

# Bureaucratic Stagnation Versus the New Hope of the President of the Republic of Indonesia Joko Widodo

Bambang Istianto  
STIAMI, Jakarta, Indonesia

The process of bureaucratic services that is slow and complicated, is an administration malpractice even up to bureaucratic stagnation. An interesting phenomenon is done by the populist government leader Joko Widodo, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, when serving as the Governor of Jakarta to carry out supervision by way of “blusukan”. This method attracted the attention of one of the richest men from the United States, the founder of “Facebook”—Mark Zuckerberg. When he came to Indonesia to meet Joko Widodo in October 2014, he was invited by Joko Widodo to perform “blusukan” to Tanah Abang market. “Blusukan” is a surveillance method to the field on the right target and directly provide solutions to any problems that are found. The blusukan inspired him with the making of various policies such as health cards, smart cards, and others. The method of direct supervision on the fields is a quite powerful way to cut off the stagnation of bureaucracy. Joko Widodo who has started his steps as the President of the Republic of Indonesia, gives new hope to the people through the mental revolution and Trisakti doctrine policies in order to improve the welfare of the people toward the great Indonesia.

*Keywords:* mental revolution, trisakti doctrine, bureaucracy, public policy, public services

Within the scope of the paradigm of public administration, “public policy” is the focus, while “government bureaucracy” is the locus of the public administration. This means that the government bureaucracy is an organ and instrument of carrying out the state policy and the government in order to achieve the state’s goals efficiently and effectively. The government bureaucracy as a system according to Istianto (2011), consists of elements which are the human resources of the apparatuses, government organizations, mechanisms and procedures or management as well as infrastructures or working facilities. While the “bureaucracy” according to Mas’ud Said (2007),

Is a system of administration and execution of daily tasks structured in a hierarchical system that is obviously done with the written rules (written procedures) carried out by a particular section separated from another section by the chosen person because of the ability and expertise in their field.

Furthermore, according to Almond dan Powel (1966), “The governmental bureaucracy is a group of formally organized offices and duties, linked in a complex, regarding subordinates to the formal role makers”. Similar with Lance Castles (Priyo, 1993), bureaucracy is mean clanked people who are charge with the function of government, the army officer, the military bureaucracy, are of course included.

---

**Corresponding author:** Bambang Istianto, Ph.D., lecturer, Department of Public Policy, the post graduate program of Mandala Indonesia Science Administration Institute (STIAMI); research fields: public administrator, public policy, public management, governance political bureau, and public private partnership. E-mail: bambang.istianto58@gmail.com.

The explanations of the bureaucracy in the implementation process of administration essentially cannot be separated from the basic element, namely human resources. Therefore, the human resources of the bureaucratic apparatuses have a central role toward the good or bad profile of the government bureaucracy. The implementation of bureaucratic services which is efficient and effective or facing the bureaucratic stagnation is highly dependent on the quality of the human resources of the bureaucratic apparatuses. The criteria and quality standards of the human resources of the bureaucratic apparatuses are competent for the position, having integrity, honest, unpretentious, living simply, and close to the people they serve.

As described in the abstract that the main problem of governance, especially in bureaucratic services is “bureaucratic stagnation”. “The stagnation of bureaucracy” means a failure in the duties and functions of public sector services optimally for example: in education, health, public space, public housing, and other public facilities. The stagnation of bureaucracy resulting in excesses among others: first, the proliferation of slums in big and medium cities; second, the health and nutrition of people are low; third, the wild squatting of many locations and even along the river which passes through the city of Jakarta; fourth, the spatial arrangement is irregular; fifth, the city environment is in disorder, tremendous traffic congestions in Jakarta and suburbs; sixth, the proliferation of street children and school dropouts; seventh, the increase of the urban poor, especially squatting on the slums in Jakarta.

During his tenure as the governor of Jakarta, Joko Widodo made a breakthrough with a very popular style called “blusukan”. The method of “blusukan” is actually to directly supervise the location of the target and directly provide the solutions. By the way of this blusukan, several populist policies were made such as “The Villages of the Row Houses”, the rehabilitation of the lakes and reservoirs with landscaped gardens, the health cards and the smart cards, and others. With the breakthroughs, in fact, they are powerful enough to cut off the bureaucratic stagnation. Joko Widodo’s blusukan style that lasted for two years was ultimately increasing his popularity and delivering him to becoming the President of the Republic of Indonesia. New hope has emerged from all the people who pin their hopes on the policies of “mental revolution and Trisakti doctrine” which are expected to make changes toward a more prosperous people in a fair and equitable way. As described in the abstract, “mental revolution” is an attempt to fundamentally change the mentality of the Indonesian people, especially the leaders at all levels. The mental change will result in Indonesian people who are friendly, polite, virtuous, honest, tenacious, hardworking, having strong integrity, competent, and professional. The doctrine of “Trisakti” is the three steps of the strategic policy, namely: political sovereignty, economic self-sufficiency or self-reliance, and cultured personality.

The future goals and new expectations of the above are almost certain to face a lot of obstacles and challenges from the political, economic, and socio-cultural aspects especially the bureaucracy. In the context of this topic, it focuses on the aspects of the bureaucratic stagnation with the new president’s hopes. As described above which explains some of the actual phenomena that come from a result of “bureaucratic stagnation” that affects the appearance of negative effects as mentioned above. The reality of the condition will be faced by the Indonesian President, Joko Widodo, who has given new hope to the people: “The Mental Revolution and the Trisakti Doctrine”.

### **Bureaucracy and State Ideology**

On the other hand, the bureaucracy is a sub-system of the state and the government, so the profile of bureaucracy is in line with the set policy along with the state ideology. The profile of bureaucracy is a form or

characteristic in carrying out the government in accordance with the policy of the state and state ideology so, it becomes the identity which is able to distinguish from others. For example, if a country adheres to the ideology of liberal capitalism, the profile of the bureaucracy will be congruent with the wishes and the spirits of that ideology. One of the characteristics of the ideology of liberal capitalism is the “Freedom” of the people in running their daily life such as in political, economic, and socio-cultural aspects. Therefore, the profile of bureaucracy is characterized as follows: democratic, decentralized, transparent, egalitarian, active-creative, independent, participatory, secularistic, top-down without any gaps. Similarly, if a country adheres to the ideology of socio-communism, the profile of the bureaucracy will be concurrent with the ideology. The ideology of communism as the antithesis of the liberal capitalism ideology so surely the profile of the bureaucracy in that country will be different even contradictory. For example, the profile of bureaucracy in communist or socialist countries in general is characterized as follows: closed, authoritarian, and centralized.

As it is known that both ideologies above have expanded throughout the countries of Europe, Asia, and Africa. These ideologies are certainly coloring the ideology of the states that once were their colonies or their satellite regions. Therefore, both the profiles of government bureaucracy are often used as a comparative study in the science of the state administration. In general, countries that follow the ideology of liberal capitalism with the open, democratic, and decentralized profile of bureaucracy have high performance in organizing and providing public services to their citizens. Therefore, the level of their well-being and economic ability is better than the countries that follow the ideology of socio-communism which in general are poor. For example, South Korea’s level of well-being and economic ability is very much different from North Korea’s, in South Korea, most of the economic life of the people is much better than that in North Korea.

Indonesia, as a major country in Asia, historically has experienced Dutch colonialism for 350 years and Japanese colonialism for 3.5 years. In the colonial era of Dutch, the lives of indigenous people also experienced a variety of influences of the major ideological struggles among the liberal capitalism, socio-communism, and religions, especially Islam, Catholicism, and Protestant. As known in the annals of the “founding fathers” fighting for the independence of the Republic of Indonesia and having experienced “contemplation” from the various influences of the world’s major ideologies. So when building a sovereign state with the wisdom of the “founding fathers”, we have been successful to put the strong state ideology, namely: “Pancasila”. Pancasila is the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia: first, the believe in one God; second, humanity that is just and civilized; third, the unity of Indonesia; fourth, democracy guided by the wisdom of representative deliberation; and fifth, social justice for all Indonesians. The originator or the giver of the name of Pancasila ideology is Ir. Sukarno who had colored the history of Indonesia was the proclinator of the independence of the Republic of Indonesia.

The contents of the state political doctrine: first, political sovereignty; second, economic self-sufficiency; and third, cultured personality. According to Istanto (2014), the ideals of “Trisakti” were ever realized through several policies when Sukarno came to power after “The Presidential Decree” in 1959 as the head of state and head of government namely: first, in 1960, Indonesia was out of the United Nations (UN) and established Ganevo as the embryo of the non-aligned movement; second, in 1964, a policy of “nationalization” of foreign companies and also to renegotiate the contract with PT. Freeport, struggling for 50% (fifty-fifty) of the result for the Indonesian government; third, at the same time, Sukarno issued a policy refusing foreign aids with a very famous speech of “Go to Hell With Your Aids”; fourth, in 1963, Soekarno’s policy repatriated the expatriates of Chinese citizens to their country. Some of above policies were the attempts of Soekarno to realize

the idea of Trisakti in order that Indonesians could be a great country which would have a political sovereignty and economic independence as well as the personality of the Indonesian culture.

However, the new ideas had not been realized because in 1965, a great revolt broke out and rocked the world and it was known as the September 30 Movement of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The tragedy of the killing of a hundred thousand or more people ended the power of Soekarno as the President of Indonesia. In the history books, the tragedy was written by many historians and individuals in various versions according to their political points of view.

The discussion of the bureaucratic relations with the ideology described above tries to determine the extent of a state policy based on the ideology carried out by the government leaders influencing the profile of the bureaucracy. Because the era of the present Indonesian Government has reintroduced the doctrine of “Trisakti”. As it is known that the doctrine of Trisakti has reappeared and become well-known in many scientific discussions because of being the main material of the vision and mission of the presidential candidate in the debate held for the 2014 presidential election. The conveyors of the Trisakti doctrine were Joko Widodo and Mohamad Yusuf Kalla, who were the elected president and vice-president of the Republic of Indonesia. Thus, the thesis that can be submitted is the bureaucratic profile substantially influenced by the ideology brought by the leaders of the government.

If the elected government leaders are professional and competent as well as having statesmanship, so they will influence the bureaucracy profile. This means that the quality of the government leaders is the primary capital to build a profile of efficient and effective bureaucracy. In turn, when the profile of the bureaucracy has its healthy performance, it will certainly be able to melt back the stagnation of the bureaucracy. Thus, the provision as well as the implementation of public services which are fast, cheap, saving, comfortable, and high-quality can be better achieved. For the next discussion, there will be an explanation of the relationship between the profile of bureaucracy and the government leaders.

### **The Profile of Bureaucracy and the Government Leaders**

The development of Indonesian history has certainly influenced the character or the profile of bureaucracy. Therefore, in the context of the development of the bureaucracy, Indonesia also has a long history with characteristics appropriate to the time. It started from the “colonial bureaucracy” during the reign of the Dutch East Indies, the bureaucracy of the Japanese reign, the bureaucracy during the reign of a sovereign government, the bureaucracy in the new order era, and bureaucracy during the reform era. The development of bureaucracy profile in Indonesia has been empirically less encouraging. As it is known that the profile of the bureaucracy of the government has so far been characterized as closed centralized, less responsive to serving the community (people), and the bureaucrats have still been feudal and corrupt.

Although in the reform era, there have been some changes in the openness, decentralization, and democracy. But the practice of democracy in Indonesia is still procedural and superficial or “face democracy” (Haynes, 2000). At the time of implementing direct democracy in selecting the public officials for 10 years’ time, the result has not satisfied the public at large. As described above that the public officials as the leaders of the government either nationally, regionally, or locally have a strong influence on forming the profile of the bureaucracy of the government. Based on the fact, the results of the practice of direct democracy of the elected heads of the regions were not more than 10 people which were great and populist. While other regional heads of more than 320 went to jail or were suspected of corruption. Theoretically and conceptually direct democracy

is very good and praised and hoped by public and considered able to prosper the people. Foundered when the negative implications have emerged, e.g., money politics, transactional politics, high-cost politics, and social conflicts.

The elected regional heads were less competent and professional in managing the government. There was something wrong in the practice of direct democracy, the mistakes included: First, starting from the upstream, the political parties did not perform the function of the political recruitment well but became a power trading (transaction); second, actually, the condition of the people was not free from a political stance as a result of the floating mass period policy during the new order, so the awareness and political education were not normal; third, the people's political participation was still low but the real politics that happened was mass mobilization; fourth, the majority of Indonesian people still had a strong feudal culture and patronage, so they lacked political and rational independence; fifth, Indonesian people tended to be more emotional than rational and sportsmanlike; sixth, in the context of the election organizers, it was not a public secret that manipulation and vote buying were massive at the district election committee level; seventh, organizing a campaign that had not been efficient and effective. The seven variables above and still many other variables that influenced the occurrence of a negative impact on the results of direct democracy became the anomaly.

The phenomenon of the reoccurrence of the polemic between direct democracy and representative democracy is a natural thing in order to find the best solution and the best format to implement democracy in Indonesia. The political temperature became hot when the regional head elections backed to the system of representation that was supported by the political parties under the red and white coalition in the legislative body for the period of 2014-2019 in a deliberation of the bill of the regional head elections.

The explanation of the above mentioned bureaucratic developments from the historical perspective and the perspective of the government leadership, if studied systematically, will be an interesting topic that will be discussed in this paper. Welcoming the new government (from 2014 until 2019) of Joko Widodo and Jusuf Kalla as president and vice president, the Indonesian people will certainly see that the governance will be colored by the policy of mental revolution and the doctrine of "Trisakti". Therefore, this paper focuses on the discussion of the bureaucratic profile that is being stagnated and dealing with the mental revolution and Trisakti doctrine policies that will guide the mission and vision of the governance in the "Working Cabinet". Toward the realization of the new steps and hopes, President Joko Widodo understandably determined his ministers very carefully by asking for clarification from the Corruption and Eradication Commission (KPK) and the Financial Transaction Reports and Analysis Centre (PPATK).

### **The Development of the Profile of Bureaucracy in Indonesia**

The above description of the practice of "bureaucracy" from time to time shows that the bureaucracy can be regarded as a science and an art. Bureaucracy as a science is continuously being studied with various researches and scientific discussions or forums at universities so as to produce books of scientific studies of bureaucracy. While the bureaucracy as an art has been practiced since humans began to cooperate in joint activities to achieve the goals. Therefore, the bureaucracy was born in public life which began on the days of the kingdoms until the time of today's modern states. Studying the development of bureaucracy profile in Indonesia is inseparable with the historical context of the Unitary Republic of Indonesia (The Republic of Indonesia), which has wide areas stretching from Sabang in the Aceh Province to Merauke in the Papua Province. Areas of Indonesia that have been integrated into the Republic of Indonesia in the past largely had a

form of kingdom. In the record of history, Indonesia also has a name called “Archipelago” and the name is still often referred to as an Indonesian (national) identity that had ever been triumphant and had become a sovereign empire.

Therefore, discussions on “bureaucracy profile” will be associated with the history of the nation and Indonesia. In the context above, so on this occasion, the bureaucracy profile will be described from time to time. By following the thought of Mason C. Hoadley (2006) based on the results of his research on the practice of “state-administration” in Indonesia by allocating the periodization of the development of the state administration, namely: first, the profile of bureaucracy in the “sovereign kingdom”. The profile of bureaucracy in this period can be described based on the latest document in “The Archives of Yogyakarta” (Carey & Hoadley, 2000). The profile of bureaucracy portrayed in this period was when the kingdom had sovereignty in Yogyakarta. In the royal government, the Java government structure dominated by a two-pole bond (*kawula and gusti*) with a highly centralized system and being bonded (tied) in the tradition of law contained the great values which must be complied by all the people and had existed before the state formed. The profile of bureaucracy during the sovereign kingdom, the relationship between the government leader (King) and the people was very far (*kawulo and gusti*). The highly centralized system of government demanded the totality of people’s adherence to the predefined rules of the king. Every saying and decree and order of the king were the policies that must be followed by the people. People were very obedient to the king’s commandment and policies and they regarded him as a fair king. Therefore, the leader (king) or the elected leader was a person who was considered as a god and should not be the slightest flaw or blemish in him.

Second, during the imperialism from 1816 to 1942, in the period of imperialism or colonialism of Dutch East-Indies, it was the transitional period of VOC (Verenigde Oostindische Compagnie) power in the event of the bankruptcy of the VOC trade mission in 1799 followed by a power that was directly controlled by the Dutch Government. According to Hoadley (2006), “This system was later replaced by the structures and norms that were more adapted to the purpose of the colonial government of the nineteenth century that was oriented to generate money for the Dutch Government”. Differentiation through ethnic exclusivism was done by legislation practically carried out through two different administrative systems. The office of public services of white Europeans, the Dutch East Indies, (*Binnenlands bestuurs*) was using Weberian bureaucratic paradigm. It was completely different from the native administrative service office (*Inlands bestuurs*) which was built upon the cosmology of the gentry or nobility bureaucrats.

During the colonial administrative system, there were two different public services between white Europeans and the indigenous people. The system of administration of public services toward white Europeans was called “*Binnenlands beesturs*” using the laws made by the Dutch East Indies Government with the paradigm concept of bureaucracy of Weber. As it is known that the bureaucracy according to Max Weber has some characteristics, among others: First, each apparatus is promoted based on the certain competence and professionalism in every position he is in; second, any government action based on a clear and firm rule seems so stiff; third, the relationship between superiors and subordinates or fellow employees is impersonal; fourth, the bureaucratic organization is highly hierarchical; fifth, the possession of official goods with personal items is separated very clearly. Weberian bureaucratic paradigm yields a more orderly, organized, systematic, and corruption-free public services. Unlike the system of administration of public services for the natives (*inlands bestuurs*), the governance of the natives by the colonial government was maintained by a government system of nobility bureaucrats.

On the basis of the appreciation of the obedience and loyalty toward the colonial government, the nobilities were appointed as “regents and district heads”. The services to the natives based on “the common law” that is the rule based on the daily habits of the local communities. As it was known in the sovereign kingdom, the relationship among the government leaders (king, regent, and district head) was called “Kawulo lan Gusti”. People were submissive and obedient to the commandments or orders of the government leaders. The compliance of the people to pay tribute of the crop to the leaders, based on the emotional closeness of the relationship between the people and their leaders, the habit was allowed to happen to the natives by the colonial government in the system of the administration of public services.

Third, during the Japanese occupation from 1942 to 1945, the Japanese Government did not have a document that described the history of the government bureaucracy, because it was the Japanese as the colonialist not giving (without giving) any opportunities to the natives to do the usual activities. The Japanese colonialists did an offensive military aggression, so the people were made frightened and tremendously miserable. Even our parents often tell the extraordinary suffering when our country was colonized by Japan. Our parents ever wore clothes made of gunny sacks full of lice. People were not allowed to store rice and other staple foods. If caught storing the staple foods, they would be seized by the Japanese army. Although the Japanese only colonized 3.5 years, but in that time, the starvation was rampant. Our parents were evacuated from one place to another place.

In short, during the 3.5 years, practically there was no government as well as no administration system of public services for the natives. Perhaps slightly positive history was recorded ahead of independence in 1945, some of the people were trained militarily by the Japanese soldiers and later they (the trained natives) formed an organization called “Defenders of the Homeland” (PETA). In the military history, the forming of the Indonesian people army and then changing into the Indonesian National Army, in which Peta was part of the combined elements of society who were armed, for example: the elements of the former KNIL (The Dutch Colonial Army and Its Members) and the Moslem fighters of Hisbullah and others formed “the Indonesian Armed Forces” (ABRI) and now becomes TNI & POLRI.

Fourth, the administration system at the time of the Republic of Indonesia, two transitional periods of government bureaucracy, especially during “the sovereign Kingdom” and “the period of imperialism” certainly influenced the efforts to build bureaucracy during the reign of the Republic of Indonesia. According to Hoadley (2006), about the profile of bureaucracy is as follows: The discussion is focused on the issue of how the state administration has been built on a system of colonial administration. The period can be said to be the era of experimentation with integrating the Western administrative structure suiting the reality of the life of the Indonesian people.

At the same time, Indonesia became open for the global forces. Because before this, Indonesia had not become a sovereign state, but only a part of the Dutch government department. As one part, the result could be worse or even better. They provided protections to the people of Indonesia when Indonesia had to deal directly with the social transition of the world economy. At the Indonesian national level, it essentially exceeds the format of “centralization” of the traditional country (state) that has ever existed. Because at this time, it is indicated by the presence of a pair of new pseudo-traditional praxes. The observation of Hoadley (2006) is quite keen to see the condition of the transitional period after the colonization. Indonesia has turned into a country which is free and independent to determine its government. As it is known that the Republic of Indonesia is as a sovereign state and by the time of running the government, it will face the theoretical and

practical matters. The influence of the two poles between the traditional values of the empire and the colonial administration is faced with the reality of adapting the Western administration which is adjusted to the desires of Indonesian people.

The combination of the two paradoxical conditions causes an anomalous profile of the government bureaucracy. On the one hand, applying the rational Western administration as the Weberian bureaucracy, but on the other hand, the bureaucratic apparatuses still have the mentality of nobility or aristocracy, so the authority or power on their positions as if as their own possession and as a source of seeking/getting wealth for themselves and political parties where they affiliate to. In the reign of the old order, KKN (corruption, collusion, and nepotism) were running systematically, structurally, and massively although during the reign of the old order from 1945 to 1959, the system of the government was parliamentary and democratic, but the profile of bureaucracy was still feudalistic. During the reign after the presidential decree of 1959-1967, the system of government was based on the guided democracy and the profile of bureaucracy at that time was more controllable under the direct command of President Sukarno. The system of the government was presidential with the profile of bureaucracy more centralized to the authority and the charisma of the leader of the government as well as the head of the state, Soekarno. In view of the very strong and dominant character of the leadership of Soekarno, actually at that time, Indonesian people were more easily directed in accordance with the leader's will. If we look meticulously at some of the controversial policies of Soekarno, he was still conducting experiments or proving the Trisakti doctrine he had conceived, namely: political sovereignty, economic self-sufficiency, and cultured personality.

The events written in this era actually prove that there is a strong relationship between the profile of bureaucracy and the character of government leader. This means that the profile of the bureaucracy can be a reform agent (a reformer) and a perfect public servant if directed by a strong and character leader in carrying out the state's missions, therefore a government leader must understand, comprehend, and master the state's ideology and the direction of the state's policy.

Fifth, the profile of bureaucracy in the new order, when Suharto became a president in 1967, he immediately carried out the cleaning and purifying of the ideology by launching the implementation of "genuine and consistent Pancasila". In the political field, all elements that smelled "the old order" should be eliminated, including all of the teachings of Bung Karno and of tending to be left-radical and the people who were very close to him. Even Soekarno was exiled in "Yaso house" until his death in 1971, still in the field of politics, Suharto implemented a restructuring policy of the number of political parties from 10 more parties to three parties, namely: PPP (The United Development Party), PDI (The Indonesian Democratic Party), and Golkar (The Functionary Group Party) called a forced fusion. Similarly, the existence of political parties was only at the district level and people were kept away from the political activities or the so-called "Floating Mass" along with the orientation of the development priorities and widely opening for investors at home and abroad as well as foreign loans to finance the development, there should be followed by a renewal in the field of state administration.

The policy in the field of bureaucratic apparatus became more intensive to guard the continuity of the implementation of development to be more on target. Therefore, an adjustment demand to the Western structure was a necessity. The introduction of a wide range of innovations in the field of modern management is improved concurrently with the technical assistance as part of a package of foreign loans to the national development. However, the efforts to change the bureaucracy faced a culture that was less appropriate with the



demand of the international administration which was more democratic and decentralized. The Javanese culture, which was strong with the great aristocratic style and was still fostering feudalism, gave most of the apparatus important positions in the government structures. In fact, it hampered the process of democratization and decentralization in the governance. The Western culture facing the traditional local demands resulted in the profile of bureaucracy which was closed, centralistic, and positioning themselves as the big and small kings in accordance with their positions, the approach tended to be top-down rather than bottom-up, bossy rather than as public servants, more self-image rather than being close to people. During the New Order Era from 1967 to 1998, the government more prioritized experts in the cabinet, but the profile of bureaucracy was as described above.

As it was known that the effort to reform the state administration (administrative reform) was less satisfactory for the people. Even the phenomenon emerging was the acts of KKN which were systematic, structured, and massive among the bureaucratic apparatus. When the top of the iceberg melted in conjunction with the financial crisis in some countries of Asia and also affected Indonesia then resulted in the collapse of the New Order regime which had been in power for 32 years.

Sixth, the profile of bureaucracy in the reform era, the reformists intensively made fundamental changes and even in 2000, they amended the constitution of 1945. The result of the amendments was able to provide significant changes in politics. Some fundamental changes were: First, the president and vice president tenure was limited by only two terms; second, the president and vice president were democratically elected by direct election; third, providing reinforcement to the house of representatives, especially in terms of legislation and budgeting; fourth, setting up new institutions, namely the Constitutional Court (MK) and the Regional Representative Council (DPD). In the reform era, since 1998 up to the present, the reformists have made changes to respond to the demands of Western structure and international administration which are democratic and decentralized. In principle, the changes (amendments) of the laws in politics and government have been supporting the democratization and decentralization.

The objective of democratization and decentralization is an attempt to get closer to the interests and aspirations of the people that have been considered being gaps and discriminatory. The reinforcement of the laws against the disclosure of public information and public services is also an attempt to improve the image of bureaucracy which is more responsive toward the aspirations of the people. Therefore, the profile of bureaucracy in the reform era has begun to be open, responsive, democratic, and close to the lower strata/levels of people (grassroots) whom they have so far thought of being taboo. Changes in the government have begun to bring results, namely the emergence of populist figures as government leaders who are close to the people and from small towns/regions/villages. And even there has spectacularly been a president.

Although the emergence of populist figures from small towns/regions/villages has so far been a small number (not so many), it has become the embryo that is rolling toward the leadership consolidation more perfectly. The great and excellent figures such as Joko Widodo (Jokowi) as a president, Ganjar Pranowo as a Governor of Central Java, Basuki Tjahaya Purnama (Ahok) as a Governor of the greater Jakarta, Risma Trimaharini as a Mayor of Surabaya, Nurdin Abdullah as a Regent of the Bantaeng, Ridwan Kamil as a Mayor of Bandung and so on are the evidences of the results of the process of democratization and decentralization. Thus, it becomes an additional note in the study of the state administration that the organizers of the public administration or public officials who are empirically qualified are able to overcome the "bureaucratic stagnation". This means that the government leaders are the keys to making changes and innovations in the public administration, especially in facing the malpractice of administration or the stagnation of bureaucracy.

### **Bureaucratic Stagnation Versus Mental Revolution and Trisakti Doctrine: Opportunities and Challenges**

As it has been explained above that the profile of the bureaucracy will follow and be influenced by a country's ideology and policy that have been outlined in them. Therefore, in the context of the plan to form a new administration, the President of the Republic of Indonesia, Ir. Joko Widodo and the Vice President M. Yusuf Kalla for the period of 2014-2019 have launched or proclaimed the mental revolution and Trisakti doctrine as the state policies. Of course, the "bureaucracy profile" will become a trade mark of the experimentation of the policies of mental revolution and "Trisakti doctrine". The policy of "mental revolution" is an effort toward the total changing of the Indonesian people, especially the leaders on the attitudes, behaviors, actions, and ways of thinking to the problems of the state and nation of Indonesia which is undergoing a multi-dimensional crisis.

For example, the profile of government bureaucracy is being stagnated in performing the functions of public services which have the impacts on the people at large: First, many poor people who are sick get less attention; second, many unhealthy and slum houses in big, medium, and small cities in Indonesia; third, the scarcity of public spaces in the cities and villages for the people who want to relax; fourth, most of the growth of the cities in Indonesia is disorderly and results in uncomfortable environments; and fifth, poor basic infrastructure such as roads and irrigation, resulting in high costs of transportation and food needs. Therefore, if the mental revolution is able to change the mentality of the government leaders toward the behaviors of being polite, friendly, unpretentious, honest, and professional, undoubtedly, the government will be able to cut off the bureaucratic stagnation.

The attempt to elucidate comprehensively each item of "Trisakti doctrine" to realize the political sovereignty of the state and government needs prerequisites: first, creating a stable political stability; second, building the high political participation of the people; third, the government has a strong public legitimacy; fourth, the government has a strong role in the international association stages; fifth, the government has a high bargaining power against the developed countries; sixth, the high political consciousness of the people; and seventh, a high supporting sense of the nationalism and patriotism from the people, if the seven prerequisites can grow and develop positively, the political sovereignty will be realized. And building "economic independence" requires prerequisites, namely: First, the state and government have a strong role in making the regulations, doing the "allocations", distributions, and stabilization of resources widely and evenly to the public; second, being able to build food sovereignty; third, the national economy has a high competitive position; fourth, realizing the love of domestic products by the people; and fifth, the government has the ability to control the economic chains from upstream to downstream. If the five preconditions realized, the economic independence can be well achieved. Then building "the personality and culture" needs prerequisites: First, the leaders at all levels should have "a strong statesmanship"; second, the people are able to build the strong values of morality; third, the government is able to implement the program of nation and character building which is well-planned, programmed, and organized; and fourth, building a tradition of populist leadership.

As described above, the prerequisites to realize the doctrine of the "Trisakti" are difficult to achieve, although the prerequisites have a high value of idealism, but as a country that has a goal and spirit of the proclamation should be supported by all the potential of the nation. Similarly, the support of the government itself through the "red tape" needs to be done in order to build the government bureaucracy which is better

(excellent) and corruption-free. Therefore, the “bureaucratic profile” which is effective will support the success of the doctrine of “Trisakti” in the governance in order to achieve the prosperity and social justice of the people: first, the profile of democratic bureaucracy; second, transparency, accountability, and responsiveness; third, being democratic to the bottom level, public services are oriented to the grassroots; fourth, the bureaucrats are the public servants who are human not robotic; and fifth, the profile of bureaucracy belonging to the “working cabinet” will be successful if it is supported by the strong government leaders who have the strong legitimacy and statesmanship. As explained above, the bureaucracy and government leaders have a positive correlation.

Joko Widodo and Yusuf Kalla elected as the president and vice president for the period of 2014-2019 are the populist figures and have a strong commitment to results oriented government (result-oriented) as well as practical thinking which is effective and efficient. Therefore, the populist leadership style and public servants as well as being results-oriented are able to change the bureaucratic performance optimally. Some of the strengths of the working cabinet as mentioned above, namely: first, the populist leadership; second, the strong commitment and integrity; third, the supports of the people are significant from either the political supra-structure or political infrastructure; and fourth, having the concept of the personification of the strong national ideology with the “Trisakti” doctrine. The four strengths are great potential to consolidate power toward the improvements and changes in all sectors in the pursuit of the “opportunities” and “goals” to build political sovereignty, economic independence, and cultured personality.

Then, the weaknesses of the working cabinet among others: First, the support of political forces in the parliament is not optimal yet and popularly known/called as “fit and limited”; second, the concept of “Trisakti” doctrine is still in the realm of idealism which is in paradoxical condition to the reality; third, the working cabinet ministers still reap the pros and cons from the people, because they cast doubt on many of them (the ministers), the economic ministers are considered weak, there are some ministers having a pale-yellow record (corruption-suspected) from KPK; fourth, the support of bureaucracy is still weak because there is still a lot of bureaucratic stagnation in various government agencies; and fifth, the global environmental conditions that are less conducive to the economic, political, and cultural aspects.

Then, some “threats and challenges” identified are faced by the “Working Cabinet” in the governance and development in the tenure of his presidency, as follows: first, the ideological aspect, as if the Indonesian people have forgotten the ideology of Pancasila in the implementation of their daily lives. For example, many systematic structured and massive practices of corruption, collusion, and nepotism, as if they were not watched by God; second, in the political aspect, the spread of money politics, money-around politics (all about money politics), transactional power, anarchy in politics, the practice of democracy is still procedural or democracy only belongs to the elite, it has not been able to provide the welfare for the people, the conflicts of the executive and the legislative tend to be latent; third, in the economic aspect, the inequality of the people’s income is getting sharper and higher, the Gini ratio has reached the point of 0.4, the GNP (Gross National Product) just reached 3,500 US dollars, the influx of foreign products both primary and secondary goods, the dependence on the foreign markets is high, the external (foreign) debts are still a burden on the state budget, the higher the budget deficit, the economic growth is relatively getting down (5.6%), the food sovereignty is increasingly fragile; fourth, the social aspect, the fading sense of the social solidarity is increasing, the social conflicts often occur with a variety of backgrounds such as arable land disputes, fights between people, and religious conflicts still often happen; fifth, the cultural aspect, the character building is getting weaker, the value of unity, patriotism and statesmanship are increasingly fading away, the identity as a nation is getting weaker, the lack of

love of the domestic products, the strong cultural influences from outside are getting higher, the pornographic influences are getting greater; sixth, the security aspect, the sense of security of the people is getting lower, more uncontrolled drug trafficking, more sadistic criminal acts; and seventh, defence aspect, alutsista (the primary tools defence system) conditions are inadequate if compared with the geostrategic and geopolitical developments which are rising, the annexation from outside is still going on, the condition of the outer islands and border areas is still concerned.

The four main aspects that have been identified above, namely: the aspects of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, and threats or challenges. These aspects are the analytical tools that can comprehensively explain the success of the thesis prediction of the “Working Cabinet” in the Jokowi’s administration (2014-2019). The thesis of “Trisakti” doctrine is the welfare and prosperity of the Indonesian people that can be realized toward a strong, superior, modern, and great country which is able to build political sovereignty, economic independence and personality of a civilized nation. When the four aspects are examined, one of the threat or challenge aspects is greatly potential and dominant, therefore, if the strengths and opportunities are less effective in the process of the implementation of governance and development, it will tend to fail to achieve the goals of “Trisakti” doctrine. On the contrary, if the strength aspect can be optimally driven, for example: First, the populist leadership is able to mobilize and raise the awareness and political participation of the people to support the government policies; second, the results-oriented leadership (mission-driven and result-oriented government), David Osborn and Ted Gaebler (1992) are able to realize the government’s policies on target; third, the practical-thinking orientation on the effective and efficient basis is able to develop the government’s policies optimally; fourth, monitoring the implementation with the “blusukan strategy” is able to reduce the mismanagement and distortion at the operational level; fifth, Jokowi as an agent of reform in bureaucracy reform is able to build the trust of public and improve the public services widely and evenly. The five operational strategies out of many other strategies which are owned by the leadership of Joko Widodo and Jusuf Kalla will give the optimistic hope for the success of implementing the “Trisakti” doctrine as already elaborated into several dimensions of operational policies above, namely: political sovereignty, economic independence, and cultured personality which can surely be carried out in accordance with the possessed leadership ability and wide-open opportunities.

The explanation above is in regard to the new hope that has been awaited by the Indonesian people and has been offered by President Joko Widodo. On the other hand, it will face the bureaucratic stagnation. But when the SWOT (Strength Weakness Opportunity Threat) analysis is done, it will give the optimistic hope, which is to carry out the policy of the “mental revolution and Trisakti doctrine”. Despite the biggest obstacle or challenge is on the political aspect because of the weakness of the supporting force of the “working cabinet” in the parliament, but if the ministers have the strong supports to him and have the characteristics as their president’s such as: a lobbyist, an excellent political communicator, they will undoubtedly overcome the political obstacles well. The political problems can be well resolved if the conflicts between the legislative and executive bodies will not be wild (worse) and the economic climate will surely be more conducive. If the political and economic problems can be well controlled by all the potential of the “Working Cabinet” of Joko Widodo’s government, his government will be safe until the end of his term. The facing of the bureaucratic stagnation is also a great barrier for Joko Widodo’s government, but the way of “blusukan”, Joko Widodo’s typical style can be a role model for his ministers who are expected to be able to push the bureaucratic services faster or at least on time and more responsively.

### Conclusions

Based on the above description, it can be concluded that: First, the profile of the government bureaucracy has a relationship with the ideology and policy of the state; second, the bureaucratic profile is also influenced by the leadership style of the government; third, the history of the bureaucracy in Indonesia from time to time has the characteristics that each is different, but they still have the same essence, which is the profile of the Indonesian bureaucracy which still has a strong influence on the feudalistic style, this condition has contributed to the bureaucratic stagnation; fourth, the connections among the profile of bureaucracy, the mental revolution policy and the Trisakti doctrine are the political sovereignty, economic independence, and cultured personality which are able to build the profile of bureaucracy which is open, accountable, responsive, public-services oriented, grassroots-democracy oriented (top-down democracy oriented), no gaps oriented. The government leaders should have the competency of the strong leadership so as to be able to overcome the bureaucratic stagnation; fifth, Joko Widodo's and Jusuf Kalla's administration based on the SWOT analysis has stronger potentialities than its weaknesses. Though the adequately sizeable obstacles and threats on both the political and economic aspects, it has the great opportunities to implement the policies of the mental revolution and the Trisakti doctrine successfully; sixth, Joko Widodo and Jusuf Kalla each has a distinctive character of leadership that can be a role model for his ministers so as to be able to overcome the bureaucratic stagnation.

### References

- Almond, G. A., & Coleman, J. S. (1960). *The politics of the developing areas*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.
- Carey, P., & Hoadley, M. C. (2000). *The archive of Yogyakarta*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- David Osborn, D., & Gaebler, T. (1992). *Reinventing government: How the entrepreneurial spirit is transforming the public sector*. New York: Addison-Wesley.
- Haynes, J. (2000). *Democracy and civil society in the third world: Politics and new political movement*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Henry, N. (1975). *Paradigms of public administration*. American Society for Public Administration.
- Hoadley, M. C. (2006). *The Indonesian state administration*. Quovadis, Yogyakarta: Yogyakarta Press.
- Istianto, B. (2011). *Democratizing bureaucracy*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Istianto, B. (2014). *The vague portrait of Indonesian politics*. Jakarta: Mitra Wacana Media.
- Mas'ud Said, M. M. (2007). *Bureaucracy in bureaucratic state*. Malang: Muhammadiyah University Press.
- Priyo, B. S. (1993). *New order government administration bureaucracy, structural and cultural perspective*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.