

Public Policy Formulation and Public Disobedience: Conceptual Lessons from Tanah Awu People Movement

DWIYANTO INDIAHONO

Jurusan Ilmu Administrasi Negara Fisip Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Purwokerto.
Jl. Prof. DR. H. Bunyamin 993 Purwokerto, 53122

Abstract: Local government in long time has wished to build international airport in *Tanah Awu – Lombok Tengah – Nusa Tenggara Barat* Province. Pro and contra to this plan happened since building plan published by government. In a period of new order, some of local residents have got compensation and some of other not yet got it. Problems emerge when building plan will be started: Public disobedience for building plan in the reality was done by resident who have got compensation and haven't got compensation. Public disobedience by farmer of *Tanah Awu* for international airport in their land has left many important lessons for the public policy formulation. This article will give conceptual answer for problems of public disobedience and public policy making in this case. The conceptual answers for public policy formulations are: *First*, public in the future have to manage aspiration better and submit the aspiration to government more democratically. *Second*, government have to: create dialogue rooms for public who giving criticism and input to every policy; have commitment and try create pro poor policy maximally; create policy framework that capable to give win-win solution for all stakeholders.

Key words: *public disobedience, public policy formulation, democratic governance.*

In long time, new order regime lead Indonesia, and there are a lot of changes that can find in the development era. But, all of that not giving most people live in good standard of live. Welfare equality is one thing that's very difficult to find in this development era. Industrialization and liberalization are very popular matters and 'have to' do. Even though, every industrialization and liberalization is not always worst, but in Indonesia case that's made in-equality on economic, social and politic sectors. Industrialization made some rich people be richer, and some people who poor are also usually in grassroots economy power. Some capitals just walk in inner circle of power. Patron clients, cronies relationship, or spoil system are some phenomena that usual and institutionally¹.

Democratization on new order era also developed in small space, government actions are too repressive and general election just for formal activ-

ity. Some parties were identified as government parties and nothing called as opposition party. All of that, making democratization face in Indonesia is not "eye catching". House of representative members in the new order just sit and do what government said. Public aspirations did not found place to get satisfaction, or better condition.

Some conditions above are matters in the new order regime; off course it's not good to think it will be permanent. At beginning 1998, reform generation found good time to accelerate the reform actions. Crisis of economic made a lot of industries collapse, increasing: unemployment values, living cost and national instability. The reform era run and took support from people movement. This is new era in Indonesia, and new of life is begin.

First agenda of reform era is democratization. General election done and succeeds for 48 parties. The second priority for the reformation era is build of economy sector. Mass Medias are opened, and people can give aspiration directly to government or house of representative members.

¹ See: Baswir, 1997: 69–91, Baswir et al, 1999: 1-56, and Yustika, 2000: 105–119.

People power is stronger to refuse government policies, and it is one consequence of democratization movement. A case below is good example for drawing people movement in reform era: Tanah Awu People Movement. Tanah Awu People refused program of international airport that should beginning at 1993. But, just for past year Tanah Awu people move to refuse this program. Some demonstrations were done to refuse airport program, famous demonstration and being accident is demonstration on September 18, 2005. On this Monday, farmers meeting should gaining permit from Head of Indonesia Police Department, but on early day permit was pulled out. Tanah Awu farmers want to meet with 15 leaders of La Via Campesina – an international farmers forum. In the middle day, police try to intervene the meeting between 700-1000 farmers from Tanah Awu and La Via Campesina delegation members. Farmer's delegation who wants give statement also refused by police, police intervening the meeting and chaos break down, 37 farmers were shoot, and other being sick.

Tanah Awu is a village, include of Lombok Tengah district, Nusa Tenggara Barat Province, Indonesia. Same with other rural society, most of people are farmer. In 1993, Tanah Awu lands are bought by government, and planned to build an international airport, and now, local government finds difficulties to implement this policy.

There are three matters that very important for this case. *First*, 1993 until 2006 is a along time for policy conflict between government and Tanah Awu people, as long as nothing agreement was done. This phenomenon make question why compromise decision did not found? *Second*, 1993 until 2005, in fact some people from Tanah Awu have gotten compensation funds for lands that planned for airport and some people other not yet get compensation funds. If the peoples who are not yet get compensation funds refused the program may be its rational, but now, some people who got funds in past time also refused airport program. *Third*, most of Tanah Awu people are farmer who haven't good human resources and political power to refuse government policy. Human resources need to make dialogue and develop good relationship with local government. Discussing and good relationship impor-

tant to improve understanding about: interests of Tanah Awu People and Local Government Program. Tanah Awu People also needs political power to get what their interests.

Government Programs and Community

“The reality of policy-making is that every policy community, and policy network, is unique. Guidelines for designing public consultations must remain flexible. Moreover, what is really needed at this time is a widespread political and bureaucratic commitment to develop a truly consultative culture the political and permanent executives. We must always remember that democratic legitimacy depends, above all else, on the character and quality of public deliberation, and the relationship between public deliberation and state decision-making”².

Government as institution was given authority to bring people in better life; in fact people found conditions: less accountable, less responsive and less transparence for the program or policy. Government program should be brought on democratization line, for popular public policies and satisfaction of public services. Government program in regime that very repressive for democracy brought in line compliance, and some irrational policies³.

Irrational programs or policies in dictator or queasy authoritarian regime may be rational for government, but not for the people. Program can be irrational program because people not given space to participate and do dialogue to arrange program that they need. Programs just were taken government and people must do it, nothing world that true except “compliance”. Programs like that caused less accountable, because government members just do what government want, and people can not do some thing although “silent”. Evaluation action also governments do, and the ends of evaluation papers are impossible to give government critics and not succeed paper for government programs. Accountable brought in line internal control, and impossible for external control. Government like that is very autonom.

² Patten, 2001: 238.

³ See: Indiahono, 2006 and Lindlom, 1980 (second edition): 56-63.

Less responsive of public policies and public services also can find on autonom government activities. Public policies as should as bring to democratization approaches and when regime too repressive, people worry to give aspiration and were pressured to understand government logic. Public policies just draw what the government wants. Public services also not give maximal satisfaction for public, because some of it very bureaucratic, and just routine activities. People cannot give second opinion about services what they want.

Government do public services just for regular program, and nothing else for develops satisfaction of public services. "Seek the public interest; public administrators must contribute to building a collective, shared notion of public interest. The goal is not to find quick solutions driven by individual choices. Rather, it is the creation of shared interests and shared responsibility"⁴.

People as community should have aspirations which have to hear by government members. Community has authority to know problems, resources and solves their problems⁵. Government should invite communities for programs that near from interests and affairs of communities. Government has to responsive with public interests and public affairs. Now, community can make horizontal relationship with the government and local government⁶.

"Sustainability requires local resources and strategies so public participation seems critical and essential. A case study approach explores links be-

tween local development activities and community strategic action plans laid several years earlier, and most importantly, determines the role of public participation in those connections"⁷.

Public Policies and People Power

In politics, some people define that public policies is just about formal legislation and not related with bureaucracies⁸. Sometimes, people said if bureaucrats just sit and write a lot of letters, and not space for them to get political activities. Neutrality principle coming and very difficulties to understand, because, there are:

- a) In every public policy, bureaucrats have data that supporting the congress or house of representative to take policies. And for this, bureaucrats include to take policies.
- b) In some ways, bureaucrats also implement policies and in facts bureaucrats also take rigid and specialist policies and made policies more simple.

Decision makers for this experience should give more space for public to give their aspirations, needs and what they want.

Public organizations who take public policy to solve problems of public were demanded to make good relation with the people, communities or public who have interest with the issue of public problems. Bureaucrats have to hear interests of nearest people (geographic, issue, or potential resource) from the public problems⁹.

People power is one idiom that very "strong" and worried. But, for the democratization issue, people power is some thing that very important. Because people power makes big opposition side or large opposition opinion and also makes government do carefully to take some policies¹⁰. People power usually was identified by biggest demonstration and other monumental action. Demonstration

⁴ Denhardt, 2003: 65.

⁵ For example: One of rural policy option for the future in America is the existence of new economic engine. This new economic engine shown by: "prosperity for many rural communities will depend on innovative income-generating strategies that attract people and jobs. Faced with continuing loss of farm jobs, some rural communities have sought to offset shrinking employment by adding value to farm products". It means government have to esteem that in community there are potencies able to be used to solve their problems and government have to esteem it (Whitener and Parker, 2007: 62-63).

⁶ Fredericksen and London Said: "Partnerships between government and community-based development organizations (CBDOs) have proven to be central to long-term neighborhood revitalization in many settings" (Fredericksen and London, 2000: 230)

⁷ Blair, 2004: 102.

⁸ See: David H. Rosendblom in Shafritz (ed). 1997 (fourth edition). 432-440, and Dennis F. Thomson in Shafritz (ed). 1997 (fourth edition): 444-451.

⁹ See: Anderson, 1979 (second edition): 185-188; Lindlom. 1980 (second edition): 83-94.

¹⁰ See: Weimer, 1999 (third edition): 166, and Bellone, 1980: 48.

and monumental action were done to show different argument or pressure to government members or public policy makers. Although, people power always identically by biggest demonstration, public disobedience to refuse public policy that taken government also include with this definition¹¹.

Public disobedience being important issue, because: *First*, public policy that's not responsive with public interest in good policy process is impossible, because there are a lot of political actors who processed policy. House of representative members who may call as "vice people" in democratic symbol have to vote what are people needs. Now, people refused the policy and it's made assumption if House of Representatives did not succeed to bring people aspiration.

Second, public as human usually silent and just taken policies from policy makers, and now public refused policies. Public in fact begin as "clever actor", public begin analyze their needs, and what can they do for them. Public usually did not in beneficial side, because movement to refuse policy is "high risk" for their next government affairs, but, they are not afraid and just walk on the street.

This study just wants to say if: public policies is not some thing just on the table of house representative, and usually call as "formal policy" or "government action". Public Policies are political activities, and public disobedience should keep government member to do process of "the true process of public affairs". Government must understand argument, and base logical of public which often different with government logic¹². Public disobedience just wants to make public policy more equal, and more responsive. Government has to understand it as new logical of public policy.

Public Policy, Democracy and Pro-Poor Policy

The public interest is the standard that guides the administrator in executing the law. This in the

verbal symbol designed to introduce unity, order, and objectivity into administration¹³. Public policy is political activities; a lot of political actors include in decision making. Public affairs and public interest have to bring in democracy room. Democracy room is one room that all of actors can give votes clearly and equal. Public policy processed in ideal form is not give any space for domination an actor, party or other political power. Public policy just introduce public interests are good guideline to take policies.¹⁴

"Public choice theory assumes that political society is composed of self interested individuals who coalesce into organized interest. Interest groups which tend to form around relatively narrow issues of special importance to their members are created by individuals seeking specific self-interest goals"¹⁵.

Public policies as political activities explain interest values from political actors. This made public policy can draw who is the strongest, and can influence public policy and other actors. Value in politics and administration is most often expressed as kind of will-be it that of political superiors in the legislature, the sovereign, or the people¹⁶. Vested interests are some value which demanded and fight the actor. In every policy, there are some values like beneficial of economic, authority, position or else that advantages for live. We can analyze who get what, when and where by simple. The policy has to be welfare policy which drawing pro-poor policy, make balancing of power and increasing distribution of welfare. It's important to know because it just related with the most of public in developing country, and most of them are poor. Pro-poor policy paradigm must get public policy more equal and make policy better by advocating poor people¹⁷. Government has to do something to distribute welfare¹⁸, and takes policies that beneficiaries for poor and majority of public are good effort and must be supported. Concerning this matter, it is better to in-

¹¹ Repeating what is told by Thoreau, Josh McNary express that: they who serve state wittingly through by resistance form, they usual viewed as enemy. Civil Disobedience happened at this type citizen form. See: da Rocha. 2002: xii and also Indiahono, 2009: 121-147.

¹² See: Rainey. 1997 (second edition): 96-118

¹³ E. Pedleton Herring in Shafritz. 1997: 78

¹⁴ See: Anderson. 1979 (second edition). 185-188

¹⁵ Grindle. 1984: 24

¹⁶ Long, 1996: 150.

¹⁷ See: Gramlich. 1981: 24-27.

¹⁸ See: Stiglitz. 1988 (second edition): 110-118 and Musgrave. 1980 (third edition): 88-106

introduce dynamic governance. Neo and Chen explain that dynamism is characterized by new ideas, fresh perceptions, continual upgrading, quick actions flexible adaptations and creative innovations. Then, institutional culture can support or hinder, facilitate or impede dynamism in policy – making and implementations. Institutional culture involves how a nation perceives the values, beliefs and principles to guide its decision-making and policy choices¹⁹.

Pro-poor policy is not simple, because there are a lot of actor with a lot of differences of interest and value. Some actors just wait for beneficiaries and self interest. Public policy process is the political activities, but, from the policy its can invite economic beneficiaries for the actor. In political activities, develop good relationship to get biggest beneficiaries is usual. Political economy for policy making is not run in neutral field. They are a lot of condition that make poor position not good²⁰.

“Justice-cantered approaches to determining the proper relation of public decision to private affair employ criteria viewed as antecedent to the welfare of individuals, the interest of classes, the need of the state, and the relative power of the person. These criteria stem from conception of justice and of the just (or well-ordered) society”²¹.

Public policies ideally have to advocate public votes, but decision makers are rational actor who just thought about beneficiaries for her or him self, and not remember with public interest and public affairs²². For this condition, poor people just have given the votes for elite who has commitment advocating their interest²³. Introducing a framework to organize public participation suggests that decision makers have a proactive role in the public participation process²⁴. Government elites must be brought

in pro-poor policy line²⁵, and its can be fact if there is opposition. Opposition can find just on democratic countries, and public disobedience is one method to build bargain position and make opposition for government policy. Public disobedience is one mechanism to build good relation between public and government. Government with this condition should back to pro-poor policy line.

CONCLUSION

Government program which is not formulated democratically and uncommitted to public have resulted public disobedience to government policy. Farmer movement in Tanah Awu at least gives valuable lessons to government to compile the policy more democratic, more pro-public and especially pro-poor (in this case is farmer). Stakeholders' involvement in public policy formulation in the future is a certainty.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Anderson, James E.. 1979 (second edition). *Public Policy-Making*. United States of America: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Baswir, Revrisond et all. 1999. *Pembangunan Tanpa Perasaan (Evaluasi Pemenuhan Hak Ekonomi Sosial dan Budaya Orde Baru*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Baswir, Revrisond. 1997. *Agenda Ekonomi Kerakyatan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Bellon, Carl. 1980. *Organization Theory and The New Public Administration*. Boston: Allyn and Bacon Inc.
- Blair, Robert. 2004. *Public Participation And Community Development: The Role of Strategic Planning*. Public Administration Quarterly; Spring 2004; 28, 1/2; ABI/INFORM Global. pg. 102-147.

¹⁹ Neo and Chen, 2007: 1-3

²⁰ See: Seligson. 1993, Indiahono, 2006: 13-27, and Indiahono, 2009: 47-54.

²¹ Caporaso. 1996: 197-198

²² See: Lindlom. 1980 (second edition). 95-102.

²³ Wallis and Dollery, 2005: 291- 306 explain that style of leadership can impact on direction of local government reform. It is important to get governmental leaders who commit to public interests and affairs.

²⁴ Walters, Aydelotte and Miller.2000: 357.

²⁵ It is important to see result of research that entrepreneurship policy can support process of poverty reduction, see: Court and Maxwell, 2005: 713-725.

- Caporaso. 1996. *Theories of Political Economy*. Mellbourne: Cambridge University Press.
- Court, Julius, and Simon Maxwell. 2005. *Policy Entrepreneurship For Poverty Reduction: Bridging Research And Policy In International Development*. Journal of International Development. J. Int. Dev. 17, 713–725 (2005). Published online in Wiley InterScience (www.interscience.wiley.com). DOI: 10.1002/jid.1234.
- da Rocha, Antonio L. Casado. 2002. *Pembangunan Sipil/ Dangerous Allegiances: Civil Disobedience and Community*. Pasuruan: Penerbit Tadarus.
- Denhard, Janet Vinzant and Robert B. Denhardt. 2003. *The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc.
- Fredericksen, Patricia and Rosanne London. 2000. *Disconnect in the Hollow State: The Pivotal Role of Organizational Capacity in Community-Based Development Organizations*. Public Administration Review • May/June 2000, Vol. 60, No. 3. pp: 230-239.
- Gramlich, Edward M. 1981. *Benefit-Cost Analysis of Government Programs*. United States of America: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Grindle, Merilee S. 1984. *Public Choices and Political Change: The Political Economy of Reform in Developing Countries*. London: John Hopkins University Press.
- Herring, E. Pedleton. 1936. *Public Administration and the Public Interest in Shafritz (ed)*. 1997 (fourth edition). 76-79.
- Indiahono, Dwiyanto. 2006. *Reformasi “Birokrasi Amplop”: Mungkinkah?*. Yogyakarta: Gavamedia.
- Indiahono, Dwiyanto. 2009. *Public Disobedience: Telaah Penolakan Publik terhadap Kebijakan Pemerintah*. Yogyakarta: Gavamedia.
- Lindlom, Charles E. 1980 (second edition). *The Policy-Making Process*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Long, Norton E. 1996. *Public Policy and Administration: The Goals of Rationality and Responsibility*. *Public Administration Review*; Mar/Apr 1996; 56, 2; ABI/INFORM Global. pg. 149-152.
- Musgrave, Richard A and Peggy B. Musgrave, 1980. (third edition). *Public Finance in Theory and Practice*. McGraw-Hill International Student Edition.
- Neo, Boon Siong and Geraldine Chen. 2007. *Dynamic Governance: Embedding Culture Capabilities and Change in Singapore*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd: Singapura.
- Patten, Steve. 2001. *Democratizing the institutions of policy-making: Democratic Consultation and participatory Administration*. Journal of Canadian Studies; Winter 2001; 35, 4; International Module pg. 221-239.
- Rainey, Hal G. 1997 (second edition). *Understanding and Managing Public Organizations*. San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- Rosendblom, David H.. 1983. *Public Administrative Theory and the Separation of Powers in Shafritz (ed)*. 1997 (fourth edition). 432-440.
- Seligson, Mitchell A.(ed). 1993. *Development and Underdevelopment: The Political Economy of Inequality*. United States of America: Lynne Rienner Publisher, Inc.
- Shafritz, Jay M. 1997 (fourth edition). *Classics of Public Administration*. United States of America: Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Stiglitz, Joseph E. 1988 (second edition). *Economics of The Public Sector*. United States of America: W.W. Norton and Company, Inc.

- Thomson, Dennis F. 1985. *The Possibility of Administrative Ethics in Shafritz (ed)*. 1997 (fourth edition): 444-451.
- Wallis, Joe and Brian Dollery. 2005. *The Impact of Alternative Styles of Policy Leadership on The Direction of Local Government Reform*. International Journal of Social Economics; 2005; 32, 4; ABI/INFORM Global. pg. 291-306.
- Walters, Lawrence C., James Aydelotte and Jessica Miller. 2000. *Putting Mor Public in Policy Analysis*. Public Administration Review: July/Agustus 2000, Vol. 60. No. 4. 349-359.
- Weimer, David Leo (ed). 1999 (third edition). *Policy Analysis: Concept and Practice*. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Whitener, Leslie A and Tim Parker. 2007. *Policy Options for a Changing Rural America*. Amber Waves; May 2007; 5, ABI/INFORM Global. pg. 58-65.
- Yustika, Ahmad Erani. 2000. *Industrialisasi Pinggiran*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.