Democracy and Anarchy in Indonesia

Mubarak Dahlan

Departement of Sociology and Anthropology Education,Faculty of Social Science and Law, Universitas Negeri Makassar Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia

* Correspondent Author: mubarak.dahlan@unm.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This research delves into the intricate interplay between democracy and anarchy in the Indonesian context, shedding light on a subject that holds significant relevance in contemporary politics. Against a backdrop of political transitions and societal complexities in Indonesia, the study's primary objective is to comprehensively understand the dynamics of democracy and anarchy through a qualitative lens. Employing a qualitative research approach, the research engages various stakeholders, including political activists, experts, and the general public, to gather rich data on their perspectives and experiences. Data collection techniques encompass in-depth interviews, document analysis, and participant observation in key locations where democratic and anarchic events unfold. Thematic and content analyses are employed to extract and examine recurring themes and patterns in the data, ensuring the robustness and validity of the findings through triangulation. The study grapples with limitations such as time constraints and potential respondent bias but ultimately seeks to provide a nuanced understanding of the coexistence and interaction of democracy and anarchy in Indonesia. The research findings have the potential to offer valuable insights to policymakers and researchers concerned with political stability and governance in Indonesia, contributing to a deeper comprehension of the challenges and opportunities posed by these two seemingly contrasting forces in the nation's political landscape.

Keywords: Democracy; Anarchy; Politic

1. INTRODUCTION

Democracy as an idea and as the institutionalization of rational political power has undeniably offered a method to eliminate doubts in political decision-making. In the concept of democracy, political decisions are measured solely through the principle of majority rule. This quantitative method is expected to eliminate uncertainties and uncertainties in the political and constitutional legal processes in the life of the state (Newton, 2001; Soedarwo, 2014).

The democratic method begins with the freedom of every citizen to participate in political decision-making. The principle of majority rule is essential to achieving decisions in the concept of democracy. The Majority principle consists of at least three types: 1) Absolute majority, which is half the number of members plus one or 50 plus one; 2) Ordinary majority,

where decisions are approved by as many votes as possible, making a distinction between the majority and the minority evident; 3) Conditional majority, which determines decisions based on certain calculations, such as 2/3 or 3/4 of the votes. The essence of these three types of majority rules remains the same, namely that the majority vote is the winner of the free and equal decision-making process.

The discourse of democracy in Indonesia cannot be separated from the reference to the values of Indonesian society's tradition. This reference can be traced back to the development of national consciousness among Indonesian independence movements that emerged in the early 20th century (Barro, 1999; Fossati et al., 2020; Fuad, 2014; Su, 2015). Thus, democracy in Indonesia can be divided into four periods, as described by Kommarudin Hidayat and Azyumardi Azra (2006, 140-144): the period of 1945-

1959, the period of 1959-1965, the period of 1965-1998, and the period from 1998 to the present.

2. METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research approach, which is well-suited for exploring complex social phenomena and understanding the perspectives and experiences of individuals in a specific context(Creswell & Creswell, 2017). The research will involve key stakeholders, political activists, political experts, and members of the general public as informants. A purposive sampling method will be used to select participants who have experience and knowledge related to democracy and anarchy in Indonesia (Patton, 2002).

Data Collection Techniques: 1) In-Depth Interviews: In-depth interviews will be conducted with selected informants. These interviews will be semi-structured, allowing for open-ended questions and a deeper exploration of participants' views and experiences (Mishra & Alok, 2022). 2) Document Analysis: A comprehensive review and analysis of relevant documents, including research reports, policy documents, and academic articles, will be conducted to provide a broader context and background information on the subject (Hardin, 2008). 3) Participant Observation: The research team will engage in participant observation in specific locations that are central to events related to democracy and anarchy. This technique will provide firsthand insights into the on-ground situations.

Data Analysis Method: 1) Thematic Analysis: Thematic analysis will be employed to identify recurring themes and patterns in the data collected through interviews and documents. This approach allows for the systematic identification of key themes related to democracy and anarchy (Braun et al., 2021). 2) Content Analysis: Content analysis will be used to extract meaning from textual data obtained from document analysis. It involves systematically examining the content of documents to uncover underlying themes and trends (Slamti, 2020). 3) Triangulation: Data from different sources, such as interviews, documents, and observations, will be compared and cross-referenced to ensure the validity and reliability of the findings.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The study's key findings emphasize that democracy, encompassing both an ideological concept and an established framework for rational political authority, serves as a pivotal means of addressing uncertainties inherent in the realm of political decision-making. Central to the democratic process is the principle of majority rule, which manifests in multiple forms, including absolute majority, ordinary majority, and conditional majority, each playing a fundamental role in shaping decisions within the democratic framework. Moreover, the research underscores the deep-rooted connection between the discourse of democracy in Indonesia and the country's rich cultural and historical context.

This profound link traces its origins to the early 20th century, during Indonesia's struggle for independence when a sense of national identity and consciousness began to take shape. Consequently, this historical perspective has exerted a profound influence on the evolution of democracy in Indonesia, spanning distinct eras from 1945 to the contemporary era. This influence has contributed to the development of unique characteristics and posed specific challenges to the democratic system.

In summary, the research provides invaluable insights into the coexistence and intricate interplay of democracy and anarchy within the Indonesian context, offering a deeper understanding of the complexities that impact governance and political stability in the nation for the benefit of policymakers and researchers alike.

The study's findings underscore the crucial role of democracy as both an idea and an institutionalized form of rational political power in Indonesia. Democracy offers a structured approach to mitigate uncertainties in the realm of political decision-making(Feste et al., 2020; Voitleithner, 2002). This research highlights the principle of majority rule, which serves as the cornerstone of the democratic process (Darling, 2022; Gleick, 1989). Majority rule manifests in various forms, including absolute majority, ordinary majority, and conditional majority, all of which are essential mechanisms for decision-making within the democratic framework (Acheampong et al., 2022; Feldman, 2017; Juliawan, 2011; Latulippe & Klenk, 2020; Sinring & Buana, 2022; Wilfahrt, 2018; Yörük et al., 2019).

Furthermore, the research emphasizes that the discourse of democracy in Indonesia is deeply

intertwined with the nation's cultural and historical context. This connection has its roots dating back to the early 20th century when Indonesia was in the midst of a struggle for independence, and a sense of national identity and consciousness began to take shape (Smit et al., 2017). The historical perspective has significantly influenced the evolution of democracy in Indonesia across different periods, from 1945 to the present day. These distinct historical periods have shaped the unique characteristics and challenges of democracy in the country.

This research sheds light on how democracy and anarchy coexist and interact within the complex political landscape of Indonesia. By examining the historical and cultural context of Indonesia, it becomes evident that the evolution of democracy in the country is closely tied to its struggle for independence and the development of a national identity. Understanding these intricate dynamics provides valuable insights for policymakers and researchers seeking a deeper comprehension of governance and political stability in Indonesia.

4. CONCLUSION

It underscores that democracy, serving as both an ideological concept and an institutionalized framework, plays a pivotal role in mitigating uncertainties in political decision-making, primarily through the principle of majority rule. Furthermore, the study highlights the profound influence of Indonesia's cultural and historical context on the discourse of democracy, tracing its roots back to the nation's struggle for independence in the early 20th century. This historical perspective has left an indelible mark on the evolution of democracy in Indonesia across distinct periods. While the research provides valuable insights into the complexities of governance and political stability in Indonesia, it also underscores the ongoing need for policymakers to navigate the delicate balance between democracy and anarchy, drawing from the nation's unique historical and cultural fabric to chart a sustainable path forward.

REFERENCES

Acheampong, A. O., Opoku, E. E. O., & Dzator, J. (2022). Does democracy really improve environmental quality? Empirical contribution to the environmental politics debate. *Energy Economics*, *109*, 105942. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eneco.2022.105942

Barro, R. J. (1999). Determinants of democracy. *Journal of Political Economy*, *107*(S6), S158–S183.

Braun, V., Clarke, V., Boulton, E., Davey, L., & McEvoy, C. (2021). The online survey as a qualitative research tool. *International Journal of Social Research Methodology*, *24*(6), 641–654.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2017). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. Sage publications.

Darling, J. (2022). The politics of discretion: Authority and influence in asylum dispersal. *Political Geography*, *94*, 102560. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.polgeo.2021.102560

Feldman, D. L. (2017). The inspector general: Political culture and constraints on effective oversight. *Public Integrity*, *19*(6), 593–606.

Feste, J., Ivens, B. S., & Pardo, C. (2020). Key account selection as a political process: Conceptual foundation and exploratory investigation. *Industrial Marketing Management*, *90*, 417–434. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.indmarman.2020.07.024

Fossati, D., Aspinall, E., Muhtadi, B., & Warburton, E. (2020). Ideological representation in clientelistic democracies: The Indonesian case. *Electoral Studies*, *63*, 102111. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.electstud.2019.102111

Fuad, A. B. B. (2014). Political Identity and Election in Indonesian Democracy: A Case Study in Karang Pandan Village – Malang, Indonesia. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, *20*, 477–485. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.060

Gleick, P. H. (1989). Climate change and international politics: problems facing developing countries. *Ambio*, 333–339.

Hardin, R. (2008). Normative Methodology. *The Oxford Handbook of Political Methodology*, *September*, 1–14. https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordhb/9780199286546.003.0002

Juliawan, B. H. (2011). Street-level politics: labour protests in post-authoritarian Indonesia. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *41*(3), 349–370. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2011.582706

Latulippe, N., & Klenk, N. (2020). Making room and moving over: knowledge co-production, Indigenous knowledge sovereignty and the politics of global environmental change decision-making. *Current Opinion in Environmental Sustainability*, *42*, 7–14.

Mishra, S. B., & Alok, S. (2022). *Handbook of research methodology*. Educreation publishing.

Newton, K. (2001). Trust, social capital, civil society, and democracy. *International Political Science Review*, *22*(2), 201–214.

Sinring, B., & Buana, A. P. (2022). Legal Politics of Sustainable Agricultural Empowerment in South Sulawesi for Community Welfare and Sustainable Development. *Golden Ratio of Law and Social Policy Review (GRLSPR)*, *1*(2), 38–48.

Slamti, F. (2020). 51 st International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development Development. *51st International Scientific Conference on Economic and Social Development*, *March*, 286.

Smit, H., Muche, R., Ahlers, R., & van der Zaag, P. (2017). The Political Morphology of Drainage—How Gully Formation Links to State Formation in the Choke Mountains of Ethiopia. *World Development*, *98*, 231–244. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.04.031

Soedarwo, V. S. D. (2014). Political Ideology Meaning and Patriarchal Ideology of Female Politicians in Indonesia: A Case in Malang. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, *20*, 486–495. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.061

Su, Y.-P. (2015). Anti-government protests in democracies: A test of institutional explanations. *Comparative Politics*, *47*(2), 149–167. https://doi.org/10.5129/001041515814224444

Voitleithner, J. (2002). The National Forest Programme in the light

of Austria's law and political culture. *Forest Policy and Economics*, *4*(4), 313–322. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/S1389-9341(02)00073-4

Wilfahrt, M. (2018). The politics of local government performance: Elite cohesion and cross-village constraints in decentralized Senegal. *World Development*, *103*, 149–161. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2017.09.010

Yörük, E., Öker, İ., & Şarlak, L. (2019). Indigenous unrest and the contentious politics of social assistance in Mexico. *World Development*, *123*. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2019.104618