

# Examining Pro-Democracy Movements in Indonesia

## A Foreword

By Arief Budiman

This study is about pro-democracy actors in Indonesia. The objectives of this study are to determine who they might be, what characteristics they possess, what issues they focus upon, and what methods they employ in their struggles.

In this context, democracy actors are individuals or a group of people who have directly or indirectly contributed to the democratisation movement. The actors studied here have struggled during President Soeharto's authoritarian government period. It can be said that where a society has been deprived of basic freedoms, opposition struggles aimed at the government, for whatever reasons, contributes towards the development of democracy by weakening authoritarian structures. If the movements are successful, they expand upon a previously restricted democratic space. If not, the movements might still provide inspiration to a range of individuals in a society, showing them that government restrictions upon their freedom can be resisted.

Pro-democracy movements at Soeharto's period culminated in Jakarta-based student movement in May 1998, and this led to the president's resignation. Historically, university students have proved themselves capable actors for reinstating democracy to a society constrained by a dictatorship. They are universally recognised as a primary agent of democratisation. What happened in Indonesia during 1998 provides another example of the central role university students play in such processes.

But, if we look closer, we see that the success of pro-democracy movements requires ongoing teamwork amongst individuals and groups for a long period of time. This is also the case for the student movements in 1998. Establishing democracy can be compared to building a tower – a number of workers lay the foundations, and with additional assistance they work their way up. The workers who complete the top of tower represent the end of a long chain, which links them with those who worked on the foundations. Just like a relay running race, the last runner can only reach the finish line if the previous runners have fully completed their own leg of the run.

In the endeavor to achieve democracy in Indonesia, the actors who passed the finish line were the university students struggling for *reformasi* in 1998. The research focus of this book, however, is not these students, but this is not because they are considered unimportant. There are two main reasons why the student movement is not dealt with in this study.

First, the research design was begun in 1994, long before the university students' movements in 1998. The central question then was why the pro-democracy movement had not succeeded at the time the research was designed. Was it because of the very strict New Order government system, or was it due to some weaknesses of the actors, or even both?

As the research progressed, the university students succeeded in tearing down the

thick wall of the New Order government. This marked the beginning of a new phase in the democratisation process for Indonesia. Thus, this research emphasises the pro-democracy actors prior to the student movement of 1998 and how they helped with the “democracy building”, which enabled the university students to execute the symbolic attainment of democracy.

The 1998 student movement was very complex. If this movement was to be incorporated as a case in this research then the complexity of this movement would not be fully grasped. The 1998 student movement should be studied exclusively, so that all aspects of this movement can be examined thoroughly. In this study, attention is given to a number of earlier actors, those who helped build the foundations of the large “democracy building”. These were the groups that enabled the university students in the 1998 movement to finish the final stage. That’s all.

The four focal points of this study are:

To study the characteristics of pro-democracy movements, the motivations driving such movements, their impact and sustainability.

To study the issues and interests of these movements, and the methods they employed.

To study the network of these movements: whether they were restricted to local contexts, or whether they developed into national or even international movements.

To study the interconnectivity between one movement and another until the movements reached its peak in the 1998 student movement.

### **The Actors**

A popular political theory suggests that there is a direct relationship between democracy and the role of the military in society. If the military interferes with the political life of civilians the result is often an authoritarian government. In the Philippines, where the military does not interfere with the civilian political arena, a fertile space for a democratic government has been achieved. Such is also the case in India. In these two countries, a democratic political system is considered the “normal” mode, and an authoritarian political system is “abnormal”. Thus, in the Philippines the question asked is not why Marcos was overthrown and democracy restored, but how Marcos was able to build an authoritarian government in the first place.

The theory saying that there is a strong connection between military interference in civilian politics and an authoritarian government structure is also applicable to Indonesia. In Indonesia, the authoritarian New Order government was not only backed up by the military, it was effectively *controlled* by the military under the leadership of General Soeharto. Movements to democratise the political system emerged occasionally, only to fade away. Most people are still uncertain whether the democratic government led by Gus Dur will survive given that military institutions and authoritarianism is still strong.

But, few experts would agree that theories of democracy and authoritarianism could be explained with reference to the military alone. This would simplify things too much.

Many people talk about economic problems, cultural factors, education levels, international influences and other contributing factors to democratic or authoritarian political systems.

Through discussions with my research partner, Dr. Olle Tornquist, we agreed that pro-democracy actors did not feature enough in existing theories. Rarely has it been questioned who these actors are, what their perceptions of democracy are like, what kinds of people involve themselves in the movements, and so on. The failure of such pro-democracy movements might have been caused by unprofessional organisational approaches, or a weak ideological basis. The military is unquestionably a very important factor, but we must also give due consideration to the many other factors, especially the various pro-democracy actors.

Stemming from our discussions we decided to highlight the contributions of pro-democracy actors by conducting more intensive research. Fortunately, our proposals were welcomed by SAREC, an institution based in Stockholm, Sweden, that provides funding to researchers in the Third World.

Before we discuss this research any further, it would be useful to make an overview of pro-democracy movements during President Soeharto's New Order (*Orde Baru*) government.

### **Pro-Democracy Movements during the New Order**

In what follows we hope to provide a general overview of some pro-democracy movements that emerged during the rule of the New Order government (1966-1998). What will be presented here is a broad brush-stroke of the diversity this movement entails; the methods applied (corrective or confrontational), the scope of the movement (local, national, international), and the actors involved (university students, the press, and political parties). This section draws upon a select number of examples, from which the reader can gain a glimpse of the various pro-democracy movements that emerged during the New Order government era.

#### **Corrective Movements**

During Soeharto's presidency many movements geared towards an expansion of democratic spaces emerged. Beginning as early as 1970, when some youths and university students in Jakarta pioneered a movement called *Gerakan Mahasiswa Menggugat* (Student Claim Movement). General Soeharto had been in power for only four years, since March 11, 1966. Pro-democracy movements at that time can be categorised as corrective movements, since they were criticisms of particular issues (there was hope that such criticisms would bring about change). This movement was not accompanied by a unifying ideology. The actors did not call for a reshuffle of the government, rather they limited their goal to changing the policies of the government.

The Student Claim Movement protested a raise in fuel prices that had also led to a rise in other prices, including bus fares in Jakarta. The protestors felt that the government

should abolish the apparent corruption in the state bureaucracy rather than raising fuel prices. Thus, it was not only a movement to lower fuel prices, but also a political movement placing demands upon the government to deal with its corrupt officials. Having formed a corrective movement, participants did not see it necessary to gather large mass support or to equip itself with an alternative ideology to that championed by the government. Their purpose was to persuade the existing government that they needed to make some changes.

This movement was followed by other corrective movements. Between 1970-1972, there were numerous protest movements: *Komite Anti Korupsi* (Anti-Corruption Committee) which was a follow up to pressures placed on the government to eliminate corruption; *Golongan Putih* (White Party) which boycotted the 1971 general election and *Gerakan Anti Taman Mini* (Anti-Taman Mini Movement) which was a follow up and an effort to eliminate corruption by rejecting mega-projects). These movements culminated in 1974, when a student-and-youth movement demanded that the government pay more attention to poverty-stricken communities, and accused President Soeharto's personal assistants of corruption in conspiracy with Japanese businessmen. This movement was launched the same time as the arrival of Japan's Prime Minister, Kakuei Tanaka, to Jakarta.

Whereas prior movements had been handled in a "fatherly" manner (the leaders were arrested for a few days, briefed, and then released), the 1974 movement known as *Gerakan Malari* (stands for *Malapetaka Januari*, or the January Disaster) was treated differently. For the first time in the history of the New Order, a student movement was dealt with harshly. The leaders were arrested and kept in prison for some years. Some of them were prosecuted, and some were not.

This was one of the earliest signals that Soeharto's government would handle the pro-democracy movements sternly if protestors did not follow the rules of the game set out for them. The New Order government viewed the university students and youths involved in these movements as stubborn, who would therefore require punishment.

Pro-democracy movements went further than corrective measures after 1974. Activists still had some confidence in the government, especially in Soeharto. They aimed their criticisms at Soeharto's assistants, who they considered a corrupt influence. It was as if they wanted to say: "*Pak Harto*, be careful with the people around you. They are abusing power for their personal interests while taking cover behind your back".

So they targeted Soeharto's personal assistants, such as General Alamsyah Ratu Prawiranegara, General Sudjono Humardani, General Suryo and General Ali Murtopo. All of them were close to the President and were accused of corruption. The university students eagerly reminded Soeharto of the dangers facing him, thinking that he was unaware of such practices taking place around him.

But, a stern reaction was imposed on the *Gerakan Malari* leaders; Hariman Siregar, Syahrir, Marsillam Simanjuntak, Rachman Tolleng and Prof. Sarbini Sumawinata were arrested and imprisoned for years. These stern actions by the government made people realise that Soeharto and his assistants were one and inseparable. Apparently, Soeharto's government resented any form of opposition, even if the opposition was corrective in

nature.

### **Confrontational Movement**

In the wake of these government clampdowns the pro-democracy movement in Indonesia shifted from corrective to a confrontational one. In 1978, following the lead of university students from Bandung, the movement no longer targeted the President's assistants, but the President himself. Taking their protests to the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) in 1978, the students demanded the Soeharto not run for the presidency again. Not surprisingly, military forces quelled this movement, and its leaders were arrested and jailed for years.

Although this movement was aimed at replacing the president, the students had no real plans as to how they would change the governmental system. That is, these movements never discussed alternative ideologies. The movement faded after the military arrested and imprisoned the key actors.

Another stern governmental reaction took place at Tanjung Priok, North Jakarta. The aim of this movement was unclear – whether the protestors gathered there demanded a change of government or not – mostly because everything happened so fast. Soon after a mass of people had gathered at a Tanjung Priok police station to demand freedom for some pro-democracy figures, police stormed them and broke up the demonstration.

The mass had being organized by members of an Islamic group based in Tanjung Priok, a group that had voiced protests against collusion between conglomerates and high officials, including the president. As mentioned above, they were then confronted by the military and a fatal clash ensued. Hundreds of people lost their lives and many others remain missing.

### **Regional and International Movements**

Outside of the major cities one movement emerged to defend the people of Kedung Ombo. At that time (1988), the government was building a large dam (funded by the World Bank) in Kedung Ombo, Central Java. Some villages, threatened by rising waters, were forcibly evacuated from their homes.

The people of Kedung Ombo initially filed a complaint to the Solo branch of the Indonesian Legal Aid Institute (YLBHI, *Yayasan Lembaga Bantuan Hukum Indonesia*). They lost the case in court. Following this, university students from Yogyakarta, Solo, Semarang and Salatiga came to their aid. With the assistance of their colleagues in Jakarta, these students met with the Minister for Internal Affairs, Rudini. The mass media also supported this joint struggle.

The fight to support the people of Kedung Ombo also involved non-government organisations (NGOs) that were eventually coordinated by INGI (International NGO Forum for Indonesia), an umbrella organisation that is now referred to as INFID (International NGO Forum for Indonesian Development). INGI consisted of NGOs from

Indonesia and other countries, such as the United States, Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, Canada, Australia, England and representatives from the World Bank. INGI held annual conventions in conjunction with IGGI (Inter-Government Grants for Indonesia). IGGI is an international consortium that provides grants to the Indonesian government for development projects. INGI was set up to criticise developments that often victimised common people, such as the people from Kedung Ombo, and to report this back to the donors in an attempt to alter their policies.

Thus, the Kedung Ombo Movement can be distinguished from prior pro-democracy movements. Most obviously, the movement was a regional one and was stemmed from local struggles. It was similar to some of the earlier protests in that the activists involved were mainly university students, however, in this case they mostly came from places other than Jakarta or Bandung. This movement was not focussed upon major issues, such as nation-wide corruption, or demands that the president resign. It simply demanded that the rights of the underprivileged farmers in Kedung Ombo be recognised. These were real and straightforward demands.

At the same time, this movement penetrated an international audience through INGI. Some NGOs in the United States lobbied the World Bank in Washington, asking it to pressure the Indonesian government into providing appropriate compensation to Kedung Ombo villagers. Similar demands were also made by NGOs from Japan, the Netherlands, Germany, France, England, Australia and some other countries.

This campaign that was executed at regional, national and international levels gained fairly good results. In the end, villagers did receive reasonable compensation. Furthermore, the World Bank are now more cautious when assisting development projects in Indonesia, paying more attention to the people who might be harmed by such developments. Since Kedung Ombo, the government is not inclined to evict people from their homes for the sake of development projects.

### **Press Movements**

In 1994, the Indonesian magazines *Tempo*, *Editor* and *Detik* were closed down by the government. These three media were very critical of the government at the time.

The Soeharto government had previously closed down various other media for a number of reasons, but this time they were confronted with strong resistance from journalists, university students, artists and intellectuals. A press organisation, the Alliance of Independent Journalists (*Aliansi Journalis Independen*, AJI), was formed immediately after these closures and was primarily set up to provide an alternative the government-controlled organisation, the Indonesian Journalists Association (*Persatuan Wartawan Indonesia*, Indonesian Journalists Association). PWI was the only journalist organization acknowledged by the government at the time. AJI were also responsible for publishing the internet-based magazine, *Tempo Interaktif*.

In an unprecedented move, *Tempo* journalists filed a lawsuit against the government. Even though they lost at the Supreme Court, this lawsuit opened up a new chapter in the Indonesian pro-democracy movement: resistance of the press.

This movement has different characteristics and patterns from previous pro-

democracy movements. Older movements were usually led by university students and educated youth from big cities such as Jakarta and Bandung, except for the Tanjung Priok incident, where university students were not involved at all. In this case the movement was led by journalists and gained the support of people in the arts community. Thus, the journalists who had been reporting pro-democracy movements had become key players. The protest differed from the Tanjung Priok affair and with movements led by university students because the journalists were members of a highly organised institution.

So, when this press-led movement emerged, the pro-democracy movement had transformed from a number of spontaneous, individual movements into an institutionally-based movement. This was a very important transformation.

### **Political Party Movements**

The biggest pro-democracy movement in the history of Soeharto period is probably the movement by PDI (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia*, Indonesian Democratic Party) led by Megawati Soekarnoputri. This movement, like the press movement, was also led by members of an institution, in this case a political party.

The movement started when PDI elected Megawati, daughter of Indonesia's first president Soekarno, as the party's leader. The government did not approve of this and began plotting to have her removed. But the majority of party members resisted and insisted on having Mega (as she is commonly called) as their leader. The movement reached a climax when PDI's headquarters in Jakarta was attacked by military-backed militias on July 27, 1996. Many PDI supporters were killed, and some are still missing.

Stated briefly, the PDI pro-democracy movement was the biggest ever, involving all social classes, and spread throughout the entire country. This was a unique phenomenon in Indonesian politics.

\*\*\*

The examples listed above describe some types of pro-democracy movements during the Soeharto era, otherwise known as the New Order period. What a pro-democracy movement means here is any social movement that tries to limit, change, correct or replace the government's authority. Many such movements took place between 1970 and 1998, and not all of them are recorded in this short book, which can only claim to provide broad outlines and a few specific examples of these movements.

It should be noted that before the 1990s, most pro-democracy movements were spontaneous and disorganised. After 1990, however, the institutional factor gained prominence. The press movement (1994) and the PDI-Mega movement (1996) fall in to this category.

Many of these movements petered out prematurely. The question is, what methods did Soeharto employ to achieve this? Or did these movements collapse internally? Is it possible that these movements inspired other pro-democracy movements to act later on? If so, the 'failure' of one movement still retains some significance. Something like the stick handed over by runners in a relay race.

Other important questions to raise concern possible differences between the individual pro-democracy movements and the institutionally-based ones. Is it true that institutional pro-democracy movements were more sustainable than the individual ones? What role does ideology play in these different movements?

### **Warding Off Pro-Democracy Movements**

The New Order government, led by General Soeharto, handled pro-democracy movements with military repression. But, if the military had done this every time there was a movement, the New Order government would have appeared very militaristic. To avoid this image, the government employed many other techniques to deal with the movements.

A way to prevent criticism of the government was also needed. The government not only sought a mandate to rule, but also to repress and silence its critics. What was the basis of this repression? How could it be justified?

In order to do this, the government needed an ideology to outline its designs for the future of the country. This ideology was given shape with the famous *Trilogi Pembangunan* (the Trilogy of Development).

The 'Trilogy of Development' ideology was formulated in the early 1970's. The ideology outlines three inter-related programs of development. These three programs are: (1) economic growth, (2) political stability and (3) distribution of wealth. It appears that political democracy was not a high priority.

When it was introduced, this Trilogy was accepted by the community. Having experienced severe economic difficulties during the previous government under Soekarno from the early 1960's until his fall in 1966, the economic situation had become a very important issue for most people. This public concern was used by the government to subordinate political democracy in favor of a policy prioritising economic growth. Political stability was deemed more important than the rights of people to state different opinions.

By pursuing this Trilogy, the government's objective to raise general prosperity levels was clear. In order to attain that objective, the government needed to establish certain pre-conditions for economic development programs. One such condition was political stability. Economic technocrats were appointed to governmental positions. To achieve political stability, the Indonesian military was strengthened and given greater organisational coherence across the country. Economic distribution was to be controlled by the government through its programs.

The government handled the pro-democracy movements in two main ways. Firstly, the movements would be tested by reference to indicators of economic development. The government would boast of a successful economic development program, against which the pro-democracy movement actors could be accused of impatience and failing to respect real achievements. Furthermore, the government suggested that the pro-democracy movements could upset the political stability necessary for development.

Worst of all, they could be accused of sabotaging the government's economic development programs. Secondly, if they persisted in their actions they would encounter the strong hand of the military. In such circumstances, the military would be made to appear as "the defender of interests for economic development" and not the government's tool of repression.

This ideological justification of military repression appears to have been the government's most effective weapon for handling pro-democracy movements. Activists were repeatedly defeated this way.

### **Problems Facing the Pro-Democracy Movement: A Research Proposal**

When this research proposal was first begun the preoccupying question was why did these movements fail? Explanations that only focussed upon a combination of ideology and military factors, justifications for authoritarian government in the name of development, were not satisfactory. This research proposal was geared towards a closer look at pro-democracy actors, their strengths and their weaknesses.

Some criteria were composed to determine which actors were to be studied, and what would be highlighted. The criteria are as follows:

Central and regional factors: Pro-democracy movements should represent a cross-section of central (Jakarta) and regional movements. Regional movements should incorporate those areas outside of Java, areas with significantly different conditions to Java. What are the similarities and differences between actors from the centre and those from various regions?

Movements that took place in Jakarta usually received instant attention from the press, both national and international. This clearly added strength to their cause. Also, such movements were often supported by intellectuals and academics based in Jakarta. They were also dealing with certain type of opponent - educated officials who possessed some understanding of the complexity of the political problems at issue. They tended to be more careful in dealing with the activists. This includes the military leaders.

What happened in the regions was vastly different. Local or regional players were not equipped with a strong press to support them. Usually, they would make some attempts to gain some coverage from the national press. Nor did they have intellectuals and academics to support them and the local officials tended to react harshly towards their actions.

So what were the strategies and tactics of local or regional pro-democracy movements? How was it different to those movements in the centre? These questions are primary concerns of this research.

Pro-democracy movements formed a variety of social organisations. Some were professionally organised, while others were spontaneously formed as reactions to a particular issue. The anti-Taman Mini case, for instance, was

a spontaneous movement to protest the construction of one “mega-project”, Taman Mini Indonesia (a theme park representing “the people and cultures” of Indonesia). Movements like this were led by a group of individuals who agreed to set up a movement with a basic organisational structure.

This is obviously different to party movements such as that of the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) in the mid-1990s, or the press protest movements led by the Alliance of Independent Journalists (AJI). Such movements were supported by a solid institution, in this case a political party and a press institution, and this meant they could sustain different tactics and had capabilities that other groups or individuals would not have had. What are the different impacts of these two types of organisation, especially in relation to long-term contributions towards the building of a democratic political system?

The types of leaders also need to be considered. What kind of leader stepped to lead the pro-democracy movements? Did the leader gain support based upon his or her charisma, or were there other factors? What influence did the different leaders have upon the long-term struggle of the numerous movements?

The issues that the movements focussed on represented another important factor for research. Pro-democracy movements during the New Order era were usually confined to a particular issue. The press resistance movement was triggered by the closing down of three influential media publications. The Kedung Ombo dam protest was a reaction to the forceful eviction of the local inhabitants and inadequate compensation.

If the pro-democracy movement simply consisted of reactions to a particular issue, then it would certainly be short-lived. What efforts were there to connect the numerous issues to a more comprehensive platform for democracy? For instance, did the Kedung Ombo movement connect up with the problem of an authoritarian government, a government which had denied the rights of their own people, their own citizens?

Furthermore, did the issues connect up with broader ideological standpoints? Were the issues connected to an alternative ideology than that championed by the government? For example, did the Kedung Ombo movement champion an ideology of democracy? Likewise, did the press movement or PDI-Mega movement uphold a particular ideology to back their position?

These are some of the central concerns of this research design. Based upon these guiding questions, seven cases, that more or less fit such criteria, were chosen. Chronologically, the cases are:

### **Kedung Ombo Resistance Movement (1989)**

This was a locally inspired movement that gained national and international

attention. The university students who were actively involved assisted the villagers, mostly farmers, who were evicted from their land to make way for the construction of a large dam in Kedung Ombo. Many Indonesian and foreign NGOs were involved, which makes this case very interesting.

#### **Nipah Case in Madura (1993)**

Nipah is a village in Madura, an island situated off the northeast coast of East Java. A clash occurred between the Indonesian military and local residents, during which the latter group suffered casualties. This incident led to a resistance movement against the government, which was led by a charismatic figure, Kyai Alawy. This local movement later gained national support from Islamic groups and others. The movement was not an on-going one.

#### **Labor Strike in Medan (1994)**

This was a local and spontaneous case, even though it was supported by a labour organisation. Strong organisations, including the Labor Union, did not take a central role. As a relatively spontaneous movement, the planning was not detailed. No distinctive leader appeared from this movement, nor was it built upon a particular ideology. This movement was more reactionary and issue-oriented.

#### **Banning and Closure of *Tempo* Weekly Magazine (June 1994)**

The collective protests and demonstrations that emerged in response to the banning of three popular media became a central movement, born from a press institution. The institutional basis of this movement was consolidated with the formation of the Alliance of Independent Journalists (*Aliansi Jurnalis Independen*, AJI) which was made possible with the support and facilities of *Tempo* magazine. *Detik* and *Editor* magazines also involved themselves. The movement became a call for the return of democracy in Indonesia and this, in turn, attracted international attention. The leader of the movement was *Tempo*'s chief editor, Goenawan Mohamad.

#### **Amungme Case in Irian Jaya (April 1996).**

The Amungme people of Irian Jaya (West Papua) launched protests against the Indonesian government and an exploitative multinational mining company from the United States. Poverty, pollution and abusive treatment near the mines insulted and angered the Amungme people, who were directly affected by all of these things and more. The Amungme case is interesting because it emerged outside of Java and was premised upon a form of tribal solidarity. They were up against a privately owned multinational company that received the support and protection of the Indonesian government. Because it was so far removed from Java, this movement did not really connect up with a national pro-democracy movement. Possibly this was due to the fact that it was not connected to any institution with wide networks in Java. The only institutional basis of this movement was a traditional one – the Amungme tribe's

familial networks.

### **PDI (Indonesian Democratic Party) / Megawati Case (July 1996)**

The movement was led by Megawati and supported by the PDI party. On July 27 1996, the party's headquarters in Jakarta was attacked by a large group of young men with military backing. As a result, anti-government, anti-military and anti-Golkar attitudes spread throughout the community, making PDI-Mega a symbol of a broader pro-democracy movement in Indonesia. This movement was supported by anti-Soeharto groups, intellectuals and a youth movement led by another party, the People's Democratic Party (*Partai Rakyat Demokrasi*, PDI). The movement led to the formation of a new party, the PDI-Perjuangan or the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle. (*Partai Demokrasi Indonesia – Perjuangan*).

### **Anti-Yellow (anti-Golkar Party) Movement in Solo (May 1997)**

This local movement was led by a charismatic figure, Mudrick Sangidoe and was supported by the Islamic party, the United Development Party (*Partai Persatuan dan Pembangunan*, PPP). The movement developed quickly gained national attention because of its good timing – spreading an anti-Golkar message prior to the general elections. The movement was primarily based at the Solo district branch of the PPP party. Unfortunately, this movement did not become a long-term pro-democracy movement and after the general election the strong anti-Golkar momentum quickly disappeared. Efforts to consolidate this movement by merging PDI-Perjuangan and PPP parties, which was called the Mega-Bintang movement, fell flat. There was a lack of support for this move, especially from the national level of the PPP party.

These seven cases are sufficient for the purposes of this book. Of course, there are still many other important cases that could be included here, but in the limited space available this is not feasible.

In Jakarta, for example, the appearance of PUDI (*Partai Uni Demokrasi Indonesia*, or Indonesian Democratic Union Party), led by Sri Bintang Pamungkas, and the PRD (*Partai Rakyat Demokrasi*, People's Democratic Party), led by Budiman Sujatmiko, are cases that could be focussed upon here. There is also the movement of the Democracy Forum group. However, when we were forming our research design, we considered the *Tempo* and PDI cases to be more important. Also, there are many other cases outside of Jakarta and Java.

>From the seven cases studied here, the strengths, weaknesses and the interconnectivity between one case and another will be evaluated. Some answers concerning why some movements died whilst others continued will be offered. Did it have anything to do with the organisation, the issues, leadership or the ideologies pursued?

## **CONCLUSION**

As this research was being written up an economic crisis occurred (1997) and this

was followed by the downfall of Soeharto (1998) after massive pro-democracy movements were organised by university students in Jakarta. As such, the pro-democracy movement had been victorious for the first time ever.

Research focussing upon why pro-democracy movements had failed no longer gained the same significance because a pro-democracy movement had just managed to overturn an authoritarian regime. This turn of events was highly instructive for the continuing research devoted to this book.

If the cases studied in the framework of this book were once considered failures, the picture had completely changed now. No longer were the questions we asked simply limited to why the movements had failed, but rather, we were now asking what sort of connection there might have been between these movements and the culmination of the 1998 student movement. This became the most important question for a rethinking of the research framework.

We reexamined the cases that we had selected for the research design. The cases that were most obviously connected with the student movements was that of PDI-Mega and the press resistance movement organised by AJI. The Anti-Yellow campaign in Solo, which involved an attempt to form a coalition between Mega and the PPP (United Development Party), along with the Nipah people's struggle in Madura, were a source of inspiration to all Indonesians that they could contest the abuse of their rights by the authorities. The Kedung Ombo and Amungme cases provided a similar source of inspiration.

But why was it only the PDI-Mega and AJI cases that continued with their struggle for a pro-democratic movement? Why didn't the other cases sustain similar long-term agendas? We hope that the answers to these questions might be gleaned from a more detailed study of the cases listed above, focussing on the character and shape of each movement.

This book, and the research that went into its making, represents a small contribution to a richer analysis of the strengths and weaknesses of pro-democracy movements in Indonesia. The conclusions to be drawn from this study might even be useful for pro-democracy movements in other countries throughout Asia, Africa and Latin America, where authoritarian regimes continue monopolise political power. For example, what has happened to the pro-democracy movement led by Aung San Syu Kyi in Myanmar? What are the weaknesses and strengths of such a movement?

This research will have fulfilled its purpose if it can assist the reader to draw clearer conclusions regarding the strengths and weaknesses of pro-democracy movements in Indonesia and other countries.

Jakarta, November 2000

