

Corruption, Poverty, and Political Communication the Order Reform in Indonesia

Supadiyanto, S.Sos.I., M.I.Kom. and Tjandra Setia Buwana, S.I.P.
Lecturer in Communication Indonesia (AKINDO) and Communication Radya
Binatama (AKRB) of Yogyakarta;
email: padiyanto@yahoo.com and buwana_tj@yahoo.co.id

Abstraction

The problem of corruption and poverty into two central issues that ensnare the lives of millions of people in Indonesia. As from the ruling Reform Order (May 21, 1998) until now, various corruption scandals; really hampers national development. The end of the New Order government of President Soeharto replaced Reform Order under the leadership of B.J. Habibie; Abdurrahman Wahid, Megawati Sukarnoputri, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, Joko Widodo; not automatically lower the quantity of cases of corruption and quantity of poor people in Indonesia. There are two main problems. One, how the character of the Reform Order government in Indonesia? Two, how to overcome the problem of corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order in Indonesia? This is a qualitative research paradigm. In the type of qualitative research, the researcher has full authority to determine the sources of appropriate information accessible to the research of good quality. All the resources obtained through a literature review. Time studies were conducted in June-September 2014 As a result, there are four main characters of rule Reform Order. First, the quantity of state officials and former officials of the state (executive, judicial, legislative) involved in increasingly large corruption scandal. Secondly, the quantity of poor people has fluctuated or shifting up and down. Third, the amount of foreign debt for more than 16 years in power Reform Order continued to rise sharply. Fourth, political communication constructed by the political elite is still sectoral ego, has not been able to cross-sectoral and cross-party political; resulting in the grouping of the political community. As a solution to overcome the problems of corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order is to give birth to the leaders at the level of the executive, judicial, and legislative professional and honest so as to minimize the corruption scandal. Others, by empowering the poor through a variety of self-collegial entrepreneurship programs. In addition, it also can be done with nullify the amount of foreign debt, to boost national revenue through a variety of creative activities that involve the private sector, government, and educational institutions. The final step to synergize the entire political elite in the vision-mission of national development of short-term, medium, and long-through political communication-oriented principle of prosperity, welfare, justice, and family.

Key words: corruption, poverty, political communication, reform, solution, construction

A. Background

Disharmony political communication that occurs between the political elite in this country resulted in the dissolution of the national development program of one regime to the next regime. This is the trigger why this nation does not have a blueprint for national development in the long term. Substitution impact on the power structure always turn the work program of national and regional development. Work programs that have been defined and implemented by the previous regime, always stop when they're not in power anymore. As a result, whenever there is change of national leadership; always identical to the turn of the work program.

Though political communication harmony among the political elite among different rulers regime a keyword to build a developed country, prosperous, and civilized. Thus it is logical that poverty, corruption, and unemployment is still a social reality which is still a major obstacle to the progress of this nation. Honestly, since the Old Order, New Order, and Order Reform about poverty, and corruption remained a serious social problem ensnare the lives of 240 million people in this country until the Reform Order. Age Reform Order which is now more than 16 years-has experienced a "forward-backward movement" in accordance with with the times that surrounded him. One of the factors that strongly affected the changing times, namely powers; where the ruling party (in this context leadership from central to local levels of executive, judicial, and legislative) has a major contribution in the design of quality of life, political, economic, social, cultural, and defense and national security. Political economy of media theory ever conceived by Professor Vincent Mosco (Germany) it is appropriate to analyze the situation and conditions in the contemporary era. With poverty and unemployment are still stood at over 28 million and 7 million people; provide greater warning to the leaders of this country.

Based on the history of Indonesia since the country was proclaimed on August 17, 1945; has been noted that there are three regimes and six presidential power ever. They are the Old Order regime led by President Soekarno; New Order regime led by President Soeharto, and reform the regime led by President B.J. Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid, Megawati Sukarnoputri, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, and is currently held by Joko Widodo. Three periods of history which certainly has a character different leadership.

Political sphere, which is known as a battlefield between the political elite in fighting the influence (ideology) and the chairs of power (executive, judicial, and legislative); actually become a battleground for national development policy makers. It is they who have become the designer of various development programs that rely on state money. The transition of power from the leadership of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono-Boediono to Joko Widodo Jusuf Kalla-the third quarter of 2014 is running with full dynamics. Political struggle between Merah Putih Coalition carrying Prabowo-Hatta Rajasa and Rakyat Coalition that carries Joko Widodo Jusuf Kalla-culminating in a win-Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla through final and binding on the Constitutional Court. Despite the dispute over the presidential election results of 2014 until the level of the Constitutional Court; but in outline the process run safely and under control. Instead it provides a valuable lesson to all elements of this nation. There is still a lack of research that thoroughly explores the problems of poverty, corruption, and political communication; triggered researchers to conduct this research.

B. Problem Formulation

There are two deliberate formulation of the problem posed in this research. First, how does the main character of the Reform Order government in Indonesia? Secondly, how to overcome the problem of corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order in Indonesia?

C. Research Objectives

This study has two main objectives. First, for a comprehensive understanding of the main characters of the Reform Order government in Indonesia. Two, to seek solutions to the problems of corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order in Indonesia.

D. Significance

In general, there are three main benefits of this research; includes practical-applicative benefits, theoretical-conceptual, and socio-civic. Theoretically-conceptually, the results of this study contribute in developing the concept of political communication

in relation to effectiveness in the fight against crime corruption and reduce poverty. In practical-applicative, the results of this study useful for policy makers (national and regional leaders) as a basis to develop and implement various programs national and regional development policies. In social, the results of this study contribute in providing important information regarding the facts of economic, political, social, and especially regarding the current condition of the map of political communication, corruption, and poverty in the era of the Reformation.

E. Studies Library

The following shows the results of previous research into a strong foundation for the process of this research. First, the results of a study entitled: Analysis of IPM Relations, Fiscal Capacity, and Corruption on Poverty in Indonesia (Case Study 38 districts/cities in Indonesia in 2008 and 2010, thesis research conducted by Purwiyanti Septina Franciari (2012) is quite interesting because it gives an overview clear that in 2008 the HDI variables, fiscal capacity and the negative effect of corruption is not significant at $\alpha = 5$ percent and $\alpha = 10$ percent against poverty. in 2010 the fiscal capacity variable is significantly negative effect on $\alpha = 10$ percent against poverty, while the HDI and the negative effect of corruption is not significant. Based on the results of granger causality, there are differences in behavior patterns between 2008 and 2010 (Purwiyanti Septina Franciari, 2012: vi).

Second, research owned by Adensi Timomor (2012) entitled: Linkage Integrity Officials State Officials on Corruption Eradication Effectiveness. This study makes clear that law enforcement should be done with full determination, empathy, dedication, commitment and courage to be supported by a legal substance that is ideal and cooperative society. Awareness of the law will give effect to the legal compliance officer compliance state officials who form a collective state administering agency organizers so that the integrity of the state apparatus as a reflection of awareness and observance of personal laws state officials and institutions will realize its effectiveness in combating corruption (Adensi Timomor, 2012: 371).

Third, the study belongs to Indal Abror titled: Poverty manipulations (Culture of Corruption in the Muslim community circles). This results in the practice of data manipulation by the people under the poverty in which the number of poor families is

enhanced when there is data collection for the poor families of the government subsidy program; but the number of poor people to be down when there is poor data collection for transmigration (Indal Abror, Without the year: 231).

Fourth, the study belongs to Supadiyanto (2013) entitled: Synergy PT-Corporations-Bureaucracy (Iron Triangle Entrepreneurship) to Empower Poor People and Unemployment in Indonesia. This qualitative research confirms that the most effective way to eradicate poverty, unemployment, and less educated population is the entrepreneurial synergy between universities, bureaucracies, and corporations (Supadiyanto, 2013).

F. Research Methods

This research is qualitative-descriptive paradigm (postpositivistic). The sources of the data obtained through in-depth review of the literature. To enhance the results held focus group discussions with colleagues on 19-20 November 2014 so get various enhancements final result. Time of this study for six months, starting from July to December by 2014.

G. Nature of Order Government Reform in Indonesia

Reform Order that are older than 16 years, starting from May 21, 1998 to the present (the results of this research was completed on 20 September 2014) has a variety of very interesting note worth examining in terms of today's political landscape. For if compared with the two previous regimes (Old Order and New Order), Order Reform has power structure much more (large) despite the short age. Because there were five national leadership conducted by B.J. Habibie, Abdurrahman Wahid (Gus Dur), Diah Permata Megawati Sukarnoputri Setiawati (Megawati), and Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, and Joko Widodo. Compare it with the Old Order regime that is long enough for 21 years 7 months (17 August 1945-12 March 1967), led by Soekarno alone; or the New Order regime very long for 31 years 2 months (12 March 1967-21 May 1998) was headed by Soeharto. There are at least four characters or character owned by governmental structures Reform Order.

First, the quantity of state officials and former officials of the state (executive, judicial, legislative) involved in increasingly large corruption scandal. This has led to

public distrust of state officials. The proof, the commission alone is able to capture the suspect corruption cases during July 2004 - July 2014 as many as 426 people. That is as much as 42.6 people per year that KPK arrested the suspect corruption. Of the 426 suspects over corruption consists of 75 members of Parliament (DPR/DPRD), 18 heads of agencies/ministries, ambassadors 4, 7 commissioner, 11 governors, 41 mayors/regents and his deputy, 115 Echelon I/II/III, 10 judges, 102 private, and 42 other professions. While the number of cases of corruption and binding determined by a number of judicial cases as many as 270 pieces.

Or in other words, the courts adjudicate cases as many as 27 pieces per year. Of the 270 cases of corruption cases that have permanent legal force is decided by the district court as many as 122 pieces, as many as 27 pieces of high court and the Supreme Court (Mahkamah Agung) amounted to 121 pieces. Data can be look on Table G.2.1. and G.2.2. below:

*Tabel G.2.1.
Tabulation Data of Corruption Actors on 2004-2014
(per July, 31, 2014)*

Jabatan	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Jumlah
Anggota DPR dan DPRD	0	0	0	2	7	8	27	5	16	8	2	75
Kepala Lembaga/Kementerian	0	1	1	0	1	1	2	0	1	4	7	18
Duta Besar	0	0	0	2	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	4
Komisioner	0	3	2	1	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	7
Gubernur	1	0	2	0	2	2	1	0	0	2	1	11
Walikota/Bupati dan Wakil	0	0	3	7	5	5	4	4	4	3	6	41
Eselon I/II/III	2	9	15	10	22	14	12	15	8	7	1	115
Hakim	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	3	2	10
Swasta	1	4	5	3	12	11	8	10	16	24	8	102
Lainnya	0	6	1	2	4	4	9	3	3	8	3	43
Total	4	23	29	27	55	45	65	39	50	59	30	426

Source: KPK, Juli 2014

*Tabel G.2.2.
Tabulation Data of Corruption Case Binding Equipment on 2005-2014
(per July 31, 2014)*

Inkracht	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010	2011	2012	2013	2014	Jumlah
Pengadilan Negeri	3	5	9	9	20	20	21	8	10	17	122
Pengadilan Tinggi	0	3	0	0	2	3	0	3	10	6	27
Mahkamah Agung	2	9	14	14	17	11	13	17	20	4	121
Jumlah	5	17	23	23	39	34	34	28	40	27	270

Source: KPK, Juli 2014

Based on data released by the Supreme Audit Agency (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan) RI, the amount of deviation from the years 2004 to 2011 the state money for the government of SBY-JK and SBY-Boediono reached Rp 103.19 trillion. Of the total nominal above, only Rp 37.8 trillion, followed by law enforcement officers. Or from 305 cases worth Rp 33.6 trillion submitted to law enforcement, there are only 139 cases were followed up. While the rest (166 cases) fate is still unclear.

This shows how the performance of law enforcement officials still seem slow. They have not been able to show their best performance. To anticipate to avoid deviations state money, the only way to keep an eye on it with extra performance against all state officials. The posts that have been risky in case of deviation the state money in the business travel sector and facility service vehicles, need to be tightened its supervision.

By referring to the data of the Central Government Financial Statements (Audited) 2009, the value of the deviation from the postal service trips to Rp 73.5 billion. While peculation in the United Indonesia Cabinet (Kabinet Indonesia Bersatu) II occurred in the post purchase service vehicles for state officials predicted spending state money of Rp 278 billion. The funds were used to purchase 79 units of vehicles to state officials, 59 units of vehicles president and vice president (Investor Daily edition of Monday, October 24, 2011). The rise of various state officials/public, as well as a former public official involved in corruption scandals in recent years; downgrades the value of public confidence in the existence of the state apparatus. In fact, a necessary condition for the state government to build a strong, sturdy, and capable of welfare of the people is public confidence in the state apparatus.

Secondly, the quantity of poor people has fluctuated or shifting up and down. Relied on data released by the Central Bureau of Statistics (Badan Pusat Statistik) in 2014, the number of poor and unemployed in Indonesia experienced significant fluctuations. The number of poor people in Indonesia until March 2014 reached 28,280,010 inhabitants. In September 2013 amounted to 28,553,930 people; and in March 2013 reached 28,066,550 inhabitants. Meanwhile, in September 2012 reached 28.59 million. Whereas in March 2012 reached 29.13 million.

The distribution of the number of poor people in March 2014 that: 881,260 poor people in Aceh, 1,286,670 people in North Sumatra, West Sumatra 379,200 people,

499,890 people in Riau, Jambi and 263,800 people in 1,100,830 people in South Sumatra. While the number of poor people in Bengkulu as many as 320,950 people, in as many as 1,142,920 people of Lampung, 71,640 poor people in Babylon Islands, 127,800 people in the Riau Islands, 393,980 people in Jakarta and West Java 4,477,530 people. Java has a 4,863,410 poor people, where as many as 4,327,070 people in East Java and Yogyakarta has a population of 544,870 people poor. While there are 622,840 poor Banten, Bali has a population of 185,200 poor, NTB has a population of 820,820; and 994,680 poor at NTT, West Kalimantan has 401,510 poor people, there are 146,320 poor people of Central Kalimantan, South Kalimantan poor where as many as 182,880 people, and there are 208,230 poor people at North Sulawesi, as many as 392,650 poor people of Central Sulawesi, South Sulawesi has 864,300 poor people, Southeast Sulawesi has a population of 342,260 poor people; and 197,170 poor people in Gorontalo, 153,890 poor people in West Sulawesi, Maluku 316,110 poor people and 82,640 poor people in North Maluku. The number of poor people in West Papua and Papua as much as 229,430 people and 924,410 inhabitants. From the above data it can be concluded that structural poverty is still concentrated in Java; especially in East Java, Central Java and West Java (where the number of poor people in 3 provinces more than 4.3 million people) and there are 4 other provinces inhabited by poor people as much as 1 million to 1.5 million by the province of North Sumatra, Lampung, and South Sumatra.

Judging from the quantity of the population unemployed, according to Badan Pusat Statistik data created in February 2014 found that the number reached 7.15 million, 125.32 million labor force, the working population of 11.17 million people. Labor force with secondary education background down as many as 76.37 million people, and college graduates as many as 11.98 million people. Meanwhile, in February 2012, there were 7.61 million unemployed, the number of people who work as many as 112.8 million people. The number of entrepreneurs in February 2011 as many as 46.05 million, in February 2012 were 43.84 million and in February 2013 as many as 42.55 million people.

When compared to the previous year, the number of unemployed in Indonesia in February 2014 (reaching 7.15 million people) is less than the number of unemployed in 2007 to reach 10 million or even 2006 totaled 10.9 million people. In 2005, even

the number of unemployed reached 11.1 million people in 2004 to 10.9 million and in 2003 reached 9.9 million people, while in 2002 the number of unemployed in Indonesia of 9.1 million people.

Map of the poor and unemployed in Indonesia on the latest; is a social reality. Because issued by state agencies recognized by the government in power. Of the various parties (agencies, private) which has a more valid the data related to the above two things; also worthy alternative reference for every national and state policy makers in making decisions. Ensure the overall welfare of the population is the main goal of the establishment of a nation-state. The more prosperous population, the more advanced countries. More and more residents are poor and prosperous, it means the state has failed to provide optimal service to the wider community.

Let's look back quantitative data related to the number of poor people in Indonesia from the year 1976-2007 presented Badan Pusat Statistik. In 1976 there were 54.2 million poor people, in 1978 the number of poor people fell to 47.2 million people. While in 1980, the figure dropped to 42.3 million. In 1981, the quantity of poor people reached 40.6 million people, and continued to decline in 1984 to reach 35 million people. 1987 poor people in Indonesia only be 30 million people and the figure dropped to 27.2 million in 1990 New Order government successfully menurunkan number of poor people in 1993 to reach 25.9 million. The poverty rate to be the lowest in the history of the Republic of Indonesia and has not been solved until now.

But in 1996, the number of poor increased again, reaching 34.5 million people and eventually break the 49.5 million people in 1998 What is the number of poor people in Indonesia after the fall of the New Order regime? In 1999, the number of poor reaches 47.9 million people, and to 38.7 million in 2001 In 2002, the number of poor people to 38.4 million people and has decreased in 2003 to 37.4 million people. In 2004 the number of poor people reached 36.15 million and in 2005 a population of 35.1 million people became destitute. The amount to 39.3 million people in 2006, and fell back in 2007 to 37.13 million. Meanwhile, in September, 2012, the number of poor people in Indonesia live 28.59 million; and in March 2014, the number of poor people reached 28.28 million.

Clearly, the number of poor people has now recorded 28.28 million people, making national competitiveness is lower than other countries. Although it is sosiografic, the number of poor in the past Reform Order is much lower when compared with the number of poor people in the New Order. But in psychographics, many parties felt the lives of the New Order better when compared to life in the era of Reform Order. But before the public drew the conclusion that life Reform Order more "prosperous" than the life of the New Order, or conversely that the New Order's life more "prosperous" than life Reform Order; it's good to look at data on the number of Indonesia's foreign debt.

Why is that? In our view, the welfare provided by government financial power sourced from the originating country of the foreign debt. Like a family filed a debt on a national bank of Rp 10 trillion, which then used the money to live "prosperous" for many years. So that we can easily refer to it as "debt economy", or can be termed as "false economies". Relied on data from Bank Indonesia, Indonesia's foreign debt total at the beginning of the Old Order of USD 2.1 billion. During the New Order, Indonesia's foreign debt increased to USD 2.52 billion in the early 1970s (in which USD 2.1 billion is owed heritage of the Old Order, but excluding debt legacy of the Dutch East Indies). The surge in Indonesia's foreign debt continues to occur from year to next year. Proven by the end of 1980, its debt to USD 20.9 billion; then swelled to USD 150.89 billion at year-end 1999, while private sector debt at the end of 1980 reached USD 14.3 billion, to USD 83.56 billion at the end of 1998 while the total foreign debt of Indonesia (private plus government) until March 31, 2008 amounted to USD 145.47 billion; consisting of USD 87.5 billion in official foreign debt and USD 57.97 of private sector debt. In January 2014, Indonesia's foreign debt soared to USD 269.3 billion.

Ironically, this fact or just be a happy surprise for the hundreds of millions of this nation; in the midst of poverty and unemployment is still high in Indonesia; Forbes magazine edition March 4, 2014 released a list of 1,645 billionaires or the richest people in the world. Total accumulation of assets that they have reached USD 6.4 trillion. Interestingly, of the thousands of billionaires in the top; there were 14 billionaires who are from Indonesia, USA has 492 billionaires, 152 Chinese people, the rest of billionaires from around the world. Publication edition of Forbes Magazine

conducted March 4, 2014 to be very strategic in the 2014 legislative elections campaign season yesterday. Therefore, from the world there are thousands of billionaires rich people who live in Indonesia. They are: R. Budi Hartono USD 7.6 billion (173 richest), Michael Hartono USD 7.3 billion (184 richest); Chairul Tanjung USD 4 billion (375 richest); Sri Prakash Lohia USD 3.5 billion (446 richest); Peter Sondakh USD 2.8 billion (609 richest); Mochtar Riady and family USD 2.5 billion (687 richest); Sukanto Tanoto USD 2.1 billion (828 richest); Bachtiar Karim USD 2 billion (869 richest); Theodore Rachmat USD 1.85 miliar (richest 973); Tahir USD 1.85 (973 richest); Murdaya Poo USD 1.75 billion (richest 1,036); Martua Sitorus USD 1.7 billion (richest 1,046); Achmad Hamami and family to USD 1.6 billion (richest 1,092); Ciputra (Low Tuck Kwong) USD 1.3 billion (richest 1,284); Edwin Soeryadjaya USD 1.2 billion (richest 1,372); Hary Tanoesoedibjo USD 1.2 billion (1,372 richest), Harjo Sutanto USD 1.1 billion (the richest 1,465); and Lim Hariyanto Wijaya Sarwono USD 1 billion (1,565 richest).

The above facts reinforce the results of research conducted by Knight Frank International, Indonesia is the 8th largest country in Asia which has the richest, or are categorized as high net worth individuals as many as 1,029 people. Nicholas Holt, Director of Research Asia Pacific Knight Frank predicts that by 2022 Indonesia will be the 4th largest country in Asia which has the highest population of the richest in Asia (Java Post edition of Friday, April 19, 2013).

Of course on top of dozens of Indonesian billionaires have a political interest to secure the 2014 election results in accordance with the "business mission" them. So it is not surprising that among them openly and terselubungkan give financial support to politicians (legislative candidates, as well as national figures were deemed potentially be a candidate for president and vice president). And the end result is predictable, the presidential election in 2014 eventually led "business partner" Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla as President and Vice President from 2014 to 2019. Although political calculations, there are many factors that cause why the duo Joko Widodo Jusuf Kalla-superior-mate Prabowo Hatta Rajasa (but sorry, this study did not examine the matter as far as it is).

Third, the amount of foreign debt for more than 16 years in power Reform Order continued to rise sharply. The implication, national policies initiated by the

government in power became interfering by the state or the international financial institutions that become the foreign creditor. In January 2014, Indonesia's foreign debt soared to USD 269.3 billion. Based on the Director General of Debt Management, Ministry of Finance, Government of Indonesia's total debt to March 2013 reached USD 1,991,220 billion with a ratio of 24,1 percent to the Gross Domestic Product. As for the state and financial institutions is creditor Indonesian are French, German, and Japanese as well as the World Bank, the Asian Development Bank (ADB), Islamic Development Bank (IDB). Though the Indonesian government's total debt as of July 2011 alone reached USD 1,733.64 billion. Even in the period of just one month, government debt rose to Rp 9,5 trillion in June 2011 which amounted to Rp 1,723.9 trillion. When compared with the amount of debt in December 2010 of Rp 1,676.85 trillion, the amount of debt until July 2011 increased to Rp 56.79 trillion.

One of the great effort to make the minimization of Indonesia's foreign debt and the state budget savings, while increasing state revenue is to revitalize BUMN. Breakthrough bold new government to make efforts to improve the productivity of BUMN as a "corporate state" is a state income miners tactical step. Efforts revitalization of BUMN so that efforts can be productive and able to provide usefulness and prosperity for millions of people of this nation, the public sorely missed. Based on data from Ministry of Enterprise, in 2008 there were 30 state-owned companies that suffered heavy losses of up to a total of Rp 14.31 triliuan.

In 2009, the rate of loss decreased to Rp 1.69 trillion, and only occurs in 24 BUMN. Meanwhile, in 2010, a total of 18 BUMN loss, so that state losses of Rp 1.29 trillion. Deft step ever taken Dahlan Iskan namely by cutting 18 BUMN were making losses, and healthy 8 central BUMN are "dying" to involve the Asset Management Company (Perusahaan Pengelola Aset/PPA). As for 8 BUMN is rescued by PPA are PT Energy Management Indonesia (EMI), PT Balai Pustaka, Perum State Film Production (PFN), PT Nindya Karya, PT Sarana Karya, PT Istaka masterpiece, Hot Air Survey PT, and PT Primissima. Tactical step, progressive and revolutionary this type should be developed by various government agencies, not just occur in the body of BUMN, but also on the entire ministry.

Through this tactical move, we expect bureaucratic reform and reform of the way of thinking of all state officials can run simultaneously. Various irregularities state

funds, state financial wastage and losses suffered by the various state-owned enterprises should be as "companies" in charge of collecting benefits for the country, not to place back in the cultural environment birocration in Indonesia. State officials should be able to set an example to the community, how to behave and act. Their performance should always give priority to sincere devotion, full of hard work and have genius ideas are implementable for the advancement of the nation (Wilson Lalengke, 2011).

In the midst of rampant corruption in various executive, judicial and legislative branches; This nation requires a clear anti-corruption management. A simple concept, but very difficult to realize them into collective national consciousness. The problem is simple! Public officials (chief executive, legislative and judicial) who becomes the holder of the key in determining the various existing regulations formalistic life, making the position of a political career that can only be achieved with a very large political cost.

Intersect, it is relevant to listen to the results of a dissertation entitled: "Legislative Commissioner and the Making of the constituents (Interpretative Study of the 2009 Election)" who made a senior politician Pramono Anung Authority. Interesting fact of the dissertation which found that the average cost of political campaigns required the House of Representatives candidates in the 2009 elections spend personal funds between Rp 300 million -Rp 6 billion. Apparently, the cost of the House of Representatives candidates campaign background artist and public figure most fairly low because only spent Rp 300 million - USD 600 million. While activists and political party management which became the House of Representatives candidates campaign cost Rp 500 million - Rp 1 billion. House of Representatives candidate from retired military/police campaign costs valued at USD 800 million- USD 1.8 billion. Medium entrepreneurs spend USD 1.8 billion - Rp 6 billion for just the cost of legislative elections campaign.

Though income members of Parliament 2009-2014 period is only about Rp 1.1 billion per year. In detail, the monthly salaries of Rp 40 million, Rp 420 million aspirations money per year and USD 212 million as the money tired of discussions legislation (special committee member), members of the team who created a faction, commission or other fittings Parliament (Independent Voice March 18, 2013 edition).

This means that members of the House of Representatives salary for 5 years in office (serving) around USD 5.5 billion; whereas for the cost of political campaigns spend Rp 6 billion. The cost of political campaigns is far greater than the income earned for a member of Parliament. From this fact, we can mengorelasikannya with the rampant practice of corruption scandals in Indonesia.

Fourth, political communication constructed by the political elite is still sectoral ego, has not been able to cross-sectoral and cross-party political; resulting in the grouping of the political community. The process of political communication between the political elite which was built in the Old Order and the New Order is structured more simple and not complex because it does not need to go through the change of national leadership baton. Because everything is controlled by a president alone. In contrast to the power structures Reform Order, which has a characteristic of the reign of each ruler relatively short-no more than 10 years; even the shortest 1 year over the 5 months of B.J. Habibie. Currently, Indonesia can be said as a democratic state and a "liberal". Indonesia is said to be a democratic state, because it has a very pluralistic political system; even become one of the countries that has the most political parties (political party) election participant. Indonesia is a country that is "liberal", because the state gives tremendous freedom to everyone to express their opinions in public or through the media, and even gives freedom to any civilians who have more than 17 years old or married to join or establish political parties. The trend now, the politicians use the power of the media industry as a business strength and political power of mutual synergism. Even a number of media owners, vulgar (explicit) or hidden (implicit) uses the media as a propaganda tool to keep themselves in power. Or conversely, the media used by the owners of the mass media as well as a politician to criticize the policies initiated by the authorities. The goal is clear. They want to "drop" the state authorities and replace their position. There is a very strong relationship between the presence of the mass media, power, democracy and the life of the nation-state (Supadiyanto, 2014: 17-19).

According to Henry Subiakto and Rachmah Ida (2012: 19), political communication is a communication activity that has political consequences or effects, the actual potential of the functioning of the political system. Thus the political consequences of that which distinguishes it from social communication. The practice

of political communication in Indonesia is of course very closely related to the system and political culture. Political communication and the lack of harmony between the ruling family between regimes, and between the ruler and the regime of the same family; results in high political tension. Because in a time span Reform Order regime that is now over 16 years old is dominated by five rulers at once; it needed more intensive communication between the political elite.

Strategy played by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono to hold Joko Widodo at the end of his reign; demonstrated faith as a "statesman" true. Despite the fact that, in a democratic party yesterday titled 2014 Presidential Election; political attitude of the majority of the political elite in the Democratic Party circles that put Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono as Chairman of the Board of Trustees and Chairman of the Democratic Party tends to be a pro at Merah Putih Coalition carrying Prabowo Subianto-Hatta Rajasa as a candidate for President-Vice President 2014; not on pair Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla carried by the Rakyat Coalition.

Political communication is still built either by Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono and Joko Widodo at the end of the Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono-Boediono and the United Indonesia Cabinet II shows awareness of the statesman. That's the difference between a politician and statesman; because a politician can not at the same time as a statesman; but a statesman must surely be a good politician. If the record of the history of this nation ranges; transition of government from one regime to the next regime; or from the ruler to the next ruler be a crucial point and risky social upheaval both at the level of the political elite (the top of the power structure) and public (under power structure). Substitution of the Old Order to the New Order in 1966 clearly through the upheavals of history that needs a "scapegoat". Likewise leadership transition from New Order to Reform Order 1998 requires physical upheaval that killed thousands of lives (http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Garis_waktu_sejarah_Indonesia).

Special transfer of power from one ruler to another ruler for Reform Order has special characteristics is short-time power. The implication of national development processes that run the power structure of the ruling at that time does not run completely. The national and regional development programs owned by previous rulers that not finished; not immediately followed by the next ruler. This is why the

pace of national development resulted to be disturbed. Political communication built by B.J. Habibie and Abdurrahman Wahid, Abdurrahman Wahid and Megawati Sukarnoputri, Megawati Sukarnoputri with Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono can be said to be less harmonious.

The success of political communication, in addition to determined by the political elite, according to Dan Nimmo (1989), also strongly influenced by the professionals and activists. In this context, professionals are those who make a living by relying on communication skills. While activists is a major political communicators that act as organizational and interpersonal channels (Roni Tabroni, 2012: 47). The integration of political communication between the political elite, professionals, and activists will result in social and political movements extraordinary. Conversely, too, the political conflict between the three parties above also generates considerable negative impact is also troubling.

As known, the political communication in the Old Order and New Order are more reliant on conventional communication patterns; which rely on interpersonal communication patterns, and through traditional media. It was given the development of communication technology at that time was still limited. The use of print media, radio, and television state (RRI and TVRI) is still enough to dominate. Unlike the Reform Order in which the use of telecommunications technology, media, and information technology (ICT) has made significant progress; so that the use of Internet-based technologies become quite dominant. Especially in the era of mass multimedia convergence such as this, the use of different types of media that are integrated into the main requirement for everyone; including the political elite. The implication is that each of the political elite are trying hard to have a variety of network media, or at least can not deploy the image, behavior, and rhetoric through a variety of print media, electronic, and online. This proved true for Reform Order, particularly in the legislative elections campaign and the Presidential Election. Where an alignment blocks in the Indonesian media industry to one candidate for president and vice president. As a result, the news and information that is produced is no longer neutral, tendensiun, and not impartial.

For that all elements of this nation must have a high awareness from the level of the political elite, professionals, activists, to the public (community) in running a

political communications in an integrated, synergistic, and humanistic. "Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono's regime" and "Joko Widodo's regime" 'is now trying hard to build each other all the channels of political communication; so that is expected to destroy all obstacles and individual egoism, egoism owned sectoral each ruler.

H. Troubleshooting Solutions of Corruption, Poverty, Politics and Disharmony Communication on the Reform Order

Various problems related to corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order could be solved with a few steps. First, the birth rate of the leaders in the executive, judicial, and legislative professional and honest so as to minimize the corruption scandal. This step can only be done through a model of the Legislative General Election, Presidential Election and local elections were democratic and professional. In this context, the people of this nation requires political savvy politicians and candidates who spirited statesman. Easy steps to combat corruption is to integrate the national anti-corruption movement is structurally and culturally, became the starting point of the success of anti-corruption management. Where structural anti-corruption movement started from the tops of the leadership of the executive, legislative and judicial branches; while the anti-corruption movement that is culturally starts from the bottom up. In which middle-class family becomes a liaison between the lower class and upper class. Being state officials, do not simply pursue various charms of power. If that's their orientation, leadership function will experience a variety of aberrations (Supadiyanto, 2011).

Second, by empowering the poor through various programs independent entrepreneurial and collegial. Third, to nullify the amount of foreign debt, to boost national revenue through a variety of creative activities that involve the private sector, government, and educational institutions. Finally, by synergizing the entire political elite in the vision-mission of national development of short-term, medium, and long-through political communication-oriented principles of prosperity, welfare, justice, and family. As an additional step, namely combine of entrepreneurship program involving the bureaucracy, corporations, and universities (Supadiyanto, 2013).

According Mudrajat Kuncoro (2012), there are 6 major national development agenda which is considered not complete. First, the problem of poverty rate decreased

from 17.7 percent (2006) to 15.4 percent (2008), and even to 14 per cent (2009). If the number above is valid, it should record the lowest poverty, both the amount and the percentage over the last 12 years. Although the figure is still far from the target of the initial poverty is pegged at 8.2 percent. Secondly, the need to improve the quality of economic growth. Third, the need to improve the quality of human resources. According to the Human Development Report 2007-2008, HDI Indonesia at 0.728 (ranked 107 of 177 countries surveyed worldwide UNDP). Fourth, the need to apply the commitment of zero tolerance on corruption against the central to local officials. Fifth, and sixth acceleration of infrastructure development, planning and budgetary mechanisms and policy formulation needs to be changed so there are no ego development tend to accentuate the sectoral and regional fanaticism oriented short-term and project orientation (Kuncoro, Mudrajat, 2012).

On the one hand, the use of saving money is also very relevant country duo campaigned by Joko Widodo-Jusuf Kalla-future. It is that state officials effective and efficient in the use of state finances. State money belongs to the people, should be used for public welfare. Waste and misuse of state funds for purposes not state, either for personal interest or family/group, is clearly detrimental to the country and the people. State money collected from levies a variety of taxes and revenue sources other countries, the political ethics; must be accountable to the public.

The question is, have the government in this state provide public services satisfactory to farmers, fishermen and workers are becoming the majority in this country? According Mas'oeed Mohtar, reasoning that underlies the formation of public institutions that guarantee the fulfillment of the need for public goods such as health, intelligence and well-being. For individual citizens, the modern state is "emancipatory instrument" to achieve social justice. The organizer is responsible for the affairs of the state "emancipation" citizens (Mas'oeed, Mohtar, 2011).

What happens now, become a failed state in carrying out its obligations, when the issue of public services such as the guarantee of health, intellect and welfare of any residents still marginalized. For this reason, the national force should be deployed in totality to fulfill the basic obligations of citizens and the state for the basic rights of the civilian population of the state (ruling government). When state officials do not fulfill their obligations to serve the public, this is why the main originator of a failed

state into a public institution. There is a very strong relationship between the rise of corrupt state officials with high rates of poverty and unemployment in Indonesia (Supadiyanto, 2013).

National development program can run successfully when the number of poor people, according to our view, stands at a maximum of only 5 percent of the total population. As well as the national unemployment rate left to live maximum 2.5 percent of the total working age population or labor force. The number of national unemployment and poverty rates are still high in Indonesia increasingly distanced dream of the entire population of the country in creating a civil society that is just, prosperous, intelligent and prosperous (Supadiyanto. 2013).

I. Conclusion

In principle, there are four character of government-Reform Order that distinguish the Old Order and New Order. First, the quantity of state officials and former officials of the state (executive, judicial, legislative) involved in increasingly large corruption scandal. Secondly, the quantity of poor people has fluctuated or shifting up and down. Third, the amount of foreign debt for more than 16 years in power Reform Order continued to rise sharply. Fourth, political communication constructed by the political elite is still sectoral ego, has not been able to cross-sectoral and cross-party political; resulting in the grouping of the political community. As a solution to overcome the problems of corruption, poverty, and political communication disharmony Reform Order in Indonesia, with a birth rate of the leaders in the executive, judicial, and legislative professional and honest; empower the poor through a variety of programs that are independent entrepreneurs collegial; boost national revenue through a variety of creative activities that involve the private sector, government, and educational institutions; and synergize the entire political elite in the vision-mission of national development of short-term, medium, and long-through political communication-oriented principles of prosperity, welfare, justice, and family.

Bibliography

Abror, Indal. (No date of publication). Poverty Manipulations (Culture of Corruption in the Muslim community circles).

Franciari, Purwiyanti Septina Franciari. (2012). HDI Relationship Analysis, Fiscal Capacity, and Corruption on Poverty in Indonesia (Case Study 38 districts / cities in Indonesia in 2008 and 2010. Thesis on Jurusan IESP Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Diponegoro.

http://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Garis_waktu_sejarah_Indonesia

Komisi Pemberantasan Korupsi (KPK) Juli 2014.

Kuncoro, Mudrajad. (2012). Regional Planning: How to Build Local Economy, Cities and Regions? Jakarta: Penerbit Salemba Empat.

Lalengke, Wilson. (2011). Pay off Debt Commitment RI. Harian Umum Suara Karya June 14, 2011 edition.

Mas'ood, Mohtar. (2011). What For State? Year End Musings on the Implementation of Public Service Responsibility. Speech Papers presented at the Open Meeting in commemoration of the 62nd Anniversary of Gadjah Mada University on December 19, 2011.

Rizky, Awali dan Nasyith Majidi. (2008). Gripping neoliberalism Indonesia. Jakarta: E. Publishing Company.

Subiakto, Henry dan Rachmah Ida. (2012). Political Communication, Media, and Democracy. Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.

Supadiyanto. (2011). Back to Khittah Reform '98, Daily Morning Yogyakarta Kingdom (Jawa Pos Group) October 31, 2011 edition.

Supadiyanto. (2013). Globalization and Inequality Universal. Harian Umum Pelita edition Maret 20, 2013; can be access at: <http://harian-pelita.pelitaonline.com/cetak/2013/03/19/globalisasi-dan-ketidakadilan-universal#.UUkCutQyhe4>.

Supadiyanto. (2013). Political Parties, Power and Conflict of Interest Stateless. Jateng Pos-Jogjakarta Pos, Februari 11, 2013.

Supadiyanto. (2013). Power charm. Koran Jakarta, Maret 21, 2013; can be access at: <http://koran-jakarta.com/index.php/detail/view01/115093>.

Supadiyanto. (2013). Relation Corruption and Poverty in Central Java. Koran Sindo. Maret 4, 2013; can be access at: <http://www.koran-sindo.com/node/297653>.

Supadiyanto. (2013). Synergy PT-Bureaucracy-Corporate (Iron Triangle Entrepreneurship) to Empower Poor People and Unemployment in Indonesia. Journal of Penelitian Kesejahteraan Sosial of Balai Besar Penelitian dan Pengembangan Pelayanan Kesejahteraan Sosial (B2P3KS) Yogyakarta Volume 12 Number 1/2013.

Tabroni, Roni. (2012). Communication Politics in the Age of Multimedia. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

Timomor, Adensi. (2012). Integrity linkage to the effectiveness of State management apparatus Eradication of Corruption. Jurnal Penelitian Hukum Volume 1 Number 2 January, 2012. ISSN 2087-2291.