An Analysis of the Discursive Gap in the Ideas and Practices of *Musyawarah Mufakat* in the Indonesian Nation-State Formation, 1900-1980s

Agus Suwignyo[1, 2] ✉, Rhoma Dwi Aria Yuliantri[3]
[1] Universitas Gadjah Mada, ✉ suwignyo_agus@ugm.ac.id
[2] 2022 Alumni-Fellow FRIAS University of Freiburg
[3] Universitas Negeri Yogyakarta

Abstract: The aim of this paper is to examine the existing studies on the Indonesian deliberative mechanism of decision making, musyawarah-mufakat (MM), in the frame of nation-state formation. The 17th of August, 1945 construction of the Indonesian nation-state was based on traditional values despite its modelling of the European modern states by way of colonial legacies. This paper argues that, although scholarly attentions to revisit the ideas and practices of MM have developed very vast over the past four decades, the transformation of MM as a state mechanism has been touched in passing. Consequently, there was a discursive gap in the ideas and practices of MM. By analyzing recent studies on MM and by employing a historical method to explore daily newspapers and official documents published between 1900 and 1980s, this paper shows that the collective nature of MM did represent the taming of the political masses that overrode an individual's sense of citizenship. Given the notion of unity, the making of MM a state ideology promoted the type of citizenship that had to work contingently with the ideological undertones of the ruling regimes. The Gesellschaft nature of the state enforced a unity as an individual's social duty, whereas the Gemeinschaft nature of MM promoted a unity as a personal initiative, hence an ambivalence. Nevertheless, the dynamics of people's citizenship in the practice of MM has become qualitatively compelling over time.

Abstrak: Tulisan ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji tentang mekanisme pengambilan keputusan di Indonesia, yakni musyawarah-mufakat (MM), dalam rangka pembentukan negara-bangsa. Pada tanggal 17 Agustus 1945 pembangunan negara-bangsa Indonesia didasarkan pada nilai-nilai tradisional meski mengadaptasi model negara-negara Eropa modern karena warisan kolonial. Tulisan ini berpendapat bahwa meskipun perhatian ilmiah untuk meninjau kembali gagasan dan praktik MM telah berkembang pesat selama empat dekade terakhir, transformasi MM sebagai mesin negara telah disentuh secara sepintas. Dengan menganalisis studi terbaru tentang MM dan menggunakan metode historis untuk mengeksplorasi surat kabar harian dan dokumen resmi yang diterbitkan antara tahun 1900 dan 1980-an, tulisan ini menunjukkan bahwa sifat kolektif MM mewakili penjinakan massa politik yang mengesampingkan rasa kewarganegaraan individu. Mengingat gagasan persatuan, menjadikan MM sebagai ideologi negara yang mempromosikan jenis kewarganegaraan yang harus bekerja secara kontinyu dengan nada ideologis rezim yang berkuasa. Sifat *Gesellschaft* dari persatuan yang dipaksakan oleh negara sebagai tugas sosial individu, sedangkan sifat *Gemeinschaft* dari MM mempromosikan persatuan sebagai inisiatif pribadi, karenanya menjadi ambivalensi. Namun demikian, dinamika kewarganegaraan dalam praktik MM menjadi menarik secara kualitatif dari waktu ke waktu.

Cite this article: Suwignyo, A., Yuliantri, R.D.A. (2023). An Analysis of The Discursive Gap in the Ideas and Practices of *Musyawarah Mufakat* in the Indonesian Nation-State Formation, 1900-1980s. *Paramita: Historical Studies Journal*, 33(1), 1-15. http://dx.doi.org/10.15294/paramita.v33i1.41514

INTRODUCTION

Since the fall of the New Order regime in 1998, the Indonesian deliberative mechanism of decision making, *musyawarah mufakat* (thereafter, MM), have received a wide scale of scholarly attentions thanks to the development of democracy in the country. Growing studies have updated the existing literatures on MM with a contextualization of its concepts and practices in the state of the art of Indonesian social and political lives (Antlöv & Wetterberg, 2021). In general, those recent studies of MM raise questions of whether and how far the deliberative mechanism have remained compatible to the recent adoption of liberal democracy in the Indonesian political system (Robet, 2019; Tapsell, 2021), for example, in the context of general elections (Bourchier & Jusuf, 2022). While the interpretation of democracy and democratic participation of a country strongly depends on its subscription to changing philosophical bases and historical experiences (Neoh & Saifulloh, 2020), the trajectory that the recent studies of MM by Indonesian scholars undertake have generally echoed an obsolete, romanticized concept of MM. Although those studies provide us with a robust, scholarly evaluation of the MM traditional concept and practices (Yani, 2018), they generally view MM as a rural mechanism of social harmony and decision making (Arifin & Putra Adela, 2018; Fadli, 2019). Some of the studies have promulgated that MM is an Indonesian style of democracy (Anggita & Hatori, 2020) and a way to bolster the rights and obligations of citizens (Nugraha & Bastari, 2018). But they have not come to suggest whether the effectuation of an MM mechanism in the political system would be an urgent political reform given the current emphasis on an individual vote system rather than on a consensual agreement (Park, 2021). Nor have the studies problematized whether and how far the MM has remained compatible to the recent development of Indonesian political system. The categories of MM, as a typical mood or a mechanism of decision making, have been taken for granted; so has how these categories changed in the different levels of state and society practices.

The aim of the present paper is twofold. The first is to examine the existing studies on MM in order to categorize the trajectory of its growing scholarly understandings. The second is to explore the discursive gap between the scholarly understandings of MM as analyzed in the existing studies and the ideas and practices of MM in the early phase of the Indonesian nation-state formation, roughly from 1900 to 1980s. It is perhaps very relevant to begin by a brief overview of the close connection between the formation of the 1945 Indonesian State, and the structure of the local polity that had existed in the archipelago, the *desa* or village. According to sociologist Satjipto Rahardjo, "[t]he founding fathers conceived of the *desa* republic as an organic construction that embodies the traditional view of the individual and society". The making of the independent state of Indonesia involved a modelling of the indigenous mode of organization, the *desa* or village, as a prototype of managerial structure (Rahardjo, 1994, pp. 493–502; see also Fakih, 2020).

Historian Benedict Anderson argued that under the so-called Ethical Policy in the early twentieth century "there was a huge extension of state apparatus into native society and a proliferation of its functions" in education, religion, irrigation, agricultural improvements, hygiene, mineral exploitation and political surveillance. Following the declaration of independence in 1945, "a penetration of the state by society" directed the process of state making by an influx into the "offices and functions of the *beambtenstaat*" of "persons who would have been walled off from it [the state] in the colonial era" (Anderson, 1983, pp. 477-496). These persons were the founding fathers and mothers, a tiny group of educated Indonesians whom Robert van Niel categorized as the political and functional elites. Most of them had come from the indigenous communities with a strong root of traditional values but they followed the path of Western modernization through education and jobs that made them 'hybrid' in terms of identity and worldview (Niel, 1960). Hence, the making of the Indonesian state more or less reflected the founders' crossroad of collective identity formation in which both the elements of Western state and traditional values were blended. While copying the idea of the Western modern state it inherited from the colonial political structure, the Indonesian state was at the same time based on the traditional values of rural community, making the modernizing process operate with traditional values in its core. One of the traditional values of the village organization which the founders of the Indonesian state adopted was MM.

The founders of the Indonesian state adopted MM and made it one of the five points of the Indonesian state ideology, the *Pancasila*, amidst a turbulent moment toward the end of the Pacific War in June 1945 (BPUPKI, 1995). The enactment of MM into the Indonesian state ideology made this set of traditional values a binding, formal measure and reference of the public life of the Indonesian citi-

zens. However, the enactment also raised a question about the nature of citizenship that the State would develop upon its citizens. While the Western idea of a nation-state bears a citizenship which designates individual citizens as the ultimate stakeholders of both civil and political rights, the adoption of MM enhanced the process of citizenship making that should be communal and collective based in character.

Some historians argue there was a clear notion of cosmopolitanism and transnational citizenship by which the Indonesia state was constructed and connected since its early formation in the eighteenth century. This argument means that the people's sense of attachment to national identity should be understood within a framework of cross-cultural encounter at a broader level (Harper, 2013, pp. 273-290). However, the notion of cosmopolitanism and transnational citizenship did not necessarily persevere to become a ruling characteristic of the post-colonial nation-state building. The re-birth of the pre-state style of political realm that sprang from feudalistic practices was self-evidently more prevailing in the making of nation-states in post-WW II Southeast Asia (Reid, 2011). As Anderson said, like in the pre-state form of political structure the people and the elite leaders of the Indonesian state developed fundamental royalties to ideological and religious grouping, paramilitary organizations and local communities (Anderson, 1983, p. 483). At the same time, the expansion of economic, political and cultural networks fell under the control of the ruling few. Instead of growing to become an efficient administrative body, consequently, the Indonesian state bureaucracy developed in the way of an empire of oligarchs (Berger, 1997, pp. 321-261).

METHOD
The studies for the present paper involved two methods, that is bibliographical method and historical method. The bibliographical method was used to build an understanding on the philosophical and cultural ideas that underlined the concept of MM. The author collected different types of publications about MM from the classic to the most recent. This included such a forgotten, foundational study about *desa* by Soetardjo Kartohadikoesoemo, the study on the *adatrecht* by Van Vollenhoven, and other more. Meanwhile the historical method was used to provide a basis of understanding on the institutionalization of MM into a state ideology. Sources for historical analysis included documents of the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian Independence, speeches of founding fathers like Soekarno, Mo-

hammad Hatta and Soepomo. Primary sources used also included newspapers published during the period from 1900 to 1980s, for example *Dharmo Kondo*, *Soeara Oemoem*, *Soeara Poeblik* and others. Sources were collected and classified, and were analyzed and contested.

A MECHANISM AND A FORUM: ORIGINS OF THE CONCEPT OF MM
By definition, the term *MM* conveys a two-fold concept of negotiation. First, the word *musyawarah* refers to the process where members of a community discuss and share ideas about particular issues the concern they share. During this process, conflicting opinions maybe emerge but open dissentients are customarily submerged by a norm of social harmony. Second, the word *mufakat* implies a phase of reaching an agreement or compromise, which is binding to all members (Kartohadikoesoemo, 1965, pp. 158-165). Altogether, an MM process starts with an assembly's share of ideas that can theoretically be conflicting one to another. But the process always ends up with a collective agreement of non-dissentious and unanimous nature to all members.

Some references suggest that the Indonesian concept of MM originated from the Arab society as a mechanism of decision making. Islam adopted it in the Koran *al Syura* verse number 38, which says "*wa amruhum syura bainahum*", "they resolve their affairs through a consensual agreement among them" (Abdillah, 2001, p. ix). During the periods of the Prophet Muhammad and after, the practice of *musyawarah* took place both at the family and the society levels, consecutively called "*musyawarah*" and "*syura*". "Musyawarah" was where family-related issues were discussed by family members. Meanwhile, "*syuzra*" was a community meeting that addressed issues of a larger scope and context. By the rise of the caliphates in the seventh and eighth centuries, the *syura* became institutionalized so that different councils were created to hold a *syura* in order to discuss complex issues of administration (Hasbi, 2001, pp. 92–109).

In the contemporary Islamic context, the concept of *syura* constitutes a spirit of solidarity rather than a political institution. The concept of *syura* implies that the existence of people (*jama'ah*) as well as their rights and obligations are well taken into account at a community meeting. The *syura* employs the principle that every decision made by a community should represent the free will of the *jumhurul jama'ah* (the collective individuals). Members of the *jumhurul jama'ah* equally share the

rights to propose or to oppose any point of ideas that are being conversed, before the ideas are collectively agreed upon. Once a decision is made, it becomes communally binding. Each and every individual of the *jumhurul jama'ah* is obliged to pay an unconditional observance (*iltizam*, or commitment). It is this commitment that makes the consensus legally binding and effective (Asy-Syawi, 1997, pp. 16–17). Literally, *syura* itself means a final consensus, whereas the process of consensus making is called either *masyurah* (which means to give advices or opinions) and *istisyarah* (to ask for advices or opinions). The word "*musyawarah*" is a derivation of the *masyurah* and *istisyarah* (*ibid.*, p. 15). Therefore, it is quite obvious that the term of MM came to be known to the Indonesian peoples by the spread of Islam to the archipelago in the thirteenth century. As a researcher Miftahul Jannah argues, the Koran presents several cases of community- and familial practices of MM. The Koranic samples of MM made it easy for the Islamic form of MM to spread in the Indonesian archipelago because of its close cultural proximity with the communal characteristic of the Indonesian society (Jannah, 2017).

Notwithstanding the Arab and Islamic origin of the term MM, the practice of consensual decision making and the community institution that organized it had existed among the peoples of the Indonesian archipelago much earlier than the spread of Islam in the region. In Java, the practice of MM was already observable far back to the period of Hinduism and Buddhism in the eighth and ninth centuries (Savitri, 1993). The classical practices of MM changed to include community level in the more recent time. Like the practice of the village councils (*panchayats*) in India (Bailey, 1965, pp. 1-20), the process of consensual decision making in the more recent period of Javanese society had a typical setting of people's meeting at the village and hamlet levels (Fris, 1946). It was embodied in the meetings between a village/hamlet leaders, the elderly (*tetua*) and the ordinary members. Or, between leaders of a group of neighboring villages—the so-called *Montjopat* (group of four villages) and *Montjolimo* (group of five villages) (Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia, 1974; Pranoto, 2001). Some of the meetings were held regularly, for example once in a Javanese month (35 days), which consequently was named after the Javanese day it was held on, for example, *Setu Wage* (Fris, 1946).

Other ethnic communities in the Indonesian archipelago also have their cultural mechanism that bears the notion of MM. The ethnic Batak community in northern Sumatra, for example, have practiced a mechanism of communal decision making known as *horja bius* (Ganda, 2012). The Minangkabau people of West Sumatra are known for their *tungku tigo sajarangan* style of leadership, by which all decisions regarding their bond are made through a collective process (Andeska, Dharsono and Martion, 2017). Meanwhile, the Bugis people of South Sulawesi have practiced the *tudang sipulung* ceremony in the farming and agrarian activities, in which decisions about planting and harvesting job distributions are made through a deliberative meeting by the elderly and community members (Amiruddin, 2021). Likewise, the people of Timor have lived in the *atoin meto* cultural system, in which *nono* (extended family), *ume* (kinship), and *uf* (community leaders) form a triangle of deliberative bond (Ethelbert, Pratama & Dhosa, 2022). Last but not least, the Minahasa people of North Sulawesi have named their own ethnic group "*Mina'esa*, a united land", to embrace the deliberative meeting mechanism of village heads (*musyawarah para ukung*) (Tamon & Leirissa, 2000). The essence of MM in the traditional practices of the Indonesian context hence referred to activities carried out by different ethnic communities. All or representative members of the communities gathered in a meeting to discuss issues of their concern and to make a decision (Vollenhoven, 1918, pp. 108-110). While such an activity is common for many community groups in the world, it is the unanimous nature of the decision making process (the *mufakat*) that gives MM probably the most salient characteristic in the Indonesian context.

An Indonesian renown anthropologist, Koentjaraningrat, argued that a decision made in MM meeting "[was] not based on a majority which embraces a certain opinion, but is made by the whole meeting as one body". For a meeting to achieve the oneness of decision, both the majority and the minority had to "modify their respective opinions so that they can approach each other". This requires a force or a strong figure who can urge the process of opinion negotiation (Koentjaraningrat, 1977, pp. 20-27). By opinion negotiation, an MM process embodies not only in the form of a meeting or forum but also in the form of the spirit of the parties that are involved to reach a consensus. MM is an extension of the mutual help system or *gotong royong* that characterizes many of the Indonesian rural communities in different times (Suwignyo, 2019). "In the entire social life," thus Koentjaraningrat said, "members of a community with a MM spirit must be willing to put aside some

of their opinions so as to adjust to, or at least approach, the general opinion, and so as not to persist in approving of only his own opinion" (Koentjaraningrat, 1961, 1977).

Anthropologist Niels Mulder argues that for the Javanese MM represents a cosmological realm of unity and oneness. The unanimity of a decision is obligatory and binding because it symbolizes the "harmonious equilibrium" of the universe and the "coordinated, hierarchically related" social order. In the *musyawarah* process, according to Mulder, "the coordinated hierarchical decision of the group is expressed by the *mufakat*". Together, *musyawarah* and *mufakat* controls harmoniously the power, which regulates the Javanese imaginary structure of the world (Mulder, 1983, pp. 100-101). Mulder's assertion suggests that for the Indonesians in general and the Javanese in particular, MM means a collective mechanism of decision making and an instrument to keep social harmony.

It is not known when and by whom a community forum of consensual decision making was named after MM. Some studies that attempt to deal with the earliest form of participatory institutions have asserted that the people's meetings at the village level were a typical practice of MM in its early institutional form. A study by Mizuno Kosuke explored the legislation by the Netherlands Indies government of *rapat desa* or *dorpsvergadering* (village meeting) in 1906. In Java the village meeting had existed under different local names, such as *boebrah*, *andoem gawe*, *bale gede* (in East Java), and *koempoelan laboeh*, *kloempoehan* (in Central Java). According to Kosuke, the 1906 Village Ordinance (*Inlandsche Gemeente Ordonnantie*) of the Netherlands Indies government legally recognized the position of village meeting (*rapat desa*) as an institution of policy making. The aim of the institutionalization of village meeting was for the colonial government to provide a power balance to the authority of village heads. Before the validation of the Village Ordinance, some village heads especially in Java assumed an almost absolute authority. Thus, the legislation of village meeting as an institution of policy making was aimed to spread the authority over a village development to its representative members. The legislation of village meeting in 1906, according to Kosuke, had switched the political constellation of village administration. Thereafter, a village head had to summon a village meeting where he shared the decision making authority with the elderly members and the labor tax payers (*heerendienstverplichtige*). Given this legislation, the village meetings played only a limited role in the

making of decisions concerning lands and administration (Kosuke, 2007). Although the officialization of *rapat desa* by the colonial government in 1906 had set in the majority vote system as a formal mechanism of decision making, many villages had avoided using it until 1920s because of a strong paternalistic principle. In many cases of village meetings in Java, as Kosuke puts it, consensus mechanism was used but it mainly relied on the village head and the elderly people, who held a decisive authority during the meeting (Kosuke, *ibid.*).

According to Kosuke, following the effectuation of the Village Ordinance the colonial government introduced the foundation of *Lembaga Musyawarah Desa* (LMD, Village Consultative Council) in 1910. The aim was to further institutionalize the village meeting and to officialize it as a legal entity in the lower government structure. However, the existence of LMD provoked a number of conflicts that centered around issues of power sharing between the village head and LMD members. In some places like Cirebon, village heads and LMD members made a report against each other disputing about the (mis-)use of communal land (Kosuke, 2007).

This study by Kosuke, while elaborate as a historical account, has yet refrained from exploring the details of the decision making process. On the one hand, the process of *musyawarah* as the way and the dynamics by which a meeting is held, is touched only in passing. On the other hand, the practice of *mufakat* is completely left unattended. The focus on the institutionalization of the meeting forum suggests an underlining assumption that the practice of such a meeting forum represents a MM in essence. In other words, a village meeting forum is assumed to be the practice of MM in itself. Although this sort of perspective blurs the boundary between MM as an institutionalized forum and that as a mechanism of decision making, some researchers tend to take it for granted.

Meanwhile, a study by Nico G. Schulte Nordholt examines the function of LMD as a village MM institutional forum during the New Order of the 1970s and 1980s. Like the colonial LMD, the New Order LMD was aimed to become an institution that shared the original idea of the village meeting. It was meant to be an official forum where village members could participate in making the decisions concerning their village. The original purpose of the LMD role was basically to provide a check-and-balance system to village administration, especially with regard to the authority of the village head. Nordholt shows that a forum of *musyawarah* was

not linearly a conveyor of *musyawarah* mechanism, nor a facilitator of *mufakat* decision making. Although the LMD bore the name *musyawarah*, its function was for legitimizing and extending government policies at the lowest administrative unit. The LMD's official role as a legislative body was jeopardized by the fact that the village head, who held the village executive power, at the same time held the position of the LMD chairmanship. The *musyawarah* function of the LMD, including its role as a check-and-balance forum, could not work out in such an administrative structure (Nordholt, 1987).

According to Nordholt, an international discussion by the Western donor countries in the 1970s "insisted that the villagers be actively involved in their own development" (Nordholt, 1987, p. 58). A 1990 case study in East Java by Hermawan Ps. Notodipoera and friends also shows that the institutionalization of the LMD in the Village Bill No 5 in 1979 was prompted by the needs on the government's side, rather than on the people's. It was the government's interest to make its development program a legitimized success and for that it needed to optimize public participation. These external factors made the LMD an extension of administrative agencies. The embodied interests of the external forces in the LMD did not always meet the need and the initiative of the people (Notodipoera & et al., 1990, p. 13).

The surveyed studies—of which the periods covered were separated by different political regimes (the colonial and the New Order)—show that MM transformed in meaning over times and over different contexts. In the first half of the twentieth century, it meant either a mechanism or a forum of consensual decision making at the village level. In the second half, these categories of MM (as a mechanism and a forum) blended in each other so that a reference to MM always dealt with both an institutionalized forum and a mechanism in/by which a consensual decision making took place. Regardless these changes, it is obvious that neither a forum nor a mechanism of *musyawarah* did guarantee the practice of *musyawarah* in its true sense. By definition, a process of MM is imbued by the spirit of collectivity and solidarity in which individual participants equally counts each other's particularity in reaching a collective decision.

THE MAKING OF A STATE-CENTERED PARADIGM OF MM

The making of *musyawarah* a state ideology by the Indonesian founding fathers in 1945 transformed the nature of its traditional values into an ideological instrumentation of the State. The idea was to keep a harmony in order to manage the country's diversity for a unity. In part, it was the way of the founding fathers to submerge the institutional structure of the State in the existing dynamics of the society. In another part, it was crystallization of the elite's views about the projected profile of citizenship that the State should/would develop. MM in the state platform was about how to make the Indonesian peoples a nation, a docile subject to the State. MM therefore represented a common ground upon which the founding fathers/the state elites aimed to transform the people's different trajectories of ideologies and political powers into a synergized aptitude for a State building.

In this section we explored two documents. These documents provide a relevant understanding of the State-centered concept of MM. They show how MM was constructed as a state ideology by the elite leaders in order to install a homogeneity of the paradigm about citizenship during the early days of Indonesian independence and the New Order periods. The first document is the proceeding of the assemblies of *Badan Penyelidik Usaha-usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia* (BPUPKI, the Investigative Council of the Preparation for the Indonesian Independence) held from May to June 1945 (BPUPKI, 1995). The second is a publication in 1985 by the New Order administration entitled *Tercapainya Konsensus Nasional* (toward a national consensus) (Notosusanto, 1985).

Making MM a State Ideology: Views of Founding Fathers

The debates during the BPUPKI assemblies, in which the philosophical foundation of the Indonesian state was being formulated, indicated how the founding fathers co-constructed the idea of *musyawarah*. Both Muhammad Yamin, an Islamic leader, and Soekarno, then president, pointed to *musyawarah* as a fundamental value on which the State "Indonesia" should be established. Largely taking the Islamic teaching of the *al-Syura* Letter verse 38 as the foundation of his thoughts, Muhammad Yamin emphasized on the nature of *musyawarah* as a given blessing. "*Musyawarah* reduces the shortcoming and incapability of an individual in the public sphere," he said. "The Indonesian state to be founded, is a State for all and every person. *Musya-*

warah is the strength of our nation, which enables each of us to participate in the administration (*pelaksanaan*) of the State" (BPUPKI, 1995, pp. 16-17).

Meanwhile, Soekarno said that *musyawarah* was an absolute prerequisite (*syarat mutlak*) for Indonesia in order to become a great State. "Indonesia is one for all, all for one. *Musyawarah* is a mechanism for us to resolve any issues concerning state and society," he said (BPUPKI, 1995, p. 77). In *musyawarah* Soekarno emphasized the value of mutual-help (*gotong royong*). Unlike the value of kinship (*kekeluargaan*), Soekarno argued *gotong royong* was a dynamic concept by which the Indonesian people work hand in hand for one mission, namely to create a just and prosperous Indonesian society. *Musyawarah* in Soekarno's view referred to the operationalization of the *gotong royong* spirit (BPUPKI, 1995, pp. 82-83).

Although it was Soekarno's ideas that were later adopted by the Assembly as a state ideology, the concept of *musyawarah* proposed to the same forum by Soepomo was perhaps the most provoking because of its elaborate philosophy. Well known for his integrality theory, Soepomo reminded the Assembly of "the long-standing philosophy of the Javanese that had formed a unity between the leaders and the people", i.e. the *manunggaling gusti—kawula*, the unification of the lord and the subject. "The history of the traditional administrations in Indonesia had shown an unparalleled form of the unity between a leader and his people," Soepomo said. The unity between the leaders and the people represented a balance of the macrocosmic and the microcosmic worlds (BPUPKI, 1995, pp. 35-40).

According to Soepomo, the state of Indonesia had to be based on the concept of integrality. The leaders and the people had to unite and together they became an organic part of the State. "In the State which is based on the integrality concept, differentiation between the state and the individuals happens only slightly," Soepomo said. "The individuals are integrated part of the State whereas the State operationalizes above and for all individuals." For Soepomo, MM was both a mechanism and a spirit for the State to work for the interest of all parties and all individuals. It was also the spirit of the interaction between the leaders and the people (BPUPKI, 1995, pp. 35-40). In Soepomo's view, the *musyawarah*-based state of Indonesia to be projected should put collectivism above individualism. The aim was for the State's goals and objectives to represent the communal interests overall and to go be-

yond the interests of any party or individual citizen (Soepomo, *ibid.*).

Responding to Soepomo, Mohammad Hatta argued on the rights of the individual citizens. Hatta said he agreed with the *gotong royong* and *musyawarah* principles on which the state Indonesia would be developed. He said he had "struggled against individualism" since long before the assemblies were held. However, the communal nature of *gotong royong* and *musyawarah* could override the rights of the individual citizens. "We aim to build a managerial state (*negara pengurus*) on the basis of a community spirit, the value of *gotong royong* and *musyawarah*," Hatta said. By the concept of integrality, he argued, there was a danger that the State would become far too strong with an authority over public lives. Hatta suggested that the rights of the citizens, especially to the freedom of speech, be explicitly recognized. In Hatta's view, collectivism and the spirit of togetherness could turn into becoming the State's instruments of oppression unless the citizens' rights were declared and equally respected (BPUPKI, 1995, pp. 262-263).

The founding fathers and mothers depicted the Indonesian state as an overarching structure with the spirit of communalism with MM in its core. The concept "all for one, one for all" was meant to become a uniting tool for the different political elements. *Musyawarah* hence constituted an instrument for the State to operationalize. However, as Hatta said, the assertion of MM into the state also meant the limit of individual rights had to be valued by a collective mechanism.

MM as a Political Tool of Unity: The New Order Policy

Following the 1965 tragedy and the succession of Soekarno by Soeharto, the notion of *musyawarah* once again came to the discussion at the state level. From the perspective of the Soeharto's regime, the Indonesian Communists attempted to replace the state ideology, Pancasila, with Communism. It means, they aimed to override MM from the five principles of the Indonesian social interaction and state formation. Likewise, the victory of Soeharto's army in crushing the Communists also meant a victory of the *musyawarah* ideology. Referring back to Soepomo's theory of integrality, the victory fostered the unity between the elite leaders and the people who together set an organic part of the State. The claim of the Soeharto's regime of Pancasila as "the primary national consensus" in the aftermath of the Communist failed coup therefore meant reinstigation of the centrality of the State before the

individual citizens. Soeharto's Indonesia was where "the national interests surpassed the individuals" whereas the latter were blurred by a jargonistic formula "the interests of the many" (*kepentingan rakyat banyak*) (Notosusanto, 1985, p. 28). In this view, musyawarah became the only accountable way for making State's decisions. As Soeharto himself put it, "To implement the Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution means that any political decisions have to be made responsibly through *musyawarah*" (Soeharto, 1985, p. viii).

Part of the Soeharto's "National Consensus" was the legalization of the general election system. The general election system that the regime institutionalized was based on the proportional representation system instead of a single member district system which required a majority voting. By the proportional representation system, people should vote for a political party, not for an individual personage representing the party. It was the party leaders who decided on whom the individual personage who should represent the party. Nugroho Notosusanto said that the New Order government had gone through a series of *musyawarah* with various groups of social and political elite leaders (Notosusanto, 1985, pp. 45-46).

A study by Arbi Sanit suggests that the people's participation and initiative in the practice of MM of the *Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat* (DPR, People's Representative Council) was absent during the New Order administration. The DPR constituted an official representative body of the Indonesian people that held a legislation authority, in which MM should be in practice. Sanit argued that the *musyawarah* processes in the DPR appeared as a political negotiation *per se* (Sanit, 1992). The mechanism of MM for law making in the DPR operationalized through formal meeting, lobbying and synchronization/adjustment of ideas. Throughout these stages, debates and dissentions took place among the parliament members. Yet, as Sanit put it, "the motives behind the debates and dissentions were factional in nature". Because the individual members of the parliament identified themselves respectively to a particular group of interest on the basis of religion, ethnicity, ideology or locality kinship (*kedaerahan*), the debates that arose actually represented those between the interest groups, not between individual representatives of the citizens. This way, the notion of representativeness referred to the degree that a parliament member could convey the agendas of his/her interest group rather than those of their electoral constituents, i.e. the real state citizens (Sanit, 1992, pp. 12-15).

The use of the term *musyawarah* after the name of an institutional organization did not necessarily mean the practice of *musyawarah* by the organization. The aforementioned LMD has been a good example in this case. Such names of a business meeting as in *Musyawarah Kerja Nasional* (Mukernas, national work meeting) that was so popular during the New Order, for example, also imply little about the practice of *musyawarah* value in the actual process of the meeting. In this context the naming of the Indonesian state institutions such as *Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat* (MPR, People's Consultative Assembly) and *Badan Musyawarah Daerah* (Bamusda, Regional Consultative Council) unnecessarily reveals anything about the actual implementation of *musyawarah*.

Some studies of MM during the New Order also referred to MM as a typically Indonesian form of democracy. This mostly regards to the case of village head elections in Java (Setiawan, 1990; Suparlan, 1977; Surjo, 1991). Contemporary accounts also argue that MM "has contributed to the successful democratic consolidation of Indonesia" especially after the New Order because it "provides both majorities and minorities with an equal veto power" and "secure[s] credible commitment by all the players" (Kawamura, 2011, p. 8). The parallelization of MM and democracy reflects the scholarly search for a concept that both incorporates and blends the local practice of political negotiation in/with that of the Western-style state system. On the other hand, the parallelization also implies doubts about whether MM *is* indeed a form of democracy and about whether it could function as a democratic mechanism.

After the fall of the New Order, the questions of whether MM *is* a form of democracy and whether it could fit in the contemporary socio-political developments, have arisen once again. Scholars have generally attempted to re-define the concept of MM by emphasizing the importance to sustain a "consensual democracy" in the state system (Hanan, 2016; Muhammad, 2016; Susanti, 2016). Others argue that MM could still function to integrate Indonesian plural societies even though the Indonesian political system has changed to become more accommodating toward popular participation (Kawamura, 2011). Some Indonesian researchers attempt to return to study the practice of MM at the community level, mostly in the rural context (Kunaeni & Sumaryati, 2014; Suryandaru, 2019).

However, MM as an ideology and an instrument of nation-state building has disappeared from the contemporary discourse of public decision

making of the parliament and administrative bureaucracy. So has the practice of MM in the more urbanized Indonesian communities. To what extent the expanding role and participation of the people in the public decision making and in the developing democratic atmosphere has also (re-)shaped their collective understanding of being Indonesians, remains exclusively unexplored. How the notion of citizenship was shaped by the ambivalent nature of the Indonesian state, in which modernization took place on the basis of the traditional rural values as Satjipto Rahardjo argued, has been hardly examined and understood.

SOME SNAPSHOTS OF COMMUNITY BASED PRACTICES OF MM

The adoption of *musyawarah-mufakat* into the Indonesian state structure not only extended the scope, meaning and usage of this traditional value. At the same time it also raises questions about whether and to which extent MM as a State ideology was an effective instrument to promote the people's sense of being Indonesians. MM sets a nature of the Indonesia citizenship that is different from that of the European nation-states. While the concept of an ideal citizen in the Western world refers to "one who both rules and is ruled" (Pocock, 2014, pp. 68-69), MM emphasizes on collectivity. This way, people are inclined to depending upon and submitting their individual political rights to elite figures rather than to indulging an accountable institution that allows a check and balance system by individual citizens. Whereas in the Western nation-states individual citizens "join each other in making decisions where each decider respects the authority of the others, and all join in obeying the decisions they have made" (Pocock, *Ibid.*), MM provides a different trajectory of negotiation. MM tends to "pacify all parties rather than to impose defeat or victory on one party" and "prevents the aptitude and special talent of an individual from developing and surpassing others" (Koentjaraningrat, 1977, p. 26). MM thus conforms the individual differences and uniqueness for the sake of social harmony and stability (Koentjaraningrat, 1971, p. 931). As political scientist Arbi Sanit argues, someone's loss and gain in *musyawarah*-based politics are not of an individual but of a collective matter (Sanit, 1992, pp. 3-19).

Although the surveyed studies have considered many factors so that the categories and changing concepts of MM across the twentieth century can be depicted, few have attempted to discern it into a portrayal about the people's dynamics of citizenship. MM has so far been depicted away from the people's positioning before the State, i.e. how the people and state relations have changed across times. While MM is by essence about people's equal participation in public decision making, studies have generally overlooked the aspect of people's role and position in the process. In this section, some snapshots of the MM practices in some communities in Java in the early twentieth century are presented. The aim of the snapshots is to provide a grounded illustration of the discursive gap between the MM implementation during the time before it was made a state ideology and the trajectory of the studies of MM following its enactment to the state institution.

The practice of MM by the people in the early twentieth-century Java was very dynamics and did not always show an unanimous process of decision making. It is important to classify the context of the events in which an MM took place. In the context that had a direct relation with the access to communal power and resources, an MM always involved a vote system. Hence it functioned as a mechanism of decision making. This section explored first the practice of *musyawarah* as a mechanism of decision making; then the development of some institutional forms of MM at the village or kampong level.

Musyawarah Leading to *Mufakat* and to Vote Gathering

Scholarly studies often suggest that *musyawarah* was the opposite concept of vote gathering as a mechanism of decision making (Anggita & Hatori, 2020; Antlöv & Wetterberg, 2021; Permatasari & Seftyono, 2014). This assertion is somewhat misleading. The practice of *musyawarah* in the early twentieth century Java showed that *musyawarah* as a mechanism of decision making could lead both to a *mufakat* or consensual agreement and to a vote gathering.

The election of village heads was an obvious case in point in which MM through a vote system was salient in the early twentieth century. In a Donomoeljo village in the Regency of Malang, East Java, the result of the village head election held in October 1940 showed the number of the votes of the ten contestants (Table 1) (NN, 1940, p. 3). In a Domijang village, in Wonosobo, Central Java an election of the village head in December 1952 was also carried out through a vote system, in which Taat, one of the contestants, reached the highest score of 312 votes. In a Kluwih village, however, elections had to be held three times because none of the five contestants collected majority votes in the

first two rounds. In the third round, Wakidjan was eventually elected by a majority of votes (NN, 1953a, p. 8).

The process of MM through a vote system consisted of a number of stages. A 1925 reportage in *Soeara Publik* says that in the case of the replacement of a village head because of death or resignation, the district governments in Central Java set an interim period of one month for the people to elect their new chairman. During the interim period, locally called a "*komplang*" or a vacuum-of-power period, potential contestants and persons of influence were mobilizing their supporters. On the day of election, people gathered in a general assembly, which was attended by "the heads of other villages, the dignitaries of the district (*prijaji-prijaji distrik*), assistant district-head (*wedono*), the *wedono*, the district controller and the regent". Before the ballot started, the *wedono* or the regent checked and examined the qualifications of the contestants. The contestants were seated in the front stage facing the audience. Each of them held a small banner as a unique sign of their candidacy. Following the examination, the *wedono* or the regent delivered a speech to remind the people. The people should vote for a contestant not because he was "brave, handsome or wealthy", but because he had "the capacity to lead village administration (*pandai benar mengemoedikan bestuur desa*)". Then the ballot started. Voters put one short piece of palm-leave stick (*lidi* or *biting* in Javanese) into a bamboo container (*boemboeng*). The number of the bamboo container

Table 1. Vote number gathered by the contestants in a village head election in Malang, 1940

No	Name of contestants	Number of votes
1	Tadjab	112
2	Djoeweni	96
3	Soegiran	312
4	Sosro	16
5	Soewito	19
6	Mangoen	5
7	Tawija	14
8	Padma	66
9	Tjarik	86
10	Kadji	94

Source: *Soeara Oemoem* 13 Nov 1940, p. 3.

was as many as the number of the contestants. Each of the containers had on its top the small banner of the respective contestant. When all voters had put their sticks, the bamboo containers were then sliced and the ballots in each of them were counted before the voters. The contestant whose bamboo container had the most number of sticks won the election. He was then sworn as the new head of the village (NN, 1925, p. 4).

The vote system was also carried out in the making of decisions which concerned the people's access to economic resources. An association of farmers in a Gambiran village in Central Java, for example, set on a ballot mechanism during its meeting in October 1940. The goal was to decide whether the village people would agree that the rice they had collectively collected in the stock house (*lumbung*) be sold. It was reported that some Gambiran villagers needed money to pay the rent of an agricultural land which they cultivated for planting new rice. The sale of the stock rice aimed to help these villagers pay their rent. The meeting was attended by twenty people of whom the majority voted 'yes' for selling the stock rice (NN, 1940d, p. 3).

However, the pattern of the meeting changed into a consensual mechanism when the issues being discussed did not deal with an individual access to economic resources or authority. A meeting in Pasarkliwon village in Central Java was about to decide whether the villagers would give up participating in a community service. The attendees of the meeting decided unanimously that they gave up participating in the community service and that they agreed to replace the service with a Rp 0.05 retribution. The retribution money collected would be used to pay professional workers to carry out the community service duty. The same case happened in a Koesoemoratan village, also in Central Java (NN, 1918b, 1918c).

MM mechanism ran without a vote system too in the case of the water flow arrangement in Bandjarmangoe village in the Tjlangap district, West Java in 1931. The villagers resolved their dispute over the water flow by having their opinions exposed and contested to each other. In a forum led by the village head, the villager groups who set a dissenting opinion had their say heard by the meeting. The decision made satisfied the disputing parties, according to *Darmo Kondo*. They agreed on the enlargement plan of the water canal so that the farmers at the upper and the lower stream sides of the canal could equally benefit the water (NN, 1931a, p. 4). Unanimous consensus was also applied in the case of repairment of a broken bridge in a

Paras village in Solo, Central Java. The people of the Paras village were summoned by their village head. The village head then gave an explanation about the bridge condition. Led skillfully by the village head, the Paras men consensually agreed to allocate some of the village savings for the construction of the bridge (NN, 1931b, p. 4).

In addition to the nature of the topics being discussed and the relative capability of the village head in building communication with his people, the scope of the community in which a meeting was held also played a role in the determination of whether an MM forum ended up with a vote or with an unanimous consensus (*mufakat*). Associational communities like Boedi Sarojo Death Association (Perkoempoelan Kematian Boedi Sarojo) in Tjilatjap, Central Java and Roekoen Death Association in a Gebang Darwo village, always employed an unanimous consensus (*mufakat*) mechanism in their process of decision making (NN, 1940c, pp. 5-6; (NN, 1940b, p. 4).

The MM could take a long process if the cases being discussed were complex and sensitive. Following the issuance of Bataviaasch Begraafplaatsenreglement (Graveyard Regulation Batavia) in 1937 by the local government of Batavia, several associations had to organize MM both among their members and between their associations with government officials. The Regulation set a rigid measure about the location, distance and size of public graveyards. It also made a more distinctive separation of the graveyard based on people's religion. According to *Darmo Kondo*, many Muslim graveyards had to be re-located due to the Regulation. However, the issue was settled down peacefully by the associations through *MM* (NN, 1939b, p. 2). Other types of associational community, such as the Association of Forest Workers (*Boschwezen*), were also able to resolve disputes among members peacefully through unanimous consensus. This was surprising given the issues being discussed were sometimes complex and lengthy (NN, 1918a, p. 3).

The communities at the levels of village, kampong or hamlet were often a good depiction of the smooth flow of communication between and among members and their leaders. Communal values such as mutual help (*gotong royong*) and social harmony (*kerukunan*) became effective tools for resolving public issues. The works required to repair or maintain roads, ditches, water flow system and village security were often easily communicated. Decisions to complete the works were made by community members under the guidance of their leaders (NN, 1953b, pp. 8-10; (NN, 1953c, pp. 6-7).

The cases analyzed show that *musyawarah* was a mechanism of idea sharing. The decision made during *musyawarah* could be either a *mufakat* (consensual agreement), or a vote gathering. In other words, *musyawarah* was not necessarily the opposite of vote gathering. In the twentieth century Java, a *musyawarah* that ended with a "*mufakat dengan suara bulat*" or an unanimous consensus, did not necessarily exclude the vote gathering mechanism in its process of decision making.

Community-Level Institutions of MM
During the Dutch colonial time of the twentieth century Indonesia, different community groups in Java had supported the development of the so-called *Roekoen Kampoeng* (RK), a kind of social bond at the hamlet level. The aims were to resolve the many problems of the respective communities. For example, in a hamlet in Solo, Central Java, more than nine RKs were erected by the people in 1940. Their missions, among others, were to help each other in the case of death, to organize community thanksgivings, to resolve unemployment problems, and to carry out community works through *gotong royong* in order to provide or maintain public facilities (NN, 1939a). The RKs also promoted people's literacy, provided small-scale business capital assistance, and lent out furniture for the members who held a blessing ceremony or *slametan* (NN, 1940a).

During the Second World War, the Japanese administration of Java needed to create a small community bond institution in order to ease mass mobilization and to spread propaganda. They created *tonari gumi* or *Roekoen Tetangga* (RT). This Japan-made bond became an official part of the administrative structure at the lowest level that worked efficiently for the Japanese war purposes (Adryamarthanino, 2022; Benjamin, 2019; Tiyanto, 2015) .

In the post-colonial period, the Japan-made ward-based institution of *Roekoen Tetangga* replaced the function of the colonial *Roekoen Kampoeng*. Modelling the Japanese, the independent state of Indonesia kept the RT bond. It used the RT bond as an administrative instrument for the execution of development programs. The reason was that the bond was the smallest organization unit and had a direct outreach toward the people (Alif, 2020; Matanasi, 2017; Muhid, 2021).

However, the primary sources we analyzed in the present research show that a number of hamlet heads in Yogyakarta and in Pekalongan, Central

Java expressed their objection to the government's decision for the making the RT bond.

In Yogyakarta, the dispute started when the city mayor issued a new policy which stated that the municipality would take over civil administrative affairs from the lower kampong units. For example, people who needed a birth certificate for their children should apply for it at the municipality without necessarily having to bring a reference letter from the head of their hamlet. An article in *Permata Magazine* published in 1951 read that a number of Yogyakarta people suggested that the former hamlet-based RK, which had been renamed *Roekoen Warga* (RW) by then, bound remain in use for administrative and social purposes (NN, 1951).

While bigger than the RT in terms of the geographical locality and the number of villagers it covered, "the hamlet-based bond, the RW, is the people's social tie and it had emerged from the people's own initiative." According to the article, the RW was more participatory and inclusive than the RT. It reflected the spirit of *gotong royong* in which MM took place as the pattern of decision making. Meanwhile, the RT "was formed by the government". It was an administrative structure which functioned only to deliver official messages of the government. According to *Permata Magazine*, the meeting of Yogyakarta RW administrators held on 21th of January, 1951 made an unanimous decision. That is, the RW should remain a community organization in the region. The meeting also required that the government legalize the RW instead of the RT. It also asked that the mayor's regulation concerning the abolition of the RW be revoked (NN, 1951, pp. 6-9).

From Pekalongan in 1953, a contributor to *Bende Magazine*, S.D. Antana, argued that the officialization of RT in the government's administration structure would change the characteristic of the people association that emerged from the initiative of the people. He suggested that he former RK, instead of RW, had to be kept as the name for the hamlet-based associational forum. "RT was not meant to replace the RW," he said. "The origin and the goals of the RT were far different from the RW." The RT developed from the Japanese purposes. On the contrary, the RW had grown up from the people's consciousness of mutual cooperation (*gotong royong*) and community building where the spirit of MM had been rooted. Thus, according to Antana, the RW in the context of independent Indonesia had to be reformed, not replaced (by the RT) because "it had a unifying national spirit based on Pancasila". Antana believed that the RW and the Pancasila spirit were the foundation of the Indonesian society (Antana, 1953, p. 15).

The aforementioned cases show the different levels of communities and social ties in which MM mechanism was mostly found in practice. Hamlet-based social tie, the RW, had been in place in Java notably since the early twentieth century. The nature of the RW bond was a social relation between individuals. The relations were based on close personal family ties. Meanwhile the RT, made by the Japanese administration in Java during the WW II, conveyed the nature of a formal, impersonal tie among people The people's resentment against the RT in the 1950s reflected their critical position embedded by the RT. The people's role in the RT emerged from their obligatory services imposed by authorities, be it Japanese or Indonesian. The people's preference to the RK or RW, on the other hand, showed the desire for a social tie that emerged from their own initiatives. The RK/RW instead of the RT constituted the hamlet-based forum in which MM likely took place in a bottom-up social circumstance.

CONCLUSION

Standard Indonesian historiography suggests that the role of the State was looming large along the different political regimes of the twentieth century. Both state and non-state institutions played inter-reliant roles in the expression of citizenship and public decision making. *Musyawarah* was a case in point in which both the state and non-state concepts of citizenship crossed a path. The making of MM a state ideology by the founding fathers of the Indonesian nation-state reflected the adoption of the *Gemeinschaft* community values. However, the adoption created an ambivalence in the nature of the Indonesian nation-state that would be developed. On the one hand, the Indonesian inherited the Western model of *Gesellschaft* structure (Tönnies, 1925) from the colonial state. On the other hand, by adopting MM in its ideology, it operated with a *Gemeinschaft* values in its core. The *Gesellschaft* nature of the modern nation-state enforced a unity as duty toward organizational bond. But, the MM bears a *Gemeinschaft* nature in which the sense of unity comes from within the people's own initiative and shared needs. In the present study I have argued that, given the notion of unity and Unitarianism that the Indonesian state aimed to promote, the adoption of MM constituted the taming by the State of the citizenship that many Indonesian communities had been practicing.

The State's adoption of MM was a strategy to replace the *Gemeinschaft* by the *Gesellschaft* tie of the people. It created a dual socio-political structure. That is, the Indonesian state structure as an umbrella institution, and the various forms of *Gemeinschaft* structures that had existed among the people. It was at this point that the dual structure started to become. The dual structure was a plural society of the colonial Netherlands Indies. Then, it became the *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* (unity in diversity) society of the independent Indonesian state. While the *Gemeinschaft* structure became institutionalized during the colonial time, it remained to stand as a separate structure from the *Gesellschaft* realm of the Netherlands Indies state. On the contrary, the independent state of Indonesia was founded on the assumed *Gesellschaft* structure par excellence. The *Gesellschaft* structure of the Indonesian state was characterized by the unitary nature it claimed and by its imposed concept of sovereignty, in which unity was the basis. Unlike its colonial predecessor, however, the Indonesian nation-state embraced the *Gemeinschaft* values of community polities, *gotong royong* and MM. Hence the platform of the Indonesian nation-state was a *Gesellschaft* structure of the Western European model, yet the ideological values in its core were *Gemeinschaft* in nature, the *gotong royong* and the MM.

MM in today's Indonesia has become both a cultural mechanism and a political institution of decision making. It is also an underlining spirit of the Indonesian state administration. However, the state institutionalization and officialization of MM indicated homogenization of its idea and practice. The community-based practice of decision making has been replaced by a state-centered paradigm of the practice of MM. While the MM mechanism can keep the unity of the Indonesian nation-state, its institutionalization also endures a co-optation of the people's citizenship.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

REFERENCES

Abdillah, M. (2001). Syura dan Demokrasi. In A. Hasbi (Ed.), *Musyawarah dan Demokrasi: Analisis Konseptual Aplikatif dalam Lintasan Sejarah Pemikiran Politik Islam* (pp. ix–x). Gaya Medi Pratama.

Adryamarthanino, V. (2022, February 14). Tonarigumi, Cikal Bakal Rukun Tetangga. *Harian Kompas*.

Alif, L. N. (2020). *Perubahan Fungsi Tonarigumi Sebelum dan Sesudah Kemerdekaan Indonesia Hingga Tahun 2018* [BA thesis]. Universitas Darma Persada.

Amiruddin. (2021). Musyawarah *Tudang Sipulung* Sebelum Turun Sawah. http://cybex.pertanian.go.id/mobile/artikel/97835/Musyawarah-Tudang-Sipulung-Sebelum-Turun-Sawah/

Andeska, N.; Dharsono; & Martion. (2017). *Tungku Tigo Sajarangan* pada Era Globalisasi dan Visualisasi dalam Kriya Seni, *Jurnal Online ISI Padang Panjang* 4(2), 173–185, https://journal.isi-padangpanjang.ac.id/index.php/Bercadik/article/download/571/336

Anderson, B. R. O. (1983). Old State, New Society: Indonesia's New Order in Comparative Historical Perspective. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *42*(3), 477–496. https://doi.org/10.2307/2055514

Anggita, C., & Hatori, T. (2020). Customary Practices of Musyawarah Mufakat: An Indonesian Style of Consensus Building. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, *589*(1), 012027. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/589/1/012027

Antana, S. D. (1953, January). Rukun Kampung Adalah Dasar Masyarakat Kita Dimasa Depan. *Bende*, 15.

Antlöv, H., & Wetterberg, A. (2021). Deliberate and Deliver – Deepening Indonesian Democracy through Social Accountability. In B. He, M. Breen, & J. Fishkin (Eds.), *Deliberative Democracy in Asia* (pp. 37–53). Routledge.

Arifin, A., & Putra Adela, F. (2018). Analysis Of Institution Political Culture And Local Democracy Through Musyawarah Desa. *Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social and Political Development (ICOSOP 2017)*. https://doi.org/10.2991/icosop-17.2018.77

Arsip Nasional Republik Indonesia. (1974). *Dessa Rapporten. Kumpulan dari J.W. Meyer Ranneft: Seri Publikasi Sumber No. 6*.

Asy-Syawi, T. (1997). *Syura Bukan Demokrasi*. Gema Insani Press.

Bailey, F. G. (1965). Decisions by Consensus in Councils and Committees with Special Reference to Village and Local Government in India. In M. Banton (Ed., p*olitical Systems and the Distribution of Power* (pp. 1–20). Tavistock Publications.

Benjamin, B. (2019, April 25). *Tonarigumi-The Origins of Indonesia's Rukun Tetangga*. Https://Student-Activity.Binus.Ac.Id/Bssc/2019/04/Tonarigumi-the-Origins-of-Indonesias-Rukun-Tetangga/.

Berger, M. T. (1997). Old State and New Empire in Indonesia: Debating the Rise and Decline of Suharto's New Order. *Third World Quarterly*, *18*(2), 321–361.

Bourchier, D., & Jusuf, W. (2022). Liberalism in Indone-

sia: Between Authoritarian Statism and Islamism. *Asian Studies Review*, 1–19. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2022.2125932

BPUPKI. (1995). *Risalah sidang Badan Penyelidik Usaha-Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia: 29 Mei 1945-19 Agustus 1945* (A. B. Kusuma, S. Bahar, & N. Hudawati, Eds.). Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia.

Ethelbert, Y.K.; Pratama, M.R. & Dhosa, D.D. (2022). Tradisi *Nono, Ume* dan *Uf Atoin Meto* di Timor dan Relevansinya Terhadap Budaya Organisasi Sektor Publik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Dinamika Sosial* 6 (2), 192–206.

Fadli, M. (2019). Active Citizenship: Participation of Village Communities in Village Social Participation Practices and Village Transformation Towards the City. *Meraja Journal*, *2*(3), 27–36.

Fakih, F. (2020). *Authoritarian Modernization in Indonesia's Early Independence Period*. BRILL. https://doi.org/10.1163/9789004437722

Fris, G. W. (1946). *Dorpsvergadering, Radio Nederland Hilversum Programma Het Rijk Overzee*. Radio Batavia.

Ganda. (2012). *Huta-Horja-Bius*: Sistem Demokrasi Masyarakat Batak. http://www.gobatak.com/huta-horja-bius-sistem-demokrasi-masyarakat-batak/

Hanan, D. (2016, July 18). Demokrasi Konsensus. *Harian Kompas*, 6.

Harper, T. (2013). Afterword: The Malay World, Besides Empire and Nation. *Indonesia and the Malay World*, *41*(120), 273–290. https://doi.org/10.1080/13639811.2013.798073

Hasbi, A. (2001). *Musyawarah dan Demokrasi: Analisis Konseptual Aplikatif dalam Lintasan Sejarah Pemikiran Politik Islam*. Gaya Medi Pratama.

Jannah, M. (2017). Konsep Musyawarah dalam Al-Quran dan Korelasinya dengan Pancasila sebagai Ideologi Negara. *Jurnal Al-Risalah*, *13*(1), 37–58.

Kartohadikoesoemo, S. (1965). *Desa*. Penerbitan Sumur Bandung.

Kawamura, K. (2011). *Consensus and Democracy in Indonesia: Musyawarah-Mufakat Revisited, Discussion Paper 308*.

Koentjaraningrat. (1961). *Some Social-anthropological Observations on Gotong rojong Practices in Two Villages of Central Java* (C. Holt, Ed.). Cornell University, Department of Far Eastern Studies, Southeast Asia Program, Modern Indonesia Project.

Koentjaraningrat. (1971). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan di Indonesia*. Penerbit Djambatan.

Koentjaraningrat. (1977). The System and Spririt of "Gotong Royong. *Prisma*, 6, 20–27.

Kosuke, M. (2007). The Emergence of Village Meetings and the Introduction of Village Assemblies in Early Twentieth Century Colonial Indonesia. *Southeast Asian Studies/Tonan Ajia Kenkyu, 45* (2), 161–183.

Kunaeni & Sumaryati. (2014). Perwujudan Nilai Sila Ke-4 Pancasila oleh Remaja Masjid di Dukuh Bamban Desa Lemahabang Kecamatan Doro Kabupaten Pekalongan. *Jurnal Citizenship*, *3*(2), 141–154.

Matanasi, P. (2017, December 7). Asal-Usul Rukun Tetangga. *Https://Tirto.Id/Asal-Usul-Rukun-Tetangga-CBhG*.

Muhammad, F. (2016, August 23). Rekonstruksi Manka Permusyawaratan. *Harian Kompas*, 7.

Muhid, H. K. (2021, October 15). Sejarah RT/RW di Indonesia, Benarkah Warisan Jepang? *Https://Nasional.Tempo.Co/Read/1517666/Sejarah-Rtrw-Di-Indonesia-Benarkah-Warisan-Jepang*.

Mulder, N. (1983). *Mysticism & Everyday Life in Contemporary Java: Cultural Persistence and Change*. Singapore University Press.

Neoh, J. Y., & Saifulloh, A. (2020). Democratic Citizenship: The Case of Indonesia and Singapore. *Kappa Delta Pi Record*, *56*(1), 28–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/00228958.2020.1696091

Niel, R. van. (1960). *The Emergence of the Modern Indonesian Elite*. Brill.

NN. (1918a, January 9). Bermoesjawaratannja Kaoem Boschwezen. *Dharmo Kondo*, 3.

NN. (1918b, March 16). Pekerdja'an Intiran. *Dharmo Kondo*, 3.

NN. (1918c, May 25). Vergadering Kampoeng. *Dharmo Kondo*, 3.

NN. (1925, June 10). Hal Pemilihan Kepala Desa. *Soeara Poeblik*, 4.

NN. (1931a, February 17). Oeroesan Air. *Dharmo Kondo*, 4.

NN. (1931b, April 28). Ra'jat Minta Bank Desa. *Dharmo Kondo*, 4.

NN. (1939a, January 21). Pangreh Ageng Pakembalan Roekoen Kampoeng. *Tjaraka*.

NN. (1939b, June 22). Rapat Oemoem Komite Soal Koeboeran Moeslim. *Dharmo Kondo*, 2.

NN. (1940a, July). Kawontenaning Pakampoengan. *Warta Kawoela*.

NN. (1940b, September 2). Perkoempoelan Kematian. *Soeara Oemoem*, 4.

NN. (1940c, September 3). Pertemoean Perkoempoelan Kematian Boedi Sarojo di Tjilatjap. *Soeara Oemoem*, 5–6.

NN. (1940d, October 15). Roekoen Tani Gambiran. *Soeara Oemoem*, 3.

NN. (1940e, November 13). Pilihan Desa. *Soeara Oemoem*, 3.

NN. (1951, March 25). Status Rukun Kampung. *Madjalah Permata 2*, 6–9.

NN. (1953a). Pilihan Lurah. *Bende*, *1*(2), 8.

NN. (1953b, March 3). Pembangunan. *Bende*, 8–10.

NN. (1953c, December 12). Keroekoenan lan Gotong-Rojong. *Bende*, 6–7.

Nordholt, N. G. S. (1987). From LSD to LKMD: Participation at the Village Level. In P. Q. van Ufford (Ed.), *Local Leadership and Programme Imple-*

mentation in Indonesia (pp. 47–63). Free University Press.

Notodipoera, H. P., & et al. (1990). *Laporan Penelitian Pembentukan dan Peranan Lembaga Musyawarah Desa pada Pemerintah Desa di Jawa Timur.*

Notosusanto, N. (1985). *Tercapainya Konsensus Nasional 1966—1969.* Balai Pustaka.

Nugraha, R. S., & Bastari, P. (2018). The Role of the Village Government in Making the Rights and Obligations of State Citizens. *Proceedings of the Annual Civic Education Conference (ACEC 2018).* https://doi.org/10.2991/acec-18.2018.100

Park, J. H. (2021). The Electoral Paradox of Party Institutionalisation: The Case of PKS in Eastern Indonesia. *Asian Studies Review*, *45*(4), 690–710. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2021.1931661

Permatasari, D., & Seftyono, C. (2014). Musyawarah Mufakat atau Pemilihan Lewat Suara Mayoritas: Diskursus Pola Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mimbar Demokrasi*, *13*(2), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.21009/jimd.v13i2.6410

Pocock, J. G. A. (2014). The Ideal of Citizenship since Classical Times. In R. Bellamy & M. Kennedy-McFoy (Eds.), *Citizenship: Critical Concepts in Political Science: Vol. 1: What Is Citizenship? Theories of Citizenship: Classic and Contemporary Debates* (pp. 67–84). Routledge.

Pranoto, S. W. (2001). *Politik Lokal: Parlemen Desa: Awal Kemerdekaan Sampai Jaman Otonomi daera.* Lapera Pustaka Utama.

Rahardjo, S. (1994). Between Two Worlds: Modern State and Traditional Society in Indonesia. *Law & Society Review*, *28*(3), 493–502. https://doi.org/10.2307/3054068

Reid, A. (2011). *To Nation by Revolution: Indonesia in the 20th Century.* University of Hawaii Press.

Robet, R. (2019). Democracy for sale: elections, clientelism and the state in Indonesia, by Edward Aspinall & Ward Berenschot. *Asian Studies Review*, *43*(3), 577–579. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2019.1636476

Sanit, A. (1992). Pembuatan Keputusan Politik Musyawarah dan Mufakat di DPR RI. *Prisma*, *4*(XXI), 3–19.

Savitri, M. (1993). *Musyawarah pada masa Pemerintahan Hayam Wuruk: Tijauan terhadap Fungsi dan*

Peran Serta Hubungannya dengan Kekuasaan Raja. Gadjah Mada University.

Setiawan, B. (1990). Demokrasi di Pedesaan. *Prisma*, *7*(XIX), 59–72.

Soeharto. (1985). Kata Sambutan. In N. Notosusanto (Ed.), *Tercapainya Konsensus Nasional 1966—1969* (p. viii). Balai Pustaka.

Suparlan, P. (1977). Democracy in Rural Java. *Prisma*, *5*, 3–10.

Surjo, D. (1991). Pilkades: Demokrasi di Pedesaan. *Prospektif*, *2*(3), 135–141.

Suryandaru, Y. S. (2019). Perempuan sebagai Fasilitator Perencanaan Pembangunan Partisipatif (Studi Kasus Rembug Warga dan Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Kelurahan (Musrenbangkel) di Kota Mojokerto). *Open Society Conference, Social and Political Challenges in Industrial Revolution 4.0*, 713–733.

Susanti, B. (2016, August 19). MPR dan Ketatanegaraan. *Harian Kompas*, 6.

Suwignyo, A. (2019). *Gotong royong* as social citizenship in Indonesia, 1940s to 1990s. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *50*(3), 387–408. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022463419000407

Tamon, M.L. & Leirissa, R.Z. (2000). Dari Mina'Esa ke Minahasa Raad (Dewan Minahasa) Akhir Abad ke-19 Sampai Awal Abad ke-20. M.A. Thesis, University of Indonesia.

Tapsell, R. (2021). Social Media and Elections in Southeast Asia: The Emergence of Subversive, Underground Campaigning. *Asian Studies Review*, *45*(1), 117–134. https://doi.org/10.1080/10357823.2020.1841093

Tiyanto, H. A. (2015). *Peran Tonarigumi (Rukun Tetangga) di Jawa Masa Pendudukan Jepang Tahun 1942-1945.* FSSR UNS.

Tönnies, F. (1925). Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft. (Theorem der Kultur-Philosophie.). *Kant-Studien*, *30*(1–2). https://doi.org/10.1515/kant.1925.30.1-2.149

Vollenhoven, C. van. (1918). *Het Adatrecht van Nederlandsch-Indie.* Boekhandel en Drukkerij Vorheen E.J. Brill.

Yani, T. A. (2018). Musyawarah sebagai Karakter Bangsa Indonesia. *Jurnal Community*, *2*(2). https://doi.org/10.35308/jcpds.v2i2.135