CHAPTER II

POLITICAL PARTY, PARTY SYSTEM,
POLITICAL STABILITY AND LEGITIMACY:
A CONCEPTUAL ANALYSIS
In modernizing society, "building the state" means in part the creation of an effective bureaucracy, but, more importantly, the establishment of an effective party system capable of structuring the participation of new groups in politics. Because, "the principal institutional means for organizing the expansion of political participation are political parties and the party system." In a democratic country, the life of political parties is very important to show how the system is working. Political parties represent the general will of the people and become the medium of communication between the system and the people. They become necessary to organize and to structure the expanded participation. A strong political party system has the capability, "first, to expand participation through the system and thus to preempt or to divert anomic or revolutionary political activity, and, second, to moderate and channel the participation of newly mobilized groups in such a manner as not to disrupt the system." The development of party system in a country depends on the ability of the political system to adjust itself to the need and function it plays. It is the political party, "a group of citizens more or less organized, who act as a political unit who, by the use of their voting, aim to control the government and carry out their general policies," that makes representative democracy works. Political parties are social organizations that attempt to influence the selection and tenure of the personnel of government by putting forward candidates for elective office and the policies of government according to some general principles or proclivities upon which most of their members agree. It exhibits a structure or organization which links leaders at the center of government to a significant popular following in the political arena and its local enclaves, and generates in-group perspectives or at least symbols of identification and loyalty. Political parties are not necessarily organized to fight elections. The idea of revolutionary party is an obvious example. Power and its pursuit, for some common purpose, is the
hallmark of a political party. Organizations that push for one single interest or represent opinion on a single issue are not parties if they do not seek power for general purposes. Political parties are the main intermediate and intermediary structures between society and government. They are central to both in the sense that they connect bridges to create two-way communication process between them. Being the ‘primary lubricants’ and ‘moving forces’ of the governmental process, they are central also to modern political systems. In one way or the other, all forms of governments in all modern and modernizing societies have turned to political parties and have maintained them as an essential institution of the political system. The stability of a modernizing political system depends on the strength of its political parties. A legitimate government will be installed to create stability in a political system. It is the party system capable of assimilating the new social forces produced through modernization that becomes the precondition of political stability.\textsuperscript{6}

Polities which have a stable balance between participation and institutionalization at low levels of both face the prospect of future instability unless the development of political institutions keeps pace with the expansion of political participation.\textsuperscript{7} This is the responsibility of political parties to provide the channel for participation. Because political parties as well as the party system are the principal means for organizing the expansion of political participation. A stable government that is legitimate will bring the political system to work accordingly for the benefits of the people. As Huntington states in his work \textit{Political Order in Changing Societies},

\ldots{}societies which have created a large-scale of modern political institutions with the
capability of handling much more extensive political participation than exist at present are presumptively stable. Societies where political participation exceeds institutionalisation are, clearly, unstable, while societies with a balance between the two at high rates of both may be said to have validated stability.8

Political stability implies the security of a regime from the threat of subversion, revolution, rebellion and eventual overthrow. Such security may be obtained through strong military or economic power but at the end, legitimacy and popular support are required to sustain it. As Rustow states, “political stability functions as the legitimacy of institutions and rulers.”9 He expresses this relationship in the following equation:

\[
\text{Political Stability} = \text{Legitimacy of Institutions} + \text{Personal Legitimacy of Rulers}
\]

He further suggests that for stability to exist, the masses must accept and support both political institutions and the actors in them. Conventionally speaking, ideology, language, religion and culture are considered contributory factors to social cohesion and eventually to stability. Countries undergoing rapid social and economic changes particularly require viable political institutions and processes to regulate and channel the pressures of change and prevent anomic effects and outbreak of violence. Because political stability is achieved when the political system has the ability to absorb changes.10 At the same time, disturbances are generated both inside and outside of the system causing the system to move. The system must then be able to accommodate or adjust to these changes in order for equilibrium to persist. In Easton’s behavioral model of input-output type of political system, a diagram is proposed as below:
The citizens' demands and supports constitute the 'input' variables, and decisions as well as actions constitute the 'output' variables.

Legitimacy, in the words of Rustow, is the precondition for political stability in democratic states. Legitimacy relates to the acceptance of power by the people and the process whereby power gains acceptance by the people which essentially includes the process of mobilization of support through ideology, institution building, system of rewards and punishment, performance or manipulation. It involves "the capacity of the system to engender and maintain the belief that the existing political institutions are the most appropriate ones for the society." It is the belief in the rightfulness of a state, in its authority to issue commands, so that the commands are obeyed not simply out of fear or self-interest, but because they are believed to have moral authority, because subjects believe that they ought to obey that bring about political legitimacy in a political system. The relationship between stability and legitimacy is thus very significant. A stable government comes when a legitimate government installed receives full support from the people and effectively functioning through its actual performance to satisfy the basic
functions of government. The effectiveness and the legitimacy of its political system affect political stability. Furthermore, political legitimacy is very significant as it is:

1. the core of political organization and affects all political activities;
2. it shapes the effectiveness of governance, the scope, pace and method of political change, and the international conduct of the state;
3. as a moral support for the ruler to rule the subjects.¹³

Thus legitimacy maintains political stability in a polity because it establishes a regime’s right to rule, and so underpins the regime’s authority over its people. Legal-rational authority is the most common basis of legitimacy in modern societies, being linked to the establishment of rule-governed behavior through constitutionalism and electoral democracy.¹⁴

2.1 Political Party: Origin and Development

So fundamental are political parties to the operation of modern politics that their role and significance are often taken for granted. It is forgotten, for instance, that parties are a relatively recent invention. As political machines organized to win elections and wield government power, parties came into existence in the early nineteenth century. In colonial days, they became an important tool of freedom movements. The leaders of the colonized societies realized that political party could become an effective tool to challenge the colonial government. As a consequence, political parties became important feature in their development as independent states. Moreover, the representative politics and the increasing
participation of the people in political process contributed much to their rapid acceptability and development. As a result, today political parties exist in all societies and wherever they do not that is because of their suppression.

The rise of political parties is indubitably one of the important distinguishing marks of modern government. The parties, in fact, have played a major role as makers of governments; more especially they have been the makers of democratic government. And whether they are the tools of democracy or sources of tyranny and repression, political parties are the vital link between the state and civil society, between the institutions of government and the groups and interests that operate within society. Three different theories have been suggested on the origin and development of political party:

1. Institutional theories focusing on the interrelationship between early parliaments and the emergence of parties;
2. Historical-situation theories that focus on the historical crises or tasks which systems have encountered at the moment in time when parties developed; and,
3. Developmental theories that relate parties to the broader processes of modernization.

The first theory describes that political party emerges gradually from the activities of the legislators to make contact with the masses and to gather supports from them. The second theory explains that historical situational crises occur in political systems that experience transition from traditional to more modern and complex structure. It has been suggested that the way in which political elites cope with such crises may determine the
kind of political system that develops. Such historical crises not only often provide the context in which political parties first emerge but also tend to be a critical factor in determining what pattern of evolution parties later take. The last theory suggests that modernization in the socio-economic aspects results in the emergence of political organization capable of aggregating and articulating various aspirations emerge in the society. Thus, political parties emerge as a logical product of socio-economic modernization process in the society. There is similarity between the second and the third theory where political parties emerge in relation with changes in the society because of modernization process. The difference is in the formation process where the second theory suggested that the changes in the polity resulting in the emergence of three different crises: legitimacy, integration and participation crises, and political parties emerge to solve them, while the third theory suggested that the changes in the polity necessitate the emergence of political parties.

In a democratic polity, political parties play a significant role that they become the backbone of the polity. The quality of democratic political system depends on the ability of the political parties to absorb demands and aspirations of the people and deliver them back as a product of political process. J. LaPalombara and Myron Weiner gave four distinct characteristics of political parties. They said that political parties should:

1. Have continuity in organization, that is an organization whose expected life span is not dependent on the life span of current leaders;
2. Manifest and presumably permanent organization at the local level, with regularized communications and other relationships between local and national units;
3. Self-conscious determination of leaders at both national and local levels to capture and hold decision-making power alone or in coalition with others, simply to influence the exercise of power; and

4. Concern on the part of the organization for seeking followers at the polls or in some manner striving for popular support.\textsuperscript{17}

Thus, in democratic polity, political party is an organization that is locally articulated, that interacts with and seeks to attract the electoral support of the general public, that plays a direct and substantive role in political recruitment, and that is committed to the capture or maintenance of power, either alone or in coalition with others.\textsuperscript{18} It becomes the vehicle for mass political participation based on political culture and ideology.

As a group that is involved wholly in politics, the foremost function of political party is to seek and maintain political power in order to materialize the party programs based on certain ideology.\textsuperscript{19} Its primary purpose is to be represented formally in the policy-making institutions of government.\textsuperscript{20} Besides, it also performs some other functions like political communication, political socialization, political recruitment, conflict management agency, and as a political control.\textsuperscript{21} In general, the common functions of political parties are:

1. It is expected to organize public opinion and to communicate demands to the centre of governmental power;

2. To articulate to its followers the concept and meaning of the broader community;

3. To be intimately involved in political recruitment.\textsuperscript{22}
Thus, it is understood that political parties become an important device to organize political power, influence government policies, connecting the people and the political process effectively, formulate the demands and aspirations of the people to be included in the process of decision making process.

As a political unit, there are stages in which political party develops. Samuel P. Huntington has described four different stages of party development in his book *Political Order in Changing Societies*. The stages are:

*Factionalism* is the first stage in the party development. When politics involves a small number of people competing with each other in a large number of weak, transitory alliances and groupings, these groupings have little durability and no structure. They are typically the projections of individual ambitions in the context of personal and family rivalries and affiliations. These political groupings may be called parties, but they lack of the continuing organization and social support which are the essence of party. A faction appeared as a portion of an electorate, political elite, or legislature whose adherents were engaged in parallel action or coordination of some consistency but limited durability in conflict with other portions. Second is *Polarization*. This stage is the crucial process in the evolution of a political system when politics breaks out of the closed circle of revolutionary or legislative factionalism, political participation broadens, new social forces appear on the political scene, and the organized linking of political faction to social force forms political parties. A multiplicity of groups and of cleavages lead the actors to devise
strategies for the redistribution of power within the system rather than for the expansion of the power of the system. They promote the extension of political participation and the establishment of links between the political factions and rising social forces. In one form or the other, the polarization of opinion is a requisite for the shift from factional politics to party politics. The third stage is Expansion. It is a process when a strong party appeals to large masses of the population and binds those masses to it through an effective organization. The expansion of participation and the organizing of that participation in parties is thus the product of the intense political struggle. It involves the efforts of political leaders either to overthrow the existing system, to control the existing system, or to enter the existing system. The final stage of party development is the Institutionalisation. The way in which political participation is expanded obviously shapes the party system which subsequently develops. The anti-system revolutionary or nationalist process eventually results in the displacement of the former political system and the establishment of a new one with typically a one-party or dominant-party system. The intersystem process most often leads to the early institutionalisation of a two-party system, while the into-system process is likely to eventuate in the emergence of a multiparty system. Once these patterns are established in the early phases of party development, they tend to become institutionalized. 23

In their development, political parties interact with each other. They form such a behavioural pattern in which these political units function effectively in a political system. The complex inter-relationships between and among parties are crucial in structuring the way political systems work in practice. This behavioural pattern and interaction among the political parties in a political system is called party system. 24 The interaction between
parties influences each unit as separate individuals and the inner structure of a political party depends on the interaction pattern among the parties. Party systems shape the broader political process in various ways. They influence the range and nature of choice available to the electorate, and affect the cohesion and stability of government. They structure the relationship between the executive and the assembly, establish a bias in favour of either conflict or consensus, and shape the general character of the political culture. However, party and party system are two different entities that separate discussion is necessary to understand them. In this study, we will focus and discuss political party in its interaction with other units in a political system, which eventually bring about political stability and legitimacy to the polity. In other words, we will discuss the party system, and not political party as a political unit, in a democratic polity.

2.2 Party System and Its Typology

In its most traditional definition, party system is studied on the basis its numerical typology. The party system is distinguished by reference of the number of parties competing for power. On this basis, Maurice Duverger divides it into three: multiparty system, biparty system and single party system. He explains that:

... a multiparty system comes when more than two political parties compete for power in the general election. It comes as a common phenomenon in heterogeneous societies, culturally as well as socio-economically. Each of the entities in the society tries to maintain its distinctive characteristics and creates different political forums to
articulate their political aspirations. Coalition governments are the common phenomenon in a multiparty system. Biparty system is a party system where two dominant political parties compete with each other for power in the general election to seek the most popular support from the masses. The winning party will control the government while the losing party fills the opposition bench loyally. This party system usually works effectively with three conditions: a relatively homogeneous society, national consensus and institutionalisation of conflict mechanism agency. ... a single party system occurs when there is only one single party in the polity. It has three variations: the single party totalitarian where a single party emerges to control the military, the government as well as controlling all aspects of life in the society with a single ideology and the total use of power for the restructuring the society’s social and economic system; the single party authoritarian where more than one political party lives in a polity but only one big party used by the government to mobilize the masses and to seek political legitimacy through it while other parties have limited functions and the government strictly controls their activities. This type of party system usually appears in the developing nations facing the problem of national integration and economic problem. It is meant for national unification and a tool to mobilize the masses in supporting government policies. If it is the party that controls the military and the state in a single party totalitarian, it is the government and the military which control the party in an authoritarian party system; and the single party dominant where there are many political parties in a political system but one dominant party emerges to dominate the political activities and attract political supports from the masses. No parties in the polity are capable of challenging its domination even though they are having the same chance to gain popular votes in the general election. The system is democratic in which there is competition among the
factions in the party. \textsuperscript{25}

Although such a typology is commonly used, party systems cannot simply be reduced to a number game. Because, as important as the number of parties competing for power, their relative size, as reflected in their electoral and legislative strength, are also very much important. Thus, Giovanni Sartori pointed out that what is vital is to establish the relevance of parties in relation to the formation of governments, and in particular whether their size gives them the prospect of winning, or at least sharing, government power. He even suggested further that contrary to this traditional division of party system, there is another different viewpoint on the types of party system. According to him, the division of party system is based on the ideological polarization between the parties and not on the number of parties in the polity, as it is generally perceived. \textsuperscript{26} It is the ideological polarization, the distance between the poles and the direction of the political behaviour that counts and not the number of parties. Thus, Sartori classifies party system into three types: simple two-party pluralism, moderate pluralism, and extreme pluralism. This can be shown in the table below:\textsuperscript{27}

\begin{center}
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
Party Systems & Poles & Polarity & Drives \\
\hline
Simple pluralism & Bipolar & None & Centripetal \\
Moderate pluralism & Bipolar & Small & Centripetal \\
Extreme pluralism & Multipolar & Polarized & Centrifugal \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{center}
The actual working of the party system pivots around two poles is bipolar, no matter whether the parties are two, three, or four; for in this case the party system has no “centre,” no centre pole. While the party system pivots upon more than two poles, for in the case the system has a “centre,” is multipolar. The distance between the poles, and not the number of poles, creates the system. He gave an example that when the spectrum of political opinion is extremized, when the Right and Left poles of a political system are literally “two poles apart,” then the system has polarity, a polarized party system. “Polarized” indicates the distance, a situation of lack of basic consensus, the congruence of basic orientations – especially values and attitudes – at the level of regime and/or of the political community, in which the distribution of opinions covers the maximum conceivable distance.

Besides the polarity that appears in the system, the drives of the polity is another important aspect in the creation of party system. Sartori says that:

*Centripetal* is the drive that occurs in the bipolar systems where the existing poles tend to converge toward the centre; the multipolar systems tend to be centrifugal: they have a centre, but no centrality, no centripetal drive. And when the drive of a political system is centripetal, it will create a moderate politics, while immoderate or extremist politics reflects the prevalence of centrifugal drives in the polity.

Thus, according to Sartori, party system is created on the basis of the number of poles, the distance between them, and the centripetal or centrifugal drives of the polity resulting in their interaction. Bipolar and multipolar indicate how many are the pivotal points of the
system; polarity and polarized are used as indicators of strong distance; and polarization and depolarisation are defined to mean a centrifugal process toward disruption of basic consensus, and vice versa, a centripetal process toward reunification of basic consensus. Sartori concluded that simple pluralism is bipolar, and not polarized two-party system, in which ideological differences markedly separate major parties, some of which adopt an anti-system stance; moderate pluralism, the systems that operate on a three-four party basis, is bipolar and centripetal in which ideological differences between major parties are slight and where there is a general inclination to form coalitions and move towards middle ground; whereas extreme pluralism is multipolar, polarized, and also likely to be centrifugal. Through his model of party systems, Sartori suggested that the traditional distinction between two-party and multiparty systems could be replaced by a model-oriented distinction between bipolar and multipolar party systems. Two reasons have been suggested that, first, this model accounts for the positioning and pattern of interaction of the parties, regardless of their number, and, second, it breaks down the undifferentiated category of the multiparty systems.

In the context of developing nations, Sartori suggested another models of party system: extreme pluralism and hegemonic party system. He describes that:

... the extreme pluralism usually appears in a complex and heterogeneous society where different groups in the society affiliate themselves into different political forums based on different ideologies that consensus among them is a minimum probability. ... the hegemonic party system is a party system where a superior
political party, a hegemonic party, dominates the polity with certain number of parties to play secondary role.  

Due to the various groupings in an extreme pluralism, coalition governments are the common phenomenon in this type of party system. And since consensus is minimum among the parties, instability of governments is the tendency that appears in the polity. But nevertheless, it would be a mistake to suggest that coalitions are always associated with instability as the record of stable and effective coalition government in Germany and Sweden clearly demonstrates.

The failure of extreme pluralism in creating political stability leads to the introduction of the second model of party system. As in many cases of the developing societies, the failure of the civilian government to provide stability and economic progress made the military to come forward as the saviour of the nation by introducing a reduced party politics and the creation of a hegemonic party. There are two types of hegemonic party: ideological and pragmatic hegemonic party system. Sartori explains that:

... ideological hegemonic party system gives the secondary parties a representation in the parliament with a limited role that they cannot fully participate in the policy making process. On the other hand, the pragmatic hegemonic party system allows full participation of the secondary parties in the policy making process.  

However, even though in the hegemonic party system all political aspirations from different political parties are accepted, the policy making process is dominated by the hegemonic
party. In the developing nations, the failure of an extreme pluralism is replaced by
hegemonic party system.

From the two types of classification of party system discussed above, one based on
numerical typology and the other on ideological distance, a question arises that which one
of the two is more capable of explaining the political stability and legitimacy phenomenon
in democratic polities, especially in a heterogeneous society like Indonesia? The first
classification, party system based on numbers of parties, is seen to be more capable in
terms of its flexibility to be applied on any political system. But its weakness is in its
inability to give clear-cut explanation on the instability situation of political system. On the
other hand, the second classification of party system, given by Giovanni Sartori, has more
capability in explaining the stability and instability phenomenon in political system as
compared to the first classification as has been clearly explained in Sartori's explanation of
Italian party system. Thus to explain the stability and legitimacy process in Indonesia, the
second classification model of party system proposed by Sartori is used.

2.3 Political Stability and Legitimacy

Political stability and legitimacy is very important to keep the polity works. Moral
acceptance of the subjects to the authority of the rulers is very important for the
justification of their right to rule. Legitimacy brings about stability and possibility to create
changes in the society as well. It also expands the authority of the ruler as well as limiting
it. Legitimate government will bring about political stability and eventually deliver what
the voters expect. Thus in order to create political stability and changes in the society,
rulers or regimes need to have legitimacy, moral right to rule, failing of which crisis of legitimacy and stability is the consequence.

2.3.1 Political Stability

The term ‘Political Stability’ is familiar to most people. In its simplest definition, political stability is “the satisfaction of popular demands, and the fulfilment of the ambitions of newly emerging generations.”^36 Ethnic violence, riots, frequent changes in governments, government in exile, social uprising and revolution are all consequences of political instability. When there is political instability, a government and its system cannot function effectively. Economic development is hampered. Thus, every country aspires to maintain or promote political stability. In general, political stability is the existence of working political system for a long time and of stable government, or ruler, that rules for quite long period of time.^37

Jeffrey G. Kittingan suggested three different hypotheses for the causes of political instability:

a. The Political Gap Hypothesis
b. The Economic Gap Hypothesis
c. Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis^38

In the first hypothesis, the widening political gap results in political instability. Huntington writes,
The rates of social mobilization and expansion of political participation are high; the rates of political organization and institutionalization are low. Thus, the primary problem of politics is the lag in the development of institutions behind social and economic change.³⁹

Therefore, in large part, violence and instability are the product of rapid social change and rapid mobilization of new groups into politics coupled with the slow development of political institutions.⁴⁰ The inability of institutions or the system to keep up with social demands is the source of political instability.

On the other hand, the second hypothesis proposed that the economic factors are responsible for political instability. Chalmers Johnson argues that the main cause of most political violence is inequality in the distribution of power and wealth among members of society.⁴¹ He postulates that because of underdevelopment, the structure of the economy favours the more progressive members of society and operates to widen the economic gap between the rich and the poor. However, some political scientists oppose this view. Huntington, for instance, argues that,

The seemingly clear deductions from the correlation between modernity and stability are invalid. If these relationships are accepted, then the promotion of economic growth should produce greater political stability. In fact, modernity breeds stability, but modernization breeds instability.⁴²
Rapid economic growth is in fact a destabilizing factor because it disrupts traditional social groupings, produces economic inequalities, and increases geographical mobility and social demands on the system which the government is unable to satisfy. While the economists and political scientists disagree, sociologists and psychologists have provided a different alternative of observation in the third hypothesis.

Many psychologists believe that political disorders are rooted in the minds of men and women. Feierabend and Gurr write,

There are seeds of violence in every man and woman, and in society. ...the precondition for violent civil conflict is relative deprivation, defined as actors' perception of discrepancy between their value expectations and the environment’s apparent value capabilities.

People will become angry when they do not get what they want, are prevented from getting what they want, are deprived of what they have or of the opportunity of getting it. In other words, relative deprivation breeds discontent which gives rise to anger, and this anger in turn is expressed through political violence.

All three hypotheses above share a common element: each points to the gap between demand and satisfaction as a key factor in the stability equation. The ability of the political system to absorb changes and the satisfaction of popular demands contribute to political stability. It is the tendency of the political system to return to a dynamic equilibrium between social expectations and social fulfilment which is called political
stability. Arbi Sanit has proposed three strongly related variables for political stability to exist in a democratic polity:

a. Strong economic development;

b. Good political institutionalisation; and

c. Political participation.

The following diagram shows how political stability is created:

A balance between economic development, political institutionalisation and political participation will bring political stability to the system. Because polities which have a stable balance between participation and institutionalisation at low levels of both face the prospect of future instability unless the development of political institutions keeps pace with the expansion of political participation. These three variables constitute equilibrium between social expectation and fulfilment thus creating political stability. Besides, there is one more important variable to create political stability. Political legitimacy as moral
acceptance of the subjects to the right of the ruler to rule is unexceptional aspect to create political stability.

2.3.2 Political Legitimacy

Political legitimacy, or the right to rule, may be defined as the belief in the rightfulness of a state, in its authority to issue commands, so that the commands are obeyed not simply out of fear or self-interest, but because they are believed to have moral authority, because the subjects believe that they ought to obey. In the modern state, the right to rule is fundamental that it constitutes the core of political organization and affects all political activities. It seeks to regulate the vital interests and actions of its citizens through binding commands, rules, and laws backed by force. The basis on which legitimacy is claimed will influence the structure of domination. Weber argues that the type of obedience, the kind of administrative staff developed to guarantee it, the mode of exercising authority, all depend on the kind of legitimacy claimed. Legitimacy also shapes the effectiveness of governance, the scope, pace, and method of political change, and the international conduct of the state. Thus, legitimacy is so important that if the government is perceived as legitimate, the social, political, and economic cost of governance will be low and the government’s capacity to promote its political and socio-economic goals will be enhanced.

Weber’s formulation of legitimacy that the basis of every system of authority, and correspondingly of every kind of willingness to obey, is a belief, a belief by virtues of which persons exercising authority are lent prestige, is best noted in the discussion of
political legitimacy. Because, authority can exist only when the ruler possesses an acknowledged right to command and the ruled have an acknowledged obligation to obey. Thus, the belief and the notion of acknowledgement by the governed are the two important key elements in Weber’s formulation of legitimacy. They underpin the ruler’s claim to authority and validate the structure of domination.

2.3.2.1 Functions of Legitimacy

Weber’s definition of legitimacy is one important contribution to the study of legitimacy in the perspective of political sociology. The specific concept of legitimacy points to attempts of regimes and claimants to political power to justify their claims and to attain or maintain support from critical groups in a population. Legitimacy is thus minimally based on formal acceptance and implementation of a state’s or ruler’s claims, promises, and justifications. Joseph Bensman proposed three other different functions of legitimacy:

1. To the extent that a regime can establish some degree of acceptance by belief or expediency, legitimacy can minimize the cost of repression, surveillance, and police work;
2. It can motivate its populace to work and to increased productivity. Legitimacy produces moral, willing obedience, work, and productivity;
3. It helps the regime to trade off its internal power for international recognition and to use its international recognition as justification for its power within its domestic society.
Besides, legitimacy, according to Ramlan Surbakti is very important in order to:

1. Create political stability and possible changes in the society; and,
2. Open the chances for the government to expand the social welfare in the society and to increase its quality as well.\(^{56}\)

2.3.2.2 Types of Legitimacy

When political leaders try to justify their right to rule, a question comes: "How the subject people accept the justification to be ruled?" This question is related to the types of legitimacy. Charles F. Andrain explains that there are several types of legitimacy. These are the traditional legitimacy, the ideological legitimacy, the personal legitimacy, the procedural legitimacy, and the instrumental legitimacy. He further explains that:

*Traditional legitimacy* comes when the subject people give their acceptance and acknowledgment to leaders based on blood lineage. Traditional monarchy is best example of this traditional legitimacy. *Ideological legitimacy* appears in a society that gives supports to their leaders for their ability to interpret and implement certain ideology in the society. When the subject people accept and support their leaders due to the personal qualities in them in the form of charisma or other personal qualities such as great achievement in certain field, the legitimacy of these leaders is called *personal legitimacy*. In a society where law is supreme and the political leaders accept their rightfulness to rule the subject based on these
laws and procedures, the legitimacy on their hands is known as *procedural legitimacy*. The last type of legitimacy relates to the acceptance and supports given to political leaders capable of delivering to the people promises and material welfare. When this process occurs, the legitimacy in the leaders is called *instrumental legitimacy*.

In the diagram below, we will see the further details of the different types of legitimacy:

**TYPES OF LEGITIMACY**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Legitimacy</th>
<th>Sources of legitimacy</th>
<th>Relations between the ruler and the ruled</th>
<th>Objects of legitimacy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>Primordial values</td>
<td>Master/slave</td>
<td>Tradition and person</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ideological</td>
<td>Final aims/goals</td>
<td>Creator/follower of the ideology</td>
<td>Ideological mysticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Personal values</td>
<td>Prophet/follower</td>
<td>Person who has special quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedural</td>
<td>Law, regulation</td>
<td>Higher/equal before the law</td>
<td>Non-personal principles (law)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instrumental</td>
<td>Skill, achievement</td>
<td>Expert/amateur</td>
<td>Knowledge, skill and successful works</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In its development, however, political leaders do not use a single type of legitimacy to stay in power but they use the combination of two or more types of legitimacy in accordance with the structure and level of development in the society. There are three different ways to
acquire and defend these different types of legitimacy. These are symbolic, procedural and material. Andrain explains that,

... through symbolic manipulation of moral tendencies, emotional, tradition and belief and traditional values, political leaders try to acquire and defend their legitimacy. The use of this method to acquire and defend legitimacy needs sensitivity and ability to identify moral, emotional, traditional tendencies, beliefs and cultural values dominant in the society. The procedural method is used in the form of general elections to choose people's representative in the government bodies or through referendum to pass certain public policy, through fair play or even manipulation and intimidation. While the material method is used through promises and implementation of material welfare to the society in the form of actually delivering the basic needs, health and education facilities, communication and transportation facilities, chances to get employment and good capital and environment to invest.  

2.3.2.3 Crisis of Legitimacy

Legitimate government is elected by the people, or is trustee for the people, or works in the interest of the people, or is a reflection of certain qualities of the people, or reflects what the people will become in the future. When such legitimate government faces severe stress on the authority it claims or acknowledges and that there is strong possibility of its disruption and transformation, it faces legitimacy crisis. It refers to the change in the nature of the ultimate authority to which political obligation is owed. It is a breakdown in the constitutional structure and performance of government that arises out of
differences over the proper nature of authority for the system. It usually occurs in a transitional period. The changes in the society from a traditional structure to a more complex and modern society usually result in the crisis in the society. Besides, changes in the level and quality of development in the society from one level to a higher one will result in the similar situation. It is thus possible that the crisis takes the form of a change in the fundamental structure or character of a government, a change in the source from which it claims to derive its ultimate authority, or a change in the ideals it professes to represent. Basic to legitimacy crisis is a change in the way in which governmental authority is conceived or itself acts.

The basic cause of the legitimacy crisis is the fact that the development syndrome always produces a widening of perception on the part of ever larger number of people and therefore an increase in sensitivities about the possibilities of alternative ways of doing things in all phases of life. Lucian W. Pye has suggested that there are four principal causes or sources of legitimacy crises in the development process. The four principals suggested by Pye are:

...first, there is the breakdown of governmental institutions that occurs because of conflicting or inadequate bases for claiming authority in the society. Second, governmental structures may disintegrate because there is excessive and un-institutionalized competition for power. Third, national leaders and the governmental divisions of authority may collapse because the justifications for
their ideological or pragmatic claims to authority have been based on unacceptable readings of history or faulty predictions of future development. 

Finally, and probably most basically, is dysfunctional socialization process. It arises because people have been inappropriately socialized and their feelings on authority are not functional for the efforts of the current leaders. 

The emergence of political party as an important agent of democracy is very important in understanding the process of political stability and legitimacy in a polity. The interaction of political parties in a polity affects the equilibrium of political stability and legitimacy. This network of inter-relationship through which parties interact and influence the political process provide different degrees of political stability and legitimacy. At the same time, legitimacy maintains political stability in the polity. Thus, it is in this view of understanding the equilibrium of political stability and legitimacy in Indonesian polity that the study is focusing on the development of party system as a network of inter-relationship through which political parties interact and influence the political processes.

2.4 Framework of Analysis of the study

A stable government comes when a legitimate government installed receives full support from the people and effectively functioning through its actual performance to satisfy the basic functions of government. A balance between economic development, political institutionalization and political participation is another important factor to keep
the equilibrium of political stability in the polity intact. Together with political legitimacy, they constitute the basic ingredients for a stable government.

Legitimacy of the government in a democratic polity is achieved when it receives the consent of the people through legal-constitutional means. The ability of the government to guarantee the basic rights of the people, to actually perform the basic functions of government and not to resort to repressive policies towards its subject guarantee the continuance of its legitimacy. The failure of the government to perform these functions erodes its moral authority that amounts to legitimacy crisis. Legitimacy crisis also occurs when legitimate government faces severe stress on the authority it claims or frequent disruptions and transformation or change in the leadership of the government. The crisis might also take the form of a change in the fundamental structure or character of a government, a change in the source from which it claims to derive its ultimate authority, or a change in the ideals it professes to represent. Legitimacy crisis erodes the moral authority of the government to rule the people, which, sometimes leads to the problem of political instability. This is the framework on the basis of which the question of political stability and legitimacy in Indonesian society is analyzed in this study.
Notes:


18. Ibid, p. 29.


30. Ibid, p. 139.

31. Ibid, p. 139.

32. Ibid, pp. 139-140.

33. Ibid, p. 140.

34. Ibid, p. 140.


40. Ibid, pp. 4-5.


42. Huntington, op. cit., p. 41.


49. Huntington, op. cit., p. 397.


52. Alagappa, op. cit., pp. 3-4.

53. Ibid, p. 4.

54. Ibid, p. 11.


58. Surbakti, op. cit, pp. 96-97.

59. Binder, op. cit., p. 56.
60. Ibid, p. 56.


63. Ibid, pp. 138-147.