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FOUR LINZ AND STEPAN REQUIREMENTS:

– AGREEMENT ABOUT PROCEDURES (1999)
– GOVERNMENT DIRECTLY ELECTED IN POPULAR VOTE (1999)
– THAT GOVERNMENT HAS AUTHORITY TO FORMULATE POLICIES (1999)
EXPLAINING THE TRANSITION I

CONSTRAINING AND ENABLING FACTORS

– THE ZEITGEIST—END OF COLD WAR, ASIAN NEIGHBORS DEMOCRATIZE
– CIVILIAN ELITE ACTORS PREFERRED DEMOCRACY
– ARMED FORCES, UNDER WIRANTO, SUPPORTIVE
– AVAILABILITY/FAMILIARITY OF SUHARTO-ERA ELECTORAL LAWS
EXPLAINING THE TRANSITION II

B. J. HABIBIE THE KEY DECISION MAKER

– WANTED DEMOCRACY
– CHOSE JUNE 1999 DATE
– DECENTRALIZED GOVERNMENT
– ALLOWED REFERENDUM IN EAST TIMOR

TRY SUTRISNO AS COUNTERFACTUAL

– FAVORED “PANCASILA DEMOCRACY”
– FAVORED STRONG CENTRAL GOVERNMENT
– FAVORED EAST TIMOR INTEGRATION
DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION
BEHAVIORAL CONSOLIDATION

NO SIGNIFICANT GROUPS ATTEMPTING TO OVERTHROW REGIME BY “TURNING TO VIOLENCE OR FOREIGN INTERVENTION TO SECEDE FROM THE STATE.”

– Islamists mostly within the system
– National identity strong, Papuan separatism weak
– Decentralization positive
– Not like 1950s democracy, which was threatened by Islamists and communists
ATTITUDINAL CONSOLIDATION I

“A STRONG MAJORITY OF PUBLIC OPINION” BELIEVES THAT FURTHER CHANGE SHOULD TAKE PLACE WITHIN THE “PARAMETERS OF DEMOCRATIC FORMULAS.”

– Voters know they were not free under Suharto, are free today
– Support for democracy high, growing (68% in 1999, 79% in 2008)
– But only 44% define democracy as freedom to elect and criticize government; 31% as affordability of basic commodities
ATTITUDINAL CONSOLIDATION II

– IF FORCED TO CHOOSE DEMOCRACY OR DEVELOPMENT:

  DEVELOPMENT—76% (!!!)
  DEMOCRACY—10%

– SBY REELECTED IN 2009 – VOTERS EQUATED HIS PRESIDENCY WITH ECONOMIC SUCCESS

– SEVERE ECONOMIC CRISIS OR LONGTERM STAGNATION COULD HAVE NEGATIVE EFFECT ON CONSOLIDATION
Figure 1. Parallels Between Political Economy Components: Choice of President, Partai Demokrat, Evaluations of Presidential Performance and National Economic Condition (%)

- Support for democracy
- Satisfaction with SBY
- Satisfaction with democratic performance
- Choose SBY
- Better national economic condition
- Choose PD
Figure 2. Correlation of Political Economy Components and Democracy 2007-2008 (N = 10)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Choose SBY</th>
<th>Choose Demokrat</th>
<th>SBY’s Perform.</th>
<th>National Economy</th>
<th>Inflation (BPS)</th>
<th>Satisfied with Dem Perform.</th>
<th>Democracy Best System</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Choose SBY</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.99</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Choose Demokrat</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>.87</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SBY’s Perform.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>-.99</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National economy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.98</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inflation (BPS)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-.76</td>
<td>NS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Satisfied with Dem. Perform.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democracy Best System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All correlations significant at P-value 0.01 or better. NS = Statistically not significant. BPS: Central Statistical Bureau.
CONSTITUTIONAL CONSOLIDATION

“GOVERNMENTAL AND NON-GOVERNMENTAL FORCES" AGREE – POLITICAL CONFLICT MUST BE RESOLVED “WITHIN THE SPECIFIC LAWS, PROCEDURES AND INSTITUTIONS” OF DEMOCRATIC REGIME.

– Caveat—ongoing U.N. research in this area
THREATS TO CONSOLIDATED DEMOCRACY IN FIVE ARENAS
CIVIL SOCIETY
(FREEDOM OF ASSOCIATION AND COMMUNICATION)

• ISLAMIST SOCIAL MOVEMENT (WITH ALLIES IN GOVERNMENT, INCLUDING MUI)
  – *POLITICAL SUCCESSES*: ANTI-PORNOGRAPHY LAW, BANNING OF AHMADIYAH, RESTRICT PERSONAL FREEDOMS, ESPECIALLY OF WOMEN

• CSOs RESOURCE-STARVED DUE TO LOW LEVEL OF ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
  – *EXAMPLES*: LABOR, LEGAL AID, ENVIRONMENTAL GROUPS
Bubarkan ahmadiyah
POLITICAL SOCIETY
(FREE AND INCLUSIVE ELECTORAL CONTESTATION)

• NO CONSENSUS ON ELECTORAL PROCEDURES
  AFTER THREE NATIONAL ELECTIONS

• LEGISLATORS AND POLITICAL PARTY LEADERS
  NOT WELL LINKED DOWN TO CIVIL SOCIETY OR
  UP TO GOVERNMENTAL PROCESS
  – Legislative resources too small
  – Legislators not responsive to constituents
  – Weak executive support in parliament due to many small parties
RULE OF LAW
(CONSTITUTIONALISM)

- INSTITUTIONS WEAK. GREATEST LONG TERM OBSTACLE TO DEMOCRATIC CONSOLIDATION

- WORLD BANK RULE OF LAW INDEX—INDONESIA AMONG LOWEST IN WORLD

- NO PRESIDENTIAL POLITICAL SUPPORT FROM SUKARNO TO SUKARNOPUTRI!!

- KPK REPRESENTS PROGRESS, BUT OUTSIDE MAIN INSTITUTIONS

- GREATEST HOPE: POPULAR AND MEDIA PRESSURE
WHY IS IT SO HARD TO MEET THE D.P.R MEMBERS??

SHSH!! BE QUIET!! THERE'S A GUY FROM K.P.K IN FRONT!!

DAMMIT! I GOTTA HIDE MY MONEY!

OH NO!!
STATE APPARATUS
(RATIONAL-LEGAL BUREAUCRATIC NORMS)

• STILL LIMITED “CAPACITY TO COMMAND, REGULATE, AND EXTRACT”

• DISADVANTAGES:
  – NATIONAL BUDGET OF USD 70 BILLION FOR 230 MILLION PEOPLE (COMPAARED TO BUDGET OF USD 65 BILLION FOR US STATE OF ILLINOIS WITH 13 MILLION)
  – WIDESPREAD INCOMPETENCE, INEFFICIENCY, CORRUPTION

• ADVANTAGES:
  – IMPROVED STATE INFRASTRUCTURE BY NEW ORDER
  – “EPISTEMIC COMMUNITY” OF ECONOMISTS
  – NAÏVE OR TOLERANT CITIZENRY (E.G., HEALTH, EDUCATION POLICY)
ECONOMIC SOCIETY
(INSTITUTIONALIZED MARKET)

• ECONOMIC FREEDOM NETWORK—INDONESIA 101ST/141 IN LEVEL OF ECONOMIC FREEDOM (2006)

• PRIVATE SECTOR DOMINATED BY SINO-INDONESIANS VULNERABLE TO EXTORTION BUT ALSO CAPABLE OF CAPITAL FLIGHT

• STATE SECTOR—MORE THAN 150 STATE-OWNED ENTERPRISES (SOEs), FEW PROFITABLE BUT MANY MILCH COWS

• PERNICIOUS POLITICIAN—SOE OFFICIAL—BUSINESS NEXUS

• AN “OLIGARCHY?”
CONCLUSIONS I

DEMOCRACY CONSOLIDATED

- **BEHAVIORALLY:** NO SIGNIFICANT GROUP SUPPORTS RETURN TO AUTHORITARIANISM OR SEPARATION
- **ATTITUDINALLY:** IN SURVEYS, VOTERS SUPPORT DEMOCRACY, UNDERSTAND DIFFERENCE WITH NEW ORDER
- **CONSTITUTIONALLY:** AMENDED 1945 CONSTITUTION WIDELY ACCEPTED
CONCLUSIONS II

REASONS TO BE WATCHFUL/PRIHATIN:

• **BEHAVIORALLY**—ISLAMIST THREAT TO FREEDOM, DEMOCRACY; LONG-TERM SEPARATISM IN PAPUA

• **ATTITUdINALLY**—DEMOCRATIC SUPPORT HOSTAGE TO ECONOMIC SUCCESS

• **FIVE INTERACTING ARENAS**: LOW GDP/SLOW GROWTH; WEAK RULE OF LAW; CONCENTRATION OF ECONOMIC POWER IN STATE AND BUSINESS ELITE
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