

# THE EXISTENCE OF AMERICAN LIBERAL DEMOCRACY IN INDONESIA AS THREAT OR OPPORTUNITIES IN RELATION TO SOME CRISIS

Oleh:

Didik Murwantono, S.S., M.Hum  
Universitas Islam Sultan Agung (UNISSULA) Semarang

## ABSTRACT

*Democracy interests a lot of people with its challenges and hopes. Some people even consider democracy as a new religion. Most people admire it and wish very much that it will improve their lives. It is like a fresh cake taken from the oven. People have smelled the aroma as they know from media that democracy gives peace and prosperity. But smelling is not enough. They want to get a piece of the cake and taste it. Some crisis happened in our home caused not only by internal issues but also external values. Moreover, we live in an era in which everything is possible and nothing is certain. Shortly the changing of an era will bring some great values on which we must be selective to filter those values as threat or opportunities based on our identities and experiences. This paper is by no means a comprehensive account of democracy or more accurately, American liberal democracy, in Indonesia. In fact, it is intended to be more suggestive than comprehensive though it is characterized by more summary than controversy.*

**Key words:** democracy, opportunities, threat, crisis, values.

## I. INTRODUCTION

### A. Background

The existence of democracy in this era is inevitably. Everyone is familiar with the word democracy but he is always not certain in its definition. There is much disagreement over the meaning of the democracy term today. It is a word that has come to mean very different things to different people. Most people simply define it as "the power of the people", of course, from the Greek roots, *demos* "the people" and *kratos* "power". In addition, some political scientists argue that democracy is simply a way of making decision. They believe democracy is nothing more than an agreement among citizens that the majority vote will carry the issue.

In more recent times, definitions and practices of democracy vary widely. The United States is one of the countries that practices it in

political life. Some people claim that America itself is well-known as a super power country seen as a mighty democracy and the leader of the Western world of democratic nations. This image may seem clear enough at the first glance. For example, around the mid-nineteenth century, the United States was to be a symbol of democratic nation in the world when democracy was to be the main issue in the world at the time.

In the eighteenth century, America adopted democracy and made revolution by and for democracy. At that time, a popular revolution slogan was "no tax without representation". After getting its independence from Westerns which were fully dictator and anarchy, America made a new theory of government based on its experiences. As in the opening lines of



the second paragraph, Thomas Jefferson clearly and simply stated the basic principles of what today we call democracy "... all men are created equal, they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights; ... among these are life, liberty, and the pursuits of happiness." Unalienable rights are rights which can not be taken away from the people—not by any government, nor even by the people themselves (Todd and Curti, 1972: 123).

Democracy as a practical possibility of individualism is also linked to the rights of the people pertaining to the government. Democracy refers not only to the rights of life, liberty and happiness individually or personally, but also to the rights of people in determining their own government. People have a central and strong position and right in establishing their own government systems. They have rights to abolish the government if the government is corrupt or weak and establish again a new government that can secure and save their lives and freedom.

According to Hegel, a democratic political system is a historical necessity. Sooner or later it comes to all societies. Human history shows that political systems changed from monarchy (in which one person rules) to oligarchy (a group rules) and lastly to democracy (all the people rule). A democratic political system, according to Hegel and later on picked up by Francis Fukuyama, is *The End of History*

I do not mean that I agree with his conclusion that we are arriving at "the end of history" by having a democratic political system. Democracy is something desirable, but is it also a project of capitalism to secure free market competition. Democracy does not solve the unjust economic exploitation of the poor by economically rich. Therefore, rather than arriving at "the end of history" societies continue to struggle for a just society (Fukuyama 19).

It is to emphasize that democracy needs for continuous and progressive improvement with a view to perfecting democratic institutions in all their aspects and practical applications. Though, these will of course differ from country to country and from continent, based on the lessons of experience.

Democracy can exist in various forms, but each of democracy may vary with the historical, social, cultural and economical conditions of the nations such as Athenian democracy, Classical democracy, Liberal democracy, or even *Pancasila* Democracy in Indonesia. Here, *Pancasila* is an philosophical basis of the state. China tends to equality-oriented democracy adopting communism as the philosophical basis of the state. Meanwhile a term of liberal democracy is associated with Western democracy.

As mentioned above, there is no single definition of democracy, much less in a liberal democracy. It means that democracy is always followed by local values. Democracy has no end. On the other hand, democracy cannot be taken for granted as something established once and for all, nor can it be viewed as a single static model of applicable work. On the contrary, democracy is an evolving system that is gradually enriched and fine-tuned in each country that adopts it in response to the socioeconomic, technological, and cultural changes to which today's open and dynamic societies are exposed.

For these reasons, no single definition of democracy is entirely satisfactory since this term is the paradigm case of the essentially contested concept, or one about which there is no agreed meaning. This is not to say, however, that the word lacks contents; in fact it is one of the richest concepts in heritage of political thought. Each of the elements within this and most other definitions will require further specification. In the course of such elaboration most theories go beyond



description and definition to some statement of democratic ideals.

The global spreading of democracy always brings some critics of democracy. Thomas R. Dye and L. Harmon Zeigler observed that *"Elites, not masses, govern America. In an industrial, scientific, and nuclear age, life in a democracy, just as in a totalitarian society, is shaped by handful of people. This the irony of democracy"* (1984:3-4). The words of liberty, freedom, equality, security, and justice are merely descriptive than the word of democracy itself. Some forms of government provide security, others give liberty or even, they guarantee prosperity and peace. Democracy may provide all these social economic and spiritual needs if it is allowed to its functions. In fact, democracy has in time been captured liberalism, nationalism, and capitalism.

One of the personal dissatisfaction of democratic outcomes is from Bruce Gilley (2009:114-116). He states democracy is not desirable because it causes mob rule, inequality, instability, inefficiency, repression, and Westernization. Democracy is not possible because of aggregation problems, power differences, propaganda, and citizen stupidity and ignorance. It is also reflected in the unwillingness or inability of citizens to take up the heavy burdens of self-rule, or the logical problems of translating individualism preferences into public choice. Ideally, democracy could bring individual participation in the decisions that affect one's life. As John Dewey wrote: "The keynote of democracy as a way of life may be expressed as the necessity for the participation of every mature human being in formation of the values that regulate the living of men together".

Therefore the issue of democracy is very interesting to be analyzed in correlation with some crisis happened in our beloved country, Indonesia. In 1997, Indonesia was afflicted with a severe El Nino-induced, a plumed exchange rate, and near paralysis of the banking

sector. By early 1998, Indonesia experienced rising inflation, growing unemployment, and declining GDP growth. In this reform era, Indonesia is still facing some crisis dealing with power and wealth orientation such as corruption, terrorism, and violence. In fact, there are some prominent factors to be noted here as cornerstone in analyzing Indonesian crisis. They are democracy and capitalism. Seemingly, they are not fair enough to discuss Indonesian crisis. But by using American Studies discipline with the main stream of inter-disciplinary study, it will cover them by combining the different fields of study. This article highlights on historical, economical, sociological and political aspect supported by the related theories in analyzing Indonesian crisis.

## **B. Problem Statement**

The writer highlights on some indispensable problems in this paper as follows:

1. How is the existence of American liberal democracy identified or characterized in globalization era in relation to Indonesian democracy along with some crisis?
2. How the best way to filter the Western and American values by comparing and contrasting with our values in society in order to build our nation

## **C. Goal**

Based on the above formulated-problems, the writer attempts to gain a number of goals such as:

1. To identify and analyze American liberal democracy and Indonesian democracy in line with the changing of era correlated with Indonesian crisis, and
2. To find out any solution for Indonesia in facing national crisis and to learn some experiences from big countries to avoid stumbling into the same pitfalls as they.



## II. REVIEW AND DISCUSSION

### A. AMERICAN LIBERAL DEMOCRACY AND GLOBALIZATION

#### A.1. AMERICAN LIBERAL DEMOCRACY

It is rather difficult to determine some issue related to American liberal democracy. One useful way to explore the dynamic that led to the democratization of liberalism is to consider the views expressed by some leading liberal thinkers of the late eighteenth century. An early example of the invocation of natural equality and consent of the people as a basis for rejecting anything other than popular government can be found in the work of Thomas Paine, who can always be counted upon to draw the most radical conclusions from the Lockean teaching on Natural Rights.

In his *Dissertation on First Principles of Government* (1795), Paine argued that "there were only two primary division of government: First, government by election and representation; secondly, government by hereditary succession". The former, Paine contends, is founded on the rights of the people, while the latter is founded on usurpation. Hereditary government, according to Paine, has not a right to exist (Adkins 124).

The following paragraph, by borrowing the writing of Eric Hiariej (22-23), based on its history, liberal democracy for the first time came up in amidst the attacks of opposition movements against political institutions of the Middle Age, which was considerably very hierarchical, under the authority of despotic kings. Under the lights of liberalism spirit, opposition movements attack the feudal monarchy system from two sides.

First were demanding the resign of the government and realizing the dream country, which provided every citizen a wide guarantee to express without intervention from the governing authority. This demand gradually grew into one important liberal democracy doctrine. The doctrine was that it is the right of each individual to fight for personal interests in politics, economy, social or whatever fields that relates to his everyday life.

Second, opposition movements in the Middle Age bravely disposed natural or supernatural rights as the source for the King's authority legitimating. On the contrary, the authority and competence of government or state relied on society's desires. In the popular words, sovereignty is much belonged to the people. The spirit of this sovereignty then encouraged the birth of ideas of representation to assure each chosen political leader having widely supported by the society (23)

Based on the data above, regardless of the section of the country, state, or community in which a person lives, Americans widely share values coming out of the collective national experience. These values, many articulated during the colonial era and having their roots in Western liberal political thought, continue to contour the way Americans look at government, think about their relationship to it, and define public problems.

Most basic liberal values are such as: (1) Popular sovereignty. It holds that political power resides in the people, not in the government itself. Government exists at the people's behest, and they can replace their elected representatives; (2). Limited government. It aims to prevent



government authority and discretion from being exercised arbitrarily or tyrannically; (3). The rule of law. It is that law applies to all equally; (4). Individual liberty. It holds that each individual is best positioned to decide what is in her own best interest; (5). Equality. It stipulates that all people have the right to equal protection under the law, and one person's vote counts the same as another's, regardless of personal circumstances (Payne and Nassar 19-20).

## A.2. GLOBALIZATION

Globalization is a process of national economic integration of nations into a global economic system. It involves the creation of at least one of the world economy that not only is the totality of the national economy, but a strong independent reality. The flow of capital, commodities, technology and large scale employment and long term state across the border, is the definition of the process of globalization.

Economics in America is familiar with the concept of capitalism. It is very interesting in collaborating with the globalization era because of some changes in line with the development of American capitalism itself. Besides, America is well known as an economic world order. There are some prominent issues dealing with the above statement. They are as follows: (1). The Bretton Woods Conference make America be de facto as a leader over the world due to international monetary system; (2). The significant position in every international institution such as PBB and World Bank; (3). And its social responsibilities such as Leaden Rule, Reward and Punishment, and Extraterritorial Laws

America and its alliances which adopt capitalism and democracy will get

big advantages to dominate the world free market. America fully realizes to build big power by creating global industries and strengthening the economic sector as significant factors in society and nation. When America's economy transformed into strong and ready to competitive with others, It needed an abroad market for its products. In fact, America did it for trade and imperialism.

Some cases prove that America as a super power country always shows its roles to make any hegemony other nations. At least, War in the Middle East is one of the ways for America to get its interest like military business as well as economical aspects. It is very impossible that America produces its military industries for domestic consumptions. It needs target consumerism. Middle East is primary target to bring about those goals. MIC (military Industrial Complex) is as a tool to get a big profit from a big business. Sometimes, conflict is made to change any society. The fact that private arms dealers do conduct a lot of business of military, the five largest arms exporters – the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, France, and China – are also the five permanent members of the United Nations Security Council. Theory of conflicts, Idealist, and Capitalism is always used by America to run its business easily.

## B. REFORM ERA, INDONESIAN DEMOCRACY AND CRISIS

### B.1. REFORM ERA

The reform movement began with the demand that Soeharto be replaced as president. Some political activists now say that economic crisis was a blessing in disguise because it would have been impossible to unseat Soeharto without it.



As the movement grew there began to be demands for more fundamental political changes. But the reform movement started as a moral force in its demands for these fundamental changes. Such demands are framed under a single target: to unseat President Soeharto. The president was seen as symbol of demoralized (Santoso 21)

The students were well aware that a genuine democratic election in 1999 would be the real institutional solution for the political and economic crisis. The holding of free elections was the top of the agenda in their political struggle. Related to this was the total abolition of military's dual-function role. The other main item at the top of their agenda was to investigate the wealth of Soeharto, and to make the former president stand trial. Replacement of Habibie administration also entered the students' agenda because they did not believe that his government, which was still controlled by Soeharto's cronies, could genuinely democratize the country (Budiman 46).

In short, Gus Dur was elected as the fourth President in free election in October 1999. In making a start on reform, one of Wahid's first presidential concerns was to build a team of people whom he trusted to oversee the process of reform and the management of government. A first official act was to abolish two government departments. He closed down the Ministry for Information, arguing that it did more harm than good, both because of Stalinist approach to the control of information and because of its entrenched practice of extorting from media outlets (Barton 360).

In the middle term, Gus Dur revoked the ban of communism and Marxism-Leninism. It made a controversial issue. Protesters took to

the streets. Newspaper and magazines were filled with analyses about communism. Political commentators said that the president should be dealing with more urgent issues. Some legislators even threatened to impeach him. In responding these reactions, he simply said that "Reopening debate about the events of 1965 can help the nation search for the truth"(Timberlake 1-2).

## B.2. INDONESIAN DEMOCRACY AND CRISIS

Discourse of Indonesian democracy can be divided into Parliamentary Democracy (1950-1959), Guided Democracy (1959-1965), *Pancasila* Democracy (1965 – 1998), and Democracy after Reform Era (1998-Nowadays). Upon independence from Dutch, Indonesia immediately introduced a form of liberal parliamentary democracy. In this system, political parties were the major actors and a free and fair general election was conducted in 1955. But the 1955 election yielded fragmented bodies without clear majorities. There were seven rotations of cabinet in this era such as Natsir, Sukiman, Wilopo, Ali Sastroamidjojo I, Burhanuddin, Ali Sastroamidjojo II, and Juanda (Soebiantoro 55).

Unstable cabinets and rotating prime ministers could not stop ethno-regional and religious tensions from escalating into civil war. The army and President Soekarno grew less and less willing to play secondary roles. In 1959, with army backing, President Soekarno dispersed the assembly and returned Indonesia to the strong executive constitution of 1945, calling his new system "Guided Democracy". In 1963 he had himself named president for life



Guided Democracy, later termed the Old Order, was in theory a tripod with Soekarno at the top. The legs were nationalist, religious and communist, each with its own main political party: respectively, the Indonesian National party (PNI), the Islamic Scholars' Revival, and the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). At the apex, Soekarno played one group off against another while insisting on national unity, as if by manipulation and exhortation he could bridge the country's pluralism with a single state (Suryadinanta 76).

The period of liberal democracy came to an end the imposition of martial law by Soekarno in 1957. According to President Soekarno, Western democratic practices were not appropriate for Indonesia. It was difficult to make decisions with the multi-party system. Because all levels of society participated in great numbers, the parliamentary system became overwhelmed with demands and became ineffective.

Meanwhile *Pancasila* Democracy, this term was well-known as New Order or Soeharto's regime. It might appear to be an extension of Soekarno's. Soeharto did decide to keep the Constitution of 1945 in force, including the article that assigns lawmaking authority to the president, subject to legislative assent. He also chose as the centerpiece of his New Order a formula, *Pancasila* or the five principles, that Soekarno himself had set forth in 1945. In 1985 all social and political organizations in Indonesia were obliged to endorse the five principles: monotheism, humanitarianism, unity, democracy, and justice. In his autobiography, President Soeharto says:

The democracy we need practice is *Pancasila*. Briefly its major

characteristics are its rejection of poverty, backwardness, conflicts, exploitation, capitalism, feudalism, dictatorship, colonialism, and imperialism. This is the policy I have chosen with confidence (193-194).

Like Soekarno's Guided Democracy, the New Order under Soeharto was authoritarian. There was no return to the relatively unfettered party policies of the 1950-57 period. In the decades after 1966, Soeharto's regime evolved into a steeply hierarchical affair, characterized by tight centralized control and long-term personal rule. At the top of the hierarchy was Soeharto himself, making important policy decisions and carefully balancing competing interests in a society that was, despite strong centralized rule, still extremely diverse. Arrayed below him was a bureaucratic state in which ABRI played the central role. Formally, the armed forces' place in society was defined in terms of the concept of *dwifungsi* (McKay 67).

President Soeharto of Indonesia, who came to power in 1965 after he led a military takeover of government, attempted to legitimize his authoritarian rule by building a strong economy. Soeharto's government insisted that people should minimize their difference and work together to develop the country. Indonesians agreed to accept fewer democratic rights in exchange for rapid economic development.

In Soeharto era, Indonesia has an economic success by getting *swasembada pangan*. At least, most Indonesians feel that they are secured in economic sector. As modernization theory suggest, Indonesia's economic success inevitably led to the increased



participation in the society. When Indonesia's economy collapsed, the government had not built a large enough reservoir of political legitimacy to convince people to remain loyal and to keep their side of the bargain. Ironically, Soeharto had developed Indonesia sufficiently to enable Indonesians to realize that economic development leads to greater demands for political development. In a way, his success was also a cause of his downfall. KKN also contributed to his demise (Santoso 25).

After the Soeharto's regime, Indonesia has committed itself to make a transition to democracy. Indonesia has committed itself to make a transition to democracy. Political reform is now accepted by governments that once strongly opposed any effort to allow the people to govern themselves. Several factors contributed to this shift. As countries achieved higher levels of economic development, the traditional foundations on which leaders based their power were weakened. International changes, especially the disintegration of the Soviet Union and the end of its control over eastern Europe, also speeded up the transition to democracy around the world.

After the reform era, some crisis still hit in economical and political sector. Corruption and cronyism were more widespread in our beloved country, Indonesia. In 1990s there was clearly an increase in nepotism in Indonesia. The corruption problem, however, is often misunderstood; the issue is not simply its role in generating moral hazard, but also its effect on governments' management of the crisis. We can see some unsolved cases in Indonesia. It shows that the power of government is questionable to solve these problems.

### C. HANDLING OF THE INDONESIAN CRISIS : A PERSPECTIVE

Seemingly, what is happening in the America is happening globally. I think that globalization itself is any product of America to hegemony. America offers us products of democracy and capitalism that can give peace and prosperity is still questionable until now. Globalization itself is a camouflage of capitalism with free trade. Not in order to be alienated from the inter-relation among nations, Indonesia must take and face it. It is very inevitably. Absolutely, Indonesia found difficulties in challenging the globalization era. It was a logical response cause Indonesia got it for once (unprepared).

If we see the success of China and India in facing the era, at least we have good efforts to competitive with them. Only by imitating without considering some aspects, ideology, for an example, it will be dangerous for the next economic climate. At least, in regional area, Indonesia tried liberalizing its economic to attract foreign investors with joining APEC and AFTA. Government believed that by liberalizing markets, industries, and companies, would be competitiveness internationally. But many government's policies were discriminative (not accompanied by certain group / sector from deregulation program). So there were no fair competitions at the time. Company puffed up, not it takes efficiency and competitions but it can control asset and economy sources because of privilege or KKN with the ruling class.

Orientation of globalization is to make division of work for getting efficiency. One indication that Indonesia has abandon workers with low salary in many manufacturing industries (sweatshop) like garment in a global production chain. Female workers dominate in Indonesia. They work in the home and in the fields, often putting in longer hours than the males, but at a fraction of men's pay and without education, training,



health, and safety protection. Women are far more likely than men to be displaced by technology, to work for subsistence rather than cash, to be illiterate, and to suffer from malnutrition. China and India have the same experiences in sweatshop firstly, but they can up-grade their industries fast. It is in contrast with Indonesia.

In facing this era, apparently, Indonesia faces many obstacles, moreover Indonesia economies continue to suffer from various economic ills preventing them to take advantages of opportunities offer by globalization and government tends to "taken for granted". It means that Indonesia lacks for the competitiveness. There are main obstacles that need to be waved so that Indonesia can take advantage of globalization are such as innovation capacity in high value added industries and services is very weak; oligopolistic structure of the private sector in which a few family owned groups largely dominates the modern segment of the economy; and high rates of unemployment, particularly among young people and people with academic background. How is to accelerate the economic change? Indonesia should take the following steps (alternatives): Defining agents of change; Defining issues and tools to be active; Linking the actors of change in a common strategy to taking advantage of globalization; and Exiting from the vicious circle of low productivity to the virtuous circle of high productivity and competitiveness on the global market

The above information describes in a brief of China and India from the viewpoint of global competition. We can take the characteristics shared by the two nations the factors that are important to Indonesian companies as they strive to increase their competitive advantage in world market. At a time when global competition is intensifying, China and India, using different strategies,

remain internationally competitive. China has supplied innovative products to global market. India decided on the global-operations strategy. Despite their different approaches, both China and India have successfully met the challenges of global competition.

The penetrating of globalization in this era is inevitably. Alienation from this phenomenon will put aside Indonesia from inter-relation among nations in the world. I am positive by learning some great experiences and histories from big countries will support us to have clear vision as a nation. Until now, Indonesia is still questionable "quo Vadis of Indonesia". See competitiveness with opportunity oriented not risk oriented. I am sure Indonesia still should (must) keep to learn. Some points that we can learn are such as visioning, positioning, strategy, government policy, and leader. It is absolutely essential that our creative endeavor should be directed towards the formulation of genuinely Indonesian solutions

The existence of American liberal democracy can seemingly not be ignored again. At least in Indonesia, when we saw some demonstrations, most militant activists frequently saying and defending the 'people's interest' generally do not want to excessively argue about the problem of democracy. To them, who the people is very obvious. The people are a lot of persons ruled by the authority. Structurally, the people are more specific, namely farmers, labors, urban poor, street children, street singers, beggars, jobless people, and other people whose life is suppressed and very difficult (Hiariej 9).

The following paragraphs still borrow the thought of Hiariej. Back to the issue of people that the activists are no need to argue complicatedly and refer to various confusing literatures to understand the people's government. To them, democracy is people's participation in the government, people's control to the government, people's freedom, press freedom, a fair and independent general election, openness, responsible government,



etc. To realize democracy, as the activists convinced, the people's critical consciousness must be risen up and organized well to fight against oppression.

Unconsciously, the activists' understanding come into perspective trap of liberal democracy, an ideology they frequently fight against. In formulating democracy, the liberal tradition might be said as the most initial, the sturdiest, having universal claim and global influence. These tradition followers generally understand procedural democracy by referring to the Schumpeter ideology saying that democracy covers three fundamental things: competition, participation and liberalization (the civil right guarantee and the politic of citizen).

Procedurally, this democracy covering those three indicators is institutionalized through the general election arena and two main political institutions: the parliament and the political parties. These are the basis of the idea birth and the institutionalization of representative democracy. General election is a competition arena to determine the leaders or representatives through political parties being the receptacle of articulation, aggregation, and people' participation.

Democracy, certainly, is the best government form, or at least it has the fewest weaknesses compared to other governmental forms. In Indonesia, the idea of liberal-stylist representative democracy has been accepted widely as a frame work of political system from national level to the village one. Indonesian people prefer democracy by voting based on one man one vote principal to model of deliberative democracy or *Pancasila* democracy.

A lot of people say that democracy of *Pancasila* is only jargon reproduced by New Order regime, whereas empirically, that regime is far from *Pancasila* idealism. *Pancasila* was ruined, and disgraced by New Order regime itself. A lot of people also did

not like deliberate democracy because the practice of decision making would be won by elite which power over the weak people.

In fact, democracy is government "by the people" but the survival of democracy rests on the shoulders of elites. It also happened in Indonesia. The irony of democracy in Indonesia is that elites, not masses, are most committed to democratic values. Despite a superficial commitment to the symbol of democracy, the Indonesian people have a surprisingly weak commitment to individual liberty, toleration of diversity and freedom of expression for those who would challenge the existing order.

In addition, based on its cultural background, Indonesia is in multicultural democracy so that it is very fragile by existing of the fundamentalist democracy. In order to get good understanding, people need to understand why change needs to happen. Moreover, "rule of law" in Indonesia is still questionable. Some big cases are still in "grey" area. Indonesia need be transparent in decision-making and implementation. Another obstacle is most Indonesian still believe that "morale" can be fixed rather than "rule of law".

Furthermore, democracy needs prosperity to bring about it. Indonesia is till processing it. Politics and economics are big factors in shaping democracy. Indonesia not only has no distinctive vision and mission, but also find difficulty which one is to be priority firstly. The fighting between those issues give the bad effects for its people. We often forget our great history. We can learn from America which is to be a superpower country because of its history. The North can be rich because of the South's plantation. Economics is to be priority first then democracy.

### III. CONCLUSION

Because of the differences and the similarities, America and Indonesia have



different form of democracy. America tends to liberal democracy because of its root of liberalism. Meanwhile Indonesia is eager to *Pancasila* democracy as ideology state. Even though in some cases, Indonesia also adopted liberal democracy. Therefore democracy is inevitable for all countries. In short, it proved that the definition of a concept as complex as democracy will inevitably be culturally based and historically conditioned. Therefore, Indonesia that emerged from colonialism after 1945 will have different perceptions of democracy that will America of long-established country. And a person's definition of democracy will be influenced by any number of other factors as well.

For Indonesia, although the gate for democracy is open, it is not opened very wide. Indonesia has to face some facts, two of them are feudalism and patron-client relationships. They remain strong factors governing the political behavior of the public, and hampering the rise of independent political institutions. The prospects for democracy in Indonesia

depends very much on the initiatives of the governing elites. Efforts are needed to spread political education, to allow more political participation, to get rid of KKN (corruption, collusion and nepotism), and continuously establish political institutions needed for democracy to work. In short, democracy in Indonesia is forced. It is not a well-planned strategy.

In facing the era of globalization, education has also a significant role in preparing of qualified human resources with the mastery of science and technology with keeping good morality and strong religion. Education shortly is a form of long-term investment. Therefore education system is expected to play a central role in generating new knowledge to increase the Nation's competitiveness based on local wisdom and diversity of resources as well as access and adapt global knowledge to local use. Finally, it is also expected to contribute to the process of shaping a democratic, civilized, and inclusive society, maintaining national integration through its role as moral force.

## REFERENCES

- Adkins, Nelson F. Ed. *Dissertation on First Principles of Government*. By Thomas Paine. New York: Liberal Art Press, 1953. Print.
- Barton, Greg. *The Impact of Neo-Modernism on Indonesian Islamic Thought: The Emergence of a New Pluralism*. Victoria: Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University, 1994. Print.
- , *The Authorized Biography of Abdurrahman Wahid*. Trans. Lie Hua. Australia: UNSW, 2002. Print.
- Budiman, Arif. The 1988. *Crisis: Change and Continuity in Indonesia*. Reformasi: Crisis and Change in Indonesia. Australia: Monash Asia Institute, 1999. Print.
- Bruce, Steve. *Fundamentalisme: Pertautan Sikap Keberagaman dan Modernitas*. Trans., Herbhayu A dan Noerlambang. Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga, 2000. Print.



- Dahl, Robert A. *Modern Political Analysis*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1970. Print.
- Dye, Thomas R. and L. Harmon Zeigler. *The Irony of Democracy: An Uncommon Introduction to American Politics*. ed. 6th. Monterey, California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company, 1984. p.3-4. Print.
- Dewey, John. "Democracy and Educational Administration". School and Society. April 3, 1937. Print.
- Fukuyama, Francis. "The End of History and the Last Man." Journal of Democracy. Vol. 3. No. 2, April 1992. Print.
- Gilley, Bruce. "Is Democracy Possible". Journal of Democracy. January 2009, Volume 20, Number 1. Print .
- Held, David. *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1987. Print.
- McKay, David. *American Politics and Society*. 6th ed. USA: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2005. Print.
- Murwantono, Didik. *Thomas Jefferson and Gus Dur on Democracy*. Yogyakarta: Graduate School Gadjah Mada University, 2009. Print.
- Paine, Thomas. "Common Sense". The Norton Anthology of American Literature. Ed. Baym, Nina, et.al., Ed. 3rd. Vol. I, 1989. Print.
- Payne, Richard J. and Jamal R. Nasser. *Politics and Culture in the Developing World*. New York: Pearson Education, Inc. 2003. Print.
- Santoso, Amir. "Democratization: The Case of Indonesia's New Order" Democratization in Southeast and east Asia. Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1997. Print.
- Soeharto. *My Thoughts, Words and Deeds: and Autobiography*. Ed. Muti'ah Lestimo. Trans. Sumadi. Jakarta: Citra Lamtoro Gung Persada, 1991. Print.
- Soebiantoro, M. Et al. "Perkembangan Demokrasi di Indonesia: Analisis Hubungan Legeslatif dan Eksekutif 1950 – 1992." BPPS-UGM. 10 (1A), Februsri 1997. Print.
- Suryadinata, Leo. *Military Ascendancy and Political Culture: The Study of Indonesia's Golkar*. USA: Ohio University Press, 1992. Print.
- Todd, Lewis P. and Merle Curti. *Rise of The American Nation*. Ed. 3rd. USA: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich. Print.
- Timberlake, Ian. "Indonesian Split over Legalization of Communism". The Washington Time, May 12, 2000. (www. Questia.com)