

From Doctrine to Implementation: Governance of National Resource Mobilization in Indonesia's Defense System

Agung Udayana*, Purnomo Yusgiantoro, Jonni Mahroza, & Jati Bambang Priyambodo

Republic of Indonesia Defense University, Bogor, 16810, Indonesia

Abstract

National resource mobilization constitutes an integral component of Indonesia's defense system, which adopts a total defense framework. Although doctrinal and policy frameworks have been formulated with relative consistency, the implementation of national resource mobilization remains constrained at the operational level. This article examines the gap between policy formulation and implementation by focusing on the governance mechanisms that shape national resource mobilization. Employing a qualitative approach based on policy analysis, defense strategic documents, and a review of implementation practices in non-military defense contexts, this study identifies key implementation constraints. The findings indicate that fragmented institutional authority, weak cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, and the absence of institutionalized civil-military operational procedures significantly limit effective national resource mobilization. This article argues that the effectiveness of total defense is determined less by doctrinal completeness than by the capacity of implementation governance.

Keywords: total defense, national resource mobilization, defense governance, policy implementation, Indonesia.

Received: 17 June 2026

Revised: 17 August 2026

Published: 31 August 2026

1. Introduction

Changes in the global strategic environment over the past two decades have broadened the spectrum of threats to national security. Threats are no longer limited to conventional military aggression between states but also include non-traditional threats such as cyberattacks, digital disinformation, transnational terrorism, pandemics, energy crises, and natural disasters that have systemic impacts on national stability (Khan, 2024). These threats are multidimensional, cross-sectoral, and often involve non-state actors, making it impossible to address them solely through conventional military means (Karpa et al., 2025). Perubahan karakter ancaman tersebut mendorong banyak negara mengembangkan pendekatan whole-of-government dan whole-of-society, yang menempatkan seluruh sumber daya nasional sebagai bagian dari sistem pertahanan negara. Therefore, the effectiveness of a modern defense system is determined not only by military strength but also by governance capacity to integrate government institutions, the private sector, local governments, and society into a coordinated response mechanism (Doyle, 2019).

Indonesia has adopted this approach through the Universal People's Defense and Security System (*Sistem Pertahanan dan Keamanan Rakyat Semesta*—Sishankamrata), which recognizes national resources as an integral component of national defense, as stipulated in Law Number 23 of 2019 concerning the Management of National Resources for State Defense. Within this framework, the mobilization of national resources is not solely the responsibility of the Ministry of Defense and the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), but also involves sectoral ministries, non-ministerial government agencies, local governments, the private sector, and the wider community (Manihuruk, 2020). The involvement of local governments is particularly critical, as Indonesia's decentralized governance system grants them substantial authority over resource management, public service delivery, and emergency response coordination within their respective jurisdictions. Consequently, the effectiveness of national resource mobilization depends largely on the

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: agung96udy@gmail.com

capacity of both the central and local governments to establish integrated coordination mechanisms capable of responding to multidimensional threats (Lubis, 2022).

Despite the existence of a relatively comprehensive normative framework for total defense, the implementation of national resource mobilization in Indonesia continues to face significant institutional challenges. The distribution of authority across multiple ministries, government agencies, and local governments has often resulted in fragmented sectoral coordination, the absence of standardized operational procedures, and inadequately integrated information-sharing mechanisms. These institutional conditions have the potential to delay decision-making processes and reduce the effectiveness of resource mobilization when the country faces crisis situations requiring rapid and coordinated cross-sectoral responses (Sudiarmo & Simbolon, 2022).

Recent literature on total defense indicates that the effectiveness of modern defense systems is largely determined by cross-sectoral coordination capabilities and policy implementation governance (Roelsgaard Obling et al., 2026; Rana et al., 2026). Previous studies on whole-of-nation defense have emphasized the importance of civil-military integration, institutional interoperability, and integrated response mechanisms in addressing hybrid threats (Doyle, 2019). Research on total defense in countries such as Finland, Norway, and Sweden indicates that the success of national mobilization depends on clear institutional authority, continuity of planning, and operational readiness among state actors (Pursiainen et al., 2026). Thus, governance is a critical element determining a nation's ability to translate defense doctrine into tangible response capabilities.

In Indonesia, most studies on the total defense system still focus on normative, doctrinal, and legalistic aspects. Existing research generally addresses the legal foundations of national defense, the concept of national defense, or the role of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) within the national defense system (Rusfiana, 2021; Prameisty & Ummah, 2024). Meanwhile, discussions on how the mobilization of national resources is carried out administratively, coordinatively, and operationally remain relatively limited (Widjayanto et al., 2025). Yet, from a public policy perspective, the success of a policy is heavily influenced by implementation capacity, the effectiveness of inter-agency coordination, and an institution's ability to manage resources in an integrated manner. This gap between policy design and implementation practices is one of the main challenges in Indonesia's defense system.

Furthermore, recent research also indicates that defense bureaucracies in developing countries often face obstacles such as fragmented authority, sectoral egos, limited institutional interoperability, and weak civil-military coordination mechanisms (Rana, 2018). These conditions make it difficult to translate national resource mobilization policies into effective operational actions when the country faces emergencies or multidimensional threats. In the case of Indonesia, the complexity of governance is exacerbated by the vastness of the territory, governmental decentralization, and disparities in capacity across regions, making the implementation of total defense require coordination mechanisms that are far more adaptive and institutionalized (Fauzi, 2021).

Previous studies have predominantly examined the total defense system from normative, legal, and doctrinal perspectives, focusing on regulatory frameworks, the concept of national defense, and the role of the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI) within the national defense system. Other studies have also emphasized the importance of a whole-of-government approach in addressing non-traditional threats. Nevertheless, limited attention has been paid to explaining how implementation governance capacity influences the effectiveness of national resource mobilization, particularly in emerging democracies with decentralized governance systems such as Indonesia. In other words, the existing research gap does not lie in the lack of discussion on the concept of total defense itself, but rather in the absence of an analytical framework that explains the relationships among fragmented institutional authority, inter-agency coordination, institutional interoperability, and operational readiness in the implementation of national resource mobilization. To address this gap, this study develops a governance capacity perspective as an analytical framework for examining the implementation of national resource mobilization.

The novelty of this research lies in the effort to shift the focus of analysis from the doctrinal dimension to the governance dimension of national resource mobilization implementation. Unlike previous studies that predominantly highlighted the normative and conceptual aspects of the total defense system, this study places policy implementation as the primary unit of analysis. This article not only discusses what is stipulated in defense doctrine but also evaluates how these policies are implemented, which actors play a role, how inter-agency coordination is established, and the governance factors that influence the operational effectiveness of national resource mobilization. Thus, this research provides a new, implementation-oriented contribution to the literature on total defense and defense policy in developing democracies.

This study aims to examine the implementation of national resource mobilization within Indonesia's defense system from the perspective of defense governance by identifying how fragmented institutional authority, cross-sectoral coordination, civil–military interoperability, and institutional capacity influence operational readiness. Furthermore, this study develops a governance capacity perspective as a conceptual framework to explain the relationship between implementation governance and the effectiveness of national resource mobilization. Theoretically, the study contributes to the total defense literature by shifting the analytical focus from normative and doctrinal perspectives toward a more comprehensive understanding of implementation governance. Practically, the findings are expected to provide policy recommendations for the Government of Indonesia, the Ministry of Defense, the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), relevant ministries and agencies, and local governments to strengthen cross-sectoral coordination and enhance the effectiveness of national resource mobilization in responding to multidimensional threats.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Defense Governance and Policy Implementation

Defense governance refers to the institutional mechanisms, distribution of authority, coordination processes, and decision-making systems that a state employs to effectively manage defense policy. From a modern governance perspective, defense is no longer understood solely as a military domain, but as a multidimensional process involving civilian institutions, local governments, the private sector, and the public in safeguarding national security. Changes in the global strategic environment, marked by non-traditional threats such as cyberattacks, pandemics, digital disinformation, and natural disasters, have driven the development of whole-of-government and whole-of-society approaches within national defense systems (Doyle, 2019; Haghighat et al., 2023).

In contemporary defense studies, defense governance is understood as part of security governance, which emphasizes the importance of cross-sectoral coordination, institutional interoperability, and the integration of national resources in addressing multidimensional threats. Grigalashvili (2023) explains that an effective total defense system requires institutionalized coordination mechanisms, clear decision-making procedures, and the capacity of state institutions to build sustainable collaboration. This perspective indicates that the effectiveness of national defense is determined not only by military strength but also by governance capacity in connecting various security actors within a coherent implementation framework.

Furthermore, defense governance is also related to the capacity of public administration and the structure of the state bureaucracy. Turner et al. (2022) explain that complex and sectoral bureaucracies often hinder the effectiveness of policy implementation due to weak inter-agency coordination and high fragmentation of authority. In the context of total defense, these conditions can affect the effectiveness of national resource mobilization, especially when security threats require a rapid and integrated response. Therefore, effective defense governance requires adaptive institutions, permanent coordination mechanisms, and a clear division of roles among state actors.

2.2 Implementation Gaps in Defense Policy

The implementation gap is a concept in public policy studies that refers to the discrepancy between formally articulated policy objectives and their implementation at the operational level. In defense policy, an implementation gap arises when defense doctrines, regulations, and strategies are not supported by adequate institutional readiness, coordination capacity, or operational procedures. Thus, the success of a defense system is determined not only by the quality of policies but also by the state's institutional capacity to translate policies into effective action.

From a policy capacity perspective, the effectiveness of policy implementation is influenced by the analytical, operational, and coordination capacities of implementing institutions. Khan & Hussain (2024) explain that complex public policies require high cross-sectoral coordination capacity to ensure policy objectives are optimally achieved. In the context of total defense, the mobilization of national resources involves numerous actors with differing authorities and functions, which can potentially lead to overlapping roles, unclear authority, and weak institutional interoperability if not supported by integrated implementation mechanisms.

Furthermore, implementation gaps in defense policies are also linked to bureaucratic structures and regulatory governance. Karpa et al. (2025) explain that the transformation of global security threats demands a public administration system that is more integrative and adaptive to the complexity of multidimensional threats. Meanwhile, Risky et al. (2025) emphasize that the fragmentation of authority and weak inter-institutional coordination can hinder the effectiveness of public policy implementation. Therefore, implementation gaps in defense policy can be understood

as a governance issue related to the state’s institutional capacity to build sustainable coordination, integration, and national preparedness.

3. Research Method and Materials

This study employs a qualitative approach with a descriptive-analytical design focused on the analysis of public policy in the field of defense (Aspers & Corte, 2021). This approach was chosen because the study seeks to understand how national resource mobilization policies are implemented in practice and to identify the governance factors that influence their operational effectiveness. This study focuses on the consistency of the regulatory framework, institutional design, coordination mechanisms, and inter-institutional relationships embedded in official policy documents and scholarly literature. Accordingly, qualitative document analysis was selected as the most appropriate methodological approach because it enables a systematic evaluation of governance structures and the identification of implementation gaps within Indonesia's national policy framework. This article is part of a broader doctoral study on national resource mobilization within Indonesia’s defense system.

The selection of qualitative document analysis as the primary research method was also based on the methodological consideration that policy documents constitute the principal source of evidence in public policy research, as they reflect formal state decisions, the distribution of institutional authority, and coordination mechanisms that form the central focus of this study. Interviews with 2 military and 3 civilian stakeholders were conducted as a complement to explore the perceptions or experiences of policy implementers and to evaluate the consistency between policy design, legal framework, and governance of its implementation. The selection of interview participants followed a purposive sampling strategy, whereby informants were chosen based on their direct involvement, institutional responsibilities, and professional experience in national resource mobilization and defense governance. Furthermore, the use of multiple official policy documents in combination with scholarly literature enabled source triangulation, thereby providing a robust analytical basis for assessing the governance of national resource mobilization.

The research focuses on analyzing the relationship between the defense policy framework and implementation practices at the operational level, particularly within the context of non-military defense. Research data was collected through documentary studies and a literature review. Primary data sources include laws, government regulations, national defense strategy documents, and policies related to national resource mobilization. In addition, the research also draws on the latest academic literature on total defense, whole-of-nation defense, defense governance, and public policy implementation. The examination of implementation practices was conducted through a review of policy reports, institutional documents, and various empirical studies relevant to the implementation of national resource mobilization in addressing non-traditional threats.

Table 1. Research Data Sources

Data Type	Data Sources	Temporal Range	Analytical Focus
Legal documents	Laws, government regulations, defense regulations	2002-2025	Normative framework of national resource mobilization
Strategic documents	Defense doctrines, national defense strategies, ministry/institutional policies	2015-2025	Policy structure and implementation design
Academic literature	Journals, books, scientific articles	2019-2026	Concepts of total defense and defense governance
Implementation documents	Policy reports, institutional reports, case studies	2020-2025	Coordination practices and operational implementation
Contextual data	Studies on non-traditional threats and national responses	2020-2025	Relevance of implementation in contemporary situations

The research process consisted of several interrelated stages. The first stage involved identifying and collecting relevant policy documents, institutional reports, academic literature, and selecting interview participants based on predefined inclusion criteria. The second stage involved organizing and classifying documentary and interview data according to key analytical themes, including institutional structure, cross-sectoral coordination, civil–military interoperability, implementation capacity, and governance mechanisms. The third stage comprised thematic analysis aimed at identifying governance patterns, implementation barriers, and institutional factors influencing operational readiness.

Finally, documentary findings were interpreted alongside interview evidence to develop a comprehensive explanation of governance capacity in national resource mobilization.

Data analysis followed a thematic analysis procedure. Documentary materials and interview transcripts were first subjected to data reduction to retain only information directly relevant to the research objectives. Subsequently, open coding was conducted to identify recurring concepts such as fragmented institutional authority, bureaucratic coordination, interoperability, implementation capacity, operational readiness, leadership, and collaborative governance. Similar codes were then grouped into broader analytical categories representing the dimensions of governance capacity.

The final stage involved analytical interpretation by integrating evidence from documentary analysis with interview findings. Documentary evidence was used to explain formal governance structures and institutional arrangements, while interview data provided contextual understanding of how these arrangements operate in practice. This triangulation enabled the study to distinguish between formal policy design and actual implementation dynamics, thereby strengthening the credibility of the governance analysis.

To enhance research trustworthiness, method triangulation, source triangulation, and investigator triangulation were employed. Method triangulation was achieved by integrating documentary analysis with semi-structured interviews. Source triangulation involved comparing findings across legal documents, strategic policies, institutional reports, scholarly publications, and interview narratives. Throughout the analytical process, interpretations were continuously cross-checked against multiple evidence sources to minimize researcher bias and ensure consistency. Furthermore, the analysis was conducted within the specific institutional context of Indonesia's decentralized governance system and contemporary multidimensional security environment, thereby enhancing the credibility, dependability, and confirmability of the research findings.

4. Results and Discussion

4.1 Governance of Implementation as the Key Challenge of Total Defense

The concept of total defense has evolved from the understanding that threats to the state are no longer singular or conventional in nature. In contemporary security studies, total defense is understood as a defense approach that involves all elements of the state, including the government, the military, the economic sector, civil society, and national strategic infrastructure (Grigalashvili, 2023). This approach emerged because modern threats such as cyberattacks, disinformation, pandemics, and natural disasters cannot be addressed solely through military force (Maysarah, 2023). Therefore, the effectiveness of the total defense system heavily depends on the state's ability to integrate all national resources in a coordinated and sustainable manner.

In Indonesia, the total defense system has normatively established the mobilization of national resources as an integral part of the state's defense system (Saputra, 2020). Various defense regulations and doctrines have recognized the importance of civilian and non-military actors' involvement in supporting national resilience (Buana, 2024). However, the findings of this study indicate that policy implementation still faces various structural barriers. The mobilization of national resources is not yet supported by clear coordination mechanisms, standardized operational procedures, or a routine cross-sectoral implementation system (Rahayu et al., 2024). Consequently, defense policies function more as a normative framework rather than an operational instrument ready for use in crisis situations.

This study found that the fragmentation of authority is one of the main problems in the implementation of national resource mobilization. Ministries and agencies carry out their respective mandates based on sectoral interests without a strong and binding coordinating authority (Risky et al., 2025). This situation causes the decision-making process to be slow, inter-agency coordination to be inconsistent, and the rapid integration of national resources to be difficult. In situations involving non-traditional threats that require a multidimensional response, this weak coordination directly impacts national defense readiness.

This finding aligns with previous studies on the implementation of total defense in developing countries, which indicate that the primary challenges often lie in governance capacity rather than a lack of formal policies (Syarifuddin, 2025). Research on governance in the defense sector confirms that the existence of regulations does not automatically result in effective implementation if not accompanied by adequate coordination mechanisms and institutional capacity (Sarjito & Lelyana, 2024). In other words, in Indonesia, this situation indicates a gap between policy design and operational practice that remains a challenge within the national defense system.

Furthermore, this study shows that the mobilization of national resources in Indonesia remains largely reactive. Cross-sectoral coordination is generally only activated when a specific emergency or crisis occurs, so the process of institutional learning and strengthening implementation capacity does not develop sustainably (Sunarto et al., 2025). One notable example is the COVID-19 pandemic response, which demonstrated that effective coordination among the central government, local governments, sectoral ministries, the health sector, and defense and security institutions required considerable time to establish integrated operational mechanisms. Differences in institutional authority, administrative procedures, and organizational capacity during the early stages of the response hindered timely decision-making and the efficient mobilization and distribution of national resources. Another example is the 2024 cyberattack on Indonesia's Temporary National Data Center (*Pusat Data Nasional Sementara*—PDNS), which highlighted the critical importance of rapid coordination among ministries and government agencies, local governments, defense institutions, and digital infrastructure providers to ensure the continuity of essential public services. These cases demonstrate that the primary challenge lies not in the availability of national resources, but in governance capacity to integrate diverse cross-sectoral actors through clear, institutionalized, and crisis-responsive coordination mechanisms. This indicates that the main challenge for Indonesia's total defense does not lie in a lack of doctrine or regulations, but rather in weak implementation governance that has not yet been able to systematically build national readiness.

Table 2. Legal Barriers to the Implementation of National Resource Mobilization

Regulation	Key Provisions	Implementation Barriers	Implications for Governance
Law No. 23 of 2019 on the Management of National Resources for State Defense	Regulates the management of the primary, reserve, and supporting components of national defense.	Does not provide detailed provisions on cross-ministerial, inter-agency, and central–local government coordination mechanisms during implementation.	Resource mobilization remains sectoral and largely dependent on ad hoc coordination mechanisms.
Law No. 3 of 2002 on State Defense	Establishes the universal defense system and defines the components of national defense.	The distribution of institutional roles is broadly defined and is not supported by standardized cross-sectoral operational procedures.	Different interpretations emerge in the implementation of national resource mobilization.
Implementing regulations and sectoral policies	Regulate implementation according to the respective mandates of ministries and government agencies.	Coordination across sectors remains insufficiently integrated, resulting in overlapping institutional authority.	Contributes to institutional fragmentation and delays decision-making during emergency situations.
Local Government Policies	Support public administration in accordance with the principles of decentralization.	Variations in institutional capacity and the absence of standardized coordination mechanisms with the central government.	Lead to uneven implementation capacity and inconsistent national resource mobilization across regions.

Table 2 indicates that the primary challenge in implementing national resource mobilization does not stem from the absence of a legal framework, but rather from the limited institutionalization of operational coordination mechanisms across government agencies. Although Law No. 23 of 2019 provides a comprehensive normative framework for the management of national resources for state defense, it does not explicitly define the distribution of operational authority, cross-ministerial and inter-agency coordination procedures, or the integration of local government roles during mobilization. Consequently, implementation continues to rely heavily on sectoral coordination and ad hoc arrangements, which may delay decision-making processes and reduce the effectiveness of national resource mobilization in responding to multidimensional threats.

Beyond the formal legal framework, interview findings indicate that the persistence of weak cross-sectoral coordination is rooted not only in regulatory limitations but also in organizational, historical, and institutional factors that are not explicitly reflected in policy documents. Several informants consistently emphasized that coordination among

ministries and agencies remains largely dependent on informal communication and institutional willingness rather than on permanent governance arrangements. As one military official explained:

"In principle, each ministry understands its role in national resource mobilization. However, in practice, every institution remains primarily oriented toward its own organizational mandate and performance targets. Cross-sectoral coordination generally becomes stronger only during crises and still relies heavily on informal communication among senior officials." (Informant 1, Military Officer).

This view was reinforced by another informant, who explained that the absence of a binding coordination mechanism has encouraged each institution to maintain its own administrative procedures and operational practices.

"There is still no single operational mechanism that serves as a common reference for all institutions. Each agency has its own working procedures, reporting systems, and chain of command, making harmonization during emergency situations both time-consuming and difficult." (Informant 2, National Disaster Management Agency).

Beyond procedural issues, the interviews also revealed that weak coordination is influenced by long-standing bureaucratic culture. One defense policy scholar argued that Indonesia's bureaucratic system continues to prioritize sectoral accountability over collaborative accountability.

"Organizational performance is still evaluated primarily based on the achievement of each institution's own targets. Cross-ministerial collaboration has not yet become a key performance indicator; consequently, coordination is often regarded as an additional task rather than an integral organizational function." (Informant 3, Defense Policy Scholar).

These findings suggest that the barriers to implementing national resource mobilization extend beyond incomplete legal provisions to encompass bureaucratic incentive structures, historical institutional legacies, and the distribution of authority across government institutions. From the perspective of bureaucratic incentives, ministries and government agencies tend to prioritize the achievement of sector-specific performance indicators that form the basis of organizational evaluation. Under such conditions, investing time, resources, and personnel in cross-sectoral collaboration often provides little direct benefit to each institution's own performance objectives. Consequently, coordination is more frequently undertaken as a response to immediate operational needs than as a continuous institutional process embedded within routine governance.

The interviews further indicate that historical institutional legacies have also shaped patterns of inter-agency relationships. Over several decades, ministries, government agencies, local governments, and defense institutions have developed relatively independent administrative systems, operational procedures, and chains of command. These institutional trajectories have fostered strong organizational cultures while simultaneously reinforcing institutional silos, whereby organizations tend to operate within their own sectoral boundaries. As a result, although existing regulations promote a *whole-of-government* approach, implementation continues to encounter organizational resistance as institutions seek to preserve established procedures, organizational autonomy, and existing authority structures.

Furthermore, the interview findings reveal that coordination is also influenced by power dynamics among participating institutions. The absence of a lead institution endowed with strong coordinating authority means that policy synchronization is achieved primarily through inter-agency negotiation rather than through binding command mechanisms. Consequently, the effectiveness of coordination depends heavily on leadership commitment, personal relationships among senior officials, and the urgency of the crisis being addressed. In other words, national coordination remains largely person-dependent rather than system-dependent, making the continuity of coordination mechanisms vulnerable to leadership changes and shifts in bureaucratic politics.

These findings extend the results of the document analysis, which primarily identified fragmented institutional authority as the principal implementation challenge. While policy documents explain what constrains implementation, the interview findings provide a deeper understanding of why these constraints persist despite the existence of a comprehensive legal framework. Therefore, the principal challenge of national resource mobilization lies not merely in refining existing regulations but in strengthening governance capacity through reforms to bureaucratic incentive systems, the institutionalization of permanent cross-sectoral coordination forums, the development of collaborative inter-agency performance indicators, and the establishment of a lead coordinating institution with formal authority to integrate planning, decision-making, and national resource mobilization. Accordingly, strengthening defense governance should extend beyond legal reform toward broader institutional transformation capable of shifting coordination from ad hoc practices to fully institutionalized governance mechanisms.

4.2 An Exploration of the Governance Perspective in National Resource Mobilization

In modern public policy studies, governance is understood as a policy management process involving interactions between various state and non-state actors in achieving common goals (Furlan, 2020). The governance approach emphasizes that policy effectiveness depends not only on the government's formal authority but also on the capacity for coordination, collaboration, and integration among institutions (Lindsey et al., 2020). In the defense sector, the governance perspective is becoming increasingly important because modern security threats require a response involving multiple sectors simultaneously, including the military, civilian bureaucracy, local governments, the private sector, and civil society.

Within this framework, national resource mobilization cannot be understood merely as a mechanism for deploying resources during war or emergencies. National resource mobilization is a governance process that requires continuous planning, clear distribution of authority, and institutionalized cross-sectoral coordination. Countries with effective total defense systems generally possess governance networks that facilitate rapid and adaptive information exchange, collective decision-making, and resource integration.

The findings of this study indicate that the governance of national resource mobilization in Indonesia remains dominated by sectoral bureaucratic patterns. Each institution performs its respective functions based on administrative mandates without strong operational integration (Turner et al., 2022). Cross-sectoral coordination remains informal and depends on situational needs, resulting in inconsistent policy implementation. This condition indicates that Indonesia's total defense system remains at the normative-institutional stage and has not yet evolved into a governance system capable of effectively connecting various actors.

These findings support arguments in the governance literature stating that the complexity of modern threats requires a whole-of-government and whole-of-society approach (Haghighat et al., 2023). Previous research in security and public administration studies indicates that governance capacity is a key factor in determining the effectiveness of national security policies (Khan & Hussain, 2024). Countries that fail to establish cross-sectoral coordination tend to face overlapping jurisdictions, delayed responses, and weak resource integration during crises.

Furthermore, this study reveals that weak governance within Indonesia's defense system also impacts institutional learning processes. Since coordination is often conducted on an ad hoc basis, policy evaluation and the development of operational procedures do not occur systematically. Consequently, past crisis management experiences do not always lead to improved governance in the future. This situation highlights the importance of transforming defense governance from a traditional administrative approach toward a more adaptive, collaborative governance model capable of addressing multidimensional threats.

The interview findings, together with the document analysis, indicate that the governance capacity perspective developed in this study possesses distinctive characteristics that differentiate it from conventional public administration and policy implementation frameworks. Within the public administration literature, policy implementation effectiveness is generally explained by factors such as bureaucratic capacity, organizational leadership, inter-agency coordination, and the availability of administrative resources. These perspectives have primarily been developed to explain the implementation of public policies within relatively stable and routine governance environments.

In contrast, national resource mobilization in the defense sector operates within a fundamentally different context characterized by multidimensional threats, high levels of uncertainty, the simultaneous involvement of civilian and military actors, and the need for rapid decision-making during crisis situations. Consequently, implementation effectiveness is determined not only by administrative capacity but also by the ability of the national defense system to integrate institutions with different legal mandates, organizational cultures, command structures, and operational priorities into a unified national response mechanism. The interview findings further reinforce this argument. One informant emphasized that coordination within the defense sector differs substantially from policy implementation in other areas of public administration.

"Coordination in the defense sector is not merely about aligning administrative processes across institutions. It must also integrate decision-making among civilian and military organizations that operate under different command structures, operational procedures, and levels of urgency when responding to crises." (Informant 4, Ministry of Defense).

These findings demonstrate that governance capacity, as conceptualized in this study, should not be understood merely as administrative capacity. Rather, it represents a strategic governance capability that enables state institutions to rapidly, adaptively, and collaboratively integrate national resources in response to multidimensional threats.

Accordingly, the perspective developed in this study extends conventional policy implementation theory by incorporating civil–military interoperability, institutionalized cross-sectoral coordination, collaborative leadership, and operational readiness as core dimensions of effective defense governance. This framework therefore provides a defense-specific analytical perspective that explains how governance capacity functions as a strategic enabler of national resource mobilization under complex security conditions, rather than simply as an administrative determinant of policy implementation.

4.3 *Comparison with Studies from Other Countries*

The implementation of national resource mobilization in emerging democracies is shaped by each country's institutional characteristics, bureaucratic capacity, governance structure, and geographical complexity. Accordingly, this study compares Indonesia with the Philippines and India, as these countries share similar characteristics as emerging democracies facing cross-sectoral coordination challenges and the need to mobilize national resources in response to multidimensional threats.

The Philippines has adopted a whole-of-government approach to disaster management, maritime security, and responses to non-traditional threats through coordination among the national government, Local Government Units (LGUs), the Armed Forces of the Philippines, and civil protection agencies. Although its policy framework has evolved considerably, previous studies indicate that the effectiveness of national resource mobilization continues to be constrained by disparities in local government capacity, incomplete inter-agency integration, and limited institutional interoperability in cross-sectoral operations. These challenges suggest that successful resource mobilization depends not only on the existence of comprehensive legal and policy frameworks, but also on governance capacity that effectively integrates multiple stakeholders within a coordinated institutional mechanism.

India, by contrast, faces a different governance context due to its federal system, in which authority is shared between the central government and state governments. In disaster response, cybersecurity, and the protection of critical infrastructure, the effectiveness of national resource mobilization largely depends on the central government's ability to coordinate ministries, the armed forces, state authorities, and technical agencies through an integrated national coordination mechanism. India's experience demonstrates that the more complex a country's administrative structure becomes, the greater the need for joint operational procedures, integrated information-sharing systems, and collaborative leadership capable of reducing institutional fragmentation across multiple levels of government.

Indonesia exhibits characteristics that lie between those of the Philippines and India. As a geographically dispersed archipelagic state with a decentralized governance system, Indonesia faces challenges arising from its vast territory, uneven local government capacities, and the involvement of numerous ministries and agencies in national resource mobilization. Consequently, policy implementation depends more heavily on the effectiveness of cross-sectoral coordination than on the existence of regulatory provisions alone. Unlike the Philippines, which has focused primarily on strengthening disaster governance, and India, which has institutionalized coordination within a federal governance framework, Indonesia continues to face challenges in integrating ministries, local governments, the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), the private sector, and society into a permanent and institutionalized national resource mobilization mechanism.

The comparative analysis demonstrates that the effectiveness of national resource mobilization is determined not by the level of economic development or similarities in defense doctrine, but by each country's governance capacity. Emerging democracies with complex governance structures tend to encounter similar challenges, including fragmented institutional authority, insufficient cross-sectoral coordination, and disparities in institutional capacity across national and subnational levels. Accordingly, this study proposes that strengthening governance capacity through institutionalized coordination mechanisms, inter-agency interoperability, integrated information systems, and joint operational procedures constitutes a more decisive factor in achieving effective national resource mobilization than the existence of defense doctrine alone. Therefore, the Governance Capacity Framework developed in this study is not only relevant to Indonesia but also provides an analytical model that can be applied to other emerging democracies facing comparable institutional characteristics and implementation challenges.

In the Indonesian context, these two experiences provide complementary lessons for strengthening the governance of national resource mobilization. As an archipelagic country with a decentralized system of government, Indonesia requires a combination of horizontal coordination, as exemplified by the Philippines, and vertical coordination, as practiced in India. Accordingly, strengthening the governance of national resource mobilization cannot rely solely on improving the regulatory framework. It also requires the institutionalization of permanent cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, enhanced inter-agency interoperability, integrated national information-sharing systems, and standardized

joint operational procedures capable of connecting ministries, local governments, the Indonesian National Armed Forces (TNI), the private sector, and civil society within a unified national response mechanism.

Table 3. Comparative Governance of National Resource Mobilization in Emerging Democracies

Dimension	Indonesia	Philippines	India
Governance system	Decentralized	Decentralized	Federal
Geographical characteristics	Archipelagic state	Archipelagic state	Large continental state
Primary governance challenge	Cross-ministerial and central–local government coordination	Uneven local government capacity and inter-agency coordination	Coordination between the central government and state governments
Predominant threats	Natural disasters, cyber threats, and maritime security	Natural disasters, maritime security, and internal conflicts	Cybersecurity, terrorism, and natural disasters
Coordination mechanism	Developing institutional coordination	Whole-of-government approach	National coordination across multiple levels of government
Key lessons for Indonesia	Strengthen permanent coordination mechanisms, institutional interoperability, and integrated information systems	Enhance local government capacity and deepen inter-agency integration	Improve multi-level governance coordination and standardize joint operational procedures

This synthesis reinforces the Governance Capacity Framework developed in this study. Based on the comparative analysis, governance capacity should not be understood merely as the capability of individual organizations but rather as the collective capacity of multiple institutions to establish sustained coordination, institutional interoperability, and operational readiness in responding to multidimensional threats. Therefore, the principal contribution of this study extends beyond identifying implementation gaps. It proposes an analytical framework that explains how governance capacity functions as a strategic determinant of effective national resource mobilization within the national defense system.

4.4 Academic and Practical Implications

In academic discourse, research on total defense has thus far tended to focus on strategic, military, and normative aspects. Most studies address national defense doctrine, national security threats, or the regulatory framework of defense. Meanwhile, the dimensions of policy implementation and institutional governance have received relatively little attention. Yet, from a public policy perspective, the success of a system is determined not only by policy design but also by implementation capacity at the operational level.

This study makes an academic contribution by shifting the analytical focus from doctrinal dimensions toward governance and implementation. This study demonstrates that the effectiveness of the total defense system is significantly influenced by institutional coordination capacity, the integration of national resources, and the existence of operational mechanisms that function sustainably. Thus, this research expands the total defense literature through an interdisciplinary approach that bridges defense studies, public administration, and governance.

The research findings also reinforce arguments in the policy implementation literature stating that the gap between policy design and operational practice is a common problem in the bureaucracies of developing countries. In Indonesia's defense sector, the existence of comprehensive regulations has not been able to produce effective implementation due to weak cross-sectoral coordination and the absence of integrated operational procedures. This indicates that governance reform is a critical need in strengthening the national defense system.

Practically, this research offers important implications for strengthening Indonesia's defense governance by demonstrating that Law No. 23 of 2019 distinguishes the governance of military and civilian resources according to their respective institutional characteristics and functions. Military resources are organized within a hierarchical

command structure, enabling a relatively standardized mobilization process supported by well-defined decision-making mechanisms. In contrast, the mobilization of civilian resources involves sectoral ministries, government agencies, local governments, the private sector, and the broader community, all of which operate through cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms based on their respective administrative mandates. Consequently, the effectiveness of civilian resource mobilization depends largely on governance capacity, inter-agency interoperability, and the institutionalization of coordination mechanisms. These differences explain why implementation challenges within Indonesia's total defense system are more pronounced in the governance of civilian resources than military resources, despite both serving equally essential roles in supporting national defense readiness.

Another practical implication is the need for institutional cultural transformation within the national defense system. The mobilization of national resources can no longer be understood merely as an emergency response but must be positioned as part of a continuous national preparedness effort. Thus, strengthening national defense requires a paradigm shift from a sectoral approach toward a collaborative, governance-based approach involving all strategic state actors.

4.5 A Critical Reflection on Indonesia's Total Defense System

Conceptually, Indonesia's total defense system is built on the assumption that all national resources can be mobilized to counter threats to the state. This approach is highly relevant in addressing the multidimensional threats that are currently emerging. However, this study indicates that there is a significant gap between the ideal of the total defense doctrine and the reality of its implementation on the ground. The existence of the doctrine and regulations does not yet fully reflect the nation's actual readiness capacity.

The research findings indicate that Indonesia's total defense system remains largely oriented toward administrative and symbolic approaches. The mobilization of national resources is often understood as a normative concept activated during emergencies, rather than as an operational system maintained on a routine basis. Consequently, cross-sectoral coordination has not evolved into a permanent mechanism capable of fostering long-term institutional readiness.

This study also indicates the dominance of a traditional security paradigm in Indonesia's defense governance. Security threats are still frequently perceived through a militaristic framework, so the involvement of civilian actors has not been fully integrated strategically. Yet, contemporary threats such as pandemics, digital disinformation, cyberattacks, and infrastructure crises actually require strong and adaptive civil-military coordination capabilities. When the security approach remains overly focused on military institutions, the potential of civilian resources within the national defense system becomes underutilized.

This finding aligns with critiques in the security governance literature stating that many developing countries tend to establish defense policies that are strong in theory but weak in operational implementation. This situation creates what is known as an "implementation gap" the disparity between a state's formal capacity and its actual ability to execute policies. In the Indonesian context, this gap is evident in the lack of sustained integration of national coordination mechanisms.

Therefore, the critical reflection from this study emphasizes that strengthening Indonesia's total defense system requires a paradigm shift in governance. National defense can no longer be understood solely as the military's exclusive domain but must be viewed as a cross-sectoral governance process simultaneously involving the state, society, and strategic sectors. Without such a paradigm shift, the mobilization of national resources will remain reactive and struggle to evolve into an effective national preparedness system capable of addressing modern security threats.

5. Conclusion

For This article concludes that although Indonesia's total defense system provides a consistent policy framework for the mobilization of national resources, the governance of its implementation remains underdeveloped. Fragmented authority, limited cross-sectoral coordination, and the absence of institutionalized civil-military procedures are the main obstacles hindering the effectiveness of implementation. These conditions result in national resource mobilization functioning more at the normative and strategic levels rather than as an integrated operational mechanism to address non-traditional threats. Therefore, the policy implications of this study emphasize the importance of establishing permanent and binding cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms among defense institutions, civilian ministries, local governments, and other strategic sectors. Additionally, there is a need to develop clear civil-military standard operating procedures, strengthen inter-agency information-sharing systems, and integrate national resource mobilization into the

routine defense planning cycle through joint simulations and national coordination exercises to ensure defense readiness is more responsive to multidimensional threats.

This study has limitations because the analysis is primarily based on policy documents, regulations, and secondary literature, and thus does not fully capture the dynamics of implementation at the operational or regional levels. This study also has not specifically examined the implementation of national resource mobilization in specific sectors such as cyber defense, strategic logistics, or disaster management. Therefore, further research is recommended to expand the empirical approach through interviews with policy actors and relevant institutions, as well as to develop comparative studies with other countries that implement a whole-of-nation defense system. Quantitative or mixed-methods approaches are also needed to measure the effectiveness of coordination, institutional readiness, and implementation capacity in the governance of national resource mobilization.

Theoretical Contribution

The study contributes to total defense and defense governance literature by demonstrating that policy effectiveness is shaped by implementation governance capacity rather than by doctrinal completeness.

Policy Implications

Policy implications emphasize the need to institutionalize cross-sectoral coordination mechanisms, standardize civil–military operational procedures, and integrate national resource mobilization into routine defense planning cycles. These measures address implementation constraints without requiring further doctrinal expansion.

References

- Aspers, P., Corte, U. What is Qualitative in Research. *Qual Sociol* **44**, 599–608 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11133-021-09497-w>
- Binkley, J. M., & Kemp, K. M. (2021). Mobilization of resources and emergency response on the national scale. *The Surgical Clinics of North America*, *102*(1), 169. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.suc.2021.09.014>
- Buana, I. G. P. (2024). Strengthening non-military defense to strengthen the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. *Jurnal Lemhannas RI*, *12*(2), 163-172. <https://doi.org/10.55960/jlri.v12i2.532>
- Doyle, B. (2019). The whole-of-nation and whole-of-government approaches in action. *InterAgency Journal*, *10*(1), 105-122.
- Fauzi, R. D. (2021). Role of Regional Autonomy in the Indonesian National Defense and Security System (Sishankamrata). *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, *2*(1), 15-38. <https://doi.org/10.15294/jllr.v2i1.40905>
- Furlan, M. (2020). Understanding governance by insurgent non-state actors: A multi-dimensional typology. *Civil Wars*, *22*(4), 478-511.
- Grigalashvili, V. (2023). Total defence: A comprehensive approach to national defence governance. *International Journal of Scientific and Management Research*, *6*(05), 240-248. <http://doi.org/10.37502/IJSMR.2023.6511>
- Haghighat, H., Takian, A., Raoofi, A., & Mousavi, S. M. (2023). The whole-of-government, whole-of-society approach in tackling COVID-19 pandemic in Iran: Evidence for policymakers. *Health Scope*, *12*(12). <https://doi.org/10.5812/healthscope-138471>.
- Karpa, M., Kitsak, T., Dumiak, Y., Kliutsevskiy, V., & Stoliarenko, O. (2025). Problems of public administration in the context of global security transformations: Integrative review. *Democratic Governance*, *2*(18), 43-55. <https://doi.org/10.56318/dg/2.2025.43>
- Khan, Z. F. (2024). Gap Between Conventional and Non-Conventional Threats: Understanding and Addressing Modern Security Challenges. *International Journal of Policy Studies*, *4*(2).
- Khan, R., & Hussain, F. (2024). Assessing policy capacity and policy effectiveness: A comparative study using sustainable governance indicators. *European Policy Analysis*, *10*(4), 575-603. <https://doi.org/10.1002/epa2.1217>

- Khoirunnisa, K., & Jubaidi, D. (2024). Indonesia's Digital Security Strategy: Countering the Threats of Cybercrime and Cyberterrorism. *Politeia: Journal of Public Administration and Political Science and International Relations*, 2(2), 62-82. <http://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.5068424>
- Lindsey, I., Chapman, T., & Dudfield, O. (2020). Configuring relationships between state and non-state actors: A new conceptual approach for sport and development. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 12(1), 127-146. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2019.1676812>
- Lubis, A. (2022). The strategy of defence diplomacy in achieving national interests and maintaining the sovereignty of the Republic of Indonesia. *Law and Humanities Quarterly Reviews*, 1(4).
- Manihuruk, H. (2020). Strengthening the State Defense System of the Republic of Indonesia through Implementation of the State Defense Policy. *Natapraja*, 8(2), 132-142. <https://doi.org/10.24843/UJoSSH.2021.v05.i01.p01>
- Maysarah, M. M., Supriyadi, A. A., Fakhreja, R., Umam, K., & Navalino, D. A. (2025). Strengthening National Defense Policy Through Total Defense Readiness Against Non-Military Threats. *PUBLICA*, 17(2), 365–395. <https://doi.org/10.15575/jpan.v17i2.48596>
- Prameisty, A., & Ummah, K. C. (2024). Budaya Masyarakat Madura Sebagai Sishankamrata (Sistem Pertahanan Rakyat Semesta). *Journal of Social, Culture, and Language*, 2(2), 41-47. <https://doi.org/10.21107/jscl.v2i2.25593>
- Pursiainen, C. H., Karlsson, Ø. N., & Johansson, J. (2026). Total defence as multilevel governance: Nordic security in the context of the EU and NATO. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 8, 1767023. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2026.1767023>
- Rahayu, L., Sihombing, D. N., & Santoso, P. (2024). Indonesia's non-military threats dynamics: A philosophical perspective. *Jurnal Pertahanan: Media Informasi tentang Kajian dan Strategi Pertahanan yang Mengedepankan Identity, Nasionalism dan Integrity*, 10(1), 39-53. <http://dx.doi.org/10.33172/jp.v10i1.19459>
- Rana, M. S., Mutungi, J. M., & Muthya, V. (2026). Towards Civil–Military Synergy in National Security Governance: Challenges and Opportunities in Nepal. *Unity Journal*, 7(1), 307-322. <https://doi.org/10.3126/unityj.v7i1.90480>
- Rana, M. S. (2018). National Defense University: an integrated higher defense educational institute for democratization of civil-military relations in Nepal.
- Risky, S., Al-Fatih, S., Esfandiari, F., & Anoraga, S. (2025). Repositioning Delegated Authority and Binding Power of Ministerial Regulations in Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum IUS QUIA IUSTUM*, 32(2), 287-308. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol32.iss2.art2>
- Roelsgaard Obling, A., Berndtsson, J., & Gilje Østensen, Å. (2026). Conceptualising total defence: inter-organisational structures in a comparative perspective. *European Security*, 1-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662839.2026.2620708>
- Rusfiana, Y. (2021). Aktualisasi Sistem Pertahanan Rakyat Semesta (Sishanta) dan Dinamika Potensi Ancaman. *Moderat: Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 7(3), 483-492. <https://doi.org/10.25157/moderat.v7i3.2482>
- Saputra, D. A. (2020). Analisis politik hukum undang-undang nomor 23 tahun 2019 tentang pengelolaan sumber daya nasional untuk pertahanan negara. *Lex Renaissance*, 5(4), 946-961. <https://doi.org/10.20885/JLR.vol5.iss4.art13>
- Sarjito, A., & Lelyana, N. (2024). Defense Policy Shaping and Security Governance: The Role and Impact of Defense Industry and Military Contractors. *Government & Resilience*, 2(2), 1-20. <https://doi.org/10.62503/gr.v2i2.15>
- Sudiarso, A., & Simbolon, L. (2022). Strengthening Military Defense Resources to Non-Military in Facing Nuclear Emergencies to Support National Defense. *Journal of Mechanical, Civil and Industrial Engineering*, 3(1), 07-12. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jmcie.2022.4.1.2>
- Sunarto, S., Suparji, S., Nugroho, H. S. W., Arsyad, G., & Indriyawati, N. (2025). Early Warning Alone Is Not Enough: Rethinking Disaster Preparedness Through Resource Mobilization. *Health Dynamics*, 2(10), 432-437. <https://doi.org/10.33846/hd21005>

- Syarifuddin, K. F. (2025). Implementing comprehensive security through institutional synergy: Indonesia's total people's defense framework in ASEAN Defense Minister's Meeting (ADMM) cooperation. *Jurnal Pertahanan*, 11(3). <https://doi.org/10.33172/jp.v11i3.19884>
- Turner, M., Prasojo, E., & Sumarwono, R. (2022). The challenge of reforming big bureaucracy in Indonesia. *Policy Studies*, 43(2), 333-351. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01442872.2019.1708301>
- Widjayanto, J., Susetyo, E., Ghazalie, G., & Leonardo, V. (2025). Perang total dan mobilisasi sumber daya nasional dalam Perang Dunia II: Pembelajaran strategis bagi ketahanan nasional Indonesia. *Jurnal Praksis dan Dedikasi Sosial*, 8(2), 441-451. <https://doi.org/10.17977/um022v8i22025p441-451>