

**CITIZENSHIP MODEL OF INDONESIA:  
THE CONTESTATION WITHIN WELFARE, RULE OF LAW,  
AND ITS CRISIS**

**Author:**

**Vegitya Ramadhani Putri**  
Lecturer of Sriwijaya University  
Ministry of Education and Culture  
Republic of Indonesia

The paper will presented at The 2nd *Bajo Palabra* International  
Philosophy Conference “Philosophy, Human Rights and Democracy”  
on 12 – 16 November 2012  
in Autonomus University of Madrid  
(Universidad Autonoma de Madrid - UAM)  
SPAIN

# **Citizenship Model of Indonesia: The Contestation within Welfare, Rule of Law, and Its Crisis**

Author: Vegitya Ramadhani Putri

## **Abstract**

Indonesia has unique model of citizenship, contests the liberal paradigm into the communitarian context - both of which are mutually regime of knowledge that being contested. The distinctiveness model of citizenship in Indonesia is exist in the form of contestation, and it can be labeled as oppositional citizenship model, namely: denizenship. Traces of citizenship construction in Indonesia, especially in the political arena of welfare policy in focus on energy subsidies, shows that citizenship in logic framework of lawmaker in Indonesia is strongly influenced by the agenda of liberalism. Practices of welfare policy where there is tendency to minimize the role of state toward its citizen, as well as integrates citizens to the global market. The arguments that forms the basis of price is showing the orientation of the reason of the lawmaker. At the same time, lawmakers also used arguments of communitarianism reason for subsidy allocation, as well as while they formulate solution of the energy crisis. Meanwhile, in parliamentary`s debate and public debate, seen that both paradigms that 'irreconcilable' are working together in the logic of lawmakers. Thus, models of citizenship within reason of lawmaking, which the citizenship as ongoing discursive contestation, called as denizenship : the citizenship of denied people. Afterward, discursive contestation arose questions toward Rule of Law and arguing the meaning of welfare itself.

Keywords: citizenship model, welfare policy, lawmaking

## **A. Introduction**

Situations in which the spirit of liberal living in the communitarian body is a contradiction as well as the biggest challenge of democratization in Indonesia. The government of Indonesia is essentially the government that runs by liberal ethics. It is marked by liberalization of investment, privatization of state enterprises, the delivery rate of price on supply-demand mechanism, ratified and codified norms of human rights, national and regional elections which is based on freedom of expression, and so forth. Meanwhile, Indonesian society in general social principles still hold communitarianism

nature, characterized by social cleavages based on religion, ethnicity, geographical landscape, gender, customs union, and variety of other social fragmentation. Thus, the encounter between the principle communitarianism and the principle of liberal creates most contradiction.

Amongst space of welfare issues, it appears that politics of energy are the most often creates dilemmas. Relation between state and citizens in the arena of the energy sector can be a complete picture of the configuration of citizenship in Indonesia. Government's role is regulators as well as the sole provider of energy products, and by its state-owned enterprise is the monopoly holder over the lives of citizens. Given that dependence on energy benefits are so vital, then it creates power relation between state and citizens that is top-down. Therefore, energy issues as a dynamic arena deemed appropriate for understanding the mode of citizenship in Indonesia that are struggling in an effort to respect the sustainability of democratization as a basis for comprehensive human rights. Therefore, the formulation model of citizenship in Indonesia, focus on the clash of different models of citizenship in different regime of knowledge. In this study focused more on the arena of the energy sector as a part of welfare policy, taking into account the power relations that tend nuanced patron-client where state regulators as well as the sole producer of that deal with the basic needs of citizens.

Linking theory to the context requires modeling work. The debate on citizenship rarely have a place in welfare discourse in Indonesia – and if anything, is still at the level of philosophical – and practical studies have not been touched. Models are abstracted in the arena of welfare issues, focusing energy polemic in Indonesia, is the right choice to construct the buildings in the context of existing models. To focus the discussion on models of citizenship in Indonesia, the energy sector as well as narrowed arena on major issues, namely: energy subsidies. Contextualization citizenship in the welfare arena of energy will be elaborated in order to find a model of citizenship in Indonesia. Model of citizenship is what will be one of the prototype of state and citizen relations.

## **B. The Landscape of Debate**

Contradiction is a political necessity. Contradiction occurs not only at the conceptual level, but also in the realm of contextual political praxis. Interpretation of the term politics - for example: the rights, property, participation - in different regimes of thought would imply differently. Aggregate among the least in liberal democracies is different from the state-maximal practice of socialist democracy. Normative base in the fulfillment of human rights shall be interpreted in various ways in different models of democracy. In fact, the normative basis of human rights itself is built in typical construction, namely: civil and political rights based on individual freedom that implies minimization of the role of the state, while the economic, social, cultural rights oriented to the optimization of the state's role in meeting these basic rights.

The interpretation of the 'minimal state' and 'maximal state' in democratic regime is not always linear. The conception of minimal-state implies the minimal role of the state in the lives of citizens, because of state intervention potentially arbitrary (such: abuses of power) on people's lives. In contrast, the concept of maximal-state is maximal role of the state as an institution that has legitimacy as well as responsibilities in meeting the basic needs of society. The second viewpoint of this approach toward power relations is determine how to interpret the relationship between its citizens. For example, who is responsible for the fulfillment of socioeconomic security? Social democracy would interpret the term as part of the responsibility of the state is imperative, but liberal democracy would view that compliance with security of socioeconomic not only by state actors, but rather from other actors, such market. Then, state's role as a voluntarist. Rezimental interpretations are crucial issue. Especially, when products of socioeconomic security is affecting the livelihood of the community, such as energy, food, health, education, and so on. Complexity is inevitable, while at the level of the political character of liberal democracy with its minimalist, yet at the same time, the provider of socioeconomic security products are singular: the state. Indonesia is in this contradiction.

In order toward the deductive analysis and inductive analysis can be explicitly, the need for specifications and scope of the study arena. Each test requires a conceptual arena. This debate puts energy politics – as a part of welfare issue – is significant arena in

configurations about the state-citizen relationship. Selection of energy politics as an arena based on the following considerations: first, the dependence of the energy issues aggregated by any direction of welfare policy with all systemic effects. Second, the state as determinant actor in energy policy creates state-citizen relations as subordinate relationship.

Relation of state and citizens within the framework of citizenship, can be read through welfare policy. Variety of the most prominent welfare policies that create controversy is in the energy sector. Welfare policies in the energy sector in Indonesia in the last decade reaps a lot of criticism from various parties. Energy policies that most often gets the spotlight, namely the reduction of subsidies as part of Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) mandated by Letter of Intent between the Government of Indonesia and the International Monetary Fund (IMF). Cutting subsidies are consequential on the national budget policy. The impact of rising fuel prices and its inflation extends into systemic impacts of inflation on the prices of goods and services in various sectors, and so on. Social deficits potentially affects the democratic deficit. At this stage, as Drysdale (2005) implies, the determination of compliance socioeconomic security is a dilemma.

Considering that energy policy is very broad and complex, this departure focuses on the impact of energy subsidy policy. Product policy is chosen on the grounds that (1) the policy is fully initiated in top-down so that the configuration of state-citizen relations are patterned subordinate becomes most visible, (2) the subsidy policy is actually an integral part of structural adjustment programs package that have systemic effects, not only in economic, but also political, (3) the impact of those policies degrades the position of the citizen (with its all attribution) to 'denizen' (with the risk of exclusion). Agenda of structural adjustment program (SAP) and state budget tightening agenda contributes polemic in broader aspects of citizenship, especially who is citizen in the logics framework of lawmakers.

Praxis policy could not be separated from the context (arena) in which policy is formulated. Context of Indonesian society is the communal society. Configuration context is 'demanding' discretions toward the implementation of law. The variables that can be used to bring conceptual deduction and induction textual, among others: (a) right, (b) status, (c) participation, (d) cohesiveness, and (d) exclusion. Citizenship in the logics framework of

lawmakers of energy subsidies could be elaborated by the agenda setting of the underlying reasoning, while the dilemma of social, economic and cultural backgrounds are selected discretionary by legal drafters in response to the context of pluralistic society.

There is a disparity between what is mandated by the (global) agenda setting whose liberal, who are faced with the affirmative demands of identity-based. As a simple illustration, can be illustrated by the following rhetorical, What happens when a cross-country exploration, it brought a piece of the map is very different from the reality of the field to be taken? What happens when the geometric lines and shades of colors that appear in two-dimensional map that is in fact are the mountains, forests, rivers, swamps, and even the abyss? Improvisation, or even frustrated. Maybe that's a simple word that can describe the confusion also ambivalence, when the map as the only means of navigation could be so different from the landscape that must be taken. Illustrations can be an analogy condition that occurs in the realm of welfare policy: political map nuanced liberal, while it remains in span of commonality of community life. This is what happened in Indonesia, while at the conceptual level, it is assumed that the autonomy inherent in each individual; but at the contextual level, the basis of social relations based upon the collectivity.

Indonesia's democratization journey armed with navigation liberal then faced with the range of societal cleavage such identity-demographic, regional, and cultural. Although true liberalism and communitarianism have same key words, such Walzer (2007) implies, but with very different meaning. For example: equality, that on one side is attached to the right, while on the other side attached to the status. The meaning of justice initially transformed, then became distributive.

### **C. Constructing The Model**

Transformation of citizenship in theoretical discourse into empirical context requires 'simplification work'. In this case, the simplification is not intended as 'easily', but rather as an effort to draw generalization line by abstraction of reality. Based on abstraction, the model is obtained that can be used to explain the whole debate around the theme. This model is important to remember that the complexity of the relation of state and national issues are too complicated to be explained by a giant building commonly known as

the welfare narrative. In this study, the grand narration of welfare issue themed into the discourse of citizenship. Model of citizenship in Indonesia is an abstraction of it. Work requires modeling instruments (devices) theory to dissect the configuration object of its study. Citizenship not escape from the classic debate between libertarian and communitarian. Each flow ideology has distinctive way in dissecting citizenship.

The concept of citizenship is certainly on the definition of national citizen, that is, those who have the capacity to govern also ruled: both governs and to be governed, which qualified as autonomous as well as loyalty is also a prerequisite. Van Gusteren (in Bart, 1996) states that the citizenship-related rights on the one hand, and the other side is also related obligations, such deals with citizenship rights and entitlements on the one hand and with obligations on the other. Liberal regime and communitarianism regime also have different perspective in the definition of the rights and the definition of obligations, which generally attaches citizenship in the relationship between the state vis-à-vis citizens.

Model of citizenship addressed in this study focused on models that are typically denizenship, which is creates disparity between that espoused values and methods used - particularly in reason of legal drafters in the political arena of energy subsidies. Model of citizenship in reasoning lawmaker becomes very important to remember that there are different analyzed agenda setting welfare policy underlying each, while each agenda setting is definitely charged by construction of value. Parallel with that, the operationalization of these values had discretion in favor of policy context. Construction and configuration of these discretion will be interpreted as manifestation of citizenship model in Indonesia.

Through the efforts of formulating a model of citizenship, the study of Putri (2012) try to prove that. First, there is duality paradigm, namely liberal agenda setting as base of construction, but it work on communitarianism context. Dualism paradigm consequences on the model that contested citizenship values of liberalism within communitarianism method, which is actually the two are in opposition.

Second, initiation of market mechanisms into the context of state control in the vital sector - in this focus: energy subsidies - shows the workings of liberal ideological reasoning. At the same time, debates surrounding the interpretation of the role of the state – in this case: the meaning of "controlled by the state" – both affirmative or negative, leaving

from the claims of communitarianism. In same time, it is ridden by the issue of populism. Ideological reasoning is shown standing-position of each actor. The work of two regimes of knowledge is arose the paradigmatic and ideological debate irreconcilable. If further abstracted, irreconcilable situation creates discursive character of citizenship.

Third, as result of the operation of the two paradigms are mutually contested, it creates oppositional citizenship, which typically can be called 'denizenship'. Denizenship term is not the negation of citizenship as a whole, but rather as a model of citizenship in the context of Indonesia.

Fourth, contestation between liberalism paradigm and communitarianism paradigm has implications for the interpretation and practical issues that instrumenting legitimacy, polemics on exclusion, and obsessed with equality. Operationalization denizenship working through discretion that has transformed the rights, as well as identity transformation, and distortion of roles, and creates exclusion.

Modeling method is inspired by the modeling approach by Beiner (1995) who displays model of citizenship based on the character of the political arena study. However, in this modeling, slightly different from the approach that classifies Beiner which political character assumed linear and homogeneous. Modeling in this study assumes that the political character is not always homogeneous and linear, but rather heterogeneous. Based on the arena which lies within the global-local, then the instrumentation liberal theory and the theory of communitarianism is the right choice in formulating models of this citizenship. Although the assumption of communitarianism and liberal virtue that looked contested each other, but both concepts actually play in the same arena and often meets. Thus, the use of both theoretical instrument is usefull to displays the welfare issues precisely because of its logical connectedness. It will be apparent that these two theoretical instruments are juxtaposed simultaneously. In the context of Indonesia's, the aforementioned theoretical instruments will be also related to the conceptions that underlie the normative relationship between state and citizens as set forth in welfare policy, especially in politics of energy subsidies, as well as thoughts on the agenda setting behind the arena. The reasoning and context of liberal and communitarianism 'work' and 'fight' in the same arena .



The diversity of identity, given both the nature and the artificial, has implications for the diversity of identity actualization. The diversity of social identity and geographic landscape are potentially and actually creates nuanced communal society. For the empirical validity study of the contextual background of Indonesian society, more appropriate when referring to the conclusions of the research work of several researchers who have dedicated their studies in Indonesia and has published widely in social science. On this occasion, the study of anthropology, sociology and history provides ample evidence of the pattern commonality in Indonesian society. Of course it is tempting to look at each of the findings of ethnographic and historical study of these works, but because of the focus of research is contextual model of citizenship in order formulation, the function of these works are limited to providing justification for the conclusion that the Indonesia is the social cohesiveness of society bound by certain identities. The long list of such works on the basic assumption is the validity of the evidence related to the communal character of the people, so no need repetes what has been inferred previously.

Communitarianism of course based on the bond of membership. Ties can be in the form of identity, such as ethnicity, language, religion, gender, ideology, and so on. It could also be based on naturally by geographical boundaries, the diversity of natural resources, and so on. There is also structural diversity such as the level of economic, political role, or various manifestations of social mobility (vertical and horizontal). The consequences of this membership-based communitarianism is the identification between self and other. Claims related to power relations are always in the framework of binary opposition between the self and the other. Ideally of democratic system is the maximization of participation. The problem is, on the communal character, against whom claim of self and who other, determining who is eligible to participate and who are not eligible.

No matter how 'liquid' communal identity, the limits of identity will continue to be reproduced. It is not difficult to map the boundaries of identity. As an obvious example, ask a trivial question to a citizen of Indonesia, then quickly he can answer identities attached to him, just one sentence. Ideally, the status of citizen is cross-identity, but later it became ambivalent status. Countries have to deal with the many identities with their respective claims. Encourage social cohesion experienced some identity fusion (melting), but some

are actually fusion become increasingly microscopic identification with 'boundary wall' is getting thicker. When the cohesive commitment has created new identity, at the same time, fragmentation and exclusion against other identities.

#### **D. Lawmaking of Welfare Policy in Question**

Trail construction citizenship models can be traced from the consequences of agenda setting and agenda setting, in the form of trends. Here this study is to elaborate models of citizenship in Indonesia in a logic-framework formulation of welfare policy. More specifically, namely, in the political arena of energy subsidies. From the arena of study, can be traced to the trail of citizenship in a logical construction of lawmakers. Based on these traces can be identified that the operation of structural adjustment programs - which correlates to the continuation of budget tightening and reduction of subsidies - can be used as proof that liberalism is a policy-oriented sense of understanding of power relations between state and citizen. Reason liberal working with countries to minimize the role of citizens as well as integrate citizens to the global market.

There are situations that occur due to the operation of discursive reasoning and logic of liberalism and communitarianism simultaneously on energy subsidy policy. Privatization of oil and gas mining sector is part of a package of investment liberalization through the deregulation of the sector. As a result, there was a transformation of the energy position as a strategic commodity which is it as mandated by the Constitution 1945 - as the 'welfare of the majority', so it must be 'controlled by state'. Opposite from the virtue of Constitution, in fact, recently energy becomes commercial commodity delivered to the market mechanism. Although the Constitutional Court has decided that the Oil and Gas Act and the Electricity Act must be amended because it is not mandated by the Constitution, but in reality, the arguments of welfare policy was mixed based on values of liberalism, while also using communitarianism claims.

A similar situation can be interpreted so differently when interpreted by the regime of knowledge differently. Even so, this also happens when lawmakers configuring citizenship in relation to the Rule of Law. Privatization of the mining sector - since the enactment of the Gas and Electricity Act - are the base of the energy dilemma. Rising fuel

prices - as part welfare policy and its manifestation in policy of reduction of energy subsidies - have been repeatedly enforced, even when it has risen many times over. Series of welfare policy, especially the operationalization energy sector regulation, such: privatization of State Oil Enterprise (Pertamina), the separation of the oil and gas management into the upstream and downstream, deregulation of mining investment to facilitate control of transnational corporations to exploit oil and gas, and the use of the international pricing benchmark as an indicator of domestic prices, and the gradual reduction of energy subsidies; are manifestation of the liberal ethos of working in the reasoning of the lawmakers.

Communitarianism in the logic framework of lawmakers was looked at the standing-position of the parties based on the interests of political parties, instrumentation-based communal institutions, and the considerations underlying the decision, as well as responses to the decision. Of debate in parliament and debate in the media, it appears that the lawmaker - both pro and contra - are equally employ the logic of mutual contestation. This is shown in the statements, preamble, preamble to the law of the product, format and price orientation, compensation solutions offered, the reasons for rejection or support, as well as claims filed. Through the key words are explicit, the implicit model of citizenship can be formulated in the sense of welfare policy formulation in Indonesia, namely denizenship. Model of citizenship that employs denizenship are two mutually contestation reason so ideologically irreconcilable.

Although the Constitutional Court approved the oil and gas law and judicial review of Electricity Act so highlight the definition of 'controlled by state' as the role of the state towards the fulfillment of 'welfare of the majority', but Constitutional Court considers that "the 1945 Constitution did not reject privatization". It is would be another dilemma that is not less complicated. What happened next is: transformation of fuel as a strategic commodity - which is the 'welfare of the majority' is - into delivered by the market mechanism.

Along with the devolution in fuel prices to the market mechanism, then enforce lawsuit against the fuel price component. During this time, the mining sector is a sector that is very exclusive, so the balance of expenditure and income of the country and the sector is

also a lot of questionable validity - some fiscal experts to counter rising prices called 'stunt budget'. The reasons for the government to raise fuel prices, for example, concerning the high cost of imports to the state budget deficit, energy subsidies are poorly targeted, so need to be transferred to another form, and so on. It is not just ideologically opposed to Article 33 of The Constitution of Indonesia and contrary to the 2012 State Budget Law, but also unacceptable both economically and politically as well.

The debate in massive lawmaking becomes very difficult and delayed. Various welfare policy alternatives are offered, ranging from restrictions on the initiative - which is the separation between the eligible citizens for subsidies and citizens who are not entitled to subsidies - which eventually found a dead end. It is seen creating new problems: solution in the form of compensation programs on energy subsidies which involves of other institutions to obtain the 'legitimacy'. This is a reflection of the workings along of liberal reason and the communalism reason within Rule of Law.

Learning from experience related to the previous subsidy compensation program, the planned increase in fuel prices this time does not run smoothly because many experts views that such programs tend to improve the image of the government's politically motivated, compared to improve people's lives. Strong reaction was seen in protracted debates and strong opposition in parliament - especially from the political parties whose reject the initiative. Government looks likely to manipulate populist issue to justify the reasoning behind liberal policies and the reduction of fuel price subsidies, such as promising channeling subsidies directly to the welfare policy.

Of ideological contestation behind the welfare policy debate on the visible workings of the two regimes of knowledge that contested. On the one hand, the privatization of the energy sector through the instrumentation as well as interpretation of laws, efforts to integrate domestic energy prices to international prices, the reduction of energy subsidies, etc.; are testaments to the workings of liberal reason.

Along with that, arguing the state budget savings through subsidy limitation by the classification of 'who-not-eligible' and 'who-is-eligible' scheme, the underlying considerations of welfare policy choices, as well as the involvement of political actors based on constituents' claims, and so on; showed that the sense of communitarian work in

welfare policy formulation. Debates between the parties that pro or contra mutually toward welfare policy works constituted the basis of their respective communities. The standing-position was looked at legal drafters. Meanwhile, outside the parliament itself, opposition from the mass organizations which have a strong basis of legitimacy in the community – among mass organization, such religious groups, indigenous groups particularly, as well as professional organizations (i.e. service providers, and so on) whose refused the rise of fuel prices – implies the workings of communitarianism reason.

Construction of citizenship is built not only as a consequence of the pressures that are supported by many parties, but also as a response to demands of the ruling class (Turner, 1986). The ‘rulling class’ in this study focused on legal drafters. Tracking the traces of citizenship through the corridor construction (a) agenda setting and (b) variety of trends as a consequence of setting those agenda shows that:

First, interpretation of power relations between state and citizens affected by the liberal paradigm. This is evidenced by: (a) gradual reduction of energy subsidies in the budget from year to year as political choice based on the demands of structural adjustment programs to save state budget expenditure wherever possible; (b) the implementations of structural adjustment programs in Indonesia is consequential to the tightening of budget spending - which as obligation to reach the economics growth and settled loan - impacts on the configuration of the relation of state and its citizens. Options for tightening budget of government spending turned out to prefer a reduction of budget subsidies than others. Reflection of welfare policy choices are: minimization of the role of the state into their citizens, and at the same time, integrates citizens to the global market that emphasizes the price mechanism.

Second, the liberal paradigm deals with the context of commonality in society that led to political choices taken – the welfare policy – as a real dilemma and inconsistent with the liberal orientation itself. Contestation of liberal paradigm and communitarianism paradigm become inevitable. Meanwhile, the two regimes of knowledge are opposite to each other - that's where the assumption of the regime rejected the assumption that one regime to another - thus create oppositional hybridization. Ambivalence of oppositional contestation is the crucial issue on the model of citizenship in Indonesia. Of traces of

polemics and dilemmas in the liberal-communitarian contestation that this oppositional model of citizenship, it can be elaborated in Indonesia is a 'denizenship' model.

So, who is a citizen? An adage states: If someone dies of hunger, then it is called the 'tragedy'; but if there are millions of people die of starvation, then it is called as 'statistics'. For legal drafters, citizens are a bunch of statistics. From the description of the contradictions and contestation of liberalism and communalism - are enriched with the issue of populism - the reason lawmakers energy subsidies, it appears how the model of citizenship in Indonesia. The working regime of mutual knowledge is creating contestation debate ideologically irreconcilable. Discursive situation of citizenship in the end creates mutually repel contestation so.

Thus the character of the denizenship model as oppositional contestation of liberalism-communitarianism comes from the regime of knowledge which continuous contested and repels each other (denying). In practice in Indonesia, then to adjust in the context of very diverse categorization creates 'new' cuts for all different communities, namely the economic degrees cleavage. Discretions are then consequences the gradation relation between state and citizen, such: transformation of the right to be charity, citizens become consumers, the obligation to be voluntary, the distortion of participation, a strong fragmentation and the occurrence of exclusion. Theoretically, contestation between the regimes of knowledge – liberal regime and communitarianism regime – is then embodied in the power relations between state and citizen practically. This is an extract denizenship models at once abstract polemical citizenship and state-worship in Indonesia in a discursive situation irreconcilable. Finally, it is created model denizenship within welfare policy, the citizenship of people who are denied.

#### **E. Concluding Remarks**

Traces of citizenship construction in Indonesia, especially in the welfare arena of energy subsidies, shows that citizenship in Indonesia is strongly influenced by the agenda of liberalism and practices of welfare policy where there is a tendency to minimize the role of citizens as well as integrate citizens to the global market.

The arguments of lawmaking that forms the basis of welfare policy in subsidies, showing the orientation of lawmaker whose their consideration based on liberal virtue. At the same time, lawmakers also used arguments of communitarianism reason for distributive subsidy, as well as formulate solutions, such the energy subsidy compensation program. Meanwhile, counter-responses that rejects market prices of the liberal welfare policy has built within the foundation of communitarianism claims as its basis legitimacy. It shown on parliamentary` debate and media debates. Populism paradigm also graced the discursive situation between the two regimes of knowledge that continues to contesting it. Both paradigms that 'irreconcilable' are working together in logics framework of lawmakers. Thus, models of citizenship within reason lawmaker is denizenship, the citizenship as an ongoing discursive situation.

The construction of citizenship model in Indonesian lawmaker who brings the concept of liberal and communitarian context into theirs welfare policy, paradigmatically gave birth oppositional citizenship. So that the true model of citizenship in Indonesia is 'denizenship', which is the citizenship model of denied people by their own lawmaking. Manifestation of denizenship model: instrumentation legitimacy, then remains exclusion, but in otherside obsesses to equality. While the operationalization of the model denizenship work by (a) transforming the right to charity, (b) transforming citizens into consumers, (c) transforming obligation into voluntary, (d) distortion of participation, and (a) the dilemma of fragmentation and exclusion.

There are several things that can be recommended from the results of this study. an As abstraction of citizenship-in-practice in Indonesia, it is not just textual but also contextual, so it can be used as models in understanding the political practices of citizenship in a wider scale. Model of citizenship-in-practice in this study are specific to the arena and the politicization of energy subsidies around each arena is, however, can be used as a reference in the test in different political arenas. In this denizenship models, it is clear that oppositional contestation - as in citizenship in Indonesia are based on liberal values, but working with the communitarian method - this is what causes the various dilemmas and polemics in the state and citizen relations. Departing from this denizenship models, may be continued on further study - both on an academic level and at the level of praxis - to more

carefully examine the configuration of state-citizen relations contests two regimes of knowledge that each contestation.

*Vegitya Ramadhani Putri*



## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Antons, Christoph, 2003, **Law and Development in East and Southeast Asia**, London : RoutledgeCurzon
- Beiner, Ronald (ed). 1995. **Theorizing Citizenship**. New York : State University of New York Press
- Bussemaker, Jet. (ed). 1999. **Citizenship and Welfare State Reform in Europe**. New York : Routledge.
- Costa, Pietro & Zolo, Danilo (eds), 2007, **The Rule of Law: History, Theory, and Criticism**, Dordrecht ; Springer
- Drysdale, Peter, (ed), 2005, **The New Economic in East Asia and the Pacific**, London : RoutledgeCurzon
- Finlayson, G. 1990. **Citizen, State and Social Welfare**. Oxford : Oxford University Press
- Glennerster, H, (ed). 1983. **The Future of Welfare State**. London : Heinemann
- Goodhart, Michael, 2005, **Democracy as Human Rights : Freedom and Equality in the Age of Globalization**, New York : Routledge
- Jayasuriya, Kanishka (ed), 1999, **Law, Capitalism, and Power in Asia: The Rule of Law and Legal Institutions**, London: Routledge
- Peerenboom, Randall (ed), 2004, **Asian Discourses of Rule of Law : Theories and Implementation of Rule of Law in Twelve Asian Countries, France, and The US**, London : Routledge
- Saphir, Gershon (ed), 1998, **The Citizenship Debates : A Reader**, Minnesota : International Minnesota Press
- Somers, Margaret, 2008, **Genealogies Of Citizenship : Markets, Statelessness, and the Right to Have Rights**, Cambridge : Cambridge University Press
- Turner, B. 1986. **Citizenship and Capitalism**. London : Allen and Undwin
- Walzer, Michael, 2007, **Thinking Politically : Essays in Political Theory**, New Heaven : Yale University Press.
- Wuthnow, Robert (ed). 1991. **Between States and Markets**. Princeton : Princeton University Press