

May 1998 Mass Riots in Jakarta: A Holistic and Contextual Analysis of Critical Political Communication

Wahyu Iryana , Muhamad Bisri Mustofa
UIN Raden Intan Lampung,  wahyuiryana@radenintan.ac.id

Article history

Received : 2022-08-03
Accepted : 2023-08-14
Published : 2023-10-05

Keywords

May 1998,
Riot,
New Order,
Reformasi,
Political Communication

Abstract: The discussion of the May 1998 mass riots in Jakarta did not only focus on demonstrations carried out by thousands of people. The existence of related events around Jakarta's capital city caused mass panic due to political problems in the bureaucracy, public anxiety about security in the capital city of Jakarta, and the emergence of public panic due to the economic crisis and anti-Chinese issues. Using a critical political communication approach that takes into account the holistic and contextual factors surrounding the event. By analyzing the political communication processes that took place during the event, this paper identifies the factors that contributed to the riot and explores how a critical political communication approach can be used to prevent similar incidents in the future. This approach focuses on increasing public participation in the political process and promoting accountability among political leaders, which can reduce political tension and the likelihood of riots. The results of the research can be concluded that the process of the May 1998 mass rioting in Jakarta was an act of protest against the government, which was found to be an injustice to society. It started from the economic crisis that caused price increases and the weakening of the Rupiah value, which resulted in soaring Indonesia's debt to foreign countries, the corruption cases carried out by President Soeharto and his cronies. The occurrence of Nepotism made ministers part of President Soeharto's family, and the demonstrations also demanded the downfall of the New Order regime.

Abstrak: Pembahasan kerusuhan massal Mei 1998 di Jakarta tidak hanya fokus pada demonstrasi yang dilakukan ribuan orang. Adanya kejadian terkait di sekitar ibu kota Jakarta menimbulkan kepanikan massal akibat permasalahan politik di birokrasi, kegelisahan masyarakat terhadap keamanan di ibu kota Jakarta, serta munculnya kepanikan masyarakat akibat krisis ekonomi dan isu anti Tionghoa. Menggunakan pendekatan komunikasi politik kritis yang mempertimbangkan faktor holistik dan kontekstual seputar peristiwa tersebut. Dengan menganalisis proses komunikasi politik yang terjadi pada peristiwa tersebut, tulisan ini mengidentifikasi faktor-faktor yang berkontribusi terhadap kerusuhan dan mengeksplorasi bagaimana pendekatan komunikasi politik kritis dapat digunakan untuk mencegah kejadian serupa di masa depan. Pendekatan ini berfokus pada peningkatan partisipasi masyarakat dalam proses politik dan mendorong akuntabilitas di antara para pemimpin politik, sehingga dapat mengurangi ketegangan politik dan kemungkinan terjadinya kerusuhan. Hasil penelitian dapat disimpulkan bahwa proses terjadinya kerusuhan massal Mei 1998 di Jakarta merupakan sebuah aksi protes terhadap pemerintah yang dinilai memberikan ketidakadilan terhadap masyarakat. Bermula dari krisis ekonomi yang menyebabkan kenaikan harga dan melemahnya nilai Rupiah yang mengakibatkan melonjaknya hutang Indonesia ke luar negeri, kasus korupsi yang dilakukan oleh Presiden Soeharto dan kronikroninya. Terjadinya Nepotisme menjadikan menteri sebagai bagian dari keluarga Presiden Soeharto, dan demonstrasi juga menuntut jatuhnya rezim Orde Baru.



Cite this article: Iryana, W. & Mustofa, M.B. (2023). May 1998 Mass Riots in Jakarta: A Holistic and Contextual Analysis of Critical Political Communication. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 33(2), 201-211. <http://dx.doi.org/10.15294/paramita.v33i2.38022>

INTRODUCTION

Riot is a state of chaos, noise, and protest (Depdiknas, 2005). Riots refer to collective action that is spontaneous and disorganized and usually involves the use of violence, whether to destroy, take things, or attack other people. (Soemardjan, 1999) Collective action is a form of deviation carried out by a community (mob) and a group of many people (crowd). Usually, the objects that are the targets of riots or destruction are objects that are easy to see and are in the vicinity of the incident. For example, the city's public facilities. Next, the objects that are the targets of the riots represent attributes or symbols of establishment and prosperity, such as a store, supermarkets, magnificent buildings, and so on (Soemardjan, 1999). Other objects represent symbols of power and authority, such as security posts, government offices, etc. However, riots are not only damaging material objects but also physical objects, which often take lives.

Riots have a general pattern that begins with gathering passive masses consisting of local masses and immigrants or unknown masses. Then, a group of people provoke the masses with various modes of action, such as burning tires or provoking fights, shouting slogans that escalate the situation, damaging traffic signs, and so on. After that, a group encouraged the masses to destroy goods and buildings and loot goods. In some places, it was ended by burning buildings or other objects. Variations were also found; the provocateur group directly carried out the destruction, only to invite the masses to damage the others further. (Ecip, 1999)

The riots that occurred in the city of Jakarta began with demonstrations that led to mass anarchy. This movement was carried out by students from all over Indonesia and was caused by the dissatisfaction of the Indonesian people towards the government, which was considered incapable of overcoming the worsening monetary crisis. However, in the last 50 years, the 1997 crisis was the worst, which caused Indonesia's debt to become unbearable. As a result, prices soared, and the value of the rupiah decreased. The complex and uncertain socio-political situation also exacerbates this condition. Corruption, collusion, and nepotism are increasingly rampant, especially among state officials. In addition, there is a sense of injustice, and various deviations occur (Sri, 2010). In such a situation, almost all Indonesian people felt that it had a negative impact on the country and people under the leadership of President Suharto and his

staff. This caused the Indonesian people to grow and develop a sense of distrust of the government led by President Suharto. (Himawan, 2022)

The monetary crisis had a negative impact on the government, which caused the students and local people to demand the resignation of Suharto as President of the Republic of Indonesia because he could not carry out the government properly and was not in accordance with the state agenda. During the New Order era, apart from relying on regional income, the government also applied for foreign loans through the IMF. However, these loans were unable to revive the national economy (Sri, 2010).

Several causes led to the occurrence of the monetary crisis in Indonesia, as follows (Sri, 2010) : (1) The productivity phenomenon (Productivity Gap) which is closely related to the weak allocation of assets or production factors. (2) The phenomenon of the disequilibrium trap is related to the discontinuity of the structure between the production sectors. (3) The phenomenon of Loan Addiction (dependence on foreign debt) is related to business behavior that tends to mobilize funds in foreign currency (Foreign Currency). The outline of the themes demanded by students in their actions on campuses in various cities in the prosecution of lowering skyrocketing prices, especially the price of nine essential commodities, abolishing monopoly and Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism (KKN) and succession of national leadership (Luhulima, 2007).

The presence of the student movement in 1998 was due to the condition of the country, which was experiencing a shock to the national political system, which was constantly changing the form of government from the Old Order to the New Order, which was caused by the weak position of the state over its people. This is as stated by Fachry Ali that, "this condition is shown by symptoms of mass poverty in urban or rural areas, the destruction of economic facilities and infrastructure, causing economic destruction and high debt as well as damage or malfunctioning of infrastructure and means of transportation, communication and modernization (Martha, 1985).

Political turmoil and economic crisis became one of the causes of the presence of the student movement. Therefore, the student movement emerged due to the country's unstable economic and political conditions. Therefore, in 1965-1966, Indonesia was hit by an economic and political crisis. It finally led the various student groups to make fundamental changes for the nation and state.

Apart from being an intellectual group, it turned out that the dynamics of state politics are also significant enough to move students to become a force for the extra-parliamentary movement as one of its actualization options. 1965 was the most challenging period for the Soekarno government's economy. The people's welfare fell due to the inflation rate, which reached 650%. The government, which did not have an alternative to solve the problem, had issued a policy in the economic field that worsened the condition of the Indonesian people (Martha, 1985).

Not getting the proper response from the government, students in various cities started holding demonstrations until they left campus. Even so, the students had to deal directly with the security forces on guard in front of the campus gate. As a result, clashes between students and security forces occurred almost every day, and injuries began to fall. Student actions increased in intensity when President Suharto was re-elected as president for the seventh time, in 1998-2003, on March 11, 1998. Students demanded that President Suharto resign from his post. Moreover, the phrase "lower the price" also means "abdicate Harto and his family" (Martha, 1985).

METHOD

Historical research is research that focuses exclusively on the past. This research tried to reconstruct what had happened in the past as completely and accurately as possible and usually explains why it happened. The search for data was carried out systematically in order to be able to describe, explain, and understand activities or events that occurred some time ago. Writing past events in the form of historical events or stories that could be justified scientifically should go through historical work procedures.

The narration of the past cannot be done without a source relating to the past; the source in question is similar to data that goes through the analysis process into an authentic fact or statement related to the theme of the problem in the science of history these sources are known, whether written or not. Conflict theory was used to explain a conflict between the Indonesian people and the government; this conflict theory appears as a form of reaction to the growth of structural functionalism theory, which is considered to pay less attention to the phenomenon of conflict as one of the symptoms in society that needs attention " The most influential thought or the basis of this conflict theory is the thought of Karl Marx in the

1950s, the theory of conflict was increasingly widespread. This theory aims to analyze the origin of an incident of a violation of regulations or the background of someone who behaves deviantly. The conflict here emphasizes the pluralistic nature of society and the imbalance in power distribution between various groups; because of the power possessed by elite groups, these groups also have the power to create regulations, especially laws, that can serve their interests. (Raho, 2007)

THE COURSE AND IMPACT OF THE RIOTS

The student movement is synonymous with its massive movement. It plays a role in correcting every social and political deviation and dares to defend the oppressed people based on justice. This is what triggers the strong identity of the social movement in the student movement so that it can become a breaking force in the process of change in society. History has noted that the student movement has played a major role in some of the transition processes in this country. (Budiman, 1998)

According to the history of the youth and student movement in Indonesia, it can be seen that there was an important role when this nation experienced a critical situation. The youths and students were the originators of the youth oath in 1928. Thus, their role in the movements to fight for independence before the 1940s and when the revolution for independence in 1945 was initiated when Soekarno and Hatta were kidnapped by the youths and taken away to Regasdengklok to be forced to read the Proclamation of this nation's independence on August 17, 1945. Eventually, they reappeared in 1966, attracting attention in the 1998 reform event in overthrowing the Suharto regime (Saint, 1981).

Actors of the student movement from the internal campus began to stand out at the end of February 1998. The main factor from the internal student organizations and the academic community, which had been passive against the government, was public unrest due to increased food prices and the threat of dropping out the students so that they would have grim futures (Budiman, 1998).

Student demonstrations conducted before and after the MPR SU brought several demands, namely, lower food prices because necessities had risen since July 1997. Secondly, students also demanded that the MPR not retain Soeharto, who had been president seven times in a row. Third, students demanded political and economic reforms

after the MPR chose Suharto as President and B.J. Habibie as vice president. (Forrester, 2002)

Students do not merely move alone in voicing reform, but they also gain strong support from middle-class elements. Chancellors, deans and lecturers who previously had to submit to campus bureaucracy in various universities were busy supporting the voice of student reform. With the urge to reform, the General Chairperson of Muhammadiyah, Amien Rais, supported the student movement to demand reform. (Sahdan, 2005)

The student action in February 1998 peaked on May 12, 1998, at the Trisakti University campus on Jalan Kyai Tapa, Grogol, Jakarta. This incident has claimed the lives of four Trisakti students due to being hit by live bullets by the police (Zon, 2004). With this incident, more than a thousand people died in Jakarta, and hundreds of people who tried to loot hundreds of shopping centers were roasted to death. The uncertain condition of the homeland caused President Soeharto to shorten his visit to Cairo. Originally scheduled to return on May 16, 1998, however, President Soeharto decided to return on May 15, 1998. President Soeharto met with his assistants at his residence on Jalan Cendana to request a report on the latest conditions in the country. The government decided to lower fuel prices the next day. The President also promised to carry out reforms in all fields and immediately reshuffle the VII development cabinet he leads. These policy measures were not able to reduce the situation that occurred at that time (Poesponegoro, 2009).

In April 1998, the student movement repeatedly became the news of the mass media in the country, with thousands of students from various universities in their campus uniforms being united and various demonstrations were held repeatedly. The students came from Lampung, Jakarta, Bandung, Yogyakarta, to Ujungpandang, not only on behalf of students but various leading universities in Indonesia were also involved, such as the University of Indonesia, University of Gadjah Mada, Institute of Technology Bandung and other several universities. Several students who took part in the action took to the streets to deliver speeches about the state of Indonesia regarding economic and political reform (J.A, 2006).

The action taken to the streets by thousands of students is reminiscent of similar movements in Indonesia in 1966, 1974 and 1978. The most significant student movement occurred in 1998 when measured by the political and economic crisis

that underlies it. The marching action movement carried out by students in Indonesia was widely spread through press reports in domestic and international media regarding the frequency of the movement, the number of students and universities. (J.A, 2006)

This street action movement also reminds us of the social movements that occurred in other countries, namely in Eastern Europe in the early 1990s; what happened at that time was a student movement mixed with various other civil society forces. In this social movement, they demanded a change in the system used by the government into a historical wave in the form of the collapse of a political economy system that was undemocratic and caused controversy to the market economy. (J.A, 2006)

Seeing the student movement in Indonesia in 1998 raises two big questions. First, why was the student movement involving thousands of people from various regions in Indonesia returning to the political stage of the New Order? Why had a student movement of this magnitude emerged now but was not born in the past, like in the 1980s, then what were the similarities and differences between the causes of the student movement and the cause of the similar student movement in 1966? Second, what were the political prospects of the student movement in 1998? Would they repeat the success of a similar movement in their homeland in 1966 or social movements in Eastern Europe in the 1990s, or would they disappear like in the 1970s, then would the 1998 student movement make a new history for Indonesia? (J.A, 2006).

The chaos of the Indonesian economy, soaring high prices of goods, increasing termination of employment, and narrowing job opportunities provoked the students to demonstrate. However, this was merely held on their campus for a while, and several students came to the DPR building to hold the demonstration there (Luhulima, 2007).

The economic success that had become a legitimacy for President Soeharto for more than 30 years to continue rule turned into a prolonged economic crisis. The inability to overcome the economic crisis caused the people's trust in the government to collapse. Slowly but surely, the people began to turn their heads away from Suharto; entering the month of January 1998, the number of students who participated in the demonstration on campuses in various cities also involved lecturers and alums. Five hundred students were held at the Bandung Institute of Technology (ITB). They demanded that the

government immediately resolve the monetary crisis and reduce prices that suffocate the people. Then on February 25, 1998, alumni students of the University of Indonesia (UI) held a demonstration at the Salemba campus, which ended by closing the billboard which read "Welcome to the New Order Campus" with a white cloth and was seen among the students, the former Chancellor of UI Prof. Dr. Mahar Mardjono, Dr. Sri Edi Swasono, Prof. Dr. Selo Soemardjan, and General Chairperson of Iluni UI Hariadi Darmawan. This demonstration was continued the next day by thousands of University of Indonesia students (Luhulima, 2007).

From the demonstration held at various campuses, it can be seen that the outlines demanded the reduction of prices, especially for nine essential commodities or necessities, the abolition of monopoly, Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism and the succession of national leadership. Their actions did not get the proper response from the government, so students in various cities began to hold actions until they got off and left the campus. Even so, the students had to deal directly with the security forces on guard in front of the campus gates. As a result, clashes between students and security forces occurred almost every day. (Luhulima, 2007)

Student actions increased in intensity when President Suharto was re-elected as president for the seventh time (1998-2003) on March 11, 1998. All students who took action demanded the resignation of President Suharto by shouting to lower the prices, which also meant the abdication of Suharto and his family. The demonstration at Gadjah Mada University began by parading a paper puppet of President Soeharto two meters and setting it on fire. The students also burned a paper coffin with a symbol that justice and prosperity had died in the Republic of Indonesia (Luhulima, 2007).

The students' anger against President Suharto intensified when President Soeharto announced the personnel composition of the VII Development Cabinet in the Credentials Room. The Independence Palace, March 14, 1998, contained the names of Siti Hardiyanti Rukmana (Tutu) and Mohamad "Bob" Hasan, the eldest daughter and the colleague of President Suharto (Luhulima, 2007).

President Soeharto's attitude in including the eldest daughter and her cronies in the VII Development cabinet was considered by students as an open challenge to them. Considering the collusion between conglomerates and the government and nepotism was part of the things they strongly oppose in their actions, seeing the

rampant student actions that often turn into clashes between students and security forces, the Minister of Security and Security/ABRI Commander (Menhankam/Pangab) General Wiranto tried to suppress it by inviting students to have a dialogue. In his statement to the press, dated March 31, 1998, the Head of the ABRI Information Center (Kapuspen), Brigadier General Abdul Wahab Mokodongan said that through this dialogue, ABRI was only trying to open channels through which the public conveyed their aspirations which had been said to be blocked, including efforts to open doors for people to express their aspirations. However, he also said, "do not think that ABRI has good intentions to carry out dialogue, so this nation's problems will be solved." (Luhulima, 2007)

However, the offer to students for dialogue offered by the Mehankam/Army Commander was "rejected" by the student senates of several major universities, such as the University of Indonesia, the Christian University of Indonesia, and Jayabaya University, Padjajaran University, Institute of Technology Bandung, and Gadjah Mada University. They considered that dialogue with cabinet ministers could be more effective. According to them, their demands were clear, namely political reform and economic reform, which was marked by the resignation of President Suharto. Therefore, the presidential institution and the MPR are influential dialogue partners for them. In addition, they also doubted that the cabinet ministers would dare to present their demands to President Suharto (Luhulima, 2007).

However, the refusal of the student senate of major universities did not make the Minister of Defense/Commander of Military Command despair. Exactly on April 18, 1998, on the night of the Minister of Defense/Commander General Wiranto, a dialogue occurred between the government and community leaders, scholars, and students at the Commercial Building Arena Pekan Raya Jakarta, Kemayoran. Indeed, several student senates from universities were not present, but the Minister of Defense/Commander of Armed Forces considered the dialogue a success. Because it was recorded that they participated in the dialogue, 25 community leaders, 39 Youth Community Organizations (OKP), 39 university student senates 24 university rectors/assistant rectors and 17 ministers, including the Minister of Social Affairs, Siti Hardiyanti Rukmana, the Minister of Industry and Trade, Mohamad "Bob" Hasan, Minister of Education and Culture, Wiranto Arismunandar, Minister of Information Alwi Dahlan, Minister of

Justice, Muladi, Coordinating Minister for Economy, Industry and Finance, Head of Bappenas, Ginandjar Kartasmita and the Minister of Defense/Commander, General Wiranto (Luhulima, 2007).

In the dialogue considered positive action by the Minister of Defense/Commander of Armed Forces, there was also a demand for President Soeharto to resign. Previously, on April 11, 1998, at the initiative of the Minister of Youth and Sports Agung Laksono, a dialogue took place between the Minister of Defense/Commander General Wiranto and 39 OKPs at the Graha Pemuda Building, Jakarta. However, the dialogue between the government and the student senate did not dampen the students' intention to continue holding demonstrations at the free pulpit (Luhulima, 2007).

Meanwhile, the student actions that had been rampant since the beginning of 1998 seem to have not been underestimated by the government. On May 4, 1998, despite substantial challenges from various groups, including the DPR, the government still decided to increase fuel and electricity prices. Meanwhile, many groups had predicted President Suharto's government would continue increasing fuel prices despite challenges from everywhere. There are many examples where President Soeharto took steps contrary to what many parties demanded, requested, or advised. One of them was Ali Moertoo's advice in 1967 and 1968 not to increase fuel prices.

The demonstration about the fuel price and the basic electricity tariff had been widespread, and the number of students participating is increasing. This is because the increase in fuel and electricity tariffs impacted the transportation tariff and the price of goods to the price of nine primary commodities (Luhulima, 2007).

After the students and retired generals were directly involved, it was the turn of the University of Indonesia (UI) lecturers to come out of their ivory tower. Approximately 250 lecturers, led by Prof. Dr. Emil Salim, met with FABRI leadership in the DPR and demanded that reforms be carried out immediately in all fields. The lecturers who are registered at the University of Indonesia also followed Prof. Dr. Emil Salim, such as Prof. Dr. Meriam Budiardjo, Dr. Todung Mulya Lubis, Dr. Srimulyani, Dr. Iwa Kardono, Dr. Toeti Herarti Nurhadi, Dr. Isbodrorini, and many other young lecturers. They were all received by the deputy chairman of the FABRI for Polkam Rustandi, whom Toyo Tarmadi accompanied. The meeting between University of Indonesia lecturers and

FABRI was interesting due to the thoughts conveyed by the University of Indonesia experts were accusing DPR of being indolent and even made Rustandi confused as FABRI representative who was under attack from University of Indonesia lecturers regarding the reform. (Pos, 1998)

In the meeting held at the DPR building, Prof. Dr. Emil Salim became the first spokesman to convey the main ideas on reform. Among other things, all lecturers at the University of Indonesia supported the actions of students from various universities who demanded changes in the political, economic, legal, and socio-cultural fields. In addition, they also supported the people's movement that wanted to create a clean and responsible government system (Pos, 1998).

In the meeting between University of Indonesia lecturers and FABRI at the DPR building, Prof. Dr. Emil Salim expressed his opinion that transparency was needed in distributing foreign aid that international institutions had provided to create a clean government. He also suggested the need for an independent team to oversee the use of international aid agencies to avoid misuse of such assistance. However, the most essential thing that must be started immediately is reforming the political field. It can only be started by revising the general election system that guarantees the accountability of people's representatives, empowering the legislative body (DPR), the judiciary (MA) and the political party system. Besides that, Prof. Dr. Emil Salim also wanted the need for a review of the special powers granted to the president in the 1998 SU MPR. This review is critical, at least in how granting special powers is accompanied by laws that could prevent the misuse of these extraordinary powers (Pos, 1998).

Prof. Dr. Emil Salim said the same thing was also stated by Dr. Iwan Kardono, who was present at the meeting, said that in the political field, it was necessary to revise the current state of power balance between the government and the people. Because the power of the government was the most dominant force, this was the thing that caused the level of democracy in Indonesia to be the lowest compared to other countries. In addition, what needed to be considered was the limitation of the President's term of office in Indonesia because the President's office was in power for too long. Eventually, it was needed for the Indonesian state to accelerate reform in all fields, or it would result in the deformation of the state field (Pos, 1998)

Dr. Todung Mulya Lubis also discussed the proposal for reform of the law that the DPR needed

to think about civil rights because it was crucial so that cases of missing persons did not happen anymore. Regarding the various thoughts the University of Indonesia lecturer put forward, Rustandi said that the DPR had also agreed with the need for reform in all fields because it did not want to maintain the status quo. In this case, the reforms that could not be carried out touched on normative matters (the 1945 Constitution and Pancasila). However, the operational nature of implementing the Act could be done, for example, in a draft or a program. The law was already well arranged but needed improvement in the implementation stage. The 1945 Constitution also limits the service period; nothing about the eternal President is mentioned. Then, the DPR in carrying out reforms was also serious, and it was proven that the DPR leaders had formed a team chaired by Lt. Gen. Syarwan Hamid to examine effective laws. So, in this case, he also hoped that the lecturers of the University of Indonesia would not mock DPR. The lecturers of the University of Indonesia still need to believe that FABRI could formulate the concept of reform. Finally, Dr. Sri Mulyani offered to the DPR to include herself in drafting the reform concept, and the offer received a response from Rustandi. However, the response was negative and later denied that the University of Indonesia lecturers would only help with the reform concept compiled by the DPR. At least the lecturers could help with the thoughts they had. The DPR people had the power to unite bright thoughts and powers to accelerate reforms in all fields. (Pos, 1998)

In a demonstration held by students of several universities in Indonesia on May 9, 1998, the security forces died. Second Lieutenant (Pol) Dadang Rusmana, Head of the Intelligence Unit of the Bogor Resort Police, died while on duty to secure a demonstration at the Djuanda University (Unida) Bogor Campus. The Head of the Bogor Regional Police, Colonel (Pol) Abubakar, stated that Second Lieutenant (Pol) Dadang Rusmana was tortured to death by Unida students at around 15:00. "A student hit his head with a rock until he passed out. He was then taken to Ciawi Hospital. From there, he was transferred to the Bogor PMI Hospital. He was killed at 16.00," apart from Second Lieutenant (Pol) Dadang Rusmana, another officer who was a victim of beatings by students, namely Captain (Inf.) Ali, Head of the Military District Command Intelligence Section, was seriously injured and treated at the Bogor Salak Hospital. News of the police officer's death at the hands of students and repeated televised broadcasts

of his funeral have angered his fellow police officers (Luhulima, 2007).

However, almost a month later, the news about the death of the police officer at the hands of the students was denied by Dr. Yuli Budiningsih, a forensic medicine expert at the Faculty of Medicine, University of Indonesia, who autopsied the body of Second Lieutenant (Pol) Dadang Rusmana, dr. Yuli Budiningsih presented the statement to two members of the National Human Rights Commission, namely Clementino dos Reis Amaral and Sugiri, at the PMI Hospital in Bogor on June 2, 1998, that the death of Second Lieutenant (Pol) Dadang Rusmana on the evening of May 9, 1998 at the Unida campus, Ciawi Bogor was caused by coronary heart disease and not as a result of persecution by Unida students (Luhulima, 2007).

On May 12, 1998, three days after the incident, described as a student beating a police officer, four Trisakti students were shot dead by security forces inside their campus. The four students were Elang Mulia Lesmana (Faculty of Civil Engineering and Planning, Department of Architecture, Class of 1996), Hendriawan Sie (Faculty of Economics, Department of Management, Class of 1996) Heri Hartanto (Faculty of Mechanical Engineering, Class of 1995), and Hafidhin Alifidin Royan (Faculty of Industrial Engineering, Department of Machinery, Class of 1995), was shot at just as they and thousands of other Trisakti students had just entered the campus after they had finished holding a demonstration. (Luhulima, 2007)

The deaths of the four Trisakti students were shocking, considering that until 17:00, the demonstration, which began at 11:00 and involved thousands of Trisakti students, was calm. There was no significant tension between the students and the security forces. At 13:00, the students moved out of the campus yard, more precisely, into Jalan S. Parman Grogol. They intended to go to the MPR/DPR building, Senayan. However, the student movement was blocked by security officers. Trisakti University then had a dialogue with the security forces, and it was agreed that students could move up to the West Jakarta Mayor's Office about 300 meters from the main door of the Trisakti University Campus. Then, at 17:00, the security forces asked the students to return to the campus. The students agreed as long as the security forces retreated first. After the officers were withdrawn, the students slowly and orderly returned to campus. Starting at 17:20, about 70 percent of the students who took part in the demonstration were already

inside the campus; suddenly, from behind, the students were still in front of the mayor's office, and there was a series of gunshots from the security forces. Meanwhile, a Kompas reporter at the location immediately contacted the office tremblingly. He reported that the students were being shot at by the police, even though the actions taken by the students were peaceful actions (Luhulima, 2007).

Hearing the series of gunshots, the students panicked; they ran back and forth. Some of them ran into the campus, some were hiding inside the West Jakarta Mayor's Office, some jumped over the fence into the toll road and some students who did not have time to run were beaten. By the officers, students who were already inside the campus responded by throwing stones at the officers. The security forces responded to the stone-throwing action by releasing tear gas and shooting at students inside the campus, resulting in a chaotic atmosphere at the Trisakti campus and resulting in four students being shot dead by bullets and injured by gunshots. The students, eyewitnesses, stated that they witnessed the police soldiers who opened fire from a height towards the crowd of students below. The same statement was made by students who were injured by gunshots (Luhulima, 2007).

The picture or video footage broadcast by television stations, especially CNN, shows clearly that it was the police soldiers who fired targeted shots from the top of the pedestrian bridge towards the students. Some police officers seemed to have opened fire from the top of the Grogol fly-pass and the pedestrian bridge. Several other soldiers were seen chasing the students by firing consecutive shots directly at the students. The biggest question is whether the barrage of police bullets killed four students and seriously injured several Trisakti students; the question surfaced because the police insisted that they did not equip their members with live bullets, even though live bullets killed the four students, even some of them. Dozens of students who were injured were shot and pierced by live bullets (Luhulima, 2007).

In a press conference held by the Commander of the Regional Military Command Jaya Major General Sjafrie Sjamsoeddin, at the Polda Metro Jaya Headquarters, in the early hours of May 13, 1998, the Head of the Polda Metro Jaya Major General (Pol) Hamami Nata stated that the deaths of the four students were still being investigated while waiting for the results of the post-mortem et repertum. Because the police only used batons, empty bullets, rubber bullets, and tear gas.

After the handover of the position of the Head of the Polda Metro Jaya from Major General (Pol) Hamami Nata to Major General (Pol) Noegroho Djajoesman on May 28, 1998, Head of the Indonesian National Police (Polri) General (Pol) Dibyو Widodo emphasized that the police and Brimob were not equipped with live ammunition when served at Trisakti University on May 12, 1998. The statement by the Head of the National Police General (Pol) Dibyو Widodo and the Head of the Polda Metro Jaya Major General (Pol) Hamami Nata was still being debated, considering that from the recorded images broadcast on television, it was clear that above the crossing bridge, one of the police officers from the Mobile Brigade (Brimob) element who opened fire at the student was knocked back every time he finished shooting. Such a beat will only appear if the bullet is a live bullet. However, even if the police officer fired live bullets, it is debatable whether the bullets released by the police officers shot the students' bodies while this incident was still not easy to prove (Luhulima, 2007).

The next day, the afternoon of May 13, 1998, after the funeral of the four students who were shot, thousands of Trisakti students held a mourning on campus. The masses began to swarm around the Trisakti campus. They wanted to mourn the students but were prevented by the security forces. As a result, the masses went berserk and began throwing and vandalizing actions (Luhulima, 2007).

A similar situation also occurred at Atma Jaya Catholic University on Jalan Jendral Sudirman, where students held an act of concern and condolences for the Trisakti students who died the day before. Residents around the campus set fire to the downstream dam shopping complex. The riots around the Trisakti University campus quickly spread to other places and later developed into racist riots. The targets of the riots were that ethnic Chinese, especially their shops and houses, were the target of vandalism. Their belongings were looted, and not a few houses were burned. The masses on S. Parman Street quickly moved towards Daan Mogot. They damaged and burned cars and buildings along the road (Luhulima, 2007).

The shooting incident of four Trisakti students on May 12, 1998, followed by a major riot in the capital city of Jakarta, May 13-15, 1998, peaked on May 18, 1998, when students occupied the DPR RI building. When the crowd outside the building demonstrated their demands inside the DPR building, the leadership of the DPR and factions held a meeting with students represented

by the Jabotabek Student Senate (FKSMJ) communication forum to discuss the nation's situation. (Soemardjan, 1999)

The decision was taken considering the condition of the Indonesian nation was getting out of control and was very dangerous for the nation's unity. In the afternoon, the public was shocked by the statement by Harmoko, who was previously well-known as a loyal follower of Suharto, calling on the President to resign for national unity and integrity. At 15.20 WIB, the chairman of the DPR RI Harmoko who was accompanied by the deputy chairman of the DPR, namely Ismail Hasan Metaareum (PPP-Faction), Abdul Gafur (KP-Faction), Fatimah Achmad (PDI-Faction), and Syarwan Hamid (F- ABRI), stated that it was better for President Suharto to resign (Anderson, 1998).

The next day, May 19, 1998, at 09.00 in the MPR/DPR building, a meeting of the leadership of the DPR and the leaders of the factions was held to discuss the request of the DPR leadership to President Soeharto to resign, which the chairman of the DPR, Harmoko put forward. The meeting lasted for five hours. Finally, the leaders of the factions supported the request from the DPR leadership to President Soeharto to resign respectfully and be carried out constitutionally (Luhulima, 2007).

Harmoko and the MPR leadership asked Suharto again to step down on 20 May 1998. President Soeharto refused to resign from his position, so Harmoko gave Suharto an ultimatum: resign on Friday, 22 May 1998 or face a special session on Monday, 25 May 1998. Suharto finally gave up after receiving assurances that his family and property would be protected (Luhulima, 2007).

Not only students and the people who took part in the riots, but Islamic figures also took part in various fields, one of which was Amien Rais, who appeared open, respected pluralism and established tolerance with other religious people. Even Amien Rais once put forward the idea of a Clean Coalition (Inclusive Coalition) on various components of society; he also suggested that descendants can sit in the government. (Nadjib, n.d.) Amien Rais was included in the ranks of modernist Muslim thinkers because his activist background came from Muhammadiyah, a modernist socio-religious organization.

Amien Rais became the main locomotive of the Reformation before Suharto stepped down from the presidency (1998) on August 23, 1998. Amien Rais and several politicians declared PAN. As an open party and through this party, he was nominated for the fourth president but failed, and

in the 1999 election, he was finally elected as chairman of the MPR. Amien Rais's paradigm of thought is similar to M Natsir's. Based on the concept of monotheism, a term that comes from the most central teachings of Islam, Amien Rais viewed modern problems with contemporary concepts and criticized Amien Rais with the spirit of social monotheism; the concept of monotheism means radical liberation from *Thagut* (Tyranny) and *Adzulm* (Despotic), in the life of society and the state Amien Rais implemented *Amar ma'ruf nahi munkar* in order to create an ethical and righteous society. (Umaruddin, 1999)

In 1993, Amien Rais was the one who dared to issue the 1998 succession concept as a must. No one dared to express this thinking openly, as he did during the Suharto era. However, the succession of social leadership failed because Suharto became president in a duet with B.J Habibie. Thus, Amien Rais allowed the two leaders to resolve national problems. Amien Himself noted that there were five significant problems during the Suharto administration and after that that had to be resolved, namely: Democratization, clean government, enforcement of the rule of law, human resource development, strengthening the unity and integrity of Indonesia (Abdurrahim, 1998).

Amien Rais' political education was well known among the people. Later, he was one of the leaders of the nation's Reformation, which wanted the Indonesian people to improve. Supported by the student movement, the Suharto regime fell, which had been in power for three decades in this motherland. Behind the fall of the Suharto Regime, Amien Rais' struggle was not easy because eight days before Suharto's fall, Suharto apparently ordered Attorney General Soedjono Atmonegoro to arrest Amien Rais but was politely refused, and the task was transferred to ABRI. After the fall of the Suharto regime, Amien Rais returned to Yogyakarta. However, Amin Rais's supporters wanted him to participate in Indonesia's future development, which caused Amien Rais to return to Jakarta (Nadjib, n.d.).

After Amien Rais was elected as chairman of the MPR in 1999, eventually, the democracy of political education appeared because several of his thoughts or ideas were widely taken as a reference for democracy in our beloved country, Indonesia, including. Firstly, the service period of the President is limited to a maximum of two periods. His thought was that if the president had more than two periods without limitation, there would be much abuse of power that would result in a decline

in a country because the root of the power that was built was vital so that it could distort the power it holds. The power previously considered a mandate was finally considered a power to strengthen itself.

Secondly, regional autonomy. After failing to make Indonesia a Liberal State, he proposed Regional Autonomy to develop the region and consume natural wealth equitably. From Amien Rais' point of view and several experts, what has happened in Indonesia so far has been an imbalance between the center and the regions, taking the example of Papua, a wealthy land with natural resources. However, its people were poor; many suffered from malnutrition and even died from hunger.

Thirdly, the division of power between the legislative, executive, and judicial institutions was well-organized. Amien Rais's view of the division of power. Because the more dominant power at that time seemed to lie in the People's Representative Council, this must be removed because the domination of the executive was against democracy. At the same time, his urge must be a balance between these institutions.

Fourthly, freedom of speech, freedom of association and freedom of the press. The people's freedom at that time seemed to be constrained because, in giving news, they could not say anything against the power. Many students who demonstrated were imprisoned for criticizing the authorities who have deviated from the path of truth, making community organizations or political organizations not allowed except those with the Pancasila ideology and others. The goal was to bring back the freedom of the press, association, and speech to the right track.

Fifthly, eradication of KKN, as well as implementing the law for every citizen indiscriminately. This incident caused a state and government to become decadent, corruption, collusion, and nepotism to thrive well due to prioritizing kinship instead of intelligence and capability. The law implementation at that time was like a knife; it was getting sharper to its blade and blunt to the top, which means the corrupted top politicians were above the law. Meanwhile, the poor people were punished for their minor faults. Politicians who are against the authorities must also live behind bars.

Sixthly, direct presidential election. Before other figures in Indonesia, they were reminded that the President was directly elected. So Amien Rais had had this concept for a long time, either in his seminars or on other occasions. He started his

words, "If only the president were directly elected." The knowledge gained from America was well-spent to be implemented into the political realm in Indonesia.

Amien Rais' opinion regarding post-reform democracy enforcement, especially in the political field, which had been considered maximal, was incorrect because democracy was still done procedurally, not substantially. Direct elections were only a procedure in a democracy that does not involve the nature of democracy, which does not involve the nature of democracy in depth. (Rais, 1998)

CONCLUSION

The incident in Jakarta in 1998 was not only limited to a dominant riot with physical clashes, but other factors caused the riots, one of which was related to events surrounding the riots. First, the political tensions that occurred in the capital city of Jakarta where during the New Order era, the political situation in Indonesia, especially the capital city of Jakarta, was unstable with Suharto's assumption that the political instability was political parties, which then fused with parties. The political process during the New Order era was also very non-transparent to the pattern of regeneration, which was nepotistic and had one distinctive political characteristic: widespread corruption, collusion and nepotism. Second, the mass panic over security in the capital city of Jakarta, which did not materialize properly and led to an increase in the intensity of conflict in the community, was caused by public disappointment with the New Order government, which carried out many political deviations so that it received the spotlight of the international community related to human rights such as the kidnapping and rape of Sarinah to the occurrence of conflicts between tribes and ethnicities. Third, the Indonesian economic crisis caused the Rupiah to decrease to 9 percent; this economic crisis also resulted in rising necessities, doubling premium prices, and massive layoffs, which increased new unemployment. Fourth, there were tensions and the emergence of anti-Chinese issues. The conflict between ethnic Chinese and natives has occurred since the Dutch colonial era, which lasted until the Suharto government. During the Suharto government, many ethnic Chinese no longer used their ancestral culture because they could still live in Indonesia; a great riot ignited in Jakarta when mobs robbed, killed, and raped hundreds of people of Chinese descent, which caused a crisis of ethnic Chinese identity, this incident was a harsh lash for

the ethnic Chinese whose position was under pressure from the government and the natives.

REFERENCES

- Abdurrahim, G. (1998). *Amien Rais Dalam Sorotan Generasi Muda Muhammadiyah*. Mizan.
- Anderson, B. (1998). *Soeharto Lengser Perspektif Luar Negeri*. Terjemahan oleh Farid Wahdiyono. LKiS.
- Budiman, A. (1998). *Peranan Mahasiswa Sebagai Intelektual Dalam Cendekiawan dan Politik*. LP3ES.
- Depdiknas. (2005). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia Edisi Ketiga*. Balai Pustaka.
- Ecip, S. S. (1999). *Siapa Dalang Prabowo*. Mizan.
- Forrester, G. (2002). *The Fall of Soeharto*. C. Hurst & Co Ltd.
- Himawan, E. M. (2022). Revisiting the May 1998 Riots in Indonesia: Civilians and Their Untold Memories. In *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* (Vol. 41, Issue 2, pp. 240–257). <https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034221084320>
- J.A, D. (2006). *Jatuhnya Soeharto dan Masa Transisi Demokrasi Indonesia*. LKIS.
- Luhulima, J. (2007). *Hari-hari terpanjang menjelang mundurnya Presiden Soeharto dan beberapa peristiwa terkait*. Kompas.
- Martha, G.-A. (1985). *Pemuda Indonesia dalam Dimensi Sejarah Perjuangan Bangsa*. Fa. Sinar Bahagia.
- Nadjib, M. (n.d.). *Amien Rais dari Yogya ke Graha*. Gemma Insan Press.
- Poesponegoro, M. D. & N. (2009). *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia VI*. Balai Pustaka.
- Pos, J. (1998, May). *Emil Pimpin 250 Dosen UI ke DPR Dukung Aksi Mahasiswa dan Minta Reformasi di Segala Bidang Dipercepat*. 8.
- Raho, B. (2007). *Teori Sosiologi Modern*. Prestasi Pustaka Publisher.
- Rais, M. A. (1998). *Cakrawala Islam. Antara Cita dan Fakta*. Mizan.
- Sahdan, G. (2005). *Sejarah Indonesia Modern 2001-2004*. PT. Ikran Mandiri Abadi.
- Saint, A. (1981). *Sistem Politik Indonesia*. cv rajawali.
- Soemardjan. (1999). *Kisah Perjuangan Reformasi*. Pustaka Sinar Harapan.
- Sri, R. M. (2010). *Detik-Detik Tumbangnya Orde Baru*. PT. Regina Eka Utama.
- Umaruddin, M. (1999). *Membaca Pikiran Gusdur dan Amien Rais tentang Demokrasi* (2nd editio). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Zon, F. (2004). *Politik Huru-Hara Mei 1998*. Institute For Policy Studies.