

Political Dynasty in Badunsanak Regional Election in West Sumatra, Indonesia

Welhendri Azwar¹, Abdullah Khusairi², Mufti Ulil Amri³

^{1, 2, 3}State Islamic University of Imam Bonjol Padang

Jl. Prof. Mahmud Yunus Lubuk Lintah Padang, West Sumatra, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Welhendri Azwar

ABSTRACT: *The diversity of cultures that Indonesia has as a unitary state has a variety of democratic systems based on distinctive local cultures. This study is important in re-reading Indonesia's democratic system today, in an effort to restore state governance in accordance with the spirit of the Indonesian nation as stated in the 1945 Constitution. Data collection was carried out by observing political dynamics in the 2020 West Sumatra simultaneous regional elections, which were reported by the mass media, online media, social media, and interviews. This research finds that, first, the existence of society as citizens of the nation will be obtained if the democratic system and political practice are based on the strength of the cultural capital of society within the framework of diversity and diversity. Second, democracy based on cultural strength will give birth to a strong government. Third, local democracy must be guarded, cared for, and protected by the state, in an effort to strengthen people's sovereignty which is rooted in local political culture, in order to be able to withstand the blows of global liberalism and capitalism.*

KEYWORDS: *Political dynasty, local democracy, people's sovereignty*

Date of Submission: 08-05-2021

Date of Acceptance: 22-05-2021

I. INTRODUCTION

Democracy is a form of public expression in embodying the desire to manage their lives, both in the form of a state, ethnic community, as well as in small groups. The democratic system positions the people as very strategic in the state administration system, in every country. Each country combines its democratic system with the cultural philosophical values of its society which have given birth to various variations in the use of the term democracy, such as parliamentary democracy, people's democracy, united democracy, and Indonesia has known the term Pancasila democracy (Kaban, 2000; Muntoha, 2009; Zega, 2015). That is, democracy is a state management system or a community entity with a mechanism for granting power and authority to individuals as recipients of mandates towards a civilized society (Azwar, 2020; Nugroho, 2012; Muntoha, 2009).

Humans are natural creatures as people who live innocently, love themselves spontaneously. He is free from all other powers and is essentially equal. This natural innocence is lost after the human correctional process occurs. Humans are social creatures to ensure the necessities of social life. The existence of this dilemma gave rise to thoughts for Rousseau to show that the state religion should be so that the people in it remain free and natural (Minogue, 1986; Suseno, 1987; Noer, 1982).

To build a civilized democratic system, one must adopt political morals by prioritizing honesty, freedom and justice, by providing space for broad public participation, and avoiding partisan, exclusive and closed politics (Susanti, 2017; Wijaya, 2016). Therefore, democratic practice must be able to fulfill the basic rights of society as citizens. One of the basic rights of these citizens is the right to democracy and freedom over the administration, fulfillment and use of democratic rights itself. This right is a very important part of the national journey considering that the democratization efforts that lead to democratic freedom from time to time continue to develop (Khairazi, 2015). Philosophically, man's natural freedom is in a vortex where he is free from any "higher" worldly power, is not subject to the will or power of other humans, but fully follows natural rules as the basis of his rights (Gombert, et al., 2016; Khairazi, 2015; Zega, 2015).

At the practical political level, there are frequent deviations and irregularities in the implementation of the democratic process. Especially with regard to the use of authority and power, where the political rulers are the determinants of the value system and the moral system of society. The power becomes absolute to fulfill the lust of political interests, which goes out of its basic purpose to create justice, prosperity and peace. How many social conflicts have occurred that originated from a political process that deviates from the values of propriety and civilization (Triono, 2017; Susanti, 2017; Hidayati, 2014). Furthermore, dynastic political practices show the existence of oligarchic democracy, which shows that the roots of feudalism and monarchy tradition have not completely changed (Hidayati, 2014).

The development of the course of Indonesia's democratic process today shows another side, which tends to injure democratic values. Various election and regional election disputes often trigger social conflicts in the community, as excesses of political contestation at the national and regional levels. Society is divided, fragmented, sensitive to primordial issues that tend to erode the value of unity. And, if the potential for conflict is allowed to exist, groups that are paid anarchy will emerge. Furthermore, there will also emerge groups that are ideologically supportive of anarchy. There is also a process of learning to create or carry out conflict in various models, even myths. The perpetrators of this conflict are likely to escape their legal responsibility. Furthermore, the political explanation sees that the potential for conflict remains, that is, social conflict is considered functional, meaning that it is still politically useful because it can change the constellation. This social conflict can be created and managed in order to bring down competitors. The crowd was actually raised in the campaign.

Democracy is actually aimed at developing a dialogue which essentially does not expect anarchist method. In addition, democracy must also be put on the trust of all parties in the predetermined rules of the game. The quality of democracy must indeed be built through a collective consensus mechanism in which the people must be involved in every political process without discrimination because democracy only recognizes the law of collectivity which cancels the domination of elite groups over votes majority. However, what often becomes a problem is how to organize mass democracy towards a political order that is moral and confrontational. For this purpose, it is necessary to strengthen democracy at the grassroots level by empowering local culture. Thus society will not be dragged down by various currents towards anarchism.

II. METHOD

This research is a study of the Political Dynasty in *Badunsanak* Regional Election in West Sumatra, Indonesia. This study explains that local communities have cultural strengths with a distinctive local democratic system. To find out some important information about the local democratic system based on the philosophical values of the Minangkabau people, which is known as *badunsanak*, this is done by observing the political dynamics through the simultaneous regional elections of West Sumatra in 2020. Then, reading the current reality of political contestation in the Pilkada through mass media coverage, online media, and social media. Interviews were also conducted with community leaders, political figures, Pilkada participants and supporters, as well as community voters. Observations of the political dynamics in the 2020 West Sumatra Pilkada contest were carried out in order to improve information on some of the data obtained through interviews, in order to obtain a complete understanding. The results of observations on the dynamics of the Pilkada process were deepened through interviews to obtain complete and comprehensive information about the political dynamics of West Sumatra, especially on the simultaneous Pilkada contestation in 2020.

Interviewing was carried out by selecting informants using the snow-ball technique, by determining key informants. Information obtained from key informants is used as a basis and guide for determining other figures or informants who can provide further information required. The selection of key informants is based on the depth of their knowledge and knowledge of the various information required, as well as on the consideration of their ability to provide guidance on other informants needed for research. The process of deepening information through a chain of informants was carried out until the stage of saturation. This means that if the information obtained is no longer something new and tends to repeat itself, the interview process is considered complete (Azwar, 2018; Azwar, et. Al., 2019; Azwar et al., 2020; Denzin & Lincoln, 2009).

Data analysis was carried out in several stages; First, the data obtained through observation and interviews are completed, compared and tested with several other informants' information, through books, documents and related research results, then classified so as to give rise to categories. Second, their main characteristics are then searched for in order to know their similarities and combinations. Third, the categories are linked to one another, giving birth to propositions. Fourth, the propositions are linked again to each other so as to build a final understanding of the Nagari government model in the Minangkabau customary system, which is then analyzed with related theories to arrive at a conclusion. The connection with this research is that there is an understanding and explanation of the concept of the "*Pilkada Badunsanak*" as a model of democracy based on local culture-based political morals.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Democracy and People's Sovereignty

Literally, democracy comes from the Greek word "demos" which means the people or residents of a place and "cratein" or "cratos" which means power or sovereignty (Dahl, 1989; Jan & Svante, 2002). Democracy is defined as the state of the state in which in its governmental system, sovereignty is in the hands of the people, the highest power is in the joint decisions of the people, the people are in power, people's government and power by the people (Azra, 2010; Sumodiningrat & Agustian, 2008; Budiardjo, 1998; Jones, 2015). As a concept, democracy has a broad meaning and contains many complex elements (Nugroho, 2012). In the Oxford University Press dictionary, democracy is defined as a decision-making system in an institution,

organization, or state, where all members or citizens have the same share of power. Democracy is a political method, a mechanism for electing political leaders. Citizens are given the opportunity to choose one of the political leaders who contest to win votes (Lechmann, 1989). There are three characteristics of a democratic country, namely equal rights in determining binding collective decisions, effective participation, namely equal opportunities for all citizens in the collective decision-making process, and the realization of the level of civil and political freedom. In this case, a democratic government is different from a government whose power is concentrated in one person as in a monarchy system or a system of power that is concentrated on a small group of people such as an oligarchic system (Dahl, 1989).

Although nowadays the democratic system has occupied the top stratum accepted by many countries because it is considered capable of regulating and resolving social and political relations, whether involving inter-individual interests in society, relations between communities, society and countries or between countries in the world, democracy is not silent from the thump of criticism. Some thinkers such as Mouffe (2000) and Poell (2007) call democracy something paradoxical. On the one hand, it requires social welfare guarantees, freedom, and opportunities for contestation, but on the other hand, these guarantees are not fully defined practically. The paradox of democracy refers to a situation when a country has undergone a process of democratization, there is disappointment and dissatisfaction with democracy. Furthermore, the paradox of democracy is marked by the decline in trust in political parties and their elites. Most of the citizens of society look cynical about democracy and consider politics as something corrupt where political leaders are more selfish than concerned with the interests of their citizens (Mouffe, 2000; Poell, 2007).

To reduce paradoxical debates like this, democracy must be positioned within a dynamic framework. This means that a country can be called democratic if there is a process of development towards a better condition in implementing humanitarian values and in giving the community, both individually and socially, the right to realize these values. To measure the progress of democracy is the extent to which the increase or decrease of basic freedoms, such as freedom of expression, association and assembly. Each of the three points can be further detailed in relation to various fields of individual and social life, such as politics, economics, culture, academic science, law, and so on. Thus it can be said that a developing country may have to be seen as "more democratic" if there are processes of development of true progress in realizing and exercising freedom in the form of freedom of expression, association and assembly (Madjid, 1999).

The democratic system places a sovereignty in the hands of the people. On a plain like this, the philosophy of democracy basically respects all "human wealth" as well as "cultural wealth" possessed by which society grows and develops. Contained in this case is the recognition of the capacity of the cultural community as a self-governing community that is able to organize itself through its own unique way. In the context of Indonesian society, for example, collectivity is the basis of its unique cultural values. In the nature of the collectivity, society has a general tendency to prioritize deliberation over voting or voting. Local communities throughout Indonesia recognize the democratic system by various names, which is the basic social capital of democracy that cannot be ignored as part of the cultural sovereignty of society.

Dynamics of West Sumatra Pilkada

In the 2020 Pilkada Simultaneous in West Sumatra, 48 candidate pairs were participated in competing for the seat of the Governor-Deputy Governor of West Sumatra, Regent-Deputy Regent and Mayor-Deputy Mayor. Party support for these candidate pairs criss-crossed between parties in each city, district and province. This cross-sectional support occurs due to a coalition between supporting parties. This support dilutes the voting maps in elections that are almost impossible to read and analyze through the voting maps in the 2019 Legislative and Presidential Elections (Pilpres) and the 2020 simultaneous regional elections.

The 2020 Pilkada Simultaneously is a democratic arena that provides space for very boisterous political aspirations in the public sphere. Especially on online media and social media platforms. The pro-contra attitude among contestant supporters, observers, academics, sympathizers, is easily seen (merdeka.com, October 1, 2020). Both in the early stages of candidacy, registration, struggling for support from parties, and ending with the Constitutional Court. In fact, conflict vulnerability does not exist in West Sumatra, but the hot atmosphere is inevitable. Supporters attack each other in social media conversation rooms and online news coverage. Black campaigns in the form of slander through anonymous accounts on social media have also occurred. Including reporting to each other to the Police. In the West Sumatra governor election, two candidates reported to each other with different cases then ended up withdrawing each other's reports. In fact, there were contestants who became suspects (cnnindonesia.com., December 11, 2020).

The West Sumatra governor election was followed by four pairs of candidates, namely Mulyadi-Ali Mukhni (Democrat, PAN), Nasrul Abit-Indra Catri (Gerindra), Fakhrizal-Genius Umar (Golkar, Nasdem, PKB) and Mahyeldi-Audy Joinaldy (PKS, PPP). The West Sumatra gubernatorial election was won by the Mahyeldi-Audy Joinaldy with 726,853 votes (32.43 percent). Nasrul Abit - Indra Catri received 679,069 votes, Mulyadi -

Ali Mukhni received 614,477 votes and Fakhrizal - Genius Umar received 220,893 votes (kompas.com., 20 December 2020).

The results of the slightly different votes made the successful team and candidate pairs, who were generally in the second round of votes, to challenge the "Pilkada" results to the Constitutional Court. As of this writing, the Constitutional Court has only granted Solok Regency to proceed to the proving stage. Meanwhile, other claims were rejected with various legal arguments from the Judge. The dispute to the Constitutional Court is the final answer to the struggle for local power struggles (merdeka.com, February 16, 2021). Even though the general assumption already knows, observers and advocates have come to a conclusion, the Constitutional Court will see the results of the vote acquisition and strict legal considerations so that it rarely annul and thwart the contestants who have won the most votes, more often they reject the lawsuit because they do not meet the elements that are required. about to be sued (tribunnews.com, February 27, 2021). Lawsuits against democratic processes like this actually have historical and sociological roots in the political dynamics of the Indonesian nation (Purnaweni, 2004; Kurniawan, 2016; Sudrajat, 2016).

In other cases, throwing survey results to each other is no longer referring to academic values based on methodological honesty but rather to propaganda material to knock down the opponent's mentality. Almost every contestant has the results of a survey that tries to convince voters (merdeka.com, 22 November 2020). When a survey result is published, the political universe of West Sumatra will respond boisterously with pros and cons between supporters. There are those who strongly reject others who strongly support, but actually the elites are scrambling to gain public sympathy by attacking each other through survey data (detiknews, 5 November 2020).

Local politics is unique. Actually, the elite are not new people. Those in the contest may part ways but after the event will sit together. The discrepancy of political choices among the elites, for example between incumbent pairs who crossed paths in the 2020 Pilkada does not mean true animosity but political grievances, often reuniting at other moments. Political figures, observers, sympathizers who appear in the public space to provide comments tend to be able to map where they choose their positions and who to attack through the discourse they convey.

In this context, Pilkada is only an arena for elite power struggle which is understood by the public as not a life-and-death struggle and creates conflict and identity politics all the time. On social chat room platforms, such as WhatsApps, if there is news of attacks between one character and another, there is often a photo of the two of them, maybe a new photo and it could be an old photo. This shows that local politicians are actually in a unit of local elites who are close to each other and it is almost impossible to build a conflict that reaches the level of chaos and riots in the form of physical clashes. Even if that happened, it would not be difficult to find the culprits and politicians who took this path.

Badunsanak Democracy: Maintaining Unity in the Midst of Political Conflict

The political culture observed from the 2020 simultaneous regional elections in West Sumatra highlighted the concept of badunsanak as a value that animates the whole practical political practice. This value is also what drives the electoral process to take place safely and does not end in horizontal conflicts. Starting from the desire of all parties, starting from the local government, general election organizers (KPU), the candidate pairs for mayor and deputy mayor, and the supporting community for each candidate, that the Pilkada should not produce conflicts that can upset the community. Politically, *badunsanak* which is used in the term Pilkada is still considered political jargon from the elite to build togetherness, but still has a spirit of competition. The concept of the "Pilkada Badunsanak" directs the public to carry out what has been agreed by the political elite and is not part of the agreement making. The political elite seems to use a kind of value that lives and develops in society as an effort to build a consolidation of democracy between the elite and society (Asrinaldi, 2010; Haliim, 2016). The democratic system places a sovereignty in the hands of the people. On a plain like this, the philosophy of democracy basically respects all "human wealth" as well as "cultural wealth" possessed by which society grows and develops. Contained in this case is the recognition of the capacity of the cultural community as a self-governing community that is able to organize itself through its own unique way. In the context of Indonesian society, for example, collectivity is the basis of its unique cultural values. In the nature of the collectivity, society has a general tendency to prioritize deliberation over voting or voting. Local communities throughout Indonesia recognize the consultative system under various names.

Discussions on democratic development are not new to Indonesia. What this country is now witnessing is the continuation of a dialogue that was halted for nearly four days by authoritarian rule. The past two years have been dominated by Indonesia's efforts to emerge from the shadows of the New Order, the authoritarian regime established by President Soeharto in the mid-1960s. Soeharto built this regime on the foundations of Guided Democracy that his predecessors left behind. The introduction of Guided Democracy in 1959 led to the collapse of parliamentary democracy and replaced it with a system that did not in any way limit the presidency. There are some clear parallels between Indonesia's current democratic transition and the decade-long experiment

of liberal democracy in the 1950s. The economy is volatile, the armed forces become a potential political force, parliaments and executives are caught in a game of overthrow that results in instability, the constitution is not clear enough to state the roles and relationships between power holders and state institutions, and regional turmoil threatens the basic unity of the archipelago.

In Minangkabau culture, *dunsanak* implies brotherhood in one clan (lineage) and in one tribe (clan), the wider the brotherhood ties, the more the relationship becomes a pseudo kinship (fictive kinship). At this level kinship or brotherhood contains the strength of a relationship that tends to be in the form of pseudo kinship, but is tied to one kinship value that is shared by supporters of the clan or tribe. *Dunsanak*, actually comes from one descendant of a genealogical relative. At this level, the bonds of brotherhood are very strong and have an orientation to maintain the maternal lineage (matrilineal) along with the inheritance inherited especially for girls.

In a democratic country, every citizen or group of people has the right to convey and fight for their aspirations and interests so that conflict is a symptom that is difficult to avoid. The political system will only tolerate conflicts that do not destroy themselves, thus the problem is not eliminating the conflict, but controlling the conflict through democratic institutions to obtain solutions in the form of political decisions. This is where a political party plays an important role as a democratic institution. Political parties function to be able to control conflict through dialogue with conflicting parties. Political parties as one of the pillars of democracy are tasked with accommodating and combining various aspirations and interests of conflicting parties and bringing problems to the deliberations of the people's representative body (DPR) to obtain solutions in the form of political decisions which are a compromise between representatives of the people who come from parties. - political parties. (Sulaeman, 2015; Huntington, 1991). Larry Diamond (2003) has the view that the negotiation path between the elites of the old regime and the new regime will reduce the potential for upheaval and violence in the transition process, thus opening up the possibility to sit together both to formulate new rules of the game and to solve other problems during the transition period.

Anthropologically, in the context of *dunsanak* in Pilkada, the meaning contained is using fictitious brotherhood ties rather than true brotherhood. The sense of brotherhood is deliberately built and then controlled according to momentary interests in the realm of practical politics. The strength of this meaning lies in the imagined feeling that the actors involved in the Pilkada all come from the Minangkabau ethnic group and this means that they are still siblings. By using the substance of brotherhood, Pilkada is considered unreasonable if there is conflict or hostility between the candidates and especially among the candidate's supporters. By using the meaning of tribal brotherhood, power does not lead to an understanding of power in a centralized system of power in the past (Arrsa, 2014).

Evidence for realizing the desire of brotherhood is that the candidate pairs who will compete to make a pledge (open agreement) to carry out the Pilkada process with a full sense of brotherhood and ensure that they do not build an atmosphere of conflict, or efforts to provoke disputes so as to create horizontal conflicts, especially fellow candidate supporters. *Badunsanak* constellation in Pilkada is not only between candidates, but also with fellow law enforcement officers, such as the Pilkada case in the above newspaper report. In this Pilkada, a pledge agreement was made from the Police, Election Supervisory Committee (Panwaslu), and the General Election Commission (KPU). This pledge is an anticipatory effort to prevent conflict through fast and tended informal coordination of all units involved. In short, it can be stated that this Pilkada is equated with a number of traditional community traditions that are described as having the strength of togetherness and kinship.

The reason *badunsanak* gives another positive meaning from some community members, namely that members of the community can freely choose whoever they are because the potential for conflict between supporters has been minimized by the candidates. People also do not become afraid to choose whoever they want. Experience in other regions in Indonesia, generally the Pilkada ended in conflict between supporters. In this context, the *badunsanak* principle in the Pilkada has constructed the notion of power which is not elitist, but populist, for some members of society. Indeed, there was a dispute in the West Sumatra simultaneous regional elections in 2020, even up to the Constitutional Court. However, there was no horizontal conflict at the community level, even among candidate supporters. For this condition, the Minangkabau people are familiar with the philosophy of "*biduak lalu kiambang batauik*". The phrase for the Minangkabau people who are commonly called for to embrace two people or several parties who had fought, disagreed or had different views before. *Biduak lalu kiambang batauik*, this phrase refers to plants on the water that will be exposed when the boat or dipper passes, but will come together again after the dipper has passed. Hurry up and get together again. Like a dispute between relatives who return to harmony and peace in the strands of unity and oneness.

In a political context, the concept of *badunsanak* is actually represented in the deliberation-consensus system. This concept is accommodated in the fourth principle of Pancasila, namely "*kerakyatan yang dipimpin oleh hikmat kebijaksanaan dalam permusyawaratan/perwakilan*". However, the essential *badunsanak* democratic system has been shifted by the concept of foreign democracy, which gives room for expressive authority to individuals so that the determination of support for a candidate for the people's representative or president is through direct voting, through voting, one man one vote. This change seems to have been

recognized as a confusion, so that the idea of "badunsanak election" emerged. Direct election of leaders or representatives of the people has shifted the concept of "wisdom wisdom in representative deliberations". However, this can be corrected by regaining the awareness that we are bad kids. The electoral system may change, but the essence (*badunsanak*) must not change. The realization of the badunsanak election is that whoever wins is dunsanak. This concept will avoid words and actions that will damage *badunsanak* relationships. It's okay to have different choices or support, but within the framework of a *badunsanak* relationship. In Minangkabau culture, difference is not a problem, but it is considered a potential that needs to be nurtured and developed to achieve the common good. After all the disputes with various levels of complexity have been resolved, the people who are at odds or in disputes must come back together to be able to carry out what has been planned together for the common good.

IV. CONCLUSION

Even though the Minangkabau tradition believes in the need to maintain unity and integrity, at the same time, the Minangkabau people also do not reject or deny the debate. Election is an arena for debate that is legal and constitutional. Debates between individuals in groups or between groups in a large organization are seen as good and necessary to achieve mutual benefit. Debates based on good intentions are believed to be able to give birth to good decisions to be together. Phrases or proverbs that accommodate debates in the Minangkabau culture, *di laia kito batuka, di batin paham sasuai, kito basalisiah bak kilangan, batingkah bak talempong, sungguah batalun bak bagandang, buni di situ mangko elok, di sinan lagu mangko dapek*. As a nation, it must have the same ideals and hopes, namely that Indonesia is victorious.

Political contestation in the General Election and Pilkada must be interpreted as a competition to do one's best, a race to do good. This is because the nature of a political counteraction does not require an object to be defeated. Although of course there are parties who are considered superior and better than others, but do not make the losers considered "bad," "low," "weightless," and other negative attributes. Because both the winners and losers have tried their best, not the worst. Both are always in the process for the best direction as well.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

My thanks go to the research team and colleagues for their support in compiling this article. Thank you to public figures, political figures, governor and deputy governor candidates as participants in the 2020 West Sumatra Pilkada, as well as the voters who have supported and facilitated research activities, as well as informants who provided the necessary information. I am also grateful for the constructive comments from reviewers. And, I am responsible for all errors in this paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Arrsa, Ria Casmi. (2014). Pemilu Serentak Dan Masa Depan Konsolidasi Demokrasi. *Jurnal Konstitusi* 11(3), 515-537. <https://jurnalkonstitusi.mkri.id/index.php/jk/article/view/38/91>
- [2] Asrinaldi. (2010). Budaya Politik dan Konflik Nilai dalam Masyarakat Lokal. *Jurnal Sosiologi Sigai* 5(8), 1-11. <http://repository.unand.ac.id/id/eprint/2612>
- [3] Azra, Azyumardi. (2010). Islam, Corruption, Good Governance, and Civil Society: The Indonesian Experience. *Islam and Civilisational Renewal Journal*, 2(1), 14-3.
- [4] Azwar, W., Yunus, Y., Muliono, & Permatasari, Y. (2018). Nagari Minangkabau: The Study of Indigenous Institutions in West Sumatra. *Bina Praja*, 10(2), 231-239. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.10.2018.231-239>
- [5] Azwar, W., Muliono, M., Permatasari, Y., Akmal, H., Ibrar, S., & Melisa, M. (2019). Nagari Customary Justice System in West Sumatra. *Jurnal Bina Praja*, (21), 53-62. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.11.2019.53-62>
- [6] Azwar, W., Hasanuddin, Muliono, Permatasari, Y., Amri, Mufti Ulil & Yurisman (2020). The Models of Nagari Indigenous Governments in West Sumatra. *Bina Praja*, 12(1), 33-42. <https://doi.org/10.21787/jbp.12.2020.33-42>
- [7] Budiardjo, Miriam. (1998). *Partisipasi dan Partai Politik*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [8] Dahl, Robert. A. (1989). *Democracy and Its Critics*. New Haven & London: Yale University Press.
- [9] Diamond, Larry (2003). *Developing Democracy Toward Consolidation*. Yogyakarta: ERE Press.
- [10] Gombert, Tobias, et al. (2016). *Landasan Sosial Demokrasi*. Ivan A. Hadar (trans.). Bonn: Friedrich-Ebert-Stiftung.
- [11] Hidayati, Nur. (2014). Dinasti Politik dan Demokrasi Indonesia. *Orbith* 10(1), 18-21. <https://jurnal.polines.ac.id/index.php/orbith/article/view/357>
- [12] Haliim, Wimpy. (2016). Demokrasi Deliberatif Indonesia: Konsep Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Membentuk Demokrasi Dan Hukum Yang Responsif. *Masyarakat Indonesia, Jurnal Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Indonesia*. 42(1), 19-30. <http://jmi.ipsk.lipi.go.id/index.php/jmiipks/article/view/556/457>
- [13] Huntington, Samuel. P. (1991). *The Third Wave Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century*. University of Oklahoma Press.
- [15] Jan, E. L. & Svante, E. (2002). *Ekonomi Politik Komparatif: Demokrasi dan Pertumbuhan Benarkah Kontradiktif*. Jakarta: PT.RajaGrafindo Persada.
- [17] Jones, Sidney et al. (2015). *Sisi Gelap Demokrasi: Kekerasan Masyarakat Madani di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Pusat Studi Agama Dan Demokrasi Yayasan Paramadina
- [18] Khairazi, Fauzan. (2015). Implementasi Demokrasi dan Hak Asasi Manusia di Indonesia. *Jurnal Inovatif* 8(1), 72-94. <https://online-journal.unja.ac.id/jimih/article/view/2194>
- Kaban, Ramon. (2000). Perkembangan Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Perspektif* 5(3), 158-169. <http://jurnal-perspektif.org/index.php/perspektif/article/view/243>
- [19] Kurniawan, Dhani. (2016). Demokrasi Indonesia dalam Lintasan Sejarah Yang Nyata dan Yang Seharusnya. *Mozaik* 8(1), 94-111. <https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/mozaik/article/view/10770/8108>
- [20] Lechman, David. (1989). *Democracy and Development in Latin America*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

- [21] Madjid, Nurcholish. (1999). *Cita-cita Politik Islam Era Reformasi*. Jakarta:Paramadina.
- [22] Minogue, K.R. (1986). Thomas Hobbes dan Filsafat Absolutisme. In David Thomson, *Pemikiran-pemikiran Politik*. Jakarta: PT. Aksara Persada Indonesia.
- [23] Mouffe, Chantal. (2000). Deliberative Democracy or Agonistic Pluralism. *Politikwissenschaft, Reihe Series, Political Science*, 1–17. Retrieved from https://www.ihs.ac.at/publications/pol/pw_72.pdf
- [24] Mouffe, Chantal. (2000). *The Democratic Paradox*. London: Verso
- [25] Muntoha. (2009). Demokrasi dan Negara Hukum. *Jurnal Hukum* 3(16), 379-395. <https://doi.org/10.20885/iustum.vol16.iss3.art4>
- [27] Noer, Deliar. (1982). *Pemikiran Politik di Negeri Barat*. Jakarta: CV. Rajawali.
- [28] Nugroho, Heru. (2012). Demokrasi dan Demokratisasi: Sebuah Kerangka Konseptual Untuk Memahami Dinamika Sosial-Politik di Indonesia. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi* 1(1), 1-15. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jps.v1i1.23419>
- [29] Poell, Thomas. (2007). The Democratic Paradox. Dutch Revolutionary Struggles over Democratisation and Centralisation (1780-1813), *Ph.D diss.*, Utrecht University.
- [30] Purnaweni, Hartuti. (2004). Demokrasi Indonesia : Dari Masa Ke Masa. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 3(2), 118-131. <http://journal.unpar.ac.id/index.php/JAP/article/view/1532/1472>
- [31] Sudrajat, Ajad. (2016). Demokrasi Pancasila Dalam Persepektif Sejarah. *Mozaik* 8(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.21831/moz.v8i1.10763>
- [32] Sulaeman, Affan. (2015). Demokrasi, Partai Politik, Dan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah. *CosmoGov* 1(1), 12-24. <http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/article/view/11857/5528>
- [33] Sumodiningrat, Gunawan & Agustian, Ary Ginanjar. (2008). *Mencintai Bangsa dan Negara: Pegangan dalam Hidup Berbangsa dan Bernegara di Indonesia*. Bogor: Sarana Komunikasi Utama.
- [34] Susanti, Martien Herna. (2017). Dinasti Politik dalam Pilkada di Indonesia. *Journal of Government and Civil Society* 1(2), 111-119. <http://jurnal.umt.ac.id/index.php/jgs/article/view/440/656>.
- [35] Suseno, Franz Magnis. (1987). *Etika Politik*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- [36] Triono. (2017). Menakar Efektivitas Pemilu Serentak 2019. *Jurnal Wacana Politik* 2(2), 156-164. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jwp.v2i2.14205>
- [37] Zega, Oikurnia Adler Ainer. (2015). Konsep Negara Hukum, Demokrasi dan Konstitusi Perspektif Ham di Indonesia. *Lex Administratum* 3(4), 48-56. <https://ejournal.unsrat.ac.id/index.php/administratum/article/view/8679/8243>
- [38] Wijaya, Daya Negri. (2016). Jean-Jaques Rousseau dalam Demokrasi. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review* 1(1), 14-29. <https://journal.unnes.ac.id/nju/index.php/jpi/article/view/9075/5996>

Welhendri Azwar, et. al. "Political Dynasty in Badunsanak Regional Election in West Sumatra, Indonesia." *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Invention (IJHSSI)*, vol. 10(05), 2021, pp 36-42. Journal DOI- 10.35629/7722