

Feudalism in Indonesia Democracy

Indra Fauzan and Fernanda Putra Adela
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia

Keywords: Democracy, Feudalism, Indonesia Politics.

Abstract: Democracy is a system of government that gives freedom to every element of society to improve the quality of democracy, popular sovereignty is the most important element in modern democracy, democracy eliminates oritarianism, dictatorship and also a hierarchical system far from democracy. Indonesia is a country that uses a democratic system as a government and state, after the reformation of the democratic paradigm began to be intensively carried out as a form of implementation of modern democracy. All elements of democracy, actors and also instruments of democracy do not work well in accordance with the principles of democracy. This value is considered not in accordance with the principles of democracy as agreed, voiced, the right to vote and be elected in relation to the formation of political dynasties, corruption, collusion, and nepotism. There are still many shortcomings in running it. Most of the existing compilation with the defense system, the number of elements of feudalism that still resides in the mentality of actors, political elites in Indonesia, both from the central to the regional level, the evaluation of democracy is limited to procedure only but not in political action. the question is how non-democratic elements are lost in politics This article presents how modern democracy in Indonesia is actually a way out for politics but is used by free political riders who add to feudalism to gain, use and maintain their power. This article is expected to add to the corpus of knowledge in the political field.

1 INTRODUCTION

Democracy is now a political system used by the majority of countries throughout the world, the choice of democracy is a logical choice today because it can politically maintain good relations with countries that also use democracy primarily to place themselves in the eyes of the nation. Indonesia is a country that embraces and uses democracy as its political system choice.

Democracy in Indonesia has always changed its face since the founding of this nation. Starting from parliamentary democracy, guided democracy, Pancasila democracy and currently democracy which is considered more open, more friendly to the people and indeed tries to carry out democratic values that are actually in accordance with the theories and concepts of scholars.

Unfortunately, there are still many who believe that Indonesia's democracy at present is a mere procedural democracy, not essentially running the values of democracy and some say it is liberal democracy (Tornquist, 2001) or oligarchic democracy / ollygarchy democracy (Fukuoka, 2012)

When Indonesia underwent a reformation in 1998, the euphoria of democracy was as high as if it had just been released from a lonely, dark and narrow prison. The liberation of the Indonesian people from the shackles of political New Order that was rigid, bureaucratic and stressful made the Indonesian people have high hopes for a democracy that really - emphasizing the freedom of civil, media, justice, transparency and so forth. The cheers of reform continue to reverberate and governance after the new order is expected to be able to bring what aspired by those who fight for democracy with full of sweat and blood (Carnegie, 2008).

After more than 20 years of democracy it turns out that democracy aspired to still leaves the question whether the democracy that was lived in accordance with reform expectations or just carry out democratic obligations only such as elections, political party contestation, media freedom, distance the military from politics and give more authority to the legislature to really be a balance for the executive during the old order and the new order was not obtained.

After two decades of reforms it seems that this nation is sometimes still stuttering in democracy, the

inability to absorb the values of modern democracy which must be implemented in state life sometimes has to clash with the political interests of the authorities both local and central. It makes sense if the experts say how democracy in Indonesia works today, those who oppose the flow of democracy are still hampered by laws that support freedom of thought, discuss and report public opinion such as laws and political laws through articles defamation, harassment through defamation.

The term democracy in general is that sovereignty is in the hands of the people, in the context of modern democracy people's sovereignty is more manifested in the form of elections, even though in terms of democracy it is the most minimal understanding (Huntington, 1995). Whereas a more specific understanding of democracy was developed by elitist schools advocated by Schumpeter and his followers on procedural democracy, specifically saying that democracy '... in political life there is always some competition'.

Dahl (1971) says that democracy is Poliarchy. For Dahl, democracy has two meanings or dimensions, namely contestation and participation. Contestation is a well organized match like the institutions for holding general elections, a period of contestation that is having a clear implementation time whether every four years like in the United States or once every five years like in Indonesia there is clear political competition such as a match between free, honest and fair political parties.

Whereas the second dimension is participation, namely how every citizen who is in accordance with the conditions of voting and being elected has the right to participate in the contestation above, either as a voter or chosen to fight for a public position. Poliarchy is not just the freedom to choose and compete for power, but also the freedom to speak out and disseminate information of his thoughts through free publications, including mass media, journals, seminars and so on. In addition there is freedom to establish organizations and join certain organizations and so on.

Also following Dahl are three characteristics of a democratic country: first, having equal rights in collective and binding decision making. Second, equal opportunities for citizens in the political process. Third, the manifestation of civil and political freedom. In different contexts Following Dahl (1999) democracy produces consequences including: 1. Avoiding tyranny, 2. Human rights, 3. Lay freedom, 4. Determining one's own destiny, 5. moral autonomy, 6. Human development, 7 Protection of

personal interests, 8. Equal political rights and added peace and prosperity.

This impression is a virtue that might emerge in a democracy even though democracy still has its own weaknesses. But sometimes democracy is also difficult to apply to advanced societies (Dahl 1971) in societies that practice liberal democracy are faced with the challenge of reconciling and uniting differences in heterogeneous societies so that sometimes in plural societies, liberal democracies will find impasse.

Whereas feudalism is a political system that usually develops in traditional monarchic societies, there is a structural hierarchy that involves patron and client relations, feudalism is believed to be a system that is contrary to democracy itself which presents equality, equality, freedom and intellectualism.

Feudalism itself refers to the political, organizational, social and economic system of medieval Europe (Grimmelman, 2000), which refers to land ownership in Europe (France and England) known as vassal or lord (Moore, 2002; Cantwell, 2019), whereas in the Marxist perspective feudalism is the formation of society before capitalism and eventually becomes communist, Marx considers that the process of forming a feudal society forms social classes and creates class conflict (Epstein, 2007), the feudal era is full of sacred and noble values, with attitudes and customs such as harmony, respect for the king or nobility, with a social order where the position above and below is considered as something that crosses the world (Suseno, 2001).

So Marx saw that all kinds of relations of attitudes, feelings, rituals, and feudal norms were actually nothing more than a sacred veil that covered the exploitation of the upper feudal classes against the lower classes. Behind the people's feelings of disrespect or respect for the king and the belief in his goodness is hidden the greed of the upper classes who live from the work of the people. Feudal values are nothing more than an ideological veil of reality based on human exploitation of humans.

So when we talk about feudalism, we will be led to views about orthodoxy, conservatism, patron and client relations, superiors and subordinate culture, respect and so on, depending on what and how our perspective of seeing feudalism is in the realm of our minds based on an understanding of feudalism scientifically or factually.

This article is here to look at the condition of Indonesia's democracy At present, democracy which is expected to be a way out of Indonesian politics that was closed in the past will be able to provide a sense of justice to all Indonesian people both for the

authorities, their supporters, the opposition or for the people who really need justice from the government.

2 FEUDALISM AND DEMOCRACY IN INDONESIA

As it is known that democracy is a political system that prioritizes people's sovereignty as the main basis of its power. In the context of Indonesia, democracy experiences ups and downs especially after the independence. Democracy repeatedly changes its form, format, or also its implementation. Indonesia has experienced a number of forms of democracy based on the interpretations of the authorities, for example after independence 1945 - 1957 Indonesia used parliamentary democracy, then changed its face, form and format into guided democracy in accordance with Sukarno's understanding.

After Sukarno ended democracy again underwent a transformation into Pancasila democracy in accordance with Suharto's interpretation of democracy, the climax is the third post-reform democracy transformation which is claimed to be a pure and modern democracy in accordance with the term democracy itself which is based on the people's freedom and sovereignty.

Understanding and interpretation of democracy is constantly changing because democracy cannot have only one face. The United States alone, which is considered the most important user of democracy in the world, has a different face from France or Britain, two countries which first proclaimed themselves to be users of modern democracy after the Industrial Revolution.

Not to mention how difficult it is to imply democracy to countries that do not have historical roots and good relations with democracy, usually the countries that have advantages in the number of ethnic religions, for example, are countries in Africa and also some countries in Asia. Arendt Lijphart, a western scholar, has tried to provide solutions to countries that have this advantage by giving a face of democracy which he called as a constitutional democracy or democracy of consensus. A term of democracy which accommodates all elements in the religious and ethnic context which unite in a democracy which has its origins as happened in Malaysia (Lijphart, 1977). Suppose he is that democracy can be lived well if the countries that have plural society should make an agreement or deliberation in playing on their democracy so that it is referred to as consociational democracy.

In a different context also in Indonesia has different democratic characteristics, Indonesia prefers the approach of openness and equality of position in the context of the Indonesian republic.

What is the real problem of democracy in Indonesia? not only procedural or empirical issues as said by Maswadi Rauf about Indonesian democracy (1998) but also how cultural values are in the political context in Indonesia. For this reason, it is necessary to trace the history of Indonesian politics. Broadly speaking, Indonesia is a country rooted in a system of feudalism. When the archipelago was still the name of this region, many kingdoms dominated the archipelago, such as Samudra Pasai Kingdom in Aceh, Malay kingdom in North Sumatra, Minangkabau kingdom in West Sumatra, Sriwijaya in Palembang, Singosari, Majapahit, Mataram in the land Java and several kingdoms in Kalimantan, Sulawesi and Papua. The kingdoms were spread evenly with all kinds of rules, the feudal system then became a political system that was directed until the Portuguese, Dutch, Japanese and British colonies came to Nusantara. The invaders did not bring a new system but they still brought the feudal system in their colonial structure.

The face of Indonesian politics today is inseparable from the condition of the nation's past, for more than a century we lived under the shadow of the royal system that spread from Sabang to Merauke. In the condition of life under the domination of the kingdom, of course we also live under a system of hierarchy that controls the lives of the people with feudal rules, that the king is everything, is not blameworthy and worshiped. In fact, in some cases the king is the representative of God on earth so that these doctrines do not provide an opportunity for the people to blame the king even with his family.

After the royal system changed under colonial rule, feudalism did not even change at all because the colonizers further perpetuated the feudal system to strengthen their position on the colonized earth. Rather than that more than three centuries under the power of our colonizers is inseparable from the system of feudalism which is thick with hierarchical. That culture continues to be traditionalized even when this nation is already independent. Under the regime of the ruling regime which is said to be democratic and chosen based on a democratic system. The democratic system, as we know it, is very far from the values of feudalism because it follows that democratic ebbs and flows removes feudal values and it specifically prioritizes collective values in the people, because indeed the people are the owners of sovereignty in the state.

In this context, despite the nation's claim that Indonesia is a country that uses democracy as a political system and its government, this is indicated by the use of democracy starting in post-independence using Parliamentary Democracy, continuing with Guided Democracy and Pancasila Democracy and ultimately this country using modern democracy (just name) to show that we are a democratic country. From there we can judge that this nation is actually committed to becoming close to democracy and trying to implement it in the right way. However, the facts show that the past life of this nation which deeply animates feudalism causes the values, culture and sentiments towards feudalism to be truly manifested in social and political life in Indonesia.

Maybe we reject that assumption, but the fact that it really happened feudal mentality still resides in this nation. For example, in a democratic institution itself, namely a Political Party, when the domination of a political party to determine who is a suitable candidate to be the head of the region then resulted in the domination of dynasties in one party, for example in the central political parties, almost all general leaders of political parties put families in line with their blood in a party structure such as the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle, placed Megawati Sukarnoputri as the irreplaceable general Chairperson and placed her two children in the structure of the leadership of the political parties namely Puan Maharani and Prananda Prabowo. In a different party we can see in the Democratic party led by former President of the Republic of Indonesia Soesilo Bambang Yudhoyono who also placed his two children in the party leadership structure namely Agus Harimurti Yudhoyono and Edhie Baskoro Yudhoyono, besides that we can also see in several political parties such as in Perindo, Nasdem and others. In democracy, democracy instruments, especially democratic values, should be implemented well, frequent circulation of power, limitation of power so that there is no monopoly and of course guarantee the rights of individuals to rule.

Another example at the regional level is that many high-ranking local party leaders take advantage of their position as to the region and at the same time as the leader of a particular political party and through that power they place themselves and their families within the circle of power both in the executive and legislative branches as a form of conserving power in certain regions. This power takes advantage of the opportunities contained in democracy itself because every individual has the same rights in politics, each individual is a person who has the right to power, to

join in any political party. So if we see many regional heads who are at the same time the heads of certain political parties and they place their families in power such as members of political parties, as members of the legislature and also as the driving wheel of the economy through family businesses that utilize local projects, control the business through tenders that have been mobilized through under the table or an agreement in a coffee shop.

Of course it is very easy for local rulers to move their political machinery, because they form political dynasties through the power of power, the power of capital and also their influence in society so that the mobilization of the times is very easy. They are interest groups that structurally cause a setback in democracy, they have a level of influence that is stratified and interconnected with the stages of development achieved by society.

Democracy is equality, equality is not degraded by feudalism (it should be), while feudalism is hierarchical, structural and oppressive is coupled with sycophants. So it is rather strange indeed when democracy becomes a reference in the state, culture and traditions of feudalism that remains comfortable in the democratic life of this nation. In democratic life when this feudalism does not live as a system but it lives in the values of national culture, peaceful in bureaucratic structures, academic, both local and central government and becomes common in the application of his life.

It can be seen in bureaucratic life, why there are transactional positions because feudal mentalities are still living peacefully in the bodies of these individuals, the regional head is the ruling king in their territory, the employees there are servants who have to serve them, so it happens structured sale of positions from the lowest level to the top level. In addition, government activities are always under the spotlight, if in the past the government had TVRI as a means of broadcasting all government activities, the community lined up to welcome the head of state or his minister to be present in the regions and in some cases even schools were closed. On several occasions in some regions even now the disease began to spread again, for example school children lined the edge of the field to welcome the head of state and so forth.

Therefore, even though there are provisions in the constitution that limit political power and the restrictions are openly recognized by the authorities, they are still violations of the exercise of power with very serious consequences, this happens in the cases mentioned above where certain individuals or groups are denied the right to gather, to express opinions, to

form associations and joint actions through threats and countermeasures.

Sometimes in democracy in Indonesia there are still power interventions even through power monopolies caused by the feudal mentality. There are often fundamental violations and defeats of the legitimacy of democracy, there are strong groups with their power supported by military apparatus and institutions, or groups of economic power or influential families that can operate outside the realm of democratic power control. In this way they raised themselves to the position of the highest authority in various fields of community life.

Obstacles and attitudes that want to be respected are usually passed through approaches of power, material, patronage relations that cause dependence. In addition, the attitude of perpetuated Javanese by calling or mentionings honorary titles in the community sometimes they do not like to be called if it is not complete with their titles such as pak haji, datuk, pak Wali, Ibu Wali, pak Bupati, Ketua, Pak Menteri, Abangda and others. Even in academic institutions, academic vocation such as doctorates, prof, etc. makes feudal values appear and blossom in academic nuance.

Although in fact institutionally the noble titles had long disappeared in the community such as the Raden title in Javanese aristocratic society, the progenitor of the aristocracy was Malay and so on but in a different form mentally and that value still resides in the soul. In the class structure those classified as the upper class or bourgeoisie still hold the dominance of the class structure because they have positions, the power of money, and power relations. No longer limited to being a king, landowner, vassal, Baron or lord in the era of the royal system or colonialism and imperialism.

Although socially, politically and economically, the system has changed but the mental, feudal values and culture are still present and fertile in the souls of the Indonesian people in each class structure of their society. From the post-independence era through parliamentary democracy, especially when guided democracy and Pancasila democracy, feudalism was strengthened by a structure of power through bureaucracy if in the context of the new order through ABRI, Bureaucracy and Golkar which indeed at that time hegemony economic, social and political structures.

In modern democracies that we see today after the reform of attitudes, mentality and values are still fertile embedded in the mind and soul of a cross-structure society. Decentralization produced political oligarchies in the regions (Hadiz and Robinson,

2002). These local elites strengthened their hegemony because their regional or environmental situation was very supportive, for example in some regions these local elites were rich people while the surrounding communities lived in poverty thus forming patron patterns and client. They strengthen their hegemony through religious, political, financial, regional and organizational power (Robinson and Hadiz 2004, Van Klinken, 2007). There is cooperation between local authorities or local strongmen with the bureaucracy or legal institutions in an area to strengthen the position of feudalism in different forms. Local strongman or local bossism is individu or local elite groups that are powerful both through business, influence, power, violence and so on who are able to rule in one region and give influence both in the economic, social and cultural context. (Migdal, 1988; Sidel 1998) or in other terms is the Shadow state or individu or local groups that control the bureaucracy (Hidayat and Gisamar 2010; Argenti, 2018).

From some of the cases and explanations above, we understand that culture, values and mental feudalism still live in a democratic system even though they actually oppose this behavior, along with eliminating the dominance of the monarchy in the French and industrial revolutions, but modernization does not necessarily eliminate feudalism even though in a different form. These values and culture are still well-traded in the political, social and economic spheres and structures of society from the elite to the lower levels.

3 CONCLUSIONS

A good democracy especially in this modern era should eliminate the values of individuals and groups. Reducing tyranny eliminates dictatorship, but there are individuals, groups or even one regime that still wants to perpetuate their power in certain ways. They enter the circle of democracy to strengthen their power, maintain their feudalistic power through political power, economic and social domination. Detachment and conservatism in power make some dominant groups in politics, they arrange in such a way that the rules of democracy to perpetuate power either through family, group or regime. The power of this feudal elite circle is usually strengthened through regulations whether it is a law or a regional regulation.

In addition, at the community or lower class level, they are dominated and must obey, submit to power and the economy. They are hegemony and resigned to be controlled. People because of social factors,

especially the economy inevitably participate in this feudalism. Flattery, licking, and respect are carried out with various motives, such as power, security, economy, social status and so on.

For this reason, it is necessary to reduce the democratic system in Indonesia, so that these positive values are not harmed by servitude that hinders individual competition, meritocracy and so on. However, indirectly, feudal values, culture and mentality will.

Tornquist, O., 2001. What's wrong with Indonesia's Democratisation? *Economic And Political Weekly*, 36(14/15), 1185-1187. JSTOR.

Van Klinken, G., 2007. *Communal violence and democratization in Indonesia: Small town wars*, Routledge. London.

REFERENCES

- Argenti, G., 2018. Civil society, shadow state dan local strongmen dalam kajian politik lokal. *Jurnal Cosmogov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 4(1), 58 – 70.
- Cantwell, D., 2019. Political elite has brought feudal system to America. *Reno Gazette Journal*. Retrieved from <https://www.rgj.com/story/opinion/voices/2019/01/13/rise-lords-america-cantwell/2565243002/>
- (1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and opposition*. New Haven : Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R.A, 1999. *On Democracy*, Yale University Press. New Haven and London.
- Epstein, S. R., 2007. *Rodney hilton, marxism and the transition from feudalism to capitalism*, London School of Economic. London.
- Fukuoka, Y., 2012. Olygarchi and democracy in post-Suharto Indonesia. *Political Studies Review*, 11(1), 52-64. Sage Journals. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1478-9302.2012.00286.x>
- Grimmelman, J., 2000. *Virtual world feudalisme*. Yale L.J. Pocket Part 126.
- Hidayat, S., Gisnar, A.M., 2010. Good governance vs shadow state dalam penyelenggaraan pemerintah daerah. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 7(1), 1-13.
- Huntington, S.P., 1995. *Gelombang demokrasi ketiga*, Pustaka Utama Grafiti. Jakarta.
- Lijhpart, A., 1977. *Democracy in plural societies: a comparative exploration*, Yale University Press. New Haven.
- Suseno, F.M., 2001. *Pemikiran Karl Marx: Dari sosialisme utopis ke perselisihan revisionisme*, PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakarta.
- Moore, J.W., 2002. The crisis of feudalism: An enviromental history. *Organization and Environment Journal*, 15(3), 301 – 322.
- Rauf, M., 1998. *Demokrasi dan demokratisasi: Penjajakan teoritis untuk Indonesia*, Mizan – Laboratorium Ilmu Politik FISIP – UI. Jakarta.
- Robinson, R., Hadiz, V.R., 2004. *Reorganizing power in Indonesia: The Politics of oligarchy in an age of markets*, Routledge Curzon. London.