

DEMOCRACY AND DISCONTENT

Muhammad Dudi Hari Saputra
Graduate School Universitas Gadjah Mada

Email: dudisaputra@gmail.com

Many leaders and scholars assert that democracy is the most advanced system of governance - capable of creating harmony between a government and its citizens. Democracy empowers citizens with the right to vote on who they judge would become their best future leaders. In this way people maintain influence in determining government policy.

However, sometimes democracy can be misleading, especially in developing countries like Indonesia. Indonesia adopted a direct election system after the reformation movement began in 1998. Indonesians held rallies and demonstrations protesting former president Soeharto's New Order regime. After the fall of Soeharto, Indonesia's democracy was improperly defined, leading to the misinterpretation that democracy is in the best interests of a select group of people, and is less concerned with seeking the truth.

On the other hands, The US has made democracy its tool to achieving its superpower status. "Promoting democracy is the strategy adopted by leading Western states and institutions, particularly the US, to use instruments of foreign and economic policy to spread liberal values." (Bayliss, 2008: 579).

Democracy is only one part of liberalism. Liberalism itself is an optimistic approach to global politics based on support of human rights, free trade, and democracy. It focuses on individuals rather than states (Mansbach, 2008: 19), but the US has implemented liberalism in a very flexible manner. In some cases the US has used democracy as a perquisite for diplomacy and cooperation with other nation states. Democracy is always a principle part of US interaction with other nation states, including nations like Egypt, Iraq and Myanmar. With this approach, the US justifies policies aimed at forcing other states to liberalize trade (Naomi Klein: 2007).

Keywords: Democracy, Liberalism, Government, Foreign Policy, Power

INTRODUCTION

Democracy

Francis Fukuyama in *The End Of History and The Last Man*, explains that the philosophical debate and Historical Dialectic (History) has ended and was won by the Liberal Democratic victory, is not just in the realm of thought but also the material realm, the thought of this victory according to Francis Fukuyama is a successful paradigm (world view) is in finding the synthesis and bridge the contradiction which has been a debate in the west, the view materialism-dialectical Marxism which say that the main problems in the world economy due to the conflict between the bourgeois class (capitalists) and proletariat laborer/worker) has ended with the success of liberal democracy. Which is mainly applied by Western Europe and the United States, liberal democracy has come to understand globally and can be applied by anyone due to its universal principles is capable of giving life egalitarian, equitable and prosperous (Francis Fukuyama: 2005).

The philosopher Immanuel Kant, an international relations expert, made a post about the world condition with his article titled *Perpetual Peace* by using the principles of liberal-democracy, contrary to the opinion of Thomas Hobbes, realism and consider peace only able to be created if this world is only regulated by the one government/authority that has the power and authority to regulate, govern and force. Immanuel Kant considers contrary with his democratic-liberal thinking, Kant argues that peace will still be able to create in the world although it has many sovereign governments in many countries/nations, thus the mutual recognition of sovereignty and apply egalitarian principles that respect the rights and interests between the State with another State is must be implemented (Mark FN Franke: 2001), and Kant considers the democratic system can reduce the potential of warfare that conducted by a State than with the authoritarian system. Due under the democratic system the government is directly responsible to the people and because people also take an active role in the war as the army and defray the cost of the war through taxes, so the state apply the democratic system will be less likely to fight because people will naturally tend to peace and cooperation as well as the State equally apply democracies tend not to fight each other (Charles W. Kegley, Jr. and Eugene R. Wittkopf: 2006).

In 70-80s more than 30 countries change from dictatorship to democracy as a system of political subdivision, and is included in the third wave of democratization wave (Keith Jagers and Ted Robert Gurr: 1995), in 1992 more than half the world government has implemented a democratic system, and in 1998 the spread voters in the democratic system has been increased by 74% worldwide (Adrian Karatnycky: 1997)

and the distribution of the democratic system has reached 3.6 billion people or 55% of the total population in the World (Barry Hughes: 1997).

While its natural form is a matter of winning the war by western Democratic/Liberal stronghold (the United States and its Allies) were against Fascism led by Germany and its allies at the time, and the victory of Democratic/Liberal that happened again in the cold war after the collapse of Soviet Union as the communist superpower, the paradigm and ideology victory of liberal democracy by the United States and western European countries has a strong influence on the constellation of International Relations.

Effect of Civilizations

Recently Liberal Democratic System also received sharp criticism, the reality now show that applying democratic state becomes even easier for aggression when the political-economy crisis hit the country (Clifton Morgan and Sally Howard Campbell: 1991), and also to intervene and military invasion to achieve and secure interests (Charles Kegley Jr. and Margaret Hermann: 1997), International Relations renowned researchers such as Samuel P. Huntington warned that the validity of the argument that democracy is able to create peace but not going perpetual.

Samuel P. Huntington strongly criticized the writings of Endism flow (Samuel P. Huntington: 1996), the flow of Endism thought can be divided into 3; The first stream is hailing the cold war, the second is the flow of the proposition expressed itself in a more academic and public that a war between nation-states of certain types has ended, and the last third is the most extreme flow of Endism that try to offer by Francis Fukuyama with his the End of history and the Last man, which has been predicted that the war among developed countries will end but also has predicted the end of history that human history will end by the winning Liberal-Democratic paradigm.

In his criticism, Huntington divides it into two points; The first is too stressed Endism, he could tell the history and permanent moment, the current trend may continue until the future, maybe not, past experience clearly shows this is not possible. The second criticism is Endism tends to ignore the weakness and irrationality of human nature, the Endism assume that people will make a decision/policy based solely on the rationality and cost-benefit alone, but there is not.

In his thesis entitled *The Clash of Civilizations and the Remaking of World Order*, Huntington tried to analyze how new forms of the condition of the world, research in Huntington International Relations explained that the condition is no longer a post-cold war

ideology or economic aspects but will be more focused on the intersection of civilization. According to Huntington civilization is a group identity where identity becomes a paradigm of creativity, taste and intention of the group, it may be a cultural identity, ethnicity, nationality, religion and so on, and in the world according to his analysis largely shaped by the interrelationships between 7 or 8 great civilizations, which are Western civilization, Confucian, Japanese, Islamic, Hindu, Slavic-Orthodox, Latin American and possibly African civilization.

International Relations System in addition to the fore in the form of a multi-polar also be in the form of a multi-civilizational, in his description of Huntington divide it into 5 sections; The first part is for the first time in the history of global politics will be two concurrent systems that Multi-polar and Multi-Civilizational. The second part is the balance of power between civilizations to change, tends to decrease the influence of the western, civilization in Asia increasingly successfully develop economic capacity, military, political force, the Muslim has a strong influence both internally and externally, and not western civilization successfully adapt and return to their civilization. The third part of a world order based on civilizations is growing. Interaction and shared values between civilizations are not successful, and institutions countries tend to be tied/led by a common civilization. The fourth part of Western civilization that can cause friction and extends the conflict, especially with the Islamic and Chinese/Confucian civilizations. And the fifth is the persistence of the dominance of western culture is very dependent on how the West (North America and Western Europe) reaffirm their identity and accept civilization as well as the Universal unique but not together and keep each other in dealing with the challenges of non-western civilization, global war between civilizations can only be avoided if the world's leaders accept each other differences and work together to build a global character.

Materials (Case Studies)

Our Democracy

Generally assert that democracy is a system of government that is most advanced, and able to create harmony between the government and its citizens. Democracy empowers citizens with the right to assess and select candidates will be their best leaders in the future. In this way, the people retain influence in determining government policy.

However, democracy can sometimes be misleading, especially in developing countries like Indonesia. Indonesia adopted a direct election system after the reform movement began in 1998. The people of

Indonesia held rallies and demonstrations protesting the New Order regime, which then toppled the president Soeharto.

After the fall of Soeharto, Indonesia's democracy applied not fit its purpose. Which leads to misinterpretations that democracy solely in the best interests of the majority, and less concerned to uphold and fight for the truth, as stated in the constitution of the state.

John Locke believes in the importance of the democratic form of government. He refused firmly Tyranny form of government in which a single ruler becomes sovereign.

However, to avoid any form of democracy that leads to mobocracy (rule or domination by the masses) that tends to damage and uncontrolled. Locke stressed the importance of the legal aspects. Law according to Locke is not the coercion of one authority, but is born of an agreement/contract social (egalitarian) and the voluntary and full awareness by the public without the pressure/force (John Locke: 1690).

From this social contract agreed then society comply with and obey the contract (constitution), which has been agreed upon, which later became the foundation to establish the name of the institution (read: government), which regulates and protects the rights and obligations that must be done earlier.

However, different views with Hobbes that the government consider to be single. Locke rejected the notion that this could be a tyrannical form of government (1651), then Locke suggests separation rule, between the Legislative and the Executive.

Then, what about the Indonesian context. Indonesia implemented direct democracy after orde-baru regime, and the new condition increasingly complex challenges in the implementation of democratic, successive news both horizontal and vertical conflicts occurred in the era of openness and freedom.

Indonesian democracy, to borrow the terminology of Aristotle is a public system that is not democracy but mobocracy. Where the government was formed on gangs/majority, which later became the foundation by implementing state that the sound or the interests of the majority is the truth, and certainly adversely impact minority.

Mobocracy system consequences on the destruction of the order of state and society, where people who consider themselves the majority and many had been a ruling on the outside who are a minority and are alienated, as well as state/government finally agreed action to protect the interests of the group/gang majority.

Mobocracy is born as a result of non-compliance with the Constitution (social contract) by the public and state institutions did not try to run and enforce it (Jean-Jacques Rousseau, 1762).

Flashback on SBY presidential campaign in 2003, he has always emphasized the importance of law enforcement (enforcement) in a democracy, the initial idea of a presidential candidate was well appreciated. But in reality, the former President was only listening and obedient (read: fear) on a majority vote in defiance of the constitution of the state, rather than trying to uphold the constitution (law / social contact) state.

Counter-productive practices involving money politics, spreading rumors are not true/black campaign, and maintain patron-client system has resulted in voters choose their leaders based on emotional attachment (irrationality) rather than rationality. An emotional bond based on religion, ethnicity, tribe, culture and family has become a major consideration voters in Indonesia.

Vision, mission and policy platforms by candidates become less important. Emotions have beaten meritocracy. So many leaders or candidates have used negative campaign tactics attracted the attention of voters. This method typically produces bad leaders and ultimately produces bad policies.

Egypt Democracy

Egypt became part of the Arab spring, the popular revolutionary upheaval that eventually led to a change in leadership, constitutional, political and economic regime. People's revolution in Egypt became a pioneer and a grand narrative for the Arab peoples' movement that had been dominated by monarchies and military regimes.

Hosni Mubarak resignation was later replaced by Mohamed Morsi administration of the Muslim Brotherhood through the democratic process had become a motivation and hope of a bright future of Egypt, because the government was formed on the basis of the will of the people.

Unfortunately, over the Mursi administration, many policies of the democratically elected government hadn't reflected the values of democracy, which contains at least three major points; 1. The Constitution established based on the values of all the people (not the majority or minority), 2. The division of state powers between Executive-Legislature-Judiciary, 3. The active participation of the people on the government policy (Deliberative Democracy, Habermas: 1996).

The research analysis based on Dina Y. Sulaeman's article (2013) that related Egypt's mapping conflict, because the primary sources that he used. First analysis related to constitution, in November 2012, Mursi issued a decree stating that all legal products which produced by MPs (dominated by the Muslim Brotherhood) couldn't be

undone in court. This is in fact already violated the substance of democracy, democracy is born of the principles of liberalism-individualism and egalitarian, the dominance of the Muslim Brotherhood on the establishment of the rule of law and the constitution, has changed meaningful democracy to mobocracy, that the country is run and only accommodate the interests of specific group.

Second, the dominance of IM in the executive-legislature and judiciary has removed the principle of division / equalization of power, so it is no longer a process of checks and balances between state institutions. Third, in any of its policies Mursi administration only use IM as the primary basis of interests and the formulation of government policy without involving participation active than other groups (read: the opposition) and furthermore the people of Egypt itself consisting of various parties and interest groups.

Democracy in Egypt ultimately means only limited in the methods of election to chosen the head of government, but in the process of passage of governments, democratic values seemed to vanish replaced by the tyranny of a majority of a particular group, which would harm democracy itself, democracy needs to be strengthen as proceduralism; that the legitimacy of policy making by the government is not based on the amount of majority, but the way policy decisions are fair and through rational argumentation discourse, involving all parties deliberation (Habermas: 1984)

Mursi's government with every tyranny majority policies of its group has instigated resistance movement (Read: Revolution) by the people of Egypt, because the people of Egypt consider existing governments do not reflect the democratic values and that must be replaced, which is actually "used" by the military to carry out its coup. And this being an anti-climax, as a statement of the Egyptian people: "I joined the demonstration because he doesn't like the policy of Mursi. But he doesn't expect that the military and the pro-western power in charge of power." (Quoted from Dina Y. Sulaiman: 2013)

Democracy Euphoria? (The issue of racist-capitalist in US)

Slavoj Zizek (2011) explained that the democratic experience euphoria, for example, the familiar figure of Martin Luther King Jr. (advocates equal rights for blacks in the United States), King slogan 'i have a dream' so well known, even by the smallest children, although they do not know what that dream, at least one must have a dream.

Martin Luther and democracy into products 'encoding' (gift code) in the news media, and for that they have to do a 'decoding' (code-breaking) to filter the 'story' from 'reality'.

According to Zizek, King became the US media products and audiences who regard it as the 'father of morals' and 'axiom of equality' because it was against segregation between blacks and whites.

King struggle has indeed been successful in the context of eliminating racial segregation, but when the King to continue the struggle for a broader context such as the anti-war and anti-poverty, the King seemed to be forgotten and abandoned.

Racist attitudes, according to Zizek is just a small form of capitalist influence broader, such as capital domination by a handful of people who cause poverty and the use of military force to control the area's rich natural resources are devoted to the interests of the capitalists.

King, who tried to fight poverty and war caused by capitalism and even then eventually forgotten and abandoned, even killed while fighting for sanitation workers in the United States.

US mass media controlled by the owners of capital (capitalists), just lift that US Democracy with Martin Luther King has reached its pinnacle of achievement for having successfully eliminated racial segregation, and continued to cover a broader struggle of King and in the struggle against capitalism.

Why the capitalists in the United States and the question is not even raised the struggle against racial segregation?, because according to them (capitalists), blacks USA is not a threat to their existence, during the US-patterned black bourgeois thought and behaved like them, that by the boxer Muhammad Ali call as uncle Tom (black white behave). This is the meeting point of Foucault and Jacques Lacan, that knowledge product in society by the media only device of the ruler.

CONCLUSIONS

Firstly, In 21st century and new millennium, liberal-democracy has found its momentum to be vigor established system, after the collapsing of communism in Soviet Union, but it doesn't democracy going well-ordered, internal anomaly is also occur, democracy simply has double-edged sword that can be mouthpieces for the realization of people moral values but on the other hand can be a tool of elite politics, and it has been proven in many countries: Egypt, Indonesia or even USA as the pioneer of modern democracy.

In Indonesia, William Liddle (2009) argued that Indonesia political system which adopt democracy is in naïve period, because everybody appreciate democracy but don't want criticize too much when the mandatory government and political parties never keep accountability and credibility to voters or when the democracy only dominated by selected groups (oligarch). Because in the grass root itself, voters chose

figure, not the party quality, or even because accepted grease money from bad politicians.

The weakness Indonesia's democracy are too fragmented political powers (parties and groups), so difficult to get single majority for maintain stable government. And Indonesia's democracy is very unpredictable and volatile, too procedural than substantial to choose good leader. The party system is very top-down, where domination are held by elites, not people (bottom-up). Thus, democracy is becoming more unpopular for some scholars or states. Democracy couldn't bring welfare and prosperity, and for few cases, unbridled democracy has provoked new problem. In Indonesia, local government general election sometimes made dispute between candidate supporters, unfair countdown, parties leaded by oligarchy dominantly, and unstable Government. Otherwise in few countries, which don't adopt democracy, system obviously could make prosperity and welfare for its people, stable government and law enforcements. This case study makes Democracy is more distrusted. Then The Question is Should Indonesia change democracy system? Or should Indonesia keep adopting and learning democracy by process until settled?

Bibliography

- Baylis, John and Smith, Steve. (2008) *The Globalization of World*. 4th Ed. New York: Oxford.
- Charles Kegley Jr dan Margareth Hermann. (1997) *Putting Military intervention into Democratic Peace: A Research note, Comparative Political Studies*.
- Francis Fukuyama. (2005) *Akhir Sejarah: Amerika dan Dunia*, Yayasan Obor Indonesia dan Freedom Institute
- Habermas, J. (1984) *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Translated by T.McCarthy. *Reason and the Rationalization of Society*. 1. Boston, MA: Beacon Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996) *Between Facts and Norms: Contributions to a Discourse Theory of Law and Democracy*. Massachusetts: The MIT Press.
- Hughes, Barry. (1997) *Continuity and Change in World Politics*. 3rd Ed. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Huntington, Samuel P. (1996) Simon and Schuster. (eds.). *The Clash of Civilizations and The Remaking of Wolrd Order*. Rockeller Center, New York.
- Jaggers, Keith dan Gurr, Ted Robert. (1995) *Transition to Democracy: Tracking Democracy's Third Wave*, *Journal of Peace Research*.

- Kegley, Charles W. and Wittkopf, Eugene R. (1999) *World Politics trend and transformation*. United States of America: Worth Publishers. Inc.
- Klein, N. (2007) *The Shock Doctrine*. New York: Metropolitan Books.
- Locke, John (1996) In: Grant, Ruth W and Tarcov, Nathan. (eds.). *Some Thoughts Concerning Education and of the Conduct of the Understanding*. Indianapolis: Hackett Publishing Co.
- Locke, John. (1997) Woolhouse, Roger, (ed.). *An Essay Concerning Human Understanding*, New York: Penguin Books.
- Mansbach, Richard W. and Rafferty, Kirsten L. (2008) *Introduction to Global Politics*. New York: Routledge.
- Mark F. N. Franke. (2001) *Global Limits: Immanuel Kant, International Relations, and Critique of World Politics*. State University of New York Press.
- Zizek, Slavoj. (2011) *Democracy in What State (From Democracy to Divine Violence)*. New York: Columbia University Press.