

PROBLEMATICS OF MULTIPARTY SYSTEMS IN INDONESIA

Aditya Putera Adiguna¹, Rifaid², Zaldi Rusnaedy³

¹Magister Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta, Indonesia

²Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Administrasi Mataram, Indonesia

³Universitas Pancasakti Makassar, Indonesia

Email : rifaid@stiamataram.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Political parties are not only an important part of the many functions they carry out such as representation, recruitment and outreach, but there are complex relationships between parties and form work systems in their political practice. Party system is an analysis to examine party behavior as part of a system, that is, how each party interacts with each other. The party system consists of single parties, dual parties and multiparty parties. This paper tries to identify various kinds of problems caused by the application of a multiparty system by using literature studies based on upstream research. Indonesia is a democratic country that adopts a multiparty system in its political activities which is characterized by the many parties competing for government power. A multiparty system when combined with a presidential government system raises various problems, such as the possibility of electing a minority president, too many parties joining the coalition to become a fat coalition, and the stability of the government is disrupted.

Keywords: Presidential System, Multiparty System, Indonesian.

ABSTRAK

Partai politik tidak hanya merupakan bagian penting dari banyak fungsi yang dilakukan seperti perwakilan, rekrutmen dan penjangkauan, tetapi ada hubungan yang kompleks antara partai-partai dan pembentukan sistem kerja dalam praktik politik. Sistem kepartaian adalah analisis untuk memeriksa perilaku partai sebagai bagian dari suatu sistem, yaitu bagaimana masing-masing pihak berinteraksi satu sama lain. sistem kepartaian terdiri dari partai tunggal, dwi-partai dan partai multipartai. Artikel ini mencoba mengidentifikasi berbagai jenis masalah yang disebabkan oleh penerapan sistem multipartai dengan menggunakan studi literatur berdasarkan penelitian terdahulu. Indonesia adalah negara demokratis yang mengadopsi sistem multipartai dalam kegiatan politiknya yang ditandai oleh banyak pihak yang bersaing untuk mendapatkan kekuasaan pemerintah. Sistem multipartai ketika digabungkan dengan sistem pemerintahan presidensial menimbulkan berbagai masalah, seperti kemungkinan memilih presiden minoritas, terlalu banyak partai yang bergabung dalam koalisi untuk menjadi koalisi yang gemuk, dan stabilitas pemerintahan terganggu.

Kata kunci: Sistem Presidensial, Sistem Multipartai, Indonesia

INTRODUCTION

Democracy is one of the political systems adopted by various countries around the world. Democracy comes from the Greek language which consists of two words namely "demos" which means people and "cratos" which means sovereignty or power. The democratic (demos-cratos) is a political system within a country which means that government sovereignty is in the hands of the people, the highest authority is in the people's decision (Heywood, 2014). Democracy can simply be defined as a form of government derived from the people, implemented by the people, and for the benefit of the people. Democracy is identical with people's power (government by the people), meaning that people have the right to be involved in running the government system in a country (Budiardjo, 2013).

A democratic political system is characterized by the existence of political parties which serve as vehicle to people's participation and expression of their aspirations. Political parties in modern democratic systems are institutions which have important role that cannot be replaced by any institution even by elements of civil society (source?). The political parties become an inescapable necessity that is difficult to imagine how a representative democracy can proceed without the existence of political parties. The existence of political parties becomes an indicator of the degree of country democracy. The political parties become a structure that strengthens the building of democracy, while the democratic system provides space for the parties to play its essential functions in the life of society, nation, and state (Sulaksono, 2016).

In a democratic country, political parties operate and are in a certain party system. The party system was mentioned by Maurice Duverger in his book "Political Parties", which explains that the party system is an analysis to examine the ways of political parties to interact with other parties (Budiardjo, 2013). The party system provides an overview of the structure of competition that may occur between several political parties in an effort to gain a power (Jumadi, 2015).

Indonesia is one of the countries that embrace the democratic system in running the turns of government. The democratic system adopted by Indonesia is a democracy which

based on *Pancasila*. Democracy in Indonesia is practically carried out by using a multiparty system, which means that there are many competing parties to gain governmental power. Multiparty system is the right pattern to be used by the Republic of Indonesia because this system accommodates a country that has a variety of cultures, when compared to the dual-party system. The diversity of political culture in a society encourages choices towards this multiparty system.

The multiparty system is characterized by competition among more than two parties. In this system, there is the opportunity to reduce the chances of forming a government that is controlled by one party only and It has the opportunity to increase the formation of coalitions (Heywood, 2014). When the multiparty system is linked to a parliamentary system of government tends to place full power in the parliament/legislative body, so that the executive role is going to be weak. This is caused by no one party that is capable and strong enough to build a government by themselves, so that the impact is the most voted parties in the election must create with coalition with other parties in order to run a stable government (Budiardjo, 2013). In its implementation, government must always prioritize deliberation and compromise.

The concept of a coalition is generally an alliance between several political parties on the basis of common interests and goals to gain power (Haris, 2016). Heywood (2014) also describes that the coalition is a group formed by competing political actors who are united by a common goal and through recognition that these goals cannot be achieved if it is done separately.

The multiparty system in Indonesia is combined with a presidential system in running its government. The constitution explicitly regulates a government system that refers to presidential systems (source). The presidential system is a system in the governance at the central level that centralizes the executive in the hands of a president, meaning that a president has multiple positions as head of government and head of the countries. Executive power is stronger than legislative power (Budiardjo, 2013). A multiparty system when combined with a presidential system is considered incapable and failed to create a stable and effective government when compared to a parliamentary

system of government with a two-party system. Jumadi (2015) assumed that the failure is caused by various things, namely:

1. The election of the President and members of the House of Representatives are carried out separately. Therefore, allowing the election of a minority president, who does not get the support of the majority in parliament.
2. The personality and individual capacity of a president are to manage the support of the party coalition and the weakness of the president to communicate with the parliament.
3. The creation of coalition is a coalition that is not binding and non-permanent, because the coalition party may withdraw its support for the government before its term ends.
4. The coalition is too large, because there are many political parties participating in the general election so that the coalition involves many political parties. The government system from the coalition process is not effective, because of the large number of political parties incorporated into a coalition, the government party must consider various interests of all political parties.

Based on the description above, this paper aims to identify the multiparty system that applied in Indonesia starting from the Old Order Era, the New Order and Reformation Era. It is not only focusing on the identification of multiparty systems itself. In addition, this paper also aims to identify various types of problems caused by the application of multiparty systems which combined with a presidential government system using the literature study methods.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

a. Old Order Multiparty System

The Old Order era was noticeable by the strengthening of President Soekarno's position as a lifetime president through the TAP MPR No III / 1963 (Budiardjo, 2013). After Indonesia's independence in 1945, there were debates carried out by the founding fathers about the direction of the party system that would be implemented in Indonesia. There was a debate between Soekarno and Hatta about the ideal party system. Soekarno wanted the Indonesian National Party to be designated as a single party under the presidential

government system, while Hatta argued that democracy required political parties that necessitated the involvement of the people in its formation. Although Soekarno initially won the Indonesian National Party (PNI) by the Indonesian Proclamation Committee on August 22, 1945, the party was quickly disbanded on September 1, 1945. While it was not effective, Indonesia was implemented single-party system indirectly (Sulaksono, 2016).

Indonesia after gaining independence began to implement multiparty system, although it is in different level and qualities. During the period of Parliamentary Democracy (1945-1959), Indonesia implemented a multiparty system with a high level of competition, while in the period of Guided Democracy (1959-1965), despite practicing a multi-party system, it was only the number and absence of competition in the power struggle of the government because of the existing political parties have no role (Romli, 2011). In the Old Order Era, ideology of political parties in Indonesia was divided into three, namely Nationalist, Religion, and Communist or better known as NASAKOM. Based on the major party of the Old Order, nationalist political parties were represented by the PNI, while the religious political party was represented by an Islamic party consisting of Masyumi and PNI, the communist party was represented by the Indonesian Communist Political Party (Martini, 2010).

General Election in 1955 with 28 political parties, which produced a map of political power consisting of PNI (57 seats), Masyumi (57 seats), NU (45 seats) and PKI (39 seats). The General Election Cabinet was a coalition consisting of two major parties namely the coalition between PNI and Masyumi (Budiardjo, 2013).

Table 1.
Result of 1955 Election

No	Party Name	Number of Votes	Number of Seats
1	PNI	8.434.653	57
2	Masyumi	7.903.886	57
3	NU	6.955.141	45
4	PKI	6.176.914	39

Source: (Budiardjo, 2013)

b. New Order Multiparty System

The New Order period was noticeable by Soeharto's leadership which dominated power and political life in Indonesia which began in 1967 until 1998. According to Romli

(2011) political parties were used as political "machines" by the rulers during the New Order, so that political parties were emphasized on behalf of customers with power of authority (status quo). President Soeharto succeeded in gaining the position of President after successfully overthrowing the Soekarno's government which was the "founding father" of Indonesia. President Soeharto in his position as president was supported by a political party called *Golongan Karya (GOLKAR)*. *Golongan Karya Party* managed to control the government for approximately 26 years and there were no opposition parties or parties that opposed the government policies. Since the establishment of the Golkar Party in 1971, they have always emerged as winners with a majority of votes in a row in every General Election held in the New Order era. This Golkar Party becomes the government ruling party (Pratiwi, 2012).

Political parties inherited from the Old Order were systematically uninvolved so that the country was able to build a hegemonic party system that made Golkar (a government party) became a political engine which supported the continuity of government power from one period to the next period. In addition, besides Golkar, there are two parties that exist during that period, namely *Partai Persatuan Pembangunan (PPP)* and *Partai Indonesia Perjuangan (PDI)*. However, its existence was not able to provide significant resistance and balancing power for the Golkar hegemony and the ruling government. Both of the parties were merely placed as complementary instruments in the constellation of the New Order party system (Sulaksono, 2016).

Table 2.
Number of Voters Golkar Party in New Order

No	Election Period	Result
1	General Elections 1977	62,1%
2	General Elections 1982	63,9%
3	General Elections 1987	73,1%
4	General Elections 1992	68,1%
5	General Elections 1997	74,5%

Source: Pratiwi, 2012.

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that during the New Order, Golkar managed to win the General Election in a row. This means that the Golkar Party is a dominant party. The dominant party system is actually different from a single party system,

although sometimes it shows similar characteristics. The dominant party system is a system in which there is a competitive atmosphere and there are a number of competing parties to gain power in regular elections. A prominent feature is showed a competitive atmosphere, it is dominated by a single major party so that the party has longest period of power (Heywood, 2014).

The party atmosphere in the New Order regime was felt to be less competitive and the opposition was weak in conducting checks and balances against the government party. The Golongan Karya positioned itself as the dominant party that controlled the Indonesian government, in addition to other parties namely PPP and PDI (Martini, 2010). This Golkar domination was supported by Soeharto's policies with the effort to politicize the bureaucracy which was carried out from the central level to the regional level, even to the village level by requiring the government apparatus to become a instructor and member of Golkar. The bureaucrats are obliged to write a stamped statement which essentially means that the bureaucrats will not become members of any political party. Actually this applies to PPP, PDI and Golkar, but the fact is that the candidates for bureaucrats are directed to become members of Golkar because Golkar does not recognize as a political party (Martini, 2010). Bureaucratic politicization during the New Order under Soeharto's leadership was then known as the monoloyalty policy (Pratiwi, 2012).

Implementation of monoloyalty policy for state apparatuses conducted during the New Order period indirectly can create stability of government. Nevertheless, the application of this monoloyalty policy the ruler may utilize the performance of the bureaucracy for the benefit of his own ruler, not for the people. The central government can launch various development programs as it gets the full support of the bureaucracy that is loyal to Golkar. This is different from the Old Order era which was very difficult to increase development because bureaucratic members were divided into various political affiliations, especially Nationalist, Religion, and Communist-based political parties (Martini, 2010).

c. Reform Period Multiparty System

The Reformation period can be said to begin after the collapse of the New Order regime under the leadership of Soeharto who served for 26 years. President Soeharto's

position after announcing his resignation in May 1998 was then continued by his vice president at the time, Habibie. For approximately 26 years, the party atmosphere in Indonesia seems less competitive because there is only one party that controls the government in absolute and the absence of opposition parties in this regime. There was pressure to renew political life to be more democratic (Budiardjo, 2013). The expected change is the creation of a system that shows the absence of domination by political parties and to prevent the occurrence of a very strong executive role (executive heavy).

The General Election in 1999 was the first period of a multiparty system began to be recognized in Indonesia, as evidence by the emergence of variety of political parties competing in General Election 1999. At the beginning of the reform number of political parties reached 184 parties, 141 of which obtained approval from the government as a legal entity. Based on the number of political parties that were approved, those eligible to compete in the election for the get power in parliament through the General Election 1999 are only 48 political parties (Romli, 2011).

Table 3.
Vote for the 1999 General Election

Party	Number of Votes	%	Number of Seats	%
PDIP	35.689.073	33,74%	153	33,11
Golkar	23.741.749	22,44%	120	25,97%
PPP	11.329.905	10,71%	58	12,55%
PKB	13.336.982	12,61%	51	11,03%
PAN	7.528.956	7,12%	34	7,35%
PBB	2.049.708	1,93%	13	2,81%

Source: KPU RI (Budiardjo, 2013)

The table above revealed that the absence of one party that could dominate in the General Election 1999, resulted to? A coalition party? the vote was divided into a number of political parties with the top six in the vote was PDIP (153 seats), Golkar (120 seats), PPP (58 seats), PKB (51 seats), PAN (34 seats), and UN (13 seats). The election of the President was made by the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) which appointed by Abdurrahman Wahid (Gusdur) as the fourth President of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, the votes and seats obtained by PDIP was superior compared to the vote of PKB (Gusdur Political Party).

The fundamental problem in the governance of multiparty systems in Indonesia during the reform period is the ideology of these parties. Each political party is formed based on the ideology which is to be used as the basis and purpose of the party. Their ideology shows the identity of a political party (Romli, 2016). In general, political parties residing in Indonesia can be classified on the basis of their ideology, namely the party with the ideology of Nationalism, the party with the ideology of Islam, and the party with the ideology of Democratic Socialism. Based on these three ideologies, the majority of existing political parties base themselves on the ideology of Nationalism (Pancasila) and Islam. The role of this ideology is to be a guide for the society in determining the choice in the election which became known as ideology identification (Romli, 2011).

The election 1999 was the first general election to be held in the post-New Order era or known as the Reformation era. At that time all circles were given the green light to establish political parties. The freedom to establish a political party was accompanied by the emergence of new parties that reached up to 184 parties and 141 of them gained approval as legal entities. These 48 political parties were eligible to participate in the 1999 Election.

Table 4.
Number of Parties in the General Election After the New Order/Reformation

No.	Elections Period	Number of Party	Number of Party Getting a Seat
1	1999 General Elections	48	21
2	2004 General Elections	24	16
3	2009 General Elections	38	9

Source: Wiyono, 2009.

Based on the table above, it can be concluded that after the collapse of the New Order era noticeable by the General Election process in 1999 showed that political parties began to emerge and political parties could freely participate in elections without any concern about the domination of government by one party only. This is because the multiparty system used in Indonesia allows competition among many parties.

Multiparty system when combined with presidential system causes the role of individual character of a president is considered more prominent than the role of groups, organizations, or political parties. Therefore, the presidential office is only held by a person

elected by the people in the election which means that the president is directly responsible to the people. However, the reality is when a multiparty system is combined with a presidential government system which comes ineffective resulting government (Sari, 2012).

The presidential institutional problems in Indonesia are almost experienced by all pre-principals. President Abdurrahman Wahid in 1999-2001, and President Megawati in 2001-2004. During the leadership of Abdurrahman Wahid (Gusdur) and Megawati, and President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono in 2004. President Gusdur (PKB), Megawati (PDI-P), and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (Democrats) were basically minority presidents because their political party bases were not achieving a majority vote in parliamentary seats (DPR) (Haris, 2016). Therefore, the three Presidents formed a coalition called the cabinet by inviting other parties to support the power of the government party. The National Unity Cabinet was a coalition formed during the leadership of Gusdur, the Gotong Royong Cabinet was formed during Megawati's leadership, the Indonesian Cabinet was united during the leadership of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, and the Great Indonesian Cabinet during the leadership of President Joko Widodo (Isra, 2009).

There are several things that affect the multiparty system of presidential system in Indonesia during the era of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's government of 2004-2009 (Sari, 2012), namely: *First*, the fragility of coalition ties in the DPR. Coalition is a thing that must be done by a political party in a multiparty system adopted by Indonesia to secure its power in the legislative. The first coalition in Indonesian history occurred during the General Election in 2004 which was the direct election of the president and vice president by the people. There are 24 parties and one party can nominate its own president, Golkar Party gained voters with total national voters reaching 21.58% and 128 seats, while the Democrat Party's voters only 7.45% and 57 seats. The elected President and Vice President are candidates from the coalition of the Democratic Party and Golkar Party. In order to secure all policies, the SBY-JK government is required to form a coalition in the Legislature (DPR), because the function of supervision and budget is the authority of the House of representation. This caused the SBY-JK government have to accommodate the interests of political parties.

Second, the effectiveness of the government is disrupted due to excessive oversight by the DPR. Quantitatively, the coalition forced supporting the government called KIB (United Indonesia Cabinet) control the majority of seats in the DPR reaching 73.3%. The combined vote between the Golkar Party and the Democratic Party as a ruling party is only 33% in the DPR seats, less than the combined vote of the supporting party which reached 37%. Coalitions formed between government parties and government support parties are included in the category of large coalitions, though this coalition is fragile. In the period 2004-2009, political parties coalition supported the government in the House of Representatives which also sued various government policies through the use of interpellation rights and the right of inquiry. Consequently, the time, energy, and attention of the government and the DPR were seized to resolve political conflicts and tensions in executive-legislative relations.

Third, the dominating power of government rested with the position of Vice President. This is due to the imbalance between the party president and vice president party in the parliamentary seat so that the elected president position becomes weaker because it depends on the party of his deputy. President Yudhoyono was only relied on 7.3 seats in the House of Representatives then his position as president is powerless, unlike Jusuf Kalla supported by 21.8% of Golkar Party votes in parliament so that his power is in a safe position. The political effect that occurred the role of Vice President is seen more prominently in the strategic role in running the stability of government. For example, when the Aceh Independent Movement rebellion took place, Vice President Jusuf Kalla was active in resolving this conflict without the consent of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono.

CONCLUSIONS

In the New Order era, Indonesia had used a multiparty system in the General Election activity which was conducted to determine the power of the president and parliamentarians. Political parties recognized by the government in the New Order era were only 3 political parties, namely Golkar, PPP and PDI. The reality that occurs despite recognizing a multiparty system, the power of the government and the General Election are only controlled by one party that dominates. It is very strong in its position so that it

dominates the Indonesian government for approximately 26 years. The dominating party (The Ruling Party) was the Golkar Party which won the General Election five times in a row. This domination was inseparable from the role of President Soeharto, who at that time politicized the bureaucracy which obliged bureaucrats to submit and become Golkar members from the central level to the regional level and even to the village level. This policy is more popularly known as monoloyalty policy.

In the reform era, the party that dominated the government no longer exists. This can be proved in the 1999 General Election which was the first election to be conducted directly, placing Golkar in second place. Golkar's dominance began to be weakened in line with the spirit of a change in political activity that was more democratic, noticeable by the emergence of new political parties, the multiparty system had been implemented purely. The problem that arises after the multiparty system implementation is combined with a presidential system of government, it will lead to an ineffective and unstable government. The main problem arising from the multiparty system combined with the presidential system is the coalitions.

REFERENCE

- Budiardjo, M. (2013). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik* (Edisi Revisi). Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Tama.
- Haris, S. (2016). Koalisi dalam Sistem Demokrasi Presidensial Indonesia: Faktor-Faktor Kerapuhan Koalisi Era Presiden Yudhoyono. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 8(1), 14.
- Heywood, A. (2014). *Politik* (Edisi Keempat). Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Isra, S. (2009). Pemilihan Presiden Langsung dan Problematik Koalisi dalam SistemPresidensial. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 2(1), 107.
- Jumadi. (2015). Pengaruh Sistem Multi Partai dalam Pemerintahan di Indonesia. *Al Daulah: Jurnal Hukum Pidana dan Ketatanegaraan* 4(1), 140-150
- Martini, R. (2010). Politisasi Birokrasi di Indonesia. *POLITIKA Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 1(1), 67-74.
- Pratiwi, Y. (2012). Analisis Perolehan Suara Partai Golkar Pada Pemilu 1999 di Indonesia. *Jurnal Dinamika Politik*, 1(1).

- Purnomo, E. P., & Sulaksono, T. (2012). Asymmetric Democracy in Indonesia: Democracy Without Governor Direct Election. *SSRN Electronic Journal*.
<https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2087643>
- Romli, L. (2011). Reformasi Partai Politik dan Sistem Kepartaian di Indonesia. *Jurnal Politica*, 2(2), 22.
- Sari, S. Y. (2012). Sistem Multipartai di Era Pemerintahan Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono 2004-2009. *Dinamika Politik*, 1(01). Diambil dari
<https://jurnal.usu.ac.id/index.php/dpol/article/download/477/223>
- Sulaksono, T. (2016). Menggugat Relasi Partai Politik dan Demokrasi di Indonesia Pasca Orde Baru.
- Wiyono, S. (2009). Pemilu Multipartai dan Stabilitas Pemerintahan Presidensial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 1, 7-23.