation and development of various public policies, and also in the evaluation of performance. By this strategic position, it may be logical if every political development would involve bureaucracy in the political game.

Bureaucracy was utilized to achieve, to maintain, and to consolidate power from political parties or power-holders. In practice, bureaucracy gate was pulled into the political realms and/or into the depth of power. Since the founding of the country, or since the beginning of independence, bureaucracy was used as the object or tool for the political interests. Bureaucracy was the object of interest clash and also becoming the contest of political party effect, which may induce polarization and fragmentation of bureaucracy. The change of politic into the directed democracy era did not result in a fundamental change in bureaucracy.

Politic closely associated with the power. Politic was only a device to compel one interest to others at certain ways. Someone with a politic orientation was who attempted to gain power. Logically, after gaining a power, he will exercise his power to internalize his effect on others. After seating on the power, he must fulfill the interest of his supporters. According to Budiardjo [10], politic must always concern with the goals of the communities, not goals of the self. It must be noted that politic done by the nation should be set on the goal of increasing people welfare, not benefiting one entity. It is a huge problem for Indonesian because the masters of power always forget their supporters, like the nuts forgetting its shells. They use the power arbitrarily, disregard the interest of communities, forget where they are from, and do not bother with the wellbeing of communities, or even prefer to torment communities with "disadvantageous policies".

Principal concepts in relation with the politic are:
1. State
2. Power
3. Decision-making
4. Policy
5. Distribution or allocation of power (Budiardjo; Miriam, 2005) [10]

The presence of political party into a governance system may influence the bureaucratic order in the government. Ranks of a department in Indonesia comprise of political ranks (non-career ranks) and bureaucratic ranks (career ranks). The implication was that politicians who obtained political power through general election would be given political rank as head of department, whereas the lower ranks, such as General Secretary, General Director, and General Inspector, were allocated by professional employees. Political ranks and bureaucratic ranks are different because both are different but one is complement to other.

Wilson, James Q (1989) [11] explained the difference of politic and bureaucracy. Politic remained within the realm of *policy* while bureaucracy stood within the realm of *administration*. Dynamic happened when political process went on. Bureaucracy and politic were simultaneously formulating laws, such as statutes, local regulations, and others. The intensity of dynamic relation was becoming evident when bureaucracy did the function of policy implementation and then encountered the political institution that conducted the function of policy supervision.

Such dynamic relationship between politic and bureaucracy happens when there is a balancing relationship between both. Such balancing relationship is not a collaborative relationship to promote their interest above people. Basically, political institutions, along with their democratic and bureaucratic values, were greatly needed for the development of a locality. The stronger was local bureaucracy, the lower was local democracy. Also, the weaker was bureaucracy, the higher was democracy. (Martini, Rini, 2012) [12].

Bureaucracy develops through political and economical improvements of the people. More modernizing was the communities in democratic term, more prosperous was their economic. The cost was that new claims or demands were emerging. The development of bureaucratic network (bureaucratization) was the efforts to meet the new demand (Riswanda Imawan, 1998)[13]. In a terminology of political science, at least, four bureaucratic models were found in the development practice at various countries in the world. These four models were bureaucratic models of Weberian, Parkinsonian, Jacksonian and Orwellian. In detail, these bureaucratic models can be elaborated as following.

Weberian bureaucratic model was suggested by Max Weber. He was an important figure who explained the concept of modern bureaucracy. It was a bureaucratic model that functioned bureaucracy to meet the criteria of Weber bureaucratic ideals. There are seven (7) criteria of these bureaucratic ideals, as described by Max Weber, such as: (1) a clear job division, (2) a clear hierarchy of authority; (3) high formalization; (4) impersonality; (5) appointing staffs based on their competence; (6) career path for the employees; and (7) separating organizational life from private issue (Stephen P. Robbins, 1994)[14].

Parkinsonian bureaucratic model gave an emphasis on the quantitative shape of the bureaucracy. It attempted to increase the number of bureaucratic members to enlarge their capability of being the tool of development. In one side, Parkinsonian bureaucratic model was needed to accommodate the development and the progress of communities. In other side, Parkinsonian bureaucratic model was expected to deal with the compiled development issues (Eep Saefulloh Fatah, 1998) [15]. Jacksonian bureaucratic model tried to make the bureaucracy to be the accumulation of national power, thus removing communities out of bureaucracy, precisely outside political and governing rooms. "Jacksonian" was taken from the name of a tenacious military general, a popular statesman, and also a former of Seventh President of United States (1824-1932) with two terms of administrations – Andrew Jackson.

Orwellian bureaucratic model had positioned bureaucracy as the tool of national arm-length to leverage a control over communities. The movement space of communities was quite limited, and even "breathing" was controlled by bureaucracy. The life of communities seemed under permission of bureaucracy. Orwell described that such bureaucracy was found in United States. When Ronald Reagan was successfully elected as the President (1981), he streamlined bureaucracy. Previously, dealing only with hamburgers had forced United States to set many regulations, which implied to excessive number of employees. Streamlining employees, or removing many of them, became the norm (Eep Saefulloh Fatah, 1998:195).

Politic, power, and bureaucracy in the dynamic of Indonesian government were the unbreakable unity. The relationship of these three elements had originated since the early history of the state establishment, including during the kingdom age, colonial era, and post-independence period. Battle for political power during those ages may influence the current-days function and role of bureaucracy. Bureaucracy shall serve and defend the interest of people but bureaucracy evolves to become the servant of the ruler which biased bureaucracy toward politic and power. Until today, the strong effect of the government on bureaucracy has put difficulties on bureaucracy machine to deliver a professional public service, thus making bureaucracy vulnerable to political interest, corruption, collusion, nepotism, inefficiency, and various bureaucratic pathologies.

Within Indonesian context, both bureaucracy and politic had produced many studies. Karl D. Jackson [16] assessed that Indonesia bureaucracy was designed as a *bureaucratic polity model* where the power was accumulated on the hand of the State, the role of communities was shoved aside by political and

governmental interests. Richard Robinson and King called Indonesia bureaucracy as *bureaucratic capitalism*. Hans Dieter Evers saw that Indonesia bureaucratic model had evolved into Parkinsonian and Orwellian bureaucratic models. Parkinsonian bureaucracy was when the growth of personnel numbers and the extension of structures were beyond control. Orwellian bureaucracy was a bureaucratization as the product of the extended government that aimed to control over economical, political and social activities based on laws and regulations, and even by perforce measures. Indonesia bureaucracy was failed to be efficient and also fallen into inefficiency and twisting. Many formal regulations were not submitted. Other characteristic was a huge bureaucratic marked by the excessive growth of personnel and the enlargement of organizational structure. Bureaucracy was such absolute controller over political, economical and social aspects of the communities.

The labeling of Indonesia bureaucracy was still enormous. One of them was through a bureaucratic cultural approach that put Indonesia into a category of patrimonial bureaucracy. The characteristics of patrimonial bureaucracy were explained as following: (1) the officers were screened based on private criteria; (2) the rank was viewed as the source of wealthy and profit; (3) the officers controlled the functions of politic and administration; and (4) every action was directed by personal and political relations. Patrimonial bureaucracy was a continuance or a legacy of traditional system practiced during the age of kingdom, but it then mixed with colonial style bureaucracy. In such way, modern bureaucracy still grows but the inherited traditional bureaucracy also colors the development of Indonesia bureaucracy.

The rolling of reformation wheel since 1998 had born many claims, including a claim to the resolution of bureaucracy problems. The changed political system had influenced bureaucracy system, especially when Indonesia used a democracy system. Either willing or not, Indonesia must open the door for globalization. The author assumed that democracy and globalization should influence national bureaucracy.

2. DISCUSSION AND ANALYSIS

Bureaucratic politicization not only developed in Indonesia but also in developing countries in Asia, either because of the debilitation of productive middle class, or of the preference toward right or left ideologies. Despite various reasons, governmental bureaucracy was always the key development tool. Being the development main instrument, bureaucracy had a very strategic position and role because it determined many livelihood aspects of the communities. It overbearingly administered birth, marriage, business, and death issues, and therefore, communities could only find a hard way to escape from bureaucracy. Bureaucracy controlled over the access to natural resource, budget, staff, and projects, and also to the knowledge and information that others did not have. Bureaucracy determined the formulation, implementation and development of various public policies, including evaluation of performance. It may be considered as logical if bureaucracy was also used to win the political game. Bureaucracy was also useful to achieve, to maintain, and to consolidate the power of parties or power holders.

Parliamentary Democracy in 1950s was the age related to this description. Political parties, at that time, were the central actors within Indonesian political system. Bureaucracy, massively, had become the object of battle for political interest among political parties. The result was polarization and fragmentation of bureaucracy. The shifting into the Centralized Democracy (1959-1966) did not change any at all to the bureaucracy, but only changed the map of political power. The shift of politic toward authoritarianism had marginalized the role of parties. All political lives that previously developed were suddenly muzzled by President Soekarno who was then appointed himself as the patron of power. The only political party that benefited from this muzzle, possibly due to its connection with President Soekarno, was Partai Komunis Indonesia (PKI). However, Soekarno, PKI, and the military group of ground forces mobilized by Soeharto, were mixed up against each other within a political clash that peaked at Gerakan 30 September (G30S).

Tragic event of G30S had fragmented bureaucracy. The transition to the New Order (1966-1998) had signed a quite drastic change in political configuration. Political polarization was straightened and went toward the domination of military forces and the prominence of Golongan Karya (Golkar). Indeed, military forces during New Order had dominated bureaucratic structures and successfully used bureaucracy as their method in repressive manner. Different than before, New Order bureaucracy was not fragmented anymore by partisan interests, but it was fallen into the hegemony of authoritarian regime of New Order dominated by military forces. During the administration of New Order, bureaucracy was perfectly used as a political instrument for the patrimony and military regime of President Soeharto. Less surprisingly, after the fall-out of

New Order in 1998, there was big claim from the public toward the enforcement of neutrality in to the politic and bureaucracy.

The claim to the reformation was responded partially by post-Soeharto administration regime. The relationship between bureaucracy and political power was cut, including the linkage of bureaucracy with Golkar and its derivative chinos. Korps Pegawai Republik Indonesia (Korpri), previously being the only institution of public servant, was driven out because it was condemned as a corporate institution that handcuffed bureaucratic officers. After reformation, the efforts had been taken to disengage bureaucracy from its genuine chain, and the political effect too rapidly evolved. The awareness of the importance of bureaucratic neutrality was continuously developing. BJ Habibie, the President at that time, released Government Regulation No.5/1999 (PP No.5/1999) [17], that required the neutrality of *pegawai negeri sipil* (PNS) from political parties. This regulation was supported by Law No.43/1999 [18] about the Principles of Employment, and this Law replaced previous Law No.8/1974[19]. Essentially, PNS was still allowed to affiliate with political parties, but it was only a matter of membership. Holding certain rank in the political parties was prohibited. Similar provisions also prevailed for military officers (TNI) and police officers (Polri).

Regardless the arrangements made so far, the face of Indonesia bureaucracy in the public service hardly changed. If any, the change was not meaningful at all. Bureaucracy was crippled with deviation and inefficiency. Bureaucracy was still proud with "nasty characters" such as resistance to change (*status quo*), exclusiveness, rigidity, and dominance excess. Other indicators reflecting bad portrait of bureaucracy was varying, such as the high cost charged for public service, either *legal cost* or *illegal cost*; too long waiting time; too many desks to pass on; or less customer-oriented *service style*. Other cause was the lower competence of bureaucrats, and the signals were the low quality of recruitments, the poor quality of employees, and the dominance of political interest within bureaucratic performance. Poor bureaucratic performance then influenced development rate and business competitiveness. Pursuant to *Human Development Index* (HDI) reported by *United Nations Development Program* (UNDP) in 2004 [20], Indonesia remained at the position 111 of 177 countries, just above Vietnam but far below other neighbor countries such as Singapore or Malaysia. Referring to *Global Competitiveness Report for Period 2003-2004*, that described about growth and business, the competitiveness index for Indonesia had declined to the position 72 of 102 countries in 2003, if compared to the position 69 in 2002.

Neutralizing bureaucracy and politic was a discourse around bureaucratic neutrality, and it was not a new talk. This theme had been discussed many long ago by experts. Karl Marx's critic against Hegel philosophy of the State declared that bureaucratic neutrality was indeed important. In his critic, Marx changed "the content" Hegel theory of three groups of communities. The groups were: *particular interest* group represented by businesspeople and professionals, *general interest* group represented by the State, and bureaucratic group.

Marx [21] suggested that bureaucracy should be better acted as a social group because it allowed bureaucracy to be used as the instrument of dominant/ruler group. Being only the mediator between general interest represented by the State and particular interest represented by businesspeople and professionals, then bureaucracy did not get anything. By meaning to this concept, Marx wanted bureaucracy to take side for certain group, especially the ruling group. Hegel with three groups of communities insisted that bureaucracy must stand in the middle, or be the mediator, between general interest group (the State) and particular interest group (businesspeople and professionals). Bureaucracy, in this case, according to Hegel, must be neutral (Anshori, 2004) [22]. As said by Wilson, bureaucracy was the institution that implemented politic policy, and in relative with the concept of bureaucratic neutrality, then bureaucracy must stay outside political realm. Problems in bureaucracy or administration must only be centered on business, and it should be separated from political intricacies (*the hurry and strife of politics*).

Basic concept suggested by Wilson seemed be followed by other political scientists such as D. White, Willoughby, and Frank Goodnow [23]. According to Goodnow, there were two main functions of the government, and both functions were different to each other. As noted by Goodnow, politic made and formulated policies, whereas administration implemented policies. As a consequence, government bureaucracy was involved in the process of policy-making to produce a sense of responsibility and to empower a bureaucratic position. Avoiding the emergence of *authoritarian bureaucracy*, then a stronger control over such bureaucracy must be owned by social and political elements in the legislative agency. At least, this control would prevent governmental bureaucracy from being immune from critics, or from being

absolute and arrogant. Public service agency would be more functional in serving communities and being submissive to the government. Bureaucracy must be neutral, meaning that bureaucracy did not take side to or may not come from a dominant political force. Governmental bureaucracy must be involved within decision-making or policy-making process.

In Indonesia, disengaging bureaucracy from the political effect was not a merely discourse. During the administration of President Habibie, Government Regulation No.5/1999 required PNS to be neutral from political parties. Although it was a progressive, it could not yet produce a neutral independent bureaucracy, because Indonesia bureaucracy was not still free from the effect of the ruler (executive) as a political force.

Within Indonesia context, the aspects of nationalism and government were not clear. As said by Istkatrinah (2004) [24], on Indonesian government system, President had two positions, being a national organ that acted on the behalf of a nation, and being the organizer of the nation/ administration. In practice, however, there was a confusing mixture between President being as the head of the nation and the head of the government. Executive role played by President was usually attributed to its position as the head of the nation. Such ambiguous roles prevented bureaucracy from functioning as the institution of nation, but it worked more as the institution of government.

National administration as the bureaucratic organ in Indonesia was hardly independent and neutral. Indeed, national administration of Indonesia stood below the power of the government, and therefore, Indonesian administration was also called governmental administration. This position forced bureaucracy to stay under a strong shadow of the government, represented by its governing agents such as President and Vice-President, Minister, Governor of Province, Regent of Regency, and Mayor of City/Town. In pursuance of the Draft of Governmental Administration released by the Office of National Officers Empowerment Ministry (Menpan):

Government administration was about all legal and material actions of governing conducted by the governmental institutions, the governmental administration officers, and also other legal entities, to which the authority was given to them to carry on all functions or tasks of the government, including providing public service to communities as required by laws. Governmental institutions included all governmental agencies that implemented the administrative function of the government at executive level, either on the center, local, commissions, boards, and organizations that obtained the funding from APBN/APBD (Draft of Governmental Administration, XI B, January, 2006)[25].

The formulation above highlighted that the position of governmental administration process was below the power of executive (government). This perspective was supported by the fact that Indonesia was practicing a presidential system on which President and Vice-President were the institution that organized the highest power by being the powerful executive before the Constitution. Such system did not recognize or distinguish what so called the head of the nation and the head of the government. Both labels were represented by President and Vice-President. It was said that for implementing the governing of the nation, then power and political responsibility remained on the hand of President (*concentration of power and responsibility upon the President*).

Such understanding misled the previously recognized frame of thought:
a. Head of Government/Locality was the ruler and the caretaker of the government.
b. Bureaucracy (governmental administration) stood within executive realm, and thus, was considered as the governmental officers.
c. Government (President-Vice President, Minister, Head of Locality) had authority and responsibility to move the wheel of governmental administration.

The relationship between superior and subordinate, and between national administration and government, was clearly stated within The Obligation, Loyalty, and Submission of Civil Servants. Moreover, Law No.43/1999 about Amendment to Law No.8/1974 about The Principles of Employment, had mentioned that every Civil Servant must be loyal and submissive to Pancasila, Undang-Undang Dasar 1945[26], Nation, and Government, and also should be willing to maintain the coherence of the Unitary State of Indonesia Republic. The word *Government* in this statement reflected the fact that there was a clear relationship between the civil servant as governmental administration officer and the government. This relationship showed that government was the superior of civil servant, and therefore, civil servant must be loyal to the government. Similar relationship can be seen in the arrangement of the civil servant oath:

"*In the name of the God, I hereby declare that for my appointment to be Civil Servant, I will be loyal and submissive to Pancasila, Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Nation, and Government.*"

The word *Government* indicated the importance of civil servant's loyalty and submission to the government. It differs from the relationship between the government (executive) and National Army of Indonesia (TNI) which did not show the arrangement of superior and subordinate. The oath of TNI was almost similar to civil servant's but without the word *Government*.

"*In the name of the God, I hereby declare that I will be loyal to Pancasila, Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, and the Unitary State of Indonesia Republic*".

The greater effect of the government on bureaucracy may be felt concerning. It is then important to rearticulate bureaucratic neutrality, meaning that bureaucracy must free from governmental effect, and bureaucracy must be independent and work with professional norms. Bureaucracy should be independent from power effect and positioned itself as the servant to the nation and the communities, and not to the government. Being national servant, bureaucracy must focus on national duties given by the laws.

Being a national instrument, bureaucracy is then viewed as the national organ that executes national duties and only gives its loyalty to the nation. However, in the practice, national administration performs governmental duties as formal superior, but it does not mean that the government can operate "bureaucratic machine" named after national administration. National administration can only perform the governmental duties given by Laws. National administration has the right to reject government order if the order is not stated within the Laws or even defying UUD. In this position, ideally, national administration must use national constitution as legal reference. By the presence of the highest law as legal umbrella, then the actual superior of national administration was UUD because of its position as a very strong national instrument.

Indonesian bureaucracy and politic cannot be separated from Reformation 1998, and it brought a new political climate to Indonesia through the born of a liberal democracy system. This new political system delivered an impact on political and bureaucratic lives in Indonesia. It must be noted that bureaucracy and politic were two different structures but both were inseparable. Bureaucracy played active role in the political process of most nations, and bureaucracy carried out many activities, but the most important works were implementing National Constitution, preparing legislative proposals, making economic regulations, giving licenses to economic and professional problems, and distributing the welfare service (Herbet M. Levine, 1982) [27]. Communities were still dominated by bureaucrats, and it was described so by James Burnham in 1941 who underscored the importance of managerial group in economic sector. There was no sharp line between managerial groups and political officers (Martin Albrow, 1989)[28]. On his writing, James attempted to show the similarity between the power of managerial class and national bureaucracy.

Communities who were created and regulated by bureaucrats will be bureaucratic communities. Such communities may require bureaucracies to submit to the effects, attitudes and values attended by bureaucrats. Any changes in communities' attitude would always depend on the effect of bureaucrats. It entrapped communities into faulty engagement through the demolition of democratic values. There was a contravention among these values that would be considered as the problem that needed a resolution.

Most people perceived that conceptualizing bureaucracy as administration was not efficient and less rational. This concept involved evaluative criteria and also specification of the values (Martin Albrow, 1989)[28]. Bureaucracy concept tends to be viewed as a threatening aspect against democracy. It may so because bureaucracy is considered as the power exercised by the officers. This concept has been seriously attended and put within a discussion among national officers who advocate on pursuing democratic goals. There is a question whether this threat depends on how democratic values are interpreted or on where the interpretation is considered as wrong. Friedrich and Finer [29] show great concern with the incompatibility between modern national administration practices and democratic values. They believe that the power exercised by officers is not wrong at all, but the problem is related with how to use this power. Each characteristic of bureaucracy and democracy is used to diagnose and to heal anything happened.

Martin Albrow distinguishes three fundamental functions of the officers in democratic nation:

1. Officers have asked too many powers, and they must return to their normal function.
2. Officers have more extensive powers and duties, and therefore, their ranks should be used in wise manner
3. Power must be evenly distributed across officers, and therefore, officers should be willing to look for proper methods of service delivery.

The resolved problems can grow and develop bureaucracy by placing bureaucracy in consistent way within a political system. A liberal democratic political system was begun from the Decree of Vice-President No.X dated on 3 November 1945. It was confirmed that the politic determined the administrative shape of the government. Political infrastructure position vis-à-vis political supra-structure was relatively stronger creating a bureau-nomia political system (Moeljarto Tjokrowinoto, 1996).

As noted by relevant theories, understanding the bureaucratization in the national development of Indonesia must involve 2 concepts:
1. The concept of bureaucratic politic communities developed firstly by Fred Riggs (1966) [30] and used by Karl D. Jackson (1978) [31] within Indonesia context.
2. The concept of bureaucratic capitalism formulated by Wittfogel (1957)[32].

As shown by the concept of Jacksonian, the principles of bureaucratic politic communities are:
1. the dominant politic agency was bureaucratic officers;
2. other politic agencies, such as parliaments, politic parties, and interest groups, were all weak and incapable to control over bureaucracy; and
3. the mass outside bureaucracy was always politically and economically passive, where political parties are not quite influential to the role of bureaucracy.

Taking account the characteristics above, it can be concluded that Indonesia bureaucracy was about close to these characteristics. The question was asked on whether bureaucracy political communities was able to execute the development, especially development that could anticipate and retain external fluctuates to achieve a reliable growth rate, and that may distribute evenly to the outcomes of the struggle of communities. Three tendencies are found within Indonesia bureaucracy. First was Weberian process where a bureaucratic process started to approach the ideal type of Max-Weber. Second was Parkinsonian process where bureaucracy went toward the pathology estimated by C. Northcote Parkinson. Third, also the final, was Orwellian process where bureaucracy conquered communities. From these tendencies, Indonesian bureaucracy shows a tendency more toward Parkinsonian and Orwellian than Weberian.

Therefore, political conditions and bureaucracy in Indonesia cannot be disentangled, and it is hard way to develop bureaucratic neutrality. Indonesia bureaucracy was "sick" and its pressure point stood on Parkinsonian Law. The parameter for "healthy bureaucracy" was Weberian bureaucratic concept. However, Weberian concept was problematic because it was too idealistic to expect good bureaucracy if the conditions of certain nation was assumed constant. Both democracy and bureaucracy were needed for the development of a nation. The stronger is the bureaucracy of a certain nation, the lower is the democracy. The weaker is the bureaucracy, the higher is the democracy.

4.   CONCLUSION

The progress of a nation was among other determined by the ability of bureaucratic officers in performing their duties and functions. These officers should be the professional public servants who served communities with accountability. Bureaucratic officers must place their positions and conditions as *civil servant* or *public servant*. It would impact on the performance of bureaucratic officers based on the expectation of communities. In the end, there should a *trust* to bureaucratic officers. Trustworthiness would keep the nation on progress in serving communities, and induce the nation to be willing to create a clean, accountable and transparent bureaucracy.

Bureaucracy was the front guardian of governance, and therefore, it was required to be professional and not easily captured by political interest. Bureaucracy must show the ideal posture like what the public has expected. Political liberalization was the consequence of political reformation, but in other hand, it tempted bureaucracy to play around in the political realm, which thus, it may create a room for politic to maneuver around the bureaucracy. Some cases indicated that bureaucracy was hardly escaped from political effect. Therefore, to create more independent bureaucracy, stricter laws must be implemented and strong sanctions should be enforced to the deviant bureaucracy. The change may not be so fast, but the willingness to change to be the better would bring an ideal picture of bureaucracy. Through their article, Bowornwathana and Wescott (2008; page 1)[33] concluded that bureaucracy in the developing countries was not smoothly implemented (*uneven*) with "*stroke-of-the-pen reforms*" that run very fast. Structural change followed this trend with its slowness or even without motion at all.

Fundamental change would need "*sustained effort, commitment and leadership over many generations. Mistakes and setbacks are a normal and inevitable part of the process. The big challenge is to seize upon mistakes as learning opportunities, rather than use them as excuses for squashing reform*."(Schacter 2002) [34]. Indonesia was also there. Bureaucratic reformation must be set as the part of political development. If administrative officers can support national development, then the existing system will support the political democratization, the liberalization, and the economical industrialization in Indonesia.

Bureaucracy and politic in the age of reformation had produced three tendencies. First was Weberian bureaucratic process that resembled to the ideal type of Max-Weber. Second was Parkinsonian bureaucracy but it may go toward the pathology estimated by C. Northcote Parkinson. Third, also the final, was Orwellian bureaucracy that controlled over the communities. From these tendencies, bureaucracy of Indonesia tends to move toward Parkinsonian and Orwellian rather than Weberian bureaucracies. This pathology may be obvious because Indonesia find difficulties in neutralizing bureaucracy and politic. The difficulties were associated with the politics of rents, transactions, and oligarchies in the bureaucracies.

Therefore, such tendencies required Indonesia to anticipate any changes and openness. Bureaucratic model can transform values, principles and spirits of entrepreneurship within bureaucratic institutions.

REFERENCES

[1]. Anshori, 2004. Psikologi Remaja dan Perkembangan Pesertq Didik Jakarta. PT AKSARA

[2]. Baron de Grimm. Correspondance, Litteraire, Philosophique et Critique, 1753-1769, Edisi 1813, Vol. 4.

[3]. Budiardjo, Miriam. 2005. Dasar-dasar Ilmu Politik. Jakarta: Gramedia.

[4]. Bowornwathana, B., & Wescott, C. (2008). Introduction. In B. Bowornwathana, & C. Wesccott, Comparative Governance Reform in Asia: Democracy, Corruption, and Government Trust. Bingley: JAI Press.

[5]. D. White, Willoughby dan Frank Goodnow 2010. Principles of Public Administration.

[6]. Eep Saefulloh Fatah. 1998. Catatan Atas Gagalnya Politik Orde Baru. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

[7]. Friedrich dan Finer 1967. Contitutional Government and Democrazy; Theory and Practice in Europeand America. Waltham Balisdell Publishing

[8]. Fred Riggs 1988. Administrasi Negara-negara Berkembang Teori Masyarakat Prismatis. Jakarta: Rajawali

[9]. Fred W Rigg 1997. Public Administration Review. Jurnal, Vol 57. No. 4. Juli/Agustus.

[10]. Guillermo O' Donnel, (1993). Transisi Menuju Demokrasi . Jakarta : LP3ES

[11]. Herbert M.Levine, 1982. Administrative Behavior, A Study of Decision, Terjemahan, Jakarta : PT. Bina Aksara

[12]. Iskatrinah, Pelaksanaan Fungsi Hukum Administrasi Negara dalam Mewujudkan Pemerintahan yang Baik, Jakarta: Litbang Pertahanan Indonesia, Balitbang Departemen Pertahanan, 2004

[13]. Karl D Jackson 1987. Political Power and Comunications in Indonesia. California: University of California Press.

[14]. Karl D.Jackson 1978. Political Power and Comunications in Indonesia. California: University of California Press,

[15]. Martin Albrow, 1996, "Birokrasi", Tiara Wacana,Yogyakarta,

[16]. Machiavelli, Niccolo, 1991. Sang Penguasa: Surat Seorang Negarawan Kepada Pemimpin Republik. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

[17]. Marx, Karl. 1999. Manifesto Komunis 1848. Jakarta: Yayasan Bintang Merah.

[18]. Muhammad A. S. Hikam, 2000, Islam, Demokrasi dan Pemberdayaan Civil Society, Jakarta, Erlangga.

[19]. Max Weber 2005, Seminar Nasional "Membangun Etos Bangsa", Jakarta, 4 Desember.

[20]. Miftah Thoha. 2008. Birokrasi di Era Reformasi. PT. Gramdedia Pustaka. Jakarta

[21]. Martini, Rini. 2012. Birokrasi dan Politik.Semarang : UPT UNDIP Press Semarang.

[22]. PP No.5 Tahun 1999. Tentang Larangan praktek monopoli dan persaingan Usaha tidak sehat

[23]. Riswanda Imawan, 1998. "Desentralisasi, Demokratisasi dan Pembentukan Good Governance". dalam

[24]. Syamsuddin Haris (ed) Desentralisasi, Demokratisasi dan Akuntabilitas Pemerintahan Daerah, AIPI, Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia.

[25]. Stephen P. Robbins, 1994 Teori Organisasi: Struktur, Desain dan Aplikasi, Alih Bahasa Jusuf Udaya, Jakarta, Arcan

[26]. UU No 43 tahun 1999 Tentang Perubahan Atas UU no 8 tahun 1974 tentang Pokok-Pokok Kepegawaian, pasal 26.1

[27]. UU Nomor 8 Tahun 1974 Tentang Pokok-Pokok Kepegawaian

[28]. UNDP. (2007). United Nations Development Programme: Indonesia. Retrieved 24 May 2007, 2007, from http://www.undp.or.id/mdg/index.asp

[29]. RUU Administrasi Pemerintahan, draft XI B, januari 2006

[30]. Schacter 2002. Teacher Performance-Based Accountability : Why, What and How. Journal International. Milken Family Foundation 125 Fourth Street Santa Monica. CA 90401 – 1353.

[31]. Syafuan Rozi. 2006. Zaman Bergerak Reformasi di Rombak. Yogyakarta : PustakaPelajar . Hal 9-10.

[32]. V De Gourney (1900) in L.B. Say and J. Chailley-Bert, editors, Nouveau Dictionnaire de l'économie politique

[33]. Wittfogel, K. 1957. "Development Aspects of Hydraulic Societies". Irrigation Civilization : A Comparative Study. Social Science Monograph. Washington DC: Department of Cultural Affairs, Pan American Union. Hal 43-57

[34]. Wilson, James Q. 1989. Bureaucracy: What Government Agencies Do and Why

[35]. They Do It. US: Basic Books a Division of Harper Collins Publishers.