

**The Privatizing Party Organization at Local, Considering  
with The Impacts of Direct Election System for Local  
Administration Chief  
The Case of PDI-P Responding to The Mayor Election in  
Municipality of Semarang.**

**Masatoshi Sakurai**

Department of International Development, Nagoya University of Japan

Political parties were designed to play the main role for accomplishing the accountability for the citizens in the local political institutes in “Democratization and Decentralization” era (Post-Suharto era). Therefore, adopted electoral system was the combination of proportional representation system<sup>1</sup> and closed party-list voting system. Local assembly members are elected by the name of their affiliated political parties, and management of the assembly is handled by factions composed of each political party. Moreover, political parties are not only controlling the local assembly, but also involving in the local administration chief selection. Local administration chiefs are elected by local assembly member.

Direct election system was introduced in 2005 to enhance accountability of local administration chiefs. However, the candidate needed some conditions; they must be nominated by political party or party alliance which has more than 15% of the seats in the local assembly, or won 15% or more votes in the local assembly election. That is to say, systematically, political parties are always the main constituent which plays an enormous role in local political system. Therefore, the question should be raised regarding the approach toward accountability through political parties.

---

<sup>1</sup> At the 2004 election, there was a slight change to limited open-list voting. Voters were able to choose political party and the candidate at the same time.



Despite the importance of the issue, roles of political parties in the local political scene have hardly been faced as a research task. The reason is that, the reality of political parties in local politics is merely an unscrupulous gather of local politicians which lacks organizational unity. Moreover, political parties are considered simply as a vehicle for local leaders to attain official position in the local government<sup>2</sup>. The author also agrees with this evaluation. However, it seems that the important question has not been answered in full detail; what was the reason for the political parties to become a lousy organization?

To start the study for answering this question, this article focuses on the local branch of PDI-P (Partai Demokrasi Indonesia- Perjuangan), which is the exponent of political parties in the “Democratization” era as a research objective. The second section will be discussing the power structure of political party in local level, by focusing on the nature of local branch executives.

The following two sections will analyze the process of selection within PDI-P, regarding the mayor election in municipality Semarang carried out in 2002 and 2005. Needless to say, selection of political leaders is the most important and universal function of political parties. Therefore, implementing empirical research on candidate selecting process is essential for understanding the real status of the political party. Moreover, since the direct election system for local administration chief is adopted, it is quite important to answer this question; did the role of political parties changed in the process of selecting candidates for local administration chief?

The final section will be summing up the analysis of these focusing points, to share the perspective in the future regarding political party organizations at local.

## **2. The power structure within the political party at local**

Political party organization at local can be divided into two categories; parties in the assembly (factions which are groups of local assembly members) and those outside the assembly (branches of local parties). The purpose of this section is to analyze the actual role and the relation of these categorized two groups. This is to deepen the understandings of the power structure within political parties in the local level. The key of the analysis is local branch executives, who are able to have authority over both groups.

Firstly, let us focus on local branches, which are the groups outside the assembly. Political party organizations outside the assembly have a hierarchal structure, which the center organization controls. Indonesian law obligates political parties, including PDI-P, to establish local branch

---

<sup>2</sup> For example, Hadiz(2003).



organizations for each administrative area level<sup>3</sup>. The PDI-P organizations also have a hierarchal order. Headquarter in Jakarta (Dewan Pimpinan Pusat; DPP), provincial branch (Dewan Pimpinan Daerah; DPD), regency/municipality branch (Dewan Pimpinan Cabang; DPC), sub-district branch (Pengurus Anak Cabang; PAC), village branch (Ranting), and sub-village branch (Anak Ranting) at the bottom. Executive members of branches in each level are Chairperson, Deputy Chairperson, Secretary, Deputy Secretary, Treasurer, and Deputy Treasurer<sup>4</sup>. For DPD and DPC only, there are top officials who are in charge of party activities, which are divided into sectors. However, it can be said that actually these sectors are not active, and top officials do not possess any official authority within the branch.

Focusing on the authority dispersion between the DPP and local branches, it is clear that even in the hierarchal structured and centralized organization, the DPP guarantees local branches to have discretionary power applicable to rather wide range of decisions. For example, according to the DPP's decision letter No.304-2003, each local branch has the authority to fill the candidate list for their local assembly election<sup>5</sup>. DPP's decision letter No.304-2003 also regulates the way to determine the order in the candidate list for local assembly election. According to this regulation, the local branch executives have the priority to be ranked ahead in the candidate list without any conditions<sup>6</sup>. Therefore, it is quite certain for the local branch executives to win in the local assembly election. Moreover, they will get bigger chance to hold important positions in PDI-P's faction or/and committees within the local assembly.

---

3 Law No. 31 of 2002 regulates some conditions for founding political parties. One of them says, political parties must have their branches in at least 50% of all provinces and at least 50% of regencies/municipalities in the provinces 25% of all sub-districts in the regencies/municipalities. Moreover, as one of the conditions for participants of assembly election in 2004, political parties are obligated to have their branches in at least two third of all provinces, and at least two third of all regencies/municipalities of the provinces (Law No. 12 of 2004 regarding assembly election).

4 Executive members of DPD in Central Java province are one Chairperson, seven Deputy Chairpersons, one Secretary, three Deputy Secretaries, one Treasurer and two Deputy Treasurers. DPC executive members in Municipality of Semarang are one Chairperson, five Deputy Chairpersons, one Secretary, one Deputy Secretary, one Treasurer, and one Deputy Treasurer.

5 In selection of candidate for provincial assembly election, DPP selects 5%, DPD selects 45%, and DPC selects 50% of the targeted seats. (15th article DPP's decision letter No.304-2003). Similarly about selection of candidates for regency/municipality assembly election, DPD selects 5% , DPC:45%, and PAC:50% of the targeted seats.(16th article of DPP's decision letter No.304 - 2003)

6 All DPD executives and Chairpersons and Secretaries of DPC have the priority to be ranked in the top of the list of candidates for the provincial assembly election. All DPC executives and Chairpersons and Secretaries of PAC have the priority to be ranked in the top of the list of candidates for regency/municipality assembly election. (10th and 11th article DPP's decision letter No.304-2003).



Here is the example of Central Java Province. The former DPD Chairperson Mardijo (elected in 1999) and the incumbent DPD Chairperson Murdoko (elected in 2004) were supported by PDI-P faction, and both succeeded to gain the post of the Provincial Assembly Chair<sup>7</sup>. In addition, since 1999, the DPD Treasurer Supito is the Chair of the C Committee, which handles the local government budget. Same situation can be seen in the municipal level<sup>8</sup>. In the Municipal Assembly of Semarang, the post of the Chair has been held by the PDI-P branch executives for 2 terms; former DPC Chairperson Ismoyo (elected in 1999) and the incumbent DPC Chairperson Sriyono (elected in 2004) These conditions will lead to the remark that, local branch executives are able to have influence on PDI-P factions by gaining additional posts in the local assembly.

Moreover, since the DPD and DPC executives have strong power over the branch, they have chances to control PACs and party's vigilante corps (satgas) unofficially. The official payment for the PAC and PR executives is unscheduled and the amount is not enough. Therefore, private considerations from the DPD and DPC executives are a very important income resource for them. To thread and make the lower level branch executives follow them, they mobilize party's vigilante corps (satgas). Formally, local organization of PDI-P has centralized and hierarchically structured, which is called "Mass party" by Duverger<sup>9</sup>. However, actually, the most important authorities regarding local activities are decentralized to each local branch. These decentralized authorities to each local branch are centralized again to the DPD and DPC executives. Since local branch executives hold posts in local assemblies, local organizations of PDI-P have a structure formed by a fusion of factions in local assemblies and the local branches such as DPD and DPC. As a result, regarding local activities, the DPD and DPC executives are fairly autonomous from the control of DPP. Actually, local organizations of PDI-P have the power structure which Duverger called "Cadre party".

### **3. The mayor election of Semarang in 2000 and PDI-P**

This section will deal with the case of the mayor election of municipality Semarang in January, 2000, which was the first election in post-Suharto era. How did PDI-P select their candidates and approached the mayor election? At the time of this election, DPP of PDI-P was not ready to

---

7 PDI-P won 41 seats out of 100 in 1999 and 31 in 2004 at the Provincial election of Central Java.

8 PDI-P faction in the Municipal assembly of Semarang gained 20 seats out of 45 during 1999-2004, and will be keeping 12 seats from 2004 to 2009.

9 One of the features of "Mass party" called by Duverger is that it has a large number of party member as man powers in election campaigns, and payers of membership fee. (Duverger, 1954.) PDI-P in Municipality of Semarang which has a population of approximately 1300,000 has approximately 150,000 party members. However the party is not collecting any membership fee.



set up the regulation regarding the candidate selection for local administration chief election. Therefore, it seemed that DPC of municipality Semarang had their own way to select the candidates<sup>10</sup>.

For this election, five activists registered their names on the list of PDI-P. On November 29, 1999, the special meeting to select three nominees was hosted by DPC executives. Each of 16 DPC executives chose three nominees in the meeting. The result was as follows. Mugiono 16, Sutjipto 15, Ismangun 8, Sukawi Sutarip 8, and Bambang Pranotoone 1.

Ismangun and Sukawi collected the same number of votes. Consequently, DPC executives had to choose either one of the two. However, the voting was cancelled because it might deepen the rift within DPC. Eventually, all nominees stepped forward to the selection process in the municipal assembly as PDI-P's candidates. PDI-P was the most influential faction, which had 20 seats of 45 in the assembly of municipality Semarang. Therefore, if they have chosen one candidate for the party and concentrated their support, they had a bigger chance to win the voting in the assembly. Nonetheless, DPC executives did not select the candidates and delegated it to their faction. As a result, the assembly members of PDI-P factions also became the targets for the candidates to buy their votes.

Here are the brief profiles of the important three PDI-P candidates among five. Mugiono, Sukawi Sutarip and Sutjipto are their names.

Mugiono is a lawyer. Since the 1970s, he has been an enthusiastic member of PDI (Democratic Party of Indonesia: Partai Demokrasi Indonesia), which is the predecessor of PDI-P. In 2000, he was the deputy secretary and one of the executives of DPD. Mugiono is what we call Sukarnoist.

Sutjipto is an executive officer of Wawawan, an evening paper in Central Java. Though he is an active sympathizer of nationalist parties as PDI-P, he has no career as a member of political parties. On December 4, Sutjipto received a recommendation letter from the PDI-P chairperson Megawati and also the General Secretary Alex Litaay. Megawati was a charismatic leader among PDI-P members. Therefore, there is a point to be raised; how will this fact influence the selection process within DPC?

Sukawi Sutarip is a business entrepreneur of Semarang. He offered a large amount of material aid to PDI-P in the late term of the assembly election campaign in 1999. Therefore, he became

---

10 As far as the author recognizes, it was the DPP's decision letter No. 189-2002, which determined the process of candidate selection within the party.



popular among PDI-P. On October 24, he got a recommendation letter from Sutarjo Suryogurinto who was one of the DPP executives. However, when Sutjipto obtained a recommendation letter from Megawati, his recommendation letter almost lost its value.

On the third of December, municipal assembly had confirmed candidates list for the mayor's election. The voting by municipal assembly member was practiced on December 28. The purpose of this voting was to choose 5 candidates of 14, including candidates from other parties.

Surprisingly, among the five candidates from PDI-P, Sukawi and Sutjipto were the only survivors in the selection process. Mugiono who collected the most votes from DPC executives in the special meeting, was completely defeated. It was Sundoro who notably collected votes. He was one of the deputy chairpersons of Golkar's DPD in Central Java province. He was also the chairperson of the Chamber of Commerce in Central Java province. The final voting in the assembly was practiced on January 4, 2000. Practically, it was a single combat between Sukawi and Sundoro. Among 45 votes, 22 were for Sukawi and 16 for Sundoro. As a result, on January 19, Sukawi was inaugurated as a new mayor of Municipality Semarang.

On the other hand, Sutjipto who was gaining support from Megawati, succeeded to be the finalists in the final voting. However, he failed. He could not get even one vote.

Many DPC executives voted for Mugiono and Sutjipto in the special meeting of DPC. However, being a member of the assembly, they changed their mind to vote for Sukawi.

What was the reason for Mugiono and Sutjipto to suffer a terrible defeat at the voting in the assembly? The simple difference between the two camps can be assumed that Sukawi and Sundoro gave money to the assembly members in the course of the voting. Vote-buying was too difficult for Mugiono and Sutjipto who adhered to Sukarno's ideology, Marhaenism, to accept. However, on the contrary, for Sukawi and Sundoro, it was a rational mean to gain the post of the mayor.

Then, what was the difference between Sukawi and Sundoro? It is quite certain that the secret of Sukawi's success was that he gained support from PDI-P, which was the most influential faction in the assembly. Sundoro chose Murdoko as his partner to run for the deputy mayor. Since Murdoko was an assembly member from PDI-P, this selection was Sundoro's measure to conciliate PDI-P faction. However, Sundoro could not defeat Sukawi.



As mentioned, it can be said that PDI-P's candidate selection for the mayor election lost their function in the 2000 election. Moreover, the most important final selection was deviated to the result of vote-buying between the candidates and the faction member.

#### **4. The mayor election of Semarang in 2005 and PDI-P**

In this section, we will observe the impact of the direct election system, by focusing on the process of candidate selection within PDI-P regarding the mayor election in Municipality of Semarang in 2005. The direct election system leaves the determination of the mayor to the citizens. Therefore, parties in the assembly (factions which are groups of local assembly members) are no longer possible to involve in the decision making process. However, the regulation prescribes that the local administration chief candidate must be nominated by political party or party alliance, which has more than 15% of the seats in the local assembly, or gained 15% or more votes in the election of the local assembly. As a result, the candidate selection process within the party organization out of the assembly (branches of local parties), began to have a very important meaning in the mayor election of 2005.

Responding to this new condition, DPP in Jakarta was ready to issue the DPP's decision letter No.429-2004, to prepare for the new regulation regarding the selection of candidates for local administration chief. The brief outline of the new regulation is as follows. The new regulation divides the process of selecting candidates for local administration chief into approximately three steps. As the first step, at the special meeting of DPC, at least four nominees are selected from the activists who registered. For the second step, two of them will be chosen by DPD executives. Finally, DPP executives decide one candidate and give the party recommendation. The most important point of this new regulation is that PAC and Ranting executives are allowed to participate in the first step of the candidate selection at DPC. Consequently, compared with the 2000 election, there was a sharp increase in the number of the party activists who participated in the special meeting at DPC.

Then, how did they adopt this new regulation in the actual process of candidate selection for the mayor election in Municipality of Semarang? The 10<sup>th</sup> of February was the deadline for candidate registration in PDI-P. Four candidates including the incumbent mayor Sukawi and Mugiono the Sukarnoist who was rejected in the 2000 election, registered their names in the list of DPC<sup>11</sup>.

On March seventh, these four candidates delivered a speech at a public hearing named "Interactive dialogue between the candidates and the citizens", which was hosted by DPC. At

---

<sup>11</sup> To be precise, Sukawi is not an incumbent mayor, because his tenure has expired in January 19, 2005. For a meanwhile, the secretary of the city government is working as a acting mayor until the successor is officially determined.



the public hearing, four candidates stated their aspiration for the municipal government. After their speech, questions from the floor were accepted. Though the name of this public hearing was “interactive dialogue between the candidates and the citizens”, most of the audience were local executives and member or enthusiastic sympathizer of PDI-P. In addition, there seems to be some NGO activists included. The dialogue between Sukawi and the audience was quite interesting to make further consideration regarding the influence caused by the adoption of direct election system.

The questions are outlined below.

- You won the last election by gaining support from PDI-P. However, I do not think your administration policies for these five years reflected Sukarno’s ideology, Marhaenism. Why is that? In addition, if you are to be reelected as a mayor, what will you do to deal with this issue?
- Reminding the reason of your success in the 2000 election, you should feel obligation to PDI-P for supporting you. However, you seem to have already registered your name in other parties’ list such as Party of Democrats and the Islamic party alliance. Why did you do that? And what sort of ideas do you have regarding PDI-P?

Sukawi responded to these questions as follows with a bold smile in his face.

- Perhaps I should study the ideology of PDI-P in school again. However, we should not forget that PDI-P was based on the fusion of five parties including PNI (Partai nasional Indonesia: the Indonesian Nationalist Party) and the ideology is not only Marhaenism.
- I did not intend to disregard PDI-P in this election. I registered my name in other party’s candidate list because the deadline of registration for PDI-P’s was the latest among other parties. I was just afraid to be left behind and loose chance to run from any parties.

In Municipality of Semarang, there are many enthusiastic supporters of PDI-P who are the member of the party since the time of PNI. The audience includes many of these sympathizers who think Marhaenism is the core of PDI-P’s ideology<sup>12</sup>. Therefore, if he responds in this manner, it is clear that the he will not gain support from the audience; on the contrary, they would feel antipathy toward him. In fact, Sukawi’s name was deleted from the candidates’ list of PDI-P after this public hearing, and he was nominated by the Islamic party alliance<sup>13</sup>. What were the reasons for Sukawi to be so perfunctory to PDI-P?

---

12 Formally, PDI-P’ s ideology is “Pancasila”

13 Why Sukawi was deleted from the candidate list of PDI-P? The actual reason is not clear. However, the key seems to be that, even though he was a PDI-P member, he also had a membership of the Party of Democrats.





Sources say that, one of the reasons was very personal. The personal relation between Sukawi and PDI-P's DPC chairperson Sriyono worsened. There were troubles regarding the supports offered by the mayor at the assembly and presidential election in 2004<sup>14</sup>. The structural problem caused by the adoption of direct election system can be another reason. Sukawi simply regarded political parties as a vehicle to achieve the post of the mayor. Therefore, it was not very different for him to be nominated by the dominant party, PDI-P or by any other parties.

Moreover, it is possible to assume that Sukawi did not believe party organizations including PDI-P for their ability to collect votes in the direct election. In the presidential election of 2004, Megawati's camp was based on the alliance of several parties having PDI-P as a core. The rival candidate, Susilo Bambang Yudoyono (SBY)'s camp was based on the Party of Democrats. On the first round in the Municipality of Semarang, though it was only a 2% margin, Megawati collected 34% of the vote and rejected SBY. However, in the second round, she was defeated by SBY with almost 10% margin<sup>15</sup>. In sum, though PDI-P's support was an indispensable condition for Sukawi five years ago, it became one of his choices to be reelected in the mayor election of 2005.

On the contrary, in 2005, PDI-P executives seemed to have a deep reason to welcome influential candidates as Sukawi to run from their party. In early March, the author had chances to observe some private meeting hosted by one of the PDI-P's mayor candidates, Mugiono. This meeting was aiming to gain support from PAC and Ranting executives.

The experiences in the meeting mentioned below, were quite impressive for the author. At the meeting, Mugiono briefly introduced himself and delivered a speech regarding his aspiration as a PDI-P's candidate. After that, Mugiono was ready to answer the questions from the floor. The author could not feel any positive mood of the participants at that time. No one was eager to know about Mugiono, and the whole meeting was becoming a meaningless time. In such a mood, there was a statement as below.

-The chiefs of RW and RT are already under the influence of the incumbent mayor Sukawi. I can not believe that we will have the chance to win this election without their support. That is why I think Sukawi is the most appropriate candidate for

---

14 Since February 2005, Sukawi is under investigation by the prosecutor. He was suspected for distributing the municipal scholarship budget through the DPC of PDI-P in 2003. "Sriyono, Sukawi segera diperiksa" in Kompas Central Jawa edition. 16 February, 2005

15 PDI-P gained about 27% of the votes in the assembly election of 2004. In the other hand, the Party of Democrat gained about 17%.



PDI-P<sup>16</sup>.

Moreover, there was a question as follows.

-Will Mr. Mugiono pay for our gasoline for the coming special meeting for candidate selection in DPC?

The participants were not showing their positive attitude toward the meeting. According to the meeting chairperson, that was because most of them were waiting for the candidate to give them some suggestive words for offering money, however, Mugiono did not say a word about it. In this way, though many PAC and Ranting executives were allowed to participate in the process of candidate selection for the mayor, their concerns were not on the selection of their candidate. They just wanted to know how much they could draw immediate profits out from the candidates.

After this public hearing, the DPC chairperson, Sriyono gave a notice to the nominees. Since there were only four nominees, DPC will allow all of them to step forward to the next process without the special meeting. However, on eighth of April, a sudden announcement was released from DPC. They offered PAC and Ranting executives to participate in the special meeting scheduled on the very next evening, to select candidates. The deadline for the official candidate registration of the election committee was April 10. The announcement was only two days ahead of this deadline. It was a surprise that, at the meeting on the ninth, the registration book of DPC was reopened. There was a vote to select one formal candidate from seven nominees; the original four and three newcomers who registered on the eve of this meeting. The winner of this vote exercised by DPC, PAC and Ranting executives was Sundoro, who was one of the three newcomers. He collected 281 votes out of 666.

Sundoro was a Golkar's candidate who engaged in a fierce competition with Sukawi in the mayor election of 2000. In the election of 2005, at first, he tried to run for the mayor from Golkar. However, he failed. Next, he approached to Party of Democrat. Again he could not succeed. That is to say, the only choice left for Sundoro to be in the mayor election of 2005 was to be a PID-P candidate. Fortunately, he succeeded in getting the certificate for PDI-P's official candidate. This was the result of his vote- buying activity for DPC, PAC and Ranting executives in this special meeting.

---

16 RW(Rukun Warga) is the administrative unit at the next-to-lowest level at local, consisting of several RT(Rukun Tetanga)s and RT is neighborhood association, the lowest administrative unit.



However, if the DPC did not reopen the nominee registration in the special meeting, Sundoro could not even have the chance to be a nominee in the first place. Therefore, the reason of his success can not be concluded only to his vote-buying activity. According to the 10<sup>th</sup> article of DPP's decision letter No.429, the special meeting regarding candidate selection for the mayor must be held five month before the deadline of candidate registration. This case of Municipality of Semarang was an absolute deviation from this rule. Since Sundoro did not have enough time to get the recommendation from DPP, he registered his name in the candidate list of the election committee without it.

What made DPC executives dare to take risks against DPP for Sundoro? It is said that the chairperson of DPD in Central Java Murdoko was ambitious to have Sundoro as the PDI-P candidate to run for the mayor election on Municipality of Semarang.

Let us follow up the reasons. Firstly, if the DPC chairperson Murdoko did not endorse Sundoro, he could not gain the candidacy for the election. Because it was quite possible that without Murdoko's support, DPD would deny Sundoro even he was selected in DPC. Secondly, in the 2000 election, Murdoko had appointed Sundoro as deputy mayor candidate. Next, Sundoro chose Yuwanto as his partner in 2005 election. Yuwanto is one of Murdoko's elder brothers and also PAC chairperson of Semarang Municipality. Thirdly, in the mayor election of 2005, Murdoko installed himself as the chairperson of the success team for Sundoro and Yuwanto. From these points, we can figure out that Sundoro – Murdoko alliance had a deal with DPC executives to conveniently falsify the regulations of candidate selection process for the mayor election.

As mentioned, the adoption of direct election system caused some changes in the candidate selection process of 2005 election. However, the PDP-P's candidate for the mayor election of Municipality of Semarang was appointed behind the doors through private bargaining between DPD/DPC executives and the candidate as in the mayor election of 2000.

## **5. Concluding remarks**

Heretofore, to consider the issues of political parties in local political scenes, we observed the process of candidate selection within PDI-P for the mayor election of Municipality Semarang carried out in 2000 and 2005. The points can be summarized as follows.

At the Mayor election of Municipality Semarang in 2000, the preliminary candidate selection was implemented by the DPC executives. However, the final selection was delegated to the PDI-P's faction. The PDI-P's faction did not nominate Soetjipto who gained support from Megawati. They chose Sukawi for the candidate, although he was in the fourth place among



five selected nominees chosen by the DPC executives. Sukawi is a businessman who was said to have succeeded in effective vote-buying. That is to say, neither the result of the DPC executives' selection nor Megawati's recommendation affected the final determination of PDI-P's faction.

Being conscious to the adoption of direct election system, candidate selecting process for local administration chiefs in 2005 allowed PAC and Ranting executives to participate in the decision making with the DPC executives. However, the new rule for the candidate selecting process for local administration chief regulated by DPP was conveniently falsified by DPD and DPC executives and candidates who had a collusive relationship. Most of PAC and Ranting executives were easily bribed. As a result, Sundoro, a businessman who was a member of Golkar in Central Java, won more than half of all votes of PAC and Ranting executives at the candidate selection meeting in DPC. He succeeded to be the formal candidate for the mayor election of Municipality Semarang.

These two cases indicate that DPD and DPC executives have a strong influence over candidate selecting process for the mayor election of Municipality Semarang. However, it should be noted that the executives' influence was not exercised to let the party organization select the candidates by their initiatives, but to emasculate party's selection process for their interests. Actually, in 2000 and 2005 election, candidates were already decided behind the doors by private bargaining between DPD/DPC executives and the candidates. They did not achieve their accountability about the process not only to the citizens, but also to the executives of local branches. They do not have the orthodox conception that political party leaders should have; gain more support from the citizens in middle-long term by fulfilling their accountability about the process for candidate selection.

What can be the basis of this problem? Firstly, there is a structural weakness of local party organization as mentioned in the first section. Since authorities for party activity management are centralized in DPD and DPC executives, they are able to control local party organization (local branches and faction in the assembly) privately. Secondly, there is a critical problem regarding the mentality of local branch executives who are easily manipulated by DPD and DPC executives. Most of the local branch executives consider the mayor election as a important chance to collect their personal and direct interests. Of course there are some executives who are trying to be loyal to their ideology and ideal (namely "Sukarnoist"). However, as the failure of Mugiono in the 2000 and the 2005 election symbolically indicates that, they are losing their places in the local party organizations.

These are the unchanged points regarding the process of candidate selection for the mayor election in Municipality Semarang. However, there was an obvious change by adopting direct



election system for the mayor election. That was the power relation between the candidates and the party.

Since the mayor was elected by the representatives of the municipality assembly in 2000, the most important issue for the candidate including Sukawi was to gain support from the influential and dominant party in Municipality Semarang assembly such as PDI-P. However, regarding the 2005 election, to put it strongly, political parties in the direct election system is nothing but a political entity, which give candidates the certificate for the election. The structural change of power relation between the candidates and the party caused a noticeable result. Sukawi, who won the mayor election of 2000 by gaining support from PDI-P made the easy switch to other party in 2005 election to get their candidacy. Therefore, PDI-P had to dump their candidacy to Sundoro who failed to get the candidacy of Golkar and also the Islamic parties alliance.

As mentioned above, since the political party at local level was privatized by the local branch executives, it lost their function in the candidate selecting process for local administration chief election. As far as observing the case in Municipality of Semarang, though the adoption of direct election system could not save functions of political parties from faltering, it did succeed in reversing the power relationship between candidates and the party. As a result, political parties are changing into a vehicle for power seekers to gain official post in local government.

### References

Dewan Pimpinan Pusat Partai Demokrasi Indonesia Perjuangan

2000 Piagam Perjuangan, Anggaran Dasar, Anggaran Rumah Tangga 2000-2005.

DPP's decision letter(Surat Keputusan DPP PDI-P) No. 189-2002., No.304-2003., No.429-2004.

Duverger, Maurice

1954 *Political Parties*. Methuen: London.

Hadiz, Vedi R.

2003 "Power and Politics in North Sumatra: The Uncompleted Reformasi", Aspinall, Edward. and Fealy, Greg. ed. *Local Power and Politics in Indonesia: Decentralisation & Democratisation*, Institute of Southeast Asian Studies: Singapore. :119-131.



Imawan, Riswanda. and Sukmajati Mada

“Sentralisasi dan Otonomi Politisi dalam pelaksanaan Desentralisasi dan Ptonomi Kota Madiun.” Schiller, Jim. Ed. Jalang Terjal Reformasi - Local Dinamika Politik di Indonesia. Program Pascasarjana Politik Local dan Otonomi daerah, Program Studi ilmu politik, Universitas Gadjah Mada :Yogyakarta. :65-104.

Law No. 31 of 2002., No. 12 of 2004.

Masaaki, Okamoto

forthcoming. “From the Decentralized and Separated model to the Weakly Centralized and Fusion model -the new framework of decentralization and Department of Home affair’s win” in Matsui Kazuhisa and Kawamura Koichi. ed. *the general election in 2004 and the start of new government in Indonesia -from Megawati to Yudoyono*

News papers:

Kompas. (Central Java edition)

Suara Merdeka.

Wawasan.

