

DEMOCRACY AND AUTONOMY TRANSFORMATION IN THE GOVERNANCE OF MENGWI VILLAGE, PROVINCE BALI INDONESIA IN THE TRANSITION ERA

I Wayan Gede Suacana¹, Diah Rukmawati², I Nyoman Wiratmaja³

¹Lecture of Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Warmadewa University, Denpasar-Bali, ²Head of Government Department, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Warmadewa University, Denpasar-Bali, ³Doctoral Candidate Department of Cultural Studies, Udayana University, Denpasar-Bali, INDONESIA.

ABSTRACT

The problem investigated was the shift in the nation's approach to the policy of villages after the reign of New Order. In this era, the policy of democratization and decentralization appeared till the village level. However, the policy was not totally implemented in the villages. The aims of this study are: to describe democracy transformation in the village governance in the transition era, to clarify autonomy transformation in the village governance in the transition era, and to analyze the implication and the sense of democracy and autonomy transformation to the development of village governance.

This study was conducted employing qualitative method. In the first stage, the primary and secondary data were collected. In the second stage, the theory applied for examining the data was chosen, and in the third stage, the collected and classified data were analyzed and interpreted. In the fourth stage the results of the study were reported and constructed.

The results of the study showed that; first, the village democracy in the first transition era (1998-1999) was mostly still uniform, and there were not many choices in the implementation of the village democracy. Second, in the second transition era (2000-2004) the role of the village representatives became so democratic accompanied by the extended village autonomy. Third, in the third transition era (2005-2015) democracy became retransformed to the procedural pattern accompanied by the strengthening of supra village government power decreasing the autonomy of the villages. Fourth, democracy and autonomy transformation contributed to the demand for the strengthening of democracy institutions, better community participation and more accountable public services, transparency and responsiveness to what was needed by the people. Fifth, democracy and village autonomy transformation, in addition to having the sense of involving the active participation of the society in the village governance.

Keywords: Democracy and autonomy, supra-village power relation, dynamic of village governance

INTRODUCTION

Decentralization of power under regional autonomy extension has set a beginning to the process of democratization and to the era of transition in Indonesia. Along with that has happened an increase in the participation of the people in the making and implementation of regional policies (Karim, 2003; Said, 2005). And then the decentralization and regional autonomy have been used as a means of empowering the people by which they become politically autonomous people and economically independent people. Regional autonomy becomes the stepping point for the local regions to establish their authorities by which they encourage social independence down to the village level (Antlov, 2003) as well as

democratization in the village governance under the principles of transparency, accountability, and participatory community (Dwipayana and Eko, 2003).

However, the fact shows that the implementation of regional autonomy has not reached any significant progress, and indeed it shows confusion in the implementation of regional governance. This is clear from the ever increasing corruption in the the local regions, the uneffective services made available and from various demands over autonomous rights by various regions (Hadiz, 1999). Even as socio-political entities the villages which have been born prior to the birth of the nation state have found their position to be burdensome in terms to the system of power relations under various supra-village powers (Khairnur, 2007; Darmawan, 2007).

The implementation of democracy and autonomy more extensive at the village level has been faced with a number of such barriers as potential inter-ethnic conflicts due to the heterogeneity of the village population, the decrease in the quality and quantity of the available manpower in the village, and the tendency to maximize the claim of rights under the authority made possible by the concept of autonomy (Irawan, 2003: 67-68).

Moreover, in reality there still exist two opposing viewpoints in relation to the implementation of democracy and autonomy in the village governance. First, whatever the problem is, a village as the basis for the lowest-level community unit preserves with it various potential local geniuses that should be revitalized. Second, (in the past) the village exercised 'genuine autonomy' and good practice of democracy. The villages in Bali, particularly the traditional customary 'adat'/'pekraman' villages, are frequently perceived as non-formal institutions relatively democratic and autonomous so that they are truly 'independent' from other powers external to them (Karim, 2003); Parimartha, 2003). In fact, along with the development of politics, the traditional 'adat'/'pakraman' customary villages have faced various problems. Internally, the traditional 'adat'/'pakraman' customary villages are being involved in the process of democratization, administration, and financial management. At the same time external challenges are also growing along with the implementation of decentralization and regional autonomy.

The problems being faced by the two types of villages, namely by administrative villages and traditional 'adat'/'pakraman' customary villages are varied enough. The condition in the traditional 'adat'/'pakraman' villages in Bali until the coming of the transition era is still not conducive due to the problem of resources and being under the shadow of the administrative villages. However, a number of traditional 'adat'/'pakraman' villages, such as the village of Mengwi, for example, with its elites and members, indeed shows bigger role than that of the administrative villages despite the latter's status as the extension of the governance at the administrative village level (Rukmawati, 1999). This fairly unique condition has been thought of as contributing to the process the transformation of democracy and autonomy in the government of the administrative village of Mengwi under the relative dominance of the co-existing 'adat' customary village.

The existence of a village as the state's lowest formal institution seems to have shown a lot of improvement of both its internal and its external conditions. However, the policies in terms of the process of democratization for the transformation of democracy at the village level and of the decentralization process leading to village autonomy have not been fully realized. The existence of the gap between the reality (*das sein*), that is, the problem of duality at the village level, and the expectation (*das sollen*) that there would be established a solid administrative system in the village (Dwipayana et al., 2003; Eko, 2005; Bebbingto et al., 2004) has stimulated the implementation of this research. The specific problem under study is the transformation of democracy and autonomy in the administrative village of Mengwi

taking place during the era of transition, namely the era following the downfall of the New Order regime (1998-2015).

The village of Mengwi alone is a representative of the village in a plain region in Bali which shares the same unit of territory with the 'Adat' customary village of Mengwi. The duality in the village governance persists until now. The existence of the administrative village become unique due to this duality system, characterized by the interaction between its main administrative function and its function in relation to the 'adat' customary village. Besides, this village is the site of the former Mengwi Kingdom (dynasty) established at the beginning of the 18th century and lasting until about 1770 (Nordholt, 2006). As a village which used to be the site of a kingdom, Mengwi and its people, according to Nordholt, have been accustomed to a democratic tradition in running their village governance since its establishment.

Now with the democratization and decentralization policies to be implemented down to the village level (Antlov, 2003) in a condition in which changes are taking place in the central-regional power relation, it becomes quite interesting to conduct a research on the problem of transformation of democracy and autonomy in the village governance in the transition era.

CONTEXT AND REVIEW OF LITERATURE

By following Plano et al. (1989: 266) and Glaser and Straus (Moleong, 1991: 37-38) this research will adopt theories under the following classification: 1) General or comprehensive theory, namely theory which is conceptually constructed in the area of disciplinary inquiry (axiology) with very vast and holistic scope; 2) Middle-range theory, namely theories adopted as parts of the general/comprehensive theories but not yet substantive and empirical in characteristic; 3) Lower-level or substantive theories, namely theories developed for the need the lower-level, substantive or empirical theories in the inquiry (axiology) in the domain of certain discipline (Moleong, 1991:37-38).

The general/comprehensive theory adopted in this research is the theory of democracy (Held), which includes middle-range theory, namely theory of political democracy (Dahl), which consists of three lower-level or substantive theories, namely theory of substantive democracy (Powell), theory of decentralization (Maddick and Smith) and theory of political culture (Almond and Verba).

The general/comprehensive theory (Held) pertaining to democracy, and Middle-range theories (Dahl) concerning political democracy are used in giving explanation to the three problems under concern in this research.

The theory of substantive democracy (Powell) seriously stresses the substantial values, of which inside is found the agenda for the prosperity of people's agenda. It is those values or such democratic substance that serves as the goal or as ideal things to be manifested through the procedural democracy. Therefore, in this context democracy functions as a method or tool, in which inside it is found the substance of the goal of the democracy alone. This theory is used to discuss the first problem in this research in order to give an explanation about the transformation of democracy in the village governance, no matter whether still substantive, procedural, or still limited/minimal in characteristic.

The theory of decentralization (Maddick and Smith) is used to analyze the second problem of this research for at least three reasons. First, is the signification of decentralization is based only on the concept of deconcentration, it is not sufficient then to catch the meaning of autonomy transformation in tact. Secondly, the concepts of political decentralization (devolution) and deconcentration each have their superior values which are mutually

complementing. Devolution opens the opportunity for democratization, political stability and development of local and village communities very suitable with the spirit of the governance. Deconcentration helps in keeping guard to the national integrity, the minimum standard of national services, and the supply of minimum infrastructure needed by the people for activities and self-development nationally. Third, the adoption of the theory of decentralization (politics/devolution and administrative) is considered capable of explaining the transformation of village autonomy which to date is still adopting the dualistic system, namely that of the administrative village in conjunction with that of the 'adat'/'pekraman' customary village.

The theory of cultural politics (Almond and Verba) is used to help explain the third problem of this research, namely to find the answer to the question as to the implication and meaningfulness of the transformation of democracy and autonomy for the development of village governance .

Some of the theories are used together and in complementing one another, which is known more popularly as eclectic approach. This approach tends to do the analysis from various patterns of thought or method rather than concentrating on a single 'correct' pattern. This eclectic approach is capable of integrating historical institutional approach with the methods of behavioral perspective (Plano, et al., 1989: 67-68). This is in line with the suggestion made by Sanderson (1995:619) that expects the adoption of eclectic approach by combining various theories for achieving an explanation more inclusive and holistic.

There are several prior researches related to the topic of this research. Agus Dwiyanto (2002) in his research concerning *Reformation of the Government System and Regional Autonomy* tries to study the government system and the decentralization in 20 provinces in Indonesia and in 150 regencies and municipalities by adopting random sampling. The study on 20 initiatives taken by civil people as learning resource for establishing an governance in Indonesia is conducted by Hetifah Sj Sumarto (2003) with a research under the topic *Inovation, Participation and Good Governance*, which is successful in revealing various crucial issues behind the ideas concerning good governance . The result of the research conducted by Wairocana (2005) concerning *Good Governance and its Implementation in the Running of Regional Government in Bali* is focused on regional legislation and regulation and he enforcement of laws against offences besides studying the behavior of regional government agents in providing public services. By adopting cultural studies perspective Wardhana (2006) in his dissertation *The Relation between Provincial and Regency Government in the Era of Regional Autonomy* describes various problems in the management of regional governance.

A study on the transition of democracy is conducted by Uhlin(2005) under the topic *Democracy and Diffusion: Transnational Lesson-Drawing among Indonesian Pro-Democracy Actors*. According to him the transition era is frequently related to various important changes in the democratization processa in Indonesia in the post reformation era of 1998. The problems accruing during the transition era becomes the main concern of Nordholt and Abdullah (2002) with research result under the topic *Indonesia in Search of Transition*. Afan Gaffar (2004) with his work *Indonesian Politics: Transition toward Democracy* sees democracy and civil people as two inseparable agents. Hiariej (ed.), 2004, in *Transitional Politics after Soeharto* reveals that the transition toward democracy is only a part of a big political project toward Indonesian democracy. Transitional democracy, as mentioned by Philpott (2003) in *Collapsing Indonesia: Postcolonial Politics and Authoritarianism*, is more a form of social construction. Inspired by Foucaultian ideas he finds that such a construction

is based on elite, historical, oriental Indonesian discourses and political studies captured within realistic and spatial reasoning.

In relation to regional autonomy, M. Mas'ud Said's research (2005) *New Direction of Regional Autonomy in Indonesia* presents a very good description. And a study on village democracy and autonomy is conducted by Antlov (1995) concerning *Exemplary Center, Administrative Periphery, Rural Leadership and the New Order in Java* which explains about the transition of power in the 1965s era by presenting new patterns of leadership and power down to the corners of the villages. Pratikno and Erawan (2006) in their empirical study pay attention to such things as implied in the research *Informal Institutions, State and Public Action in nAsia*. Hans Antlov (2003) has published his research result under the title *Village Government and Rural Development in Indonesia: The New Democratic Framework*. Babbington, Darmawan, Fahmi and Gugenheim (2004) have conducted a research under the topic *Village Politics, Culture and Community-driven Development: Insights from Indonesia* which pays attention to various forms of culture which exercise influence upon the implementation of the governance in the villages in Indonesia, particularly in the villages in Central Java and Jambi provinces.

A study on the local politics and the village governance is conducted by Kagami Haruya (2005) under the topic *Regional Autonomy in Process: A Case Study in Bali 2001-2003* with the focus on the result of the implementation of the decentralization system in the local regional system of government at the provincial, regency and village levels. Similar study, especially one conducted after the Bali Bomb blast is done by Pedersen (2007) in his research under the topic *Responding to Decentralization in the Aftermath of the Bali Bombing*; Reuter (2005) in the book *Custodians of the Sacred Mountains: Culture and People in the Mountainous Area in Bali*; Nordholt with his study *The Spell of Power: The Political History of Bali 1650-1940* (2006) reveals much about the history of Mengwi kingdom. Carol Warren (1993) conducts a research *Adat and Dinas: Balinese Communities in the Indonesian State* seeing the duality characteristic of villages, and Diah Rukmawati (1999) conducts a research on *Dynamics of the Elites of Adat and Dinas Villages in the Village of Mengwi*, which is concerned with the dynamics of the relation between the elites of the 'adat' customary village and those of the administrative village in Mengwi.

Various prior studies and researches are of much help and relevance in understanding and comparing the problems under study. Nevertheless, none, with the exception of Wardhana's dissertation (2006) has adopted an analysis using cultural studies approach or paradigm. This research is a new and original study which is different in principle from some of those previous studies. The difference is not only in terms of ontology (namely, focus of attention, research subject/object), epistemology (concept, theory, approach, model and method), but also in terms of axiology (aim and benefit of research).

METHOD

Research Location

The location of this research is the administrative village of Mengwi, district of Mengwi, Badung Regency, Bali Province. The choice of this village is based on some considerations. First, this village represents the type located on plain area in which the two types of villages, namely administrative village and 'adat' traditional village are conflated (therefore, of dualistic characteristic). Second, the Kingdom of Mengwi dynasty which was established at the beginning of the 18th century and lasted until about 1770 used to be located in this area (Nordholt, 2006) so that this village has become accustomed to handling administration. Third, this village is unique in its governance due to the presence of informal institution in

the form of a quite prominent 'adat' traditional village (Rukmawati, 1999). In running its routines the traditional 'adat' village of Mengwi relies on the income derived from the local market, the village banking institution and from 126 shops/ stalls/kiosks. Fourth, the role of Mengwi kingdom cannot be neglected in the political constellation in Badung regency in the past (Nordholt, 2006) which to a degree would characterize its present governance .

Data Source and Type

Most of the data in this research is qualitative data, while the rest is quantitative data. The qualitative data is in the form of expressions and explanation provided by a number of local key informants, which are in the forms of description, narration, and ideas. Besides, the qualitative data is also in the form of photographs and written sources (books, articles, journals, and other scientific works, archives and formal documents) which have direct as well as indirect bearing to the problems under study. With all these data it is expected this research will be able to describe the transformation of democracy and autonomy with their accompanying implication and meaningfulness to the development of village governance .

The data source of this research include that of the primary and secondary data. The source of primary data is in the forms of accurate words, activities, and documents such as the meeting agenda of the village representative body and the result of such meeting, decisions of the village head, and village regulation. The source of the secondary data is obtained from oral or written explanation of the second level. This data source is processed and obtained through both literature study (library research) and the study of previous research results already documented.

Research Instrument

Besides the researcher alone as the main instrument in this research, a unstructured depth interview guide in the form of open questions is also designed, which will make it possible for every question to be developed into more and more specific question. Besides, the instrument is also completed with a recorder and digital camera and a field note and a brief book for recording what is seen, heard, experienced and thought of during the process of data collection. Besides those instruments, a set of computer, calculator and other stationary supplies. The completeness of the research instruments is intended for minimizing the potential errors such as the confusion, emptiness and distortion of information.

Technique of Determining Informant

The determination of the informant is first done purposively by appointing a number of candidates, that is, by getting those who are carefully selected so that they are relevant to the research design (Mantra, 2004:121). The selection of informant is based on snowball system, that is, with the respondent already selected then follow-your-nose system is done, namely sensitizing the sense of smell as to who next can provide information to complement research result already done. In this way the number of informants would keep increasing, which is allowed until the required number is reached. The hunt will be stopped if the data collected is already enough, which in that case means that the process has arrived at the level of redundancy of information. So, there is no limitation to the number of research informants needed.

Technique of Data Collection

Based on the types and sources of the data to be obtained, the technique of data collection is of both interactive and non-interactive types. The interactive technique is in the form of observation and deep interview, while the non-interactive technique is in the form of document utilization.

Data Analysis

Data analysis consists of three inseparable and integral main activities, namely data presentation, data reduction, and the drawing of conclusion/verification. In this research data presentation is based on similarity, difference, relatedness, categories, main themes, concepts, ideas, and logical analysis of initial result as well as weakness or gap in the data. After the presentation, the data is then described by making categories which place behavior toward the occurring process by organizing the data around the topic or main question (Cassel and Symon, 1994:220). This step is that of data reduction, namely the choosing, the focusing of attention on the simplification, the abstraction and transformation of raw data obtained from the field.

In the next phase the data is summarized through choosing main things with the focus on important aspects by determining the theme and the pattern, which all will help in assigning codes to certain aspects. As a form of analysis data reduction also sharpens, classifies, leads, and discards the parts not needed and organizes the data in such a way that the final conclusion can be drawn and verified. Therefore, the reduced data will give a sharper picture about the result of the observation already done. All those steps will simplify all of the field data collected so that its presentation can be made more systematic for further processing, interpreting, and use.

FINDINGS

The findings that can be presented here are as follows: First, there is a transformation from normative democracy which is authoritarian-leviathan in the first era of transformation into substantive democracy which is libertarian-liliput in characteristic in the second era of transformation. This condition is followed by the minimizing of the domination of village democracy which later on is counterbalanced by the role of the Village Representative Body (BPD-1) and other villages informal institutions such as ‘adat banjar’, ‘adat’ village and ‘sekeha taruna’ youth organization. The proportion of roles between various institutions in the second transition era becomes part of the social capital within which have developed various authentic participative values.

Second, the substantive democracy which is libertarian-liliput in character in the second transition era tends to transform itself back into procedural democracy in the third transition era. The existence of the Village Representative Body (BPD-1) is replaced by The Village Deliberative Body (BPD-2) as a new legislative body in the village. The role of protecting the traditional norms, of establishing village regulation together with the village head, of accommodating and communicating people’s aspiration, and of controlling the implementation of the village governance are indeed still heldbut with no right to ask for the responsibility of the village head.

Third, there has happened a transformation of autonomy from the first transition era which is centralistic-homogeneous in character into decentralistic-heterogeneous autonomy in the second transition era. Government perspective which minimizes the role of government (government as the minimal state) is adopted by minimizing government’s intervention in the life of village society. The society has a vast autonomy for managing itself because the role of the government is limited to becoming a regulator and facilitator only. There is a kind of mechanism already, a practice and procedure, in which the people manage their own resources and solve the various public problems being faced.

Fourth, the decentralistic-heterogeneous autonomy in the second transition era again undergoes a transformation into heterogeneous recentralistic autonomy in the thrd transition era. The supra-village governance takes back several autonomous rights of the village so that

it does not create a condition that can facilitate a political society in the village legislative body, civil society and economic society in the village synergizing with the village government.

Fifth, the condition of transformation of democracy and autonomy which is dynamic-fluctuative in character in that transition era much influences the development of the village governance . The governance which already develops in the second transition era becomes waning in the third transition era along with the supra-village government which to a degree, though not as strong and vast as in the first transition era, has shared in holding the progress of the transformation of the village democracy and autonomy.

DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Transformation of Democracy in the Village Governance

The transformation of democracy in the village of Mengwi taking place in the first transition era (1998-1999) is authoritarian-leviathan in characteristic. Seen from substantive democratic theory (Powel, 1982) this era seems to be still solid with its centralization nuance and homogeneity that characterize the governance of Mengwi village. Substantive democracy is not yet fully implemented because it does not accommodate the people from the grass root, including the poor, the women, the youth, the religious and ethnic minorities, in the true sense of embracing their interests in the political agenda. Through the implementation of the authoritarian-leviathan democracy there is no manifestation of the populist agenda in the true sense of the term, but what exists is only the democratic agenda or the political agenda of the hegemonic parties.

The evolution of democratic life is still characterized by uniformity, with very few choices both in the implementation of village democracy and in the legislative election at the regency, provincial and national levels. In the same way, the structure and mechanism of the governance of Mengwi village seem to have been standardized. The policy of depolitization is still implemented down to the village level as exemplified by the creation of floating mass needed in anticipating the socio-political impact of the society whose levels of fragmentation and polarization are still high.

The gap that obstructs the harmony in the central-regional/village relation is too wide. The transpolitical approach which needs the crossing and symbiosis between political principle, method and strategy with the principle, method and strategy of other fields of activities beyond the political (Piliang, 2005: 4-5) cannot yet be realized. There is no balanced networking yet in the structure of governance whereby respect to things local could be proportionally practiced. This is due to the fact that the nuance of centralization and homogeneity in treating villages is still very strong so that there is no chance for differences to be fostered in the ways and manner village governance is implemented.

Entering the second transition era (2000-2004) which began when the Act No.22 of 1999 started to be in force concerning regional government, the practice of democracy becomes transformed into a more libertarian-liliput. The position of village heads becomes more downward oriented in accordance with political democracy (Dahl, 1971). The regents or other officers of the same level only validate (no more appointing) the village heads, who are already directly chosen by the people. The tenure of village heads is 10 years at the maximum or two times the normal tenure; however, at the regency level the tenure of the village heads is left to respective regencies to manage the term of the village head's tenure in accordance with local socio-cultural condition. So, there seems to be more flexibility and decrease in the term of the tenure of the village head than that in the previous era, when the tenure was made

a maximum of 16 years for all villages. With the decrease in the term of such tenure there is a possibility to prevent the abuse of power on the part of the village head, which was too long.

The more democratic nuance is also visible in the village legislative body, which is called village representative body (and previously village deliberation body). In this era someone can become a member of village representative body based on election, not by appointment as before. Similarly, the chairperson of the village representative body is chosen by and from among the members of the body. In the previous era the village head and village secretary are ex officio also respectively the head and secretary of the village deliberative body. The village representative body has a legislative function, controlling (nonexistent in previous era) and budgeting function. However, what makes this body's function quite strong is that it functions on behalf of the people, which makes it have the right to request the village head to deliver his accountability report, something never possessed before (Dahl, 1971). Therefore, it can be said that the village head is in a subordinate position to the village representative body.

In this era the elders of the 'adat' traditional village of Mengwi are also involved in strategic policy making and in the village representative body. For example, in the village of Mengwi the permit for investment should be under the approval of the 'adat' village, and every new comer should also be under the recommendation of both the administrative village and the 'adat' village. There seems to be a kind of parallel and coordinative relation between the two types of villages in the running of the governance of the Mengwi village. This is also made possible by the fact that the administrative village head's office and that of the 'adat' village head (called 'bendesa') are in the same location, and frequently an officer from the administrative village office is at the same time an officer at the 'adat' village office.

This condition is quite in conformity with the spirit of transpolitics (Piliang, 2005), which takes as unavoidable the relatedness and cooperation between administrative systems which are dualistic in nature ('adat' and administrative villages) in Mengwi village. Ideally, in a village where such duality is practiced there is, indeed, a willingness to put all ideas into a balanced structure in which respect to the main duties and functions of each village, 'adat' and administrative, is all intended for avoiding exclusiveness which otherwise can trigger conflicts between the two.

In the second transition era, have occurred several transformation of democracy in the governance of Mengwi village. First, there is a lot of opportunity for the village to be creative in establishing policies adjusted to the local norms, needs and aspiration of the people. Second, there is respect to plurality and 'genuine autonomy' through giving a chance for the use of other labels for the village institutions and officers: to use "keperbekelan" or administrative village, "perbekel", administrative "banjar", "kelian" head of administrative "banjar". Third, the presence of the village representative body which is quite democratic makes it possible for spreading the power at the village level from the monolithic power exclusively in the hand of the village head into power relation more oriented to people. Fourth, in terms of village financial position, both at the administrative village and the 'adat' village, there is a possibility to get support from the government at the regency level derived from a share from the taxes and regional retribution as well as a share from the compensation fund received by the regency from the central government.

The transformation of democracy in the third transition era (2005-2015) is procedural-democratic in characteristic, which began by the time the Act No.32 of 2004 concerning regional government became in force. The procedural democracy being practiced in the society cannot be set apart from the dilemmatic position as mentioned by Dahl, namely the

dilemma between autonomy (allowing freedom) and control (Pelly, 1993: 209). So, the transformation of democracy is in two way movement, to and fro, between the two poles.

For further arrangement concerning the village, three years later the central government puts into force the Government Regulations Nos. 72 and 73 of 2007 concerning village level governance. In this third transition era there is an addition of authority given to the village, namely all other administrative matters which according to law and regulation are conferred to the village. The village representative body is changed into the village deliberation body with the term of tenure of 6 years with a possible second tenure through election. So, the maximum tenure is 12 years, two years longer than before. The relation between the village head and the village deliberation body is again left to the supra-village governance to manage. In reality the relation that is established is only in terms of coordination so that the village head and the village deliberation body are equal. In the previous era, the second transition era, the village head should be responsible to the people through the village representative body and must deliver the report of his activities to the regent.

There seems to be a bit of decrease in the people's right through the Village Deliberation Body (BPD-2) in practicing democracy, particularly because of the obligation of the village to respect the procedure taken in delivering responsibility to the regent or the mayor through the district head – in addition to that through the Village Deliberation Body (BPD-2) - which is quite risky of making the village head to be more loyal to the supra-village authority than to the people who have chosen him. The possibility is also open for the village head to be employed as political tool by the regent/mayor. This is especially true for the position of village secretary which is generally assumed by a civil employee, which contains a great opportunity to be involved in the political machine of the supra-village authority (regent/mayor), which in that way can also deprive the village of its sovereignty though of course can also of positive value to the professionalism of staff in providing service.

It is clear that when entering the third transition era there has occurred transformation of value from liberal democracy practiced before to the tendency to adopt a model which is procedural in characteristic. One of the parameters very clearly seen in Mengwi is the institutional system and democratic process which have been changed through the establishment of the new institution, the Village Deliberative Body (BPD-2), whose authority is much weaker than the authority of the previous Village Representative Body (BPD1). Similarly, the relation between the village head (perbekel) and BPD-2 is only one of coordination, no longer of subordination as before, with the village head (perbekel) being the subordinate, making therefore the bargaining position of BPD-2 no longer like that in the previous era to the village head (perbekel).

The limited transformation in the third transition era which leads to the establishment of procedural democracy is a measure taken for hindering a very big increase in political participation which otherwise can cause a political condition far from being democratic. By using Powell's theory of substantive democracy (1982) it can be explained that the increase in political participation should, indeed, be followed by effective institutionalization of politics. A democratic system of course does not require only the participation of all the people any time, but more than that such democratic system should be so designed that it becomes open and transparent which makes it possible for an effective interactive process to take place between the people and the government. In this context, despite its more limited function and authority than those of BPD-1, the representative system which manifested in BPD-2 is still quite determinant in developing the village governance ayatem.

Transformation of Autonomy in the Village Governance

In the first transition era (1998-1999) the village autonomy is still homogeneous centralistic in characteristic, oriented more to the state. This era is the lowest point in the power of the New Order regime which coincides with the fact that the Act No. 5 of 1974 concerning Regional Government and the Act No. 5 of 1979 concerning Village Governance by which the format of the village governance all over Indonesia is to be made a uniformity. The government structure and components at the lowest level within the state seem to have still exercised hegemony over the informal institution as experienced by the 'adat' village and 'banjar' in Mengwi. There have been some changes to the genuine profile and meaning of the village due to the uniformity of several concepts and labels nationally made in force. For example, the name 'banjar' in Mengwi is changed into 'dusun', 'bale banjar' into 'bale dusun', 'perbekel' into 'kepala desa'.

Similarly, the designation of the village head as the single authority in the village causes the role and function of the 'adat' (original) village to be overlapping with those of the administrative village. Though different from the condition of villages in general in Bali in which the administrative villages dominate over 'adat' villages, the administrative village of Mengwi can still play a central role, particularly in matters related to tradition and religion. In a temple festival, for instance, the head of the administrative village is involved as a steering committee. Likewise, in the ceremony of 'mendem pedagingan' the process of laying down the 'pedagingan' (some kinds of precious metals and jewelry) is done by government officials such as the 'Camat' district head, the Regent, or even the Governor) depending on the level of the ceremony. Donation from government officials called 'dana punia' has become a tradition until now by which the donors, the 'Camat', the Regent or the Governor become invited to the ceremony. All those practices signal that there is an overlap between the role of the 'adat' village and that of the administrative village or the taking over of the role of the 'adat' village by the administrative village, which actually does not make part of its main function.

By using the post structural approach (Foucault) can be seen the autonomy system being adopted which is quite hierarchical and centralistic in characteristic. The central government determines all the policies concerning the governance and autonomy of the villages. The regional autonomy is so made that it is of two levels, namely that at the level of the province and that at the level of regency. In relation to the autonomy of the village, the Regency of Badung becomes the direct superior of Mengwi village because the District of Mengwi is only an administrative unit under the Badung Regency. The village of Mengwi still shows a form dominated by a hierarchical structure so that it is difficult to get it out of the system previously determined by the central government. It is from such a difficult condition is born the sense of discretion and pluralism in the structure and culture of village government.

Entering the second transition era (2000-2004) there occurs a quite principal transformation of values not only in terms of democratization but also, and more importantly, in terms of greater autonomy in making village policies since the Act No.22 of 1999 becomes in force (Antlov, 2003:197). It can be said that there has begun a deconstruction to the meaning of village autonomy which is centralistic-homogeneous both structurally and functionally due to the provision of greater autonomy down to the village level. Previously, the service sector is deconcentrated to the village, while the strategic decision making pertaining to the village remains concentrated in Jakarta. This condition allows greater development of the village potential because done under the village's own policy with minimum intervention of the parties in higher authority. It means that there is ample opportunity for handling the duties and matters pertaining to village governance.

Transformation of power has happened through its division into executive (represented by the 'perbekel' and staff) and legislative (represented by BPD-1) replacing the previously existing bodies, namely Village Deliberative Body (LMD) and Village Community Endurance Institution (LKMD). There seems to have been an effort toward developing village governance based on varieties, participation, genuine autonomy, democratization and community empowerment. However, in relation to the idea of reestablishing the role and function of the autonomous Balinese traditional villages the regional government of Bali considers it necessary to formulate a concept for establishing the accommodating institution (Parimatha, 2003:26). For that purpose has been established the regional regulation (Perda) of 2001 concerning 'Pekraman' village, which has been renewed, though not substantially, with Perda No.3 of 2003 concerning the change to Perda of Bali Province No.3 of 2001 concerning the 'Pekraman' village as a substitute for the previous Perda concerning 'Adat' village.

And moreover, in the new Perda appears a viewpoint that the term 'desa adat' is of colonial origin and therefore needs replacing. The term 'pekraman' (derived from 'karaman') is considered suitable as a name for the Balinese traditional village institution. But in reality the people of Mengwi village remain to adopt the term 'desa adat' until now, not yet replacing it with the label 'desa pekraman' as required by the last Perda. The reason, according to the head of the administrative village of Mengwi, is only that of practicality, that is, the term 'desa adat' is so familiar already and easy to say. In short, the people have become united with the term so that it is hard to replace it with the term 'desa pekraman'.

By using the post structural approach proposed by Foucault (2002:13) it could also be understood that the people of the village of Mengwi have started to create a new 'paradigm' by deconstructing all forms of domination in adopting terms, followed up with putting those forms beyond the predetermined center, of which the result is the birth of pluralism. It is visible from post structural perspective that the people of Mengwi village are actually not anti-change nor anti structure, but they just revitalize the forgotten matters of the reformation era, namely matters pertaining to the reestablishment of democratic life and to the glorification of multiculturalism.

The principle of autonomy transformation in the third transition era (2005-2015) is Heterogeneity-recentralistic which begins when the Act No.32 of 2004 concerning regional government and government regulation PP No.72 of 2007 concerning villages become in force. In this third transition era an increase is really visible in the authority given to the village, namely authority in handling other government matters which by law and regulation are conferred to the villages. Similarly, the duality in the governance of the village is quite visible in the coexistence of the two types of villages, administrative and 'adat' villages, each with its main duties and function. Sociologically, the community elders and the village head 'perbekel' accept the coexistence of the two villages as a couple (husband and wife), which by nature are to live together.

The strict state's control over the village can also be seen in the process of formation, elimination, combination, arrangement of village administrative equipments, village budget, and village development. All these are handled by the regency/municipality established under Perda with reference to the guideline established by the government. This mechanism in the village of Mengwi, or in Bali generally, has been effective since the second transition era. Even in the process of formation of new 'adat'/'pekraman' villages by splitting old one it should be done under the decree from the regent/mayor. It is not enough only by a register in the regency/municipality. This hierarchical confusion is at once indicative of unclear

structural relation between administrative village and 'adat' village in Bali, so that the 'adat' village with its genuine autonomy is potential to be intervened by the regent/mayor.

The dynamics of the elite circulation in the 'adat' village also has entered a unique development through the occurrence of very principal change and transformation (Rukmawati, 1997:124). Previously it is difficult to get candidates for holding leadership ('prajuru') in the 'adat' village. However, in mid 1990s there occurs a tendency in which the people are quite enthusiastic to hold such leadership because of the attractiveness of its power, authority, and budget. Meanwhile, the 'Perbekel' village head of Mengwi finds the village autonomy decreasing because parts of his duties and function seem not to run well unless they get a green light or approval from holder of leadership {'prajuru'} of 'adat' village.

In the third transition era, the tendency for recentralization is getting more and more visible while the consciousness on the part of the village elites has not yet occurred about the fact the role and function that they assume can bring a big impact on the life of the village. The psychological conflict that happens between the elites of the administrative village and those of the 'adat' village still persists, which will only cause a barrier to the establishment of positive and mutually strengthening relation between the two systems in the village. By adopting post structural approach it can be understood that the autonomy transformation occurring in the third transition era, particularly that pertaining to central-regional government relation system in relation to the (informal and formal) village government institution is heterogeneous-recentralistic in character. Although varieties and plurality of the village are admitted, a number of rights and authority of the village legislative institution have, however, been taken over. While through adopting the theory of political democracy as proposed by Dahl (1971) it becomes known that the government's responsiveness to the people's preference (in BPD-2) becomes decreased, no longer equal politically as occurring in the second transition era, being subordinated under the function and position of the 'perbekel' administrative village head.

Implication and Meaning of Autonomy Transformation

There are some implications of the transformation of democracy and autonomy in the development of the governance of the village including, among others the following: the change in the term of the 'perbekel' village head's tenure; a shift in the relation pattern between administrative village and 'adat' village; revitalized primordialism; mediation in the village conflict management, consolidation of village democracy; establishment of consociational democracy; and a move from autonomy into heteronomy in the village. As for the meaning of the transformation of democracy and autonomy, several meanings can be mentioned such as the following:

First, Strengthening of Civil Society. The development of democracy and autonomy in Mengwi village which starts during the second transition era brings about the decrease in the role of governance which used to be quite dominant before. The institutionalized presence of civil society through political parties, youth organization, Society Empowerment Institution (LPM), Empowerment of Women for Family Prosperity (PKK), which are all ready to articulate the aspiration and interest of the rural society in this era serves as a kind of counter force to the state hegemony of the first transition era. This condition at once replaces the state approach in managing the village, a change from what is previously very homogeneous-centralistic into what is heterogeneous-decentralistic with subsequent change of attention from state to civil society in the village. The civil society in Mengwi village has assumed several important functions: 1) a complementary element, in which the civil society assume an activity for establishing prosperity by supporting the task intended for complementing the

role of the state through the village as servant to the public (public services); The existence of Youth organization ('Sekeha Teruna', 'Karang Taruna', LPM and PKK) in Mengwi village is nothing to be doubted any longer in relation to the implementation of various development programs in the village, both those planned by the 'adat' village and those by the administrative village. Similarly, the teachers groups and other important 'adat' leading groups frequently serve as motivators in the implementation of the government policies and village development; 2) as substitutor. The Civil society represented by the 'adat' leading people in the village of Mengwi have also done a number of activities not yet assumed by the administrative village in its function as public servant. For funding various village activities, particularly the activities of the 'adat' village, they are already ready with some economic institutions which have now become established. Among these economic institutions is the 'adat' traditional market fully supported by the village banking institution (LPD). The others include tourist attraction center and the contract or leasing of kiosks and pieces of land around the traditional market and around the area of the temple Taman Ayun. At present the 'adat' village of Mengwi possesses 1 area of traditional market, one unit of 'adat' banking institution (LPD), and 126 kiosks, all for generating income needed for funding the various 'adat' activities. With those more than enough sources of income, the role and function of civil society in Mengwi village become fully supported; 3) as a counterbalancing and countervailing forces to the state. In the context of the running of daily governance and of the development of the village, the BPD-1 and BPD-2 of Mengwi village as part of existing political society have their normative roles as controlling agents to the governance of the village. However, in the context of government partnership seems to be more relevant than the confrontative approach, the former being potential for establishing parallel and harmonious relation between the village governance and BPD-1 or BPD-2 without necessarily decreasing control of both. Moreover, as a deliberation body BPD-1 or BPD-2 is expected to be able to establish legitimacy and accountability in front of the public by maximizing its articulating, legislating, and controlling roles.

Second, Development of Governance in the village. The meaningfulness of the development of village governance as the result of the transformation of village democracy and autonomy is visible in some phenomena such as the following: 1) the minimizing of the domination of village bureaucrat which is later on balanced by the roles of various village informal institutions such as 'banjar adat', 'adat' village, 'sekeha teruna' youth organization, 'pemangku' priest forum. This counterbalancing of role is a kind of social capital, inside which develop authentic values of participation. Meanwhile, the tendency for the dominance of the role of the 'adat' village is until now the consequence, on the one hand, of the strengthening of the civil society, but seems, on the other hand, to be still in need of efforts to establish equality and harmony in the dual relation toward developing good governance ; 2) the spirit for adaptation to the extended democracy and autonomy is high enough in the second and third transition eras. This can be understood from the presence of the Village Representative Body (BPD-1) which later on becomes Village Deliberative Body (BPD-2) as the Village Legislative Body which has maximally assumed its role in protecting the tradition and norms, of establishing village regulation together with the village head, of accommodating and communicating people's aspiration, as well as of supervising the village governance. Only that when the nuance of recentralization occurs again in the third transition era the right of BPD-2 to ask for the village head's report of accountability becomes a bit decreased than in the previous era; 3) with the transformation of the village democracy and autonomy especially during the second transition era the spirit of the people's participation is given priority. This situation is marked by the process of politics, governance and development in the village which is no longer within the frame of the central government's policy and command (top-down), but based on village people's participation (bottom-up).

The supra-village government starting from the second transition era cannot any longer design and implement development project in the village instructively without directly paying attention to the aspiration of the people. Therefore, the implementation of governance at and from the grassroots level can already become a reality. Therefore, the transformation of village democracy and autonomy is quite beneficial to the transformation of village governance because with this has happened change in the structure, in the process/mechanism and various goals which affect the distribution and use of power of the village governance over the village community. The meaningfulness of the development of the village governance is also visible in the management of various available resources and in the capacity to solve various public problems, which can guarantee that there is no distortion of the aspiration of the village community as well as the abuse of power.

Third, Development of Cultural Studies. The occurrence of democracy and autonomy transformation in the village governance is also quite meaningful to the development of Cultural Studies. The transpolitical and post structural approach in cultural studies can be used as an analytical tool, the application of which is tried in this research. Through the transpolitical approach it could be learned that the interaction between the 'adat' and administrative villages can be a cross and mutual one in the implementation of democracy and autonomy in the village. This condition can form because of the flexibility in the boundary that make up the segmentation of the society in Mengwi village based on their entities, which is among others into social segmentation (status, social class, social group); administrative segmentation (administrative and 'adat'); as well as phenomenological segmentation (social reality, political reality, cultural reality). The looseness in the boundaries of those segmentations is followed by the acceptance of the principle of pluralism. According to Rao (2003:51), a state is a monism which in its application is pluralistic in nature. It means that in the context of Mengwi village center of government still exists, not monolithic but pluralistic, represented by that of the administrative village and that of the 'adat' village. The life of the society could be the ideal one if the two types of government keep accommodating and allowing freedom to the development of all forms of pluralism of the society. Through the approach of post structuralism as proposed by Foucault (2002:13) it can be seen that this is a reaction against structuralism which causes uniformity in the first transition era, a reaction that wants to deconstruct every claim of the hierarchy, centrality, homogeneity, and validity of the 'center'. The government of Mengwi Village seen from this point of view can already be considered effective enough because the government of the two types of villages can already have their legitimacy through their broad-base participation, equity and accountability. Nevertheless, there seems still to be a need for strengthening the democratic institutions, for increasing the participation of the groups marginalized in the planning and implementation of development, and of providing public services more responsive to the marginalized people. In line with the spirit of the development of cultural studies, in entering the second transition era, the village governance no longer manages its own affairs but is controlled and counterbalanced by the active, articulative and organized condition of the people. The role of BPD-1 becomes quite central in this case. It can be very clearly seen that the existence of the village governance is already with the strong support of the people. For the civil community which is already strong, there are already available financial resources in the forms of village traditional market, village banking institution (LPD), and retribution from tourism objects. Moreover, social capital has also been in their possession in form of cooperation between people of the administrative village and those of the 'adat' village, who together create networking, norms, social trust, all for facilitating further coordination and cooperation between the two villages toward common prosperity.

The conclusions that can be drawn are as follows:

1. The village democracy in the first transition era (1998-1999) is still mostly uniform, that is, there are not many choices in the implementation of village democracy. The terms, structure, function and mechanism in the running of the village governance are all standardized already. The paradigm of authoritarian political arrangement does not allow enough chance for differences to take place in the types and methods of village governance. The village autonomy is still blocked by the centralistic homogeneous pattern with hierarchical structure so that it is difficult to bring it out of the system which is already predetermined by the central government. This condition makes it difficult to arrange the village governance still adopting dualistic system.
2. In the second transition era (2000-2004) there happens a very principal transformation in the democracy through the replacement of the Village Deliberative Body (LMD) which used to be corporative in characteristic before with monolithic power in the hand of the village head by the Village Representative Body (BPD-1) which is much more democratic so that it can create more balanced power relation in conformity with the demand of reformation. This condition can increase the opportunity on the part of the village to be creative in establishing village policies adjusted to the village norms, needs and aspiration of the people. In this era there has also been transformation with wider decentralization and autonomy down to the village level. Previously, the service sector is deconcentrated to the village, while the strategic decision making concerning village matters remains concentrated in Jakarta. The transformation from centralization to power decentralization has happened through development of village governance based on pluralism, participation, genuine autonomy, democratization and people empowerment.
3. Entering the third transition era (2005-2015) village democracy is again transformed toward a procedural pattern through the change of institution and process of democracy through the establishment of new institution such as the Village deliberation Body (BPD-2) whose function is much weaker than the function of the previous BPD-1. In the implementation of village autonomy there has also happened the strengthening of state control over the village through policies concerning the village, particularly pertaining to the establishment, omission, integration, and arrangement of village apparatus, village finance, as well as village development. All these are done by the regency government apparatus established through regional regulation established in turn with reference to the central government policy.
4. The transformation of village democracy and autonomy has its implication in the demand on democratic institution strengthening, on the increase in the people's participation, provision of more transparent public services, accountable and responsive to the interest of the people. The village governance no longer runs by managing its own affairs as practiced before, but under the control and counterbalance of the civil society and politics which is active, articulate, and organized in characteristic.
5. The transformation of village democracy and autonomy has involved the active participation of the people in the village governance. The presence of the civil society through various social organizations which dare to articulate the interest of village community serves as a counter force to the state hegemony in power before. Similarly, the village parliament (particularly BPD-1) as a political community has played a main role and function as a mediating structure which translates the state power at the lowest level into a government based on law and regulation, manifesting the transformation from the rule of power into the rule of law.

REFERANCE

- [1]. Almond, Gabriel A., & Verba, S. (1984). *Budaya Politik: Tingkah Laku Politik dan Demokrasi di Lima Negara*, Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- [2]. Bennett, D. (ed), (1993). *Cultural Studies: Pluralism and Theory*, Melbourne, Melbourne: University Literary and Cultural Studies, Volume 2
- [3]. Berg, B. L. (1989). *Qualitative Research Methodes for the Social Sciences*, Boston: Indiana University of Pennsylvania.
- [4]. Cheema, S.G., & Rondinelli, D. A. eds (1988). *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, Beverly Hill USA: Sage Publication.
- [5]. Dahl, R. A.(1971). *Polyarchy: Participation and Opposition*, New Haven, Yale University.
- [6]. _____, A., (1982). *Dilemmas of Pluralist Democracy: Autonomy vs Control*, New Haven: Yale University.
- [7]. Dwipayana, A., & Eko, S. eds (2003). *Membangun Good Governance di Desa*, Yogyakarta: IRE Press.
- [8]. Eko, S., & Rozaki, A. ed. (2005). *Prakarsa Desentralisasi dan Otonomi Desa*, Yogyakarta: Penerbit IRE Press.
- [9]. Fukuyama, F. (2005). *Memperkuat Negara: Tata Pemerintahan dan Tata Dunia Abad 21*, Jakarta: Penerbit PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- [10]. Gaffar, A. (2004). *Politik Indonesia: Transisi Menuju Demokrasi*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [11]. Geriya, I. W. (2000). *Transformasi Kebudayaan Bali Memasuki Abad XXI*, Denpasar: Dinas Kebudayaan Propinsi Bali.
- [12]. Held, D. (1987). *Models of Democracy*, Cambridge: Polity Press.
- [13]. Holt, C. ed. (1972). *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press.
- [14]. Jackson, Karl D., & Pye, Lucian W. Eds. (1978). *Poltical Power and Communications in Indonesia*, Berkeley: University of California Press.
- [15]. Karim, A. G. ed. (2003). *Kompleksitas Persoalan Otonomi Daerah di Indonesia*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar dan Jurusan Ilmu Pemerintahan Fisipol UGM.
- [16]. Kautilya (Canakya), Made Astana dan CS Anomdiputro, penerjemah. (2003). *Arthashastra*, Surabaya, Penerbit Paramitha.
- [17]. Maddick (1963). *Democracy, Decentralization and Development*, Bombay: India, Asia Publishing House.
- [18]. Mawhood, P. (1983). *Local Government in The Third World*, Chicester, UK: John Wisley and Sons.
- [19]. Nordholt, H. S. (2006). *The Spell of Power: Sejarah Politik Bali 1650-1940*, Denpasar: Pustaka Larasan.
- [20]. Piliang, Y. A. (2005). *Transpolitika: Dinamika Politik di dalam Era Virtualitas*, Yogyakarta: Jalasutra.
- [21]. Powel, Jr, G. B. (1982). *Contemporary Democracies: Participation, Stability and Violence*, Cambridge: Mass., Harvad University Press.
- [22]. Ritzer, G.. (1980). *Sociology: A Multiple Paradigm Science*, Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc.
- [23]. Said, M.M. (2005). *Arah Baru Otonomi Daerah di Indonesia*, Malang: UMM Press.
- [24]. Santoso, P. dkk ed. (2003). *Pembaharuan Desa Secara Partisipatif*, Yogyakarta: Program S2 Politik Lokal dan Otonomi Daerah UGM dan Pustaka Pelajar.
- [25]. Smith, B. (1985). *Decentralization*, London UK: George Allen and Unwin

- [26]. Sorensen, G.(2003). *Demokrasi dan Demokratisasi: Proses dan Prospek dalam Sebuah Dunia yang Sedang Berubah*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- [27]. Uhlin, A. (1995). *Democracy and Diffusion: Transnational Lesson-Drawing among Indonesian Pro-Democracy Actors*, Sweden: Departement of Political Science, Lund University.
- [28]. Warren, C.(1993). *Adat and Dinas: Balinese Communities in the Indonesian State*, Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press.