

The Transnationalism of Democracy and Power Multiplicity in Indonesia: A Critical Perspective

Ade Marup Wirasenjaya

Department of International Relations, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta
addewirasenjaya@umy.ac.id

Purwo Santoso

Department of Politics and Government, Universitas Gadjah Mada
psantoso@ugm.ac.id

Submitted: 9 July 2023; Revised: 11 August 2023; Accepted: 21 August 2023

Abstrak

Artikel ini mengeksplorasi konsep kekuasaan dan demokrasi dalam konteks transnasionalisme, dengan mengambil fokus pada kasus Indonesia. Penelusuran ide kekuasaan dari pemikiran politik klasik hingga gagasan kontemporer, menjembatani pemahaman yang mencerminkan kompleksitas dan multiplisitas kekuasaan dalam struktur historis transnasional. Penulis menekankan pentingnya mengenali multiplisitas kekuasaan sebagai cara baru untuk memahami kekuasaan, mengingat ruang sejarah saat ini yang telah menghasilkan berbagai aktor, mengubah institusi, dan mendekonstruksi arena politik dari model tradisional ke model kontemporer. Struktur historis transnasional tidak hanya menciptakan arena-arena kekuasaan baru, tetapi juga membentuk metode-metode baru produksi kekuasaan. Inovasi-inovasi tersebut memiliki implikasi yang mendalam bagi kehidupan politik dan wajah demokrasi Indonesia saat ini, yang mencerminkan transisi dari paradigma lama ke interpretasi modern. Paper ini mengajukan perspektif kritis tentang bagaimana pengaruh transnasional berinteraksi dengan struktur domestik untuk mendefinisikan kembali demokrasi dan dinamika kekuasaan di dunia yang mengglobal dengan cepat.

Kata kunci: kekuasaan, multiplisitas kekuasaan, transnasionalisme, demokrasi, ide-ide politik, demokrasi Indonesia.

Abstract

This article explores the concepts of power and democracy within the context of transnationalism, with a specific focus on Indonesia. It traces the foundational ideas of power from classical political thought to contemporary notions, bridging an understanding that reflects the complexity and multiplicity of power in a transnational world. The author emphasizes the importance of recognizing power multiplicity as a new way to perceive power, given the current historical structure that has produced various actors, transformed institutions, and deconstructed political arenas from traditional models to contemporary ones. The transnational historical structure not only creates new arenas for power but also shapes new methods of power production. These innovations have profound implications for political life and the current face of democracy in Indonesia, reflecting a transition from old paradigms to modern interpretations. The research offers a critical perspective on how transnational influences interact with domestic structure to redefine democracy and power dynamic in a rapidly globalizing world.

Keywords: power, multiplicity of power, transnationalism, democracy, political thought, Indonesia's democracy.

INTRODUCTION

The study of political science has been indelibly linked to the investigation of power, its multifaceted characteristics, and its dynamic nature (Heywood, 2004). As a sub-discipline of political science, international relations invariably engage with the study of power, reflecting its rich complexity and diverse manifestations (Barnett and Duvall, 2005; Troy J, 2005). The intrigue of power, transcending from the classical era to the

post-modern epoch, has consistently attracted the attention of political thinkers, marking it as a field ripe for intellectual exploration and theoretical advancement. This intrigue signals not only the multifarious nature of power, borne from intricate social interactions but also underscores the dynamism and fluidity of power as a concept. These qualities foster an environment wherein power is perpetually subject to contestation, traversing various subjects, and domains (Gunnell, 1983).

With the emergence of the globalized and transnational space, the traditional paradigms of power and democracy have been challenged, thus necessitating a reexamination of their underlying principles. This article seeks to delve into the transnationalism of democracy and the multiplicity of power within the specific context of Indonesia, taking into account the significant implications of this transnational space on extant political ideas. By situating this discourse within the framework of critical analysis, this work highlights the demands, both empirical and theoretical, that the current era imposes upon conventional political theory.

Our central argument posits that the conventional views on power and democracy require reconstruction and reorientation in light of the emergent transnational social space. In particular, the article will scrutinize the dynamics of power within the Indonesian context, illuminating how the processes of trans-nationalization both augment and complicate our understanding of power and democracy. By doing so, this article aims to contribute to the broader discourse on the reshaping of political theory and practice, offering a nuanced perspective that encapsulates the fluidity and diversity of power within the transnational historical structure.

This inquiry is not merely an intellectual exercise; rather, it embodies an essential endeavor to comprehend the contemporary challenges and opportunities that transnationalism presents to democracy and power. The critical perspective adopted in this article fosters a comprehensive understanding of these dynamics, opening new avenues for both thought and action in the field of political science. It stands as a call for scholars, policymakers, and practitioners to engage with these transformative forces, adapting and evolving the concepts of democracy and power in line with the exigencies of our increasingly interconnected world.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The genesis of the exploration of power and democracy can be traced back to ancient Greek political thought, where power was postulated as an imitation of Gods and supernatural forces. Philosophers such as Plato and Aristotle laid the philosophical groundwork for

understanding political power as a divine mandate, a notion that deeply influenced governance structures and ethical considerations in political life. Following this path, the Roman era embraced and advanced these beliefs, placing a unique emphasis on social order, justice, and law creation. Influential Roman thinkers like Cicero pioneered legal and political theory, meticulously weaving ethical considerations into governance and shaping complex understandings of power. This transition marks a critical stage in the evolution of political philosophy, setting the stage for future debates on authority, legitimacy, and justice (Jhonson, 1981).

The Renaissance ushered in a transformative phase with the writings of Niccolo Machiavelli. Departing from abstract and often metaphysical conceptions of power, Machiavelli offered a pragmatic and even starkly utilitarian view in his seminal work "The Prince". Portraying power as both a tool and a goal, he focused on efficacy over ethical considerations, crystallizing a perspective that continues to influence political strategies, statecraft, and international relations. Machiavelli's work is seen as a precursor to political realism and has resonated through the centuries, shaping the discourse on power in both theory and practice (Gramsci, 1971).

During the Enlightenment, a significant shift occurred towards human autonomy and anthropocentric philosophy. This era marked a break from transcendental understandings of power, emphasizing reason, individualism, and human agency. Key scholars like Locke and Rousseau laid the philosophical groundwork for liberal democracy, aligning with Hans Morgenthau's realism, which placed the primacy of power within the ambit of human affairs. Morgenthau's theories wove power and human self-interest into a coherent framework, reflecting the Enlightenment's shift towards autonomy, rationality, and the secularization of politics. This intellectual transformation has had lasting implications for the development of political thought, international relations, and the notion of the sovereign state (Troy, 2015).

In the realm of modern democracy, a more compartmentalized and multi-dimensional understanding of power has emerged, recognizing the complex interplay between different spheres like the state, market, and civil

society. This nuanced comprehension has led to the proliferation of diverse political ideologies, ranging from authoritarianism and capitalism to communism. Each represents a distinct vision of power's organization, application, and moral purpose, creating a complex and often contentious landscape for the operation and contestation of power. The interplay and tension between these compartments, ideologies, and the values they embody continue to shape modern political landscapes, reflecting the multifaceted complexity and dynamism inherent in contemporary governance. This evolution signifies a profound shift in understanding, with each era contributing unique insights, approaches, and challenges to the continuing discourse on power and democracy.

Seymour Martin Lipset and Brinton Moore's work extends the discourse on democracy by illuminating the interplay between social change, economic development, and democratic processes. Lipset's pioneering analysis elucidates the strong correlation between economic growth and democratic stability, illustrating how rising wealth and education levels can foster democratic values and institutions. His insights have proven significant not just in the broader political theory but also in the study of emerging democracies, including Indonesia, where economic development is closely tied to political stability and democratic growth. Moore, in contrast, delves into the transformation of agrarian structures of authority into modern political systems. His examination of the social forces and class struggles that shape political transformations provides a comprehensive understanding of how power and authority evolve and consolidate over time. Together, these analyses offer valuable insights that resonate with various political contexts and democratic transitions (Lipset, 1959; Moore, 1966).

The convergence of these diverse perspectives creates a nuanced narrative that traces the evolution of power and democracy through history. Starting with the mystical foundations of ancient Greece, where power was seen as an imitation of divine forces, the narrative advances through the pragmatic realism of the Renaissance, the human-centric rationalism of the Enlightenment, and the multifaceted dynamics of

modern democracy. These shifting paradigms of thought reflect the complexity and adaptability of political ideologies and democratic principles. In the specific context of Indonesia, these concepts are particularly valuable, as historical, cultural, and socioeconomic factors converge to shape the nation's unique democratic landscape. The understanding derived from these various perspectives provides a rich theoretical framework that informs and enhances the analysis of transnationalism and power multiplicity in Indonesia. The weaving of ancient wisdom and contemporary analysis ensures that the study remains grounded, while simultaneously challenging and expanding contemporary political thought and practice.

The 1970s marked a crucial phase in the study of political regimes and democratic procedures, with Joseph Schumpeter's procedural democracy serving as a defining framework. Schumpeter's view, emphasizing the process of competitive elections, was hailed for its simplicity but later criticized for its superficial treatment of democratic institutions. Critics argued that it failed to capture the complex relationships between citizens, interest groups, and political institutions, resulting in a narrow perspective that needed further elaboration (Bunted & Ufen, 2009).

Robert Dahl's introduction of the idea of polyarchy serves as a significant challenge and expansion of Schumpeter's procedural democracy concept. Where Schumpeter viewed democracy mainly in terms of elections and the competition for votes, Dahl's polyarchy emphasizes the multifaceted nature of democratic governance. His understanding recognizes the importance of participation, contestation, and citizens' genuine influence over government decisions. Instead of a minimalist, procedural view, Dahl's polyarchy paints a richer, more realistic, and complex portrait of how democracy functions, reflecting the different layers of democratic practice and people's involvement in it (Dahl, 1971). Building on this nuanced perspective, Wolfrang Merkel advanced the idea of "embedded democracy." Merkel's proposal serves as a bridge between various democratic forms, including participatory, liberal, and deliberative democracy, and encapsulates a comprehensive view of democracy that resonates with modern complexities (Merkel, 2004).

The discourse on democracy continues to evolve and is further enriched by studies on democratic transitions, regime changes, and the profound influences of key historical periods such as the Industrial Revolution. These historical periods such as the Industrial Revolution. These analyses incorporate foundational concepts like Max Weber's intricate thoughts on power, bureaucracy, and authority. Weber's portrayal of rational-legal authority and the efficiency of bureaucracy has inspired scholars like Huntington, Diamond, and others to delve into how political structures can evolve, adapt, and flourish across various historical and cultural contexts (O'Donnell & Schmitter, 1988; Huntington, 1991; Diamond, 1999; Fung & Wright, 2003; Johnson, 1986; Heywood, 2004). This body of work contributes essential perspectives to the understanding of political change, institutional development, and the dynamics of authority.

Together, these discussions synthesize an extensive array of ideas and theories related to power and democracy. They interweave historical, philosophical, and contemporary viewpoints into a comprehensive and cohesive theoretical framework that serves as the foundation for the research on "The Transnationalism of Democracy and Power Multiplicity in Indonesia." This exploration not only captures the unique historical and cultural context of Indonesia but also accentuates the intricate balance between local and global forces and the transnational dynamics of democracy. By offering a rigorous, well-rounded, and deeply contextual approach to the subject, this narrative sets the stage for an enriched understanding and insightful analysis specific to the Indonesian experience. The collective wisdom embedded in these analyses ensures that the study is not just an intellectual exercise but a nuanced exploration of the real-world complexities of democracy in a globally connected era.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employs a qualitative approach, focusing on a secondary data analysis to explore the transnationalism of democracy and the multiplicity of power in the Indonesian context. The method aligns with the critical perspective, emphasizing the interpretation and

understanding of the multi-layered and evolving concepts of power and democracy within transnational structures. The secondary data are collected from various academic, governmental, non-governmental, and international sources, including peer-reviewed journal articles, government reports and policy documents, records from international organizations, historical texts, and contemporary political analyses.

The sources are selected to ensure a comprehensive and multifaceted exploration of the themes in the context of Indonesia, with inclusion criteria based on relevance to the key themes and exclusion criteria designed to filter out sources that are either outdated or lacking in scholarly rigor. A thematic analysis method is employed to identify patterns and connect the complex ideas embedded in the data. This involves familiarization, coding, identifying themes, and interpretation, all aiming to group codes into overarching themes that represent the transnationalism of democracy and multiplicity of power in Indonesia (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

The research also adopts a critical perspective to unveil the underlying power structures, innovations, and implications for the current political life and democracy in Indonesia. By critically analyzing the secondary data, the research aims to unearth the nuanced connections between transnational influences and domestic structures in redefining democracy and power dynamics in a rapidly globalizing world (Foucault, 1980). Ethical considerations are strictly adhered to in handling secondary data, ensuring proper citation and acknowledgment of original authors, compliance with copyright laws, and respect for intellectual property.

RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

THE TRANSNATIONALISM OF DEMOCRACY

In the context of the current study's focus on Indonesia, the historical evolution and theoretical underpinnings of power and democracy play a crucial role. The 19th-century shift of capitalist poles from Europe to the United States saw the emergence of democracy and the distribution of power as a direct result of industrial expansion. This transformation reflects Indonesia's own evolving landscape, where industrial and

developments have led to a complex interplay of power structures (Dahl, 1986).

The work of Robert Dahl is particularly pertinent in this examination, as he provided a rational definition of power and its operation within logic. Dahl's insights into the possibilities of domination, subjugation, or withdrawal highlight the multifaceted nature of democratic structures. His concepts not only shed light on the global political stage but are also highly relevant to understanding Indonesia's unique political dynamics (Dahl, 1982). Furthermore, David Easton's structural-functional thinking complements this perspective, suggesting a more systematic approach where governments can manage power with various groups, reflecting the political balance found within Indonesia (Lukes, 1974).

Additionally, Steven Lukes' influential concept of the three faces of power, as described in "Power: a Radical View" (1974), resonates with the governance structure in Indonesia. Lukes delineates the dimensions of power from decision-making processes to thought control, offering a nuanced understanding of how power operates. This theoretical construct aligns with Indonesia's intricate balance of power, where decision-making processes must consider various sociopolitical factors (Heywood, 2004; Luke, 1974). Antonio Gramsci's explanation of hegemony further complements this perspective. His reflections on passive loyalty and the ways power operates not only in authoritarian structures but also in the production of cultural norms provide a deeper understanding of the Indonesian context (Gramsci, 1971; Johnson, 1986).

The perspectives of notable thinkers like Karl Marx and Michel Foucault, along with the contemporary debates surrounding "elitist democracy" and "pluralist democracy," further enrich our understanding of the transnational dynamics of democracy, particularly in Indonesia. Marx's insights into power as a projection of the dominant class echo within the Indonesian context, where the balance between various social classes and power structures plays a crucial role in shaping the democratic process (Heywood, 2004). Foucault's belief that power works in discourse adds a nuanced layer to this examination, emphasizing the importance of social

relations and practices in determining meaning within the political landscape (Foucault, 2004). Moreover, the discussions on "elitist democracy" and "pluralist democracy" offer a more comprehensive understanding of how power is perceived and exercised in various political arenas, reflecting the intricacies of Indonesia's governance (Palermo, 2019).

In conclusion, the arguments and references provided in this study collectively formulate a rich and detailed understanding of the transnationalism of democracy and power multiplicity. With direct relevance to Indonesia, these insights offer a multifaceted lens through which to critically analyze the complex interplay of local and global dynamics. By synthesizing these various concepts and aligning them with the historical and contemporary context of Indonesia, the research provides a coherent theoretical framework. This framework lays the groundwork for a deeper analysis and understanding of the subject, offering valuable insights for scholars, policymakers, and anyone interested in the unique intersection of democracy, power, and transnationalism in Indonesia. By connecting a wide range of theoretical perspectives, this research contributes significantly to the field, highlighting the importance of interdisciplinary thinking in comprehending the multifaceted nature of political power and democratic governance.

PUTTING INDONESIA IN A NEW WAVE OF DEMOCRACY PRODUCTION

Globalization and trans-nationalization bring together both democratic elitism and pluralist democracy. The meeting comes up in debates about electoral authoritarianism as elaborated by Levitsky and Way (2010), Lindberg (2009), Magaloni (2006), Schedler (2006) and Morse (2012). The wave of transnationalism has given birth to a kind of electoral tsunami (Morse, 2012). A new way may be needed to see how the current power has experienced the process of multiplication both in terms of growth of actors, networks, and locus.

One of the most important developments in the current phenomenon of democracy is the increasingly blurry of domestic affairs and international affairs. David Held mentions five patterns of disjuncture facing

countries and the global order. *First*, disconnection due to international law; *second*, internationalization of political decision-making versus domestic decision-making; *third*, the structure of international defense versus the structure of domestic security; *fourth*, global identity versus domestic identity and *fifth*, world economy versus domestic economy (Held, 2005). These five disconnects adequately explain why current democratic issues should be placed in a transnational dimension.

Further explanation of the nature of recent democracies is also done by Anthony McGrew who sees four political characteristics as important implications of globalization. The four political phenomena are in terms of relationship patterns, relations between actors are now marked by the emergence of stretching politics. In terms of the depth of the relationship, there is a phenomenon of 'thickening' that encourages the presence of transnational governance. In terms of relationship speed, there is now a speeding up phenomenon that makes political decisions can be taken very quickly by involving increasingly diverse actors. And finally, is the deepening phenomenon where domestic issues undergo an internationalization process and vice versa international issues experience domestication (McGrew, 2000).

One thing that is important to ask, that in terms of the growth of the type and character of political actors, it is now also experiencing an important shift. The state has to face new actors who have strong enough networks. The civil society group has now turned into a global civil society whose role is considered quite important in building power contestation both against the state and against market forces. Mary Khaldor, a thinker who is considered quite important in this idea calls global civil society as a postmodern version of the idea of new social movements that was popular in the 1970s. The growth of global civil society was triggered by the emergence of non-traditional issues in international relations such as climate change, AIDS, disasters, and also social issues born due to corporate expansion (Khaldor, 2003). One of the strong actors in this global civil society network is non-governmental organizations (NGOs). On the other hand, the emergence of the global power of civil society also emerged after the state was considered unable to cope

with current issues that arose as a result of globalization. As Khaldor points out, 'all the theorists locate global civic actors as the source of moral action and their break from conventional state-based politics as the strategic basis for radical political change. One concept which captures the importance of global civil society is the idea that it 'signifies the domestication of the international' (Chandle, 2004; Khaldor, 2003).

The circumstance of social and politics underwent a very fundamental change after being controlled by the New Order regime for more than three decades. During the New Order era, state corporatism has controlled political space and public freedom. The relationship between the state and society takes place diametrically in which the state becomes a very dominant and hegemonic power. After the New Order, Indonesia entered the neoliberal era which was marked by a process of deepening relations with the global capitalist regime which gave birth to what Hadiz and Robison called "reorganizing power" (Hadiz & Robison, 2004). For Hadiz and Robison, the fall of authoritarian regime has opened for this oligarchy to reconstitute its power within society and the institutions of newly democratic Indonesia.

This situation caused the new mode of power production in post-New Order Indonesia. The mode of production of power in contemporary Indonesia is closely related to the mode of production neoliberal transnationalism. The New Order's way of producing power experienced a slight shock in 1998. This became the momentum for the shrinking of the old historical structure and the emergence of a new historical structure. The new historical structure is called liberal democracy which grows following the shift in historical structure at the global level. The shift from the Westphalian pattern as shown in the New Order regime, towards the neoliberal era as seen in the post-New Order era, provided a sphere of political opportunity for the involvement of transnational actors. Not only those that present themselves as economic powers such as transnational corporations, but also new social blocks appear that play in the cognitive arena where the educated class that grows in transnational networks becomes "cognitive machines" (Kenway & Koh, 2013),

the presence of the transnational capitalist class (Sklair, 2009) and the transnational professional class (Faulconbridge & Muzio, 2012) and the transnational managerial class (Cox, 1987).

Since the New Order era, which followed a developmentalist model, Indonesia's integration with the power structure has deepened (Hadiz & Robison, 2004; Wirasenjaya, 2012). The development approach suffered changes throughout Joko Widodo's tenure, although it appears to be reviving a developmentalist perspective. The presence of transnational social classes became a complementary element of the post-New Order neo-developmental regime. Even though Indonesia's democracy index has increased, in its development until the Joko Widodo era, oligarchic powers emerged in the political and economic fields. In the era of Joko Widodo, the state began to show illiberal tendencies (Baker, 2016). The policy of Joko Widodo, like Suharto in new order era, placed the non-economic sector as a secondary aspect to improve economic welfare (Warburton, 2016).

The transnational social class that later existed to fill the neoliberalism compartment in Indonesia is the group that is connected to neoliberal institutions at the global level. After the New Order Era, the momentum of "Reformasi" has spawned what McAdam, Tilly, & Tarrow (2001) call the structure of political opportunities. However, it is important to note, even though democratic space is available and freedom is visible in the current political arena, only transnational classes that have collaboration and connection with neo-developmental regime that have free space.

Does globalization bring power to an immersive arena? We do not think so. As this article has believed since its inception, historically power has always been the production of the socio-political edifice that surrounds it, as well as the construction of the dominant actors present in every age. The multiplicity of power is a direct implication of changes in social order that alter the way power is produced. At least, the way power is produced is born because the wave of transnationalism has involved a third actor. Compartment three arenas: the state-society-market has melting. The old way of looking at the political arena must undergo a reinterpretation.

Multiplication of power arises when state sovereignty erodes on the one hand but the proliferation of transnational civil society movements (Benhabib, 2008; Khaldor, 2003) arises on the other. Will the emergence of a third sector such as the growing number of civil societies make democracy increasingly find social roots? At least, in the case of Indonesia, this is not entirely promising given that the way democracy is produced will be largely determined by multiplication networks of power that have access and new political resources. For Greg Fealy (2020), the emergence of populist regimes such as those that took place in Indonesia during the Joko Widodo era may give rise to a plurality of actors but lead to the emergence of repressive pluralism regimes and do not close the space for dynastic politics (Fealy, 2020). The very strong presence of civil society after the New Order was on the one hand related to the trans-nationalization of civil society at the global level.

Indonesia is in a multiplying way of producing global power. In its position as an important player in the Southeast Asian region, the configuration of politics and development issue will inevitably be influenced by the new regionalized mode of production. In a new regionalism perspective, new currents emerging in Southeast Asia will present new patterns of relations and bring up new challenges. The trends and dynamics of Southeast Asia must be seen from the process of global transformation which has given rise to a historical structure that is different from the products of previous historical structures. Björn Hettne & Fredrik Söderbaum (1998) identify several trends and new regionalism directions. The old regionalism was strongly influenced by the bipolar contestation between the West and East blocs. New regionalism is related to structural transformation in the global system which is marked by the emergence of the new international division of power (NIDP), the relative decline of American hegemony and the global political economy which is undergoing restructuring. The current way of regional power production is heavily influenced by the expansion of global capitalism, the erosion of the Westphalian state system and the emergence of a wave of transnationalism driven by non-official regionalism (Hettne & Soderbaum, 1998; Acharya, 2012).

CONCLUSION

Political studies have been facing the challenges of viewing power and democracy within the social relations and arena that have undergone radical changes in this century. Power presents itself in truly diverse faces, mobile and also increasingly flexible form. Today's democratic space increasingly presents interconnections with each other.

This research has shown that the current transnational historical structure has created heteronomy rather than hegemony. The multiplicity of power has taken place in Indonesia since the beginning of the "Reformasi" era. This condition occurs because the structure of power production has given rise to a diverse spectrum of political power from the three main political arenas. From the state arena, the multiplicity of powers was born due to the liberal democratic process that gave birth to networks of governance. From the market arena multiplicity of power was born due to the increasingly established capitalist process. And from the society arena, the multiplicity of power was born as a response to the two previous phenomena as well as the search for alternative sources of power in the context of forming new social blocs. The multiplicity of power in these three arenas is increasingly complex because it is related to the way power is produced on a global scale. Will the multiplication of power in a developing country like Indonesia lead to a more stable and consolidated democracy? Or will it bring democracy to a new face, a democracy that only creates crowds and networks but fails to create a deepening process.

REFERENCE

- Archaya, A. (2012). *The Making of Southeast Asia: International Relations of a Region*. Cornell University Press.
- Barnett, M., & Duvall, R. (2005). Power in International Politics. *Journal of International Organization*, 59(1).
- Barry, N. (1995). *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Barry, N. P. (1995). *An Introduction to Modern Political Theory*. London: Macmillan Press.
- Benhabib, S. (2007). Twilight of Sovereignty or the Emergence of Cosmopolitan Norms? Rethinking Citizenship in Volatile Times. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(1), 19-36. doi:10.1080/13621020601099807.
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative research in psychology*, 3(2), 77-101.
- Brighi, E., & Cerella, A. (2015). An alternative vision of politics and violence: Introducing mimetic theory in international studies. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 11(1), 3-25.
- Bünthe, M., & Ufen, A. (2009). The New Order and its legacy: Reflections on democratization in Indonesia. In *Democratization in Post-Suharto Indonesia*. Routledge.
- Chandle, D. (2004). *Constructing Global Civil Society Morality and Power in International Relations*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Cox, R. W. (1987). *Production, Power, and World Order: Social Forces in the Making of History*. Columbia University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1971). *Poliarchy and Opposition*. Yale University Press.
- Dahl, R. A. (1986). *Introduction to Democracy, Liberty, and Equality*. Oslo: Norwegian University Press.
- Delue, S. M., & Dale, T. M. (2017). *Political Thinking, Political Theory and Civil Society*. New York and London: Routledge.
- Diamond, L. (1999). *Developing Democracy: Toward Consolidations*. Jhon Hopkins University Press.
- Edward, M. (2014). *Civil Society*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Faulconbridge, J. R., & Muzio, D. (2012). Professions in a globalizing world: Towards a transnational sociology of the professions. *International sociology*, 27(1), 136-152.
- Fealy, G. (2020). Jokowi in the Covid-19 Era: Repressive Pluralism, Dynasticism and the Overbearing State. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56(3), 301-323. doi:10.108/00074918.2020.1846482
- Finifter, A. (1983). *Political Science: The State of The Dicipline*. The American Political.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings, 1972-1977*. C. Gordon (Ed.). New York: Pantheon.
- Foucault, M. (2004). *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Insitutional Innovations. *Politics & society*, 29(1), 5-41.
- Goldsmith, A. A. (2015). Elections and civil violence in new multiparty regimes: Evidence from Africa. *Journal of Peace Research*, 52(5), 607-621.
- Gramsci, A. (1971). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gramei, A. (1971). *Selections from Prison Notebooks*. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- Gunnel, J. G. (1983). Political Theory; The Evolution of a Sub-Field. In A. W. Finifter (Ed.), *Political Science: The State of The Dicipline*, *The American Political Science Association*.
- Hadiz, V., & Robison, R. (2004). *Reorganising Power in IndonesiaThe Politics of Oligarchy in an Age of Markets*. Routledge.
- Held, D. (Ed.). (2005). *Debating globalization*. Polity.
- Hettne, B., & Söderbaum, F. (1998). The new regionalism approach. *Politeia*, 17(3), 6-21.
- Hettne, B. (2005). Beyond the 'new' regionalism, *Journal of New Political Economy*. 10(4), 543-571. doi:10.1080/13563460500344484
- Heywood, A. (2004). *Political Theory: an Introduction*. New York : Palgrave Macmillan .
- Heywood, A. (2004). *Political Theory: an Introduction*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Huntington, S. (1991). *The Third Wave: Democracy in The Late Century*. University of Oklahoma Press.

- Jhonson, D. (1981). *Sociology Theory: Classical Founders and Contemporary*. Wiley and Sons Inc .
- Johnson, D. P. (1986). *Sosiologi Klasik dan Kontemporer*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Kenway, J., & Koh, A. (2013). The elite school as 'cognitive machine' and 'social paradise': Developing transnational capitals for the national 'field of power'. *Journal of sociology*, 49(2-3), 272-290.
- Khaldor, M. (2003). The Idea of Global Civil Society. *International Affairs*, 79(3).
- Laclau, E., & Mouffe, C. (1985). *Hegemony and Socialist Strategy: Towards A Radical Democratic Politics*. Verso Books.
- Levitsky, S., & Way, L. A. (2010). *Competitive authoritarianism: Hybrid regimes after the Cold War*. Cambridge University Press.
- Lindberg, S. I. (2009). Democratization by elections? A mixed record. *Journal of Democracy*, 20(3), 86-92.
- Lukes, S. (1974). *Power: A Radical View*. Palgrave Macmillan.
- Tilly, C., McAdam, D., & Tarrow, S. (2001). *Dynamics of contention*. Cambridge, CUP.
- Magaloni, B. (2006). *Voting for autocracy: Hegemonic party survival and its demise in Mexico* (Vol. 296, p. 30). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- McGrew, A. (2000). Power shift: from national government to global governance. *A Globalizing World?: Culture, Economics, Politics*, 127.
- Merkel, W. (2004). Embedded and Defective Democracies. *Jurnal Democratization*, 11(5), 33-58.
- Moore, B. (1966). *Social origins of dictatorship and democracy: Lord and peasant in the making of the modern world*. Boston.
- Moore, B. (Boston). *Social Origins of Dictatorship and Democracy: Lord and*. 1966.
- Morse, Y. L. (2011, January). The Era of Electoral Authoritarianism. *World Politics*, 64(01), 161-198. doi:10.1017/S0043887111000281
- Nilson, J., & Wallenstein, S. O. (2013). *Foucault, Biopolitics and Governmentality*. Swedia: Sodertorn University.
- Noer, D. (1997). *Pemikiran Politik di Negeri Barat*. Bandung: Mizan.
- Palermo, G. (2019). Power: a Marxist view Coercion and exploitation in the capitalist mode of Production. *Cambridge Journal of Economics*, 43(5), 1353-1375. doi:10.1093/cje/bey055
- Rusell, B. (2003). *History of Western Philosophy*.
- Schedler, A. (Ed.). (2006). *Electoral authoritarianism: The dynamics of unfree competition*. Lynne Rienner Publishers.
- Schmitter, G. O. (1988). *Transition From Authoritarian Rule: Prospect for Democracy*. Baltimore and London: Jhon Hopkins University Press.
- Sklair, L. (2009). The transnational capitalist class: Theory and empirical research. *European economic elites: Between a new spirit of capitalism and the erosion of state socialism*, 497-524.
- The Politics Book*. (2013). DK London .
- Troy, J. (2015). Desire for Power or the power of desire? Mimetic theory and the heart of twentieth-century realism. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 1, 26-41. doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088214555456
- Warbuton, E. (2018). A New Developmentalism in Indonesia? *Journal of Southeast Asian Economies*, 35(3), 355-368.
- Wirasenjaya, A. M. (2012). Strukturisasi Norma: Pengarusutamaan Gagasan Neoliberal dalam Pembangunan di Negara Pasca-Kolonial (Pengalaman Amerika Latin dan Asia). *Jurnal Sosial Politik UGM*, 15(3). doi:https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.10920
- Wucherpfennig, J., & Deutsch, F. (2009). Modernization and Democracy: Theories and Evidence Revisited. *Living Reviews in Democracy Vol 1*.
- Wucherpfennig, J., & Deutsch, F. (2009). Modernization and Democracy: Theories and Evidence Revisited. *Living Reviews in Democracy*, 1.