

History of the Yogyakarta Monarchy: From the Islamic Kingdom to Being Imprisoned in the Indonesian Democratic System | Author : Catur Nugroho, Wisma Nugraha Ch., S. Bayu Wahyono

History of the Yogyakarta Monarchy: From the Islamic Kingdom to Being Imprisoned in the Indonesian Democratic System

Catur Nugroho, Wisma Nugraha Christianto, S. Bayu Wahyono
Program Studi S3 Kajian Budaya dan Media, Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas
Gadjah Mada Yogyakarta
email: mas_pires@yahoo.com, krisnugraha@ugm.ac.id,
bayu_wahyono@yahoo.com

Abstract

Collaboration between democracy and monarchy occurs in government systems in several countries. What happened in Yogyakarta was a monarchy system that originated from the Islamic Mataram kingdom, which was later recognized as a political institution that held executive power in the democratic system of the Indonesian state. The King of Yogyakarta acts as the holder of executive power (Governor) in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. With the method of literature review and theoretical elaboration, this paper seeks to explore how the history of monarchy in Yogyakarta can collaborate and operate in the democratic system in Indonesia. This paper also looks at and analyze the development of the Yogyakarta Palace and Sultan Hamengku Buwono, who played the role of King and then at the same time held the position of Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. From the analysis, it is found that Yogyakarta is an Islamic kingdom that later joined the Indonesian state as one of the provinces with a special status. The current position of the Special Region of Yogyakarta is a "prison" for Sultan Hamengkubuwono. As a King, the Sultan is always supervised by the regional people's representative council in the implementation of regional governance. The King of Yogyakarta, who appears to have dual powers as a King as well as a Governor, is, in fact, nothing more than prisoners imprisoned within the palace walls under the strict supervision of the representative council and the central government.

Keywords: *History, Islamic kingdom, Yogyakarta, prison, Indonesian democracy*

Introduction

The ideal country, according to Plato is a city-state, a country that is neither too large nor too small, a large country will be difficult to maintain, while a country that is too small will be difficult to maintain because it is easy to control. According to Aristotle, the state is the most sovereign political institution, it does not mean that this institution does not have limits on power. According to Aristotle, a monarchy is an ideal form of state, because it is ruled by a wise philosopher. Power in the monarchy for the welfare of the people. But Aristotle realizes that a monarchy system is almost impossible to exist in reality, it is only a normative idea, that is very difficult to be realized in the emperor world ¹.

In today's modern world, there are still several countries that maintain a monarchy system in state life. As happened in seven of the sixteen Western

¹ John Procopé, "Greek and Roman Political Theory," in *The Cambridge History of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450*, 2008, 350–1450, <https://doi.org/10.1017/cho19780521243247.004>.

European democracies are monarchies, namely Belgium, Denmark, the Netherlands, Norway, Spain, Sweden, and the United Kingdom ². Likewise with Asian countries such as Japan, Thailand, and Malaysia. However, in some of these countries most of the monarchy that is implemented is not an absolute monarchy, but a constitutional monarchy.

One example of a country that still adheres to an absolute monarchy system is Swaziland. The king of Swaziland inherited the throne from his father with institutional arrangements and a patronage distribution system designed from the start to expand and maintain the dominant position of the royal family and princes over the political and economic system of Swaziland ³.

In most countries, they adhere to a constitutional monarchy system in which the kingdom, sultanate, empire, or other forms of monarchy seem only as a symbol of the state because they have adopted a democratic system in their state life. Monarchy can be divided into two forms, namely absolute monarchy and parliamentary monarchy. If power is gathered in the hands of the King, Sultan, or Empire, this system is an absolute monarchy, whereas when power is decentralized and limited, this system is a constitutional monarchy ⁴.

A collaboration between democracy and monarchy argues that democracy is a space for the political system of a country that can provide space for the survival of the monarchy system. The history of countries that have adopted democratic systems has been more the result of resistance and dissatisfaction with the absolute monarchy. Unaldi (2012) presented the results of his research related to the kingdoms of Spain and Thailand. Juan Carlos of Spain is depicted as having distanced Spain from the dictatorship, while Bhumibol of Thailand is under scrutiny for allegedly not having a sufficient approach to the democratic system ⁵.

What happened in Indonesia, where the state uses the pillars of democracy in the life of the nation and state, but there is one region with a royal system (monarchy) that is politically recognized, namely the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The government system in Yogyakarta is closely related to the Yogyakarta palace, where the king of the Yogyakarta palace is also the office of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The appointment of a king as governor is carried out by the Regional People's Representative Council by lineage, not by-election.

As a government, in Yogyakarta, there is a division of power between the executive and the legislature. All of this has become a strong system, becoming a

² Alfred Stepan et al., "Democratic Parliamentary Monarchies Shifting Tides in South Asia Shifting Tides in South Asia Bangladesh 's Failed Election," *Journal of Democracy* 25, no. 2 (2014): 35–51.

³ Dwayne Woods, "Monarchical Rule in Swaziland: Power Is Absolute but Patronage Is (for) Relative(S)," (*Journal of Asian and African Studies* 52, no. 4, 2017): 497–513

⁴ Ali Fuat Gökçe, "Federal Parliamentary Democracy With A Constitutional Monarchy: Malaysia," *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies* 6, no. December (2013): 327–46.

⁵ Serhat Ünaldi, "Modern Monarchs and Democracy: Thailand's Bhumibol Adulyadej and Juan Carlos of Spain," (*Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 31, no. 2, 2012). 5–34.

kind of local wisdom for the Yogyakarta Sultanate. This is what is now a public polemic, local wisdom in the form of a monarchy system amid demands for the application of democracy. In the course of time, the Indonesian government has attempted to implement a fully democratic system by implementing direct regional head elections, but on the other hand, Yogyakarta has already implemented a monarchical system of government, where a leader is appointed from generation to generation based on blood ties.

This fact will affect the condition of society if absolute democracy is implemented in Yogyakarta. Many parties have an interest in bringing down each other if democracy is implemented in the form of gubernatorial elections. In fact, what was created was disintegration and social conflict which eventually resulted in destructive efforts from various parties. Regarding the mechanism for filling the position of governor/regional head in Yogyakarta, there are parties who oppose mechanisms that are not based on elections as a representation of democracy. However, there are also those who think that the mechanism for determining the Sultan as governor and Sri Paku Alam as deputy governor is the true form of people's democratic ⁶.

Yogyakarta can be used as an example of the application of democracy, in this case in relation to the power in the hands of the people. When a governor declares that all will be left to the community, this is what is actually called democracy. The community seriously responds that they are one unit, have the same interests, and based on the local wisdom they have, they simultaneously support the specialty of Yogyakarta. They will forever support the existence of Yogyakarta local wisdom because after all, that's where integration comes into society.

The democratic system that is wanted to be implemented in Yogyakarta should not lie in the gubernatorial election process. And the election should not be implemented in its entirety because it will have a bad impact on society. The goal of implementing a democratic system has actually been achieved long ago, thanks to Yogyakarta's local wisdom. With local wisdom, the interests of the community can be fulfilled. Peace is created because of integration and the thick nature of culture makes a sense of kinship even tighter. Indirectly, democratic values have been manifested in communities with local wisdom, such as in the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

The polemic about the privileges of Yogyakarta is still ongoing. The leadership of Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X which was emphasized and clarified by the government with the passing of Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Where in Article 18 of the law it is stated that the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta must reign as the

⁶ Fajar Laksono, Helmi Kasim, and Nallom Kurniawan, "Status Keistimewaan Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Dalam Bingkai Demokrasi Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 (Studi Kasus Pengisian Jabatan Kepala Daerah Dan Wakil Kepala Daerah)," (Jurnal Konstitusi 8, 2011). 59–86.

Sultan of the Yogyakarta Sultanate, and the Deputy Governor is the Duke of Puro Pakualaman.

Article 18 of the Yogyakarta Privileges Law states "the throne of Sultan Hamengkubuwono for a candidate for governor and as Duke of Paku Alam for a candidate for Deputy Governor" (Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2012). With these provisions, there will be no election of the Governor and Deputy Governor in Yogyakarta, because these positions are filled with the appointment of Sultan Hamengku Buwono as Governor and Adipati Paku Alam as Deputy Governor. This has made Yogyakarta Province embrace a dynastic political system, where the position of Regional Head is inherited from generation to generation according to the filling of the position of the Sultan in the Yogyakarta Sultanate and Paku Alam in the Pakualaman Kadipaten.

On the one hand, the existence of Law Number 13 Year 2012 is seen as an attempt by the central government to regulate the government system in Yogyakarta, but on the other hand it is also a tool that shackles the Sultanate and Puro Pakualaman in Yogyakarta. This happened because the appointment of the governor and deputy governor had become a problem related to the Sultan's power as the holder of the Yogyakarta Sultanate and the Sultan's political power as the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

The basis for this paper is to describe how the monarchy system can stand and run in the climate of Indonesian democracy, especially democracy in the monarchy of the Yogyakarta Sultanate. This study seeks to describe more deeply about democracy-monarchy from the perspective of Cultural Studies by using the basis of Michel Foucault's theory of power relations and The Panoptical Machine. The paper writing approach used is descriptive qualitative, with the framework of the concept of political and cultural power in the Yogyakarta palace.

In this case, the author is more focused on the democratic government system which has become a symbol of political power when collaborated with the sultanate (monarchy) system which has become a symbol of cultural power in Yogyakarta. As well as how the building of democratic ideology can be presented through the political practices of the Yogyakarta Sultanate. The conclusions of this formulation later explain the process of the overall reality of the Yogyakarta Palace-Democracy-Monarchy ideology, with the dominant approach to the concept of power sharing and supervision.

Understanding the Ideology of Democracy and Monarchy

Democracy is a form of government in which all citizens have equal rights in making decisions that can change their lives. Democracy allows citizens to participate, either directly or through representation. In a democratic system

according to Aristotle in ⁷, according to him, government can be implemented by one person, by several people, or by many people. Democracy includes social, economic and cultural conditions that allow the practice of political freedom freely and equally with the aim of improving the welfare of all its members.

This word comes from the Greek (democratía) "people's power", which is formed from (dêmos) "people" and (Kratos) "strength" or "power" ⁸. This word appeared in the 5th century BC to denote the Greek city-state political system, one of which was Athens; it is the antonym of (aristocrat) "elite power". Theoretically, the two definitions contradict each other, but the reality is no longer clear. The classical Athenian political system, for example, granted democratic citizenship to elite free men and excluded slaves and women from political participation.

In all democratic governments throughout ancient and modern history, democratic citizenship remained occupied by elites until all adult populations in most modern democracies were completely free after the struggles of the voting movements in the 19th and 20th centuries. The word democracy itself has existed since the 16th century and originates from Middle French and old Middle Latin.

A democratic government is different from a form of government where the power is held by one person, such as a monarchy, or a small group, such as an oligarchy. Regardless, these differences stemming from Greek philosophy now seem ambiguous as some contemporary governments have mixed elements of democracy, oligarchy and monarchy ⁹. Karl Popper defines democracy as something different from dictatorship or tyranny, so it focuses on opportunities for the people to control their leaders and overthrow them without the need for revolution ¹⁰.

Unlike the democratic system which gives the people the opportunity to have power, the monarchy system is a political system that is not owned by the people but has the approval of the people. In the history of the monarchy, the absolute power of leaders has gained public recognition and approval based on fear ¹¹. During its development, the modern monarchy adopted a constitutional and democratic system, so that a constitutional monarchy was born.

In a constitutional monarchy the prerogatives of the monarchy are limited by constitutional rules and political powers, and the prerogatives are divided between the parliamentary system and the monarchy. A constitutional monarchy

⁷ Frank Cunningham, "Democratic Theory," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 2015, 1–14, <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.93032-0>.

⁸ Kurt A. Raaflaub, Josiah Ober, and Robert W. Wallace, *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*, *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*, 2007, 1–22, <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.44-6382>.

⁹ Raaflaub, Ober, and Wallace, 1–22.

¹⁰ Karl R. Popper, *The Open Society and Its Enemies*, *American Sociological Review*, 5th ed., vol. I and II (Routledge, 2011), 1–800.

¹¹ Gökçe, "Federal Parliamentary Democracy With A Constitutional Monarchy: Malaysia," 327–46.

is a system of government in which part of the sovereignty is exercised by the public or the king¹². In its development With the help of court intellectuals, the monarchs of Europe obtained the absolute power they were looking for, but with the movement and resistance of the people, they eventually turned the absolute monarchy into a constitutional monarchy. In a constitutional monarchy, the constitution is "formalized and codified" with the king's right to make laws and taxes¹³.

The monarchical system of government is theoretically reconstructed as a privately owned, government, which focuses on the values of capitalism and economic calculations by the government authorities. Meanwhile, democratic governance is reconstructed as government owned by the public, which is explained to lead to the present orientation and the neglect of capital values in the government authorities¹⁴. In the context of the Yogyakarta monarchy, Sultan Hamengku Buwono who became king was given executive authority as the regional head of the Yogyakarta province which is an integrated part of the Indonesian state.

The Yogyakarta monarchy system that existed and operated in Indonesia's democratic government had its own uniqueness which was different from other monarchies. The Yogyakarta monarchy is a politicized cultural institution, so that the King has executive power and authority. Instead of having absolute power, the King of Yogyakarta is supervised by the Regional People's Representative Council as a legislative body. The king who is also the governor must provide an accountability report to the legislature regarding the planning and use of the budget.

Yogyakarta Palace Monarchy Government System

The government of the Yogyakarta Sultanate was originally administered using a government structure inherited from Mataram. The government is divided into two major affairs, namely Parentah Lebet (internal affairs) which is also called Parentah Ageng Karaton, and Parentah Jawi (external affairs) which is also called Parentah Nagari¹⁵. The Sultan holds all the powers of state government. In carrying out his daily duties, the Sultan is assisted by the personal Papatih Dalem institution.

The long history of the Yogyakarta Mataram kingdom was the beginning of the emergence of the Yogyakarta palace which still exists today. However, the

¹² Gökçe, 327–46.

¹³ Hans Hermann Hoppe, *From Aritocracy to Monarchy to Democracy*, vol. 53 (Auburn: Mises Institute, 2013), 1–12.

¹⁴ Hans Hermann Hoppe, *Democracy - The God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order, Democracy - The God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order* (New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher, 2007), 1–304, <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793572>.

¹⁵ Suryo Sakti Hadiwijoyo, *Menggugat Keistimewaan Yogyakarta* (Yogyakarta: Pinus Book Publisher, 2009), 1–240.

official establishment of the Yogyakarta Sultanate has been since the signing of the Gianti Agreement between Sunan Paku Buwono III, Pangeran Mangkubumi (Sultan Hamengku Buwono I) and N. Harting (representative of the Dutch East Indies government) on February 13, 1755 which divided the Mataram region into two, namely Kasunanan and Kasultanan¹⁶. Subsequently, there was another separation of the Yogyakarta Sultanate in 1811 when Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono II signed a political contract with the British Government, and gave Pangeran Notokusumo (later titled KGPAA Paku Alam) in the Pakualaman City and Adikarta districts¹⁷.

The journey of the Yogyakarta Sultanate and the Pakualaman Kadipaten finally arrived when Indonesia declared its independence on 17 August 1945. The mandate of 5 September 1945 and the mandate of 30 October 1945 concerning the integration of the Yogyakarta Sultanate and the Pakualaman Kadipaten into the Republic of Indonesia. Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono IX and Sri Paku Alam VIII agreed to sign a mandate, one of which was that Negeri Ngajogjakarta hadiningrat and Negeri Paku Alam which were royal in nature were special regions of the Republic of Indonesia¹⁸.

This mandate is in line with the charter from the Central Government signed by President Soekarno on August 19, 1945, which stipulates that the two Swapraja leaders will always maintain the safety of the Special Region of Yogyakarta as part of the Republic of Indonesia. Furthermore, Sri Sultan HB IX and Sri Paku Alam VIII integrated into the modern and democratic government system of the Republic of Indonesia following Government Decree No. X signed by the Vice President on October 30, 1945. In collaboration with the Regional Indonesian National Committee for Workers, the two rulers in Yogyakarta agreed to give the Regional Indonesian National Committee for Workers the right to make laws and regulations and determine the running of government in Yogyakarta based on the principle of people's sovereignty¹⁹. In this case, the Regional Indonesian National Committee for Workers acts as a regional legislative body in Yogyakarta, indicating the sharing of power as one of the pillars of modern democratic governance.

In its way, the administration in Yogyakarta was further regulated in Law Number 1 of 1957 concerning the Special Region. With this government regulation, the Yogyakarta Palace, government bureaucracy is slowly being separated from the local government bureaucracy. However, the two forms of government were headed by Sultan HB X with the assistance of Sri Paku Alam VIII as executor of the running of government in Yogyakarta. Furthermore, in

¹⁶ G. Mudjanto, *Kasultanan Yogyakarta Dan Pakualaman* (Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1994), 1–202.

¹⁷ Sudarisman Purwokusumo, *Kadipaten Pakualaman* (Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1985), 62.

¹⁸ Purwokusumo, 112.

¹⁹ Hadiwijoyo, *Menggugat Keistimewaan Yogyakarta*, 111.

1959 the Presidential Decree No. 6 Regarding Regional Government, which regulates the principles of regional government administration. The Presidential Decree regulates several provisions regarding the Head of the Special Region of Jogjakarta who is appointed from a descendant of the ruling family (Sujamto, 1988: 42). After Presidential Decree No. 6 of 1959, the regulation of Regional Government is Law no. 18 of 1965. However, in this law, there is no significant change regarding the special status of Yogyakarta Province.

The next period during the Soeharto government, Law no. 5 of 1974 concerning the Principles of Government in the Regions which implicitly ignores the status and position of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. According to Sujamto (1974) in Hadiwijoyo (2009: 139), this law states about the uniformity of the form and structure of local governments without considering native rights and rights of origin²⁰. Regional heads and deputy regional heads according to this law are not bound by terms of office, terms and methods of appointment for other regional heads, which then for the appointment of subsequent regional heads shall apply provisions for regional heads and other deputy regional heads. This formulation has the intention and objective of removing the privileges of Yogyakarta after the end of the tenure of Sultan Hamengkubowono IX and Kanjeng Gusti Pangeran Adipati Arya Paku Alam Paku Alam VIII.

With the element of uniform regional government forms from Law no. 5 of 1974, the form and structure of the organization of the Provincial Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta are the same as other regions. This uniformity is a form of central government control and supervision of the running of government in the Yogyakarta region, and narrows the space for movement and the role of the Yogyakarta Sultanate Palace and the Pakualaman Kadipaten.

Finally, Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of Yogyakarta was issued after a tug of war between the various parties involved and having an interest in the law, such as the central government, the provincial government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, and the Indonesian Parliament. One of the contents of the law that makes Yogyakarta Special Region feel special and different from other regions is the provision for filling the positions of Governor and Deputy Governor with a system of determination, and not direct elections. With this law, the position of the Sultan apart from being the King of the Yogyakarta Palace is also the regional head (Governor) of the Special Region of Yogyakarta which is under the government of the Republic of Indonesia.

Power Theory and The Panoptics Machine

Foucault's ideas about power, power and knowledge relations as well as discourse and the history of Western thought are widely discussed and applied to date. According to Foucault, discourse has produced knowledge, and knowledge has always been a weapon of power, in the discourse of power and knowledge, it

²⁰ Hadiwijoyo, 130.

is always present together ²¹. Power in Foucault's view is productive and invisible because it is present in every social relationship, is widely practiced, spreads and infiltrates every aspect of human life.

According to Foucault, the relationship between modern forms of power and modern knowledge has created new forms of domination. Because, apart from exploitation and domination, there is one form that is caused by a discourse, namely subjection (a form for submitting one person to another as an individual, such as a patient to a psychiatrist). Therefore, what needs to be learned is an effort to revive local centers of power, knowledge, its transformation patterns, and efforts to enter into strategies and ultimately make knowledge capable of supporting power ²². There is no other possibility beyond your control. In fact, resistance is actually in the realm of power, so that localize-resistance must be radical and uncompromising to fight the totality of power. This is because resistance is controlled through power and this makes power work even more effectively.

Foucault argues that power does not always work through repressive means and intimidation, but works through rules and normalization ²³. Every rule and law are not seen as a result of the provisions of a particular leader or institution, but as a synthesis of the power of everyone born by agreement. All rules that are born because of mutual consensus have more power in living together.

Foucault's criticism of some social institutions (especially psychiatry, prisons, hospitals) and sexuality has had a profound influence on social science. One of Foucault's theories related to social institutions is the Panopticon Theory (The Panoptic Machine), borrowed from Jeremy Bentham ²⁴. In this theory Foucault conveyed his idea of a prison designed so that guards could continuously monitor the prisoners.

As with Bentham's "Panopticon Town" concept, this prison, according to Foucault was designed with a watchtower in the center that allows a monitor to see and supervise prisoners throughout the detention cell without the detainees knowing whether the monitor is actually inside the watchtower ²⁵. Because the prisoners felt that they were constantly being watched, the supervision changed to "self-supervision" or self-discipline.

Furthermore, Foucault explained that self-supervision and self-discipline do not only occur in prisons, but also in the fields of education, government,

²¹ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*, Pantheon Books, 1972, 1–31.

²² Michel Foucault, *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*, New York, 1980, 55–62, <https://doi.org/citeulike-article-id:798470>.

²³ Michel Foucault, "Power. Vol. 3 of The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984," *SubStance*, 2001, 326–249, <https://doi.org/10.1353/sub.2001.0025>.

²⁴ Chris Philo, Hester Parr, and Nicola Burns, "The Rural Panopticon," (*Journal of Rural Studies*, 2016). 1–10

²⁵ Philo, Parr, and Burns, 1–10.

workplaces, military and so on. Society subsequently developed according to military discipline ²⁶. Self-disciplinary model of supervision has penetrated many institutions and since the 19th century put individuals in the power of discipline through 'self-supervision' that is continuous, penetrating and anonymous. The practice of discipline is expected to give birth to obedient bodies. Fiske (1999) in (Manokha, 2018) sees Panoptic supervision as the most efficient form of power, the most totalitarian and the most difficult to resist ²⁷.

Foucault in *Discipline and Punish* states that the machine of power (prison) is a 'political anatomy', where one person can control the body of another. With this mastery, they can operate at will, with specified technique, speed and efficiency ²⁸. In the context of modern politics, supervision, control and self-discipline occur in a democratic system. The state with its entire political apparatus carries out self-supervision and discipline of citizens and their subordinate territories by means of repressive and ideological means.

The use of the theory of supervision and self-discipline in social life can be seen in research from Dove (2010) about the mystification of Mount Merapi in Yogyakarta. In his research, Dove said that in the crater of Mount Merapi, it is believed that there is a spirit world that reflects the human world. By monitoring volcanoes, it is thought that insight can be gained into what is happening in the everyday world. These beliefs, thus represent a model for self-monitoring and self-control from Bentham and Foucault's Panoptic model ²⁹. This suggests new insights into the cultural and historical dimensions of our current understanding of state views and surveillance.

Research Method

This scientific paper is a systematic literature review that examines the phenomena that occur in Yogyakarta using a qualitative descriptive approach. The purpose of a systematic literature review is to identify all empirical evidence that fits the predetermined inclusion criteria to answer a particular research question or hypothesis ³⁰. By using explicit and systematic methods when conducting articles, and all available evidence, bias can be minimized, thus providing reliable findings and accurate conclusions regarding the object of research. By looking at the events, rules and theory of the Panopticon from Michel Foucault, the authors elaborate on this, so that we can conclude from this paper.

²⁶ Philo, Parr, and Burns, 1–10.

²⁷ Ivan Manokha, "Article Surveillance, Panopticism, and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age," (*Surveillance and Society* 16, no. 2, 2018): 219–37.

²⁸ Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish; The Birth of The Prison*, ed. Alan Sheridan, *Vintage Books* (New York: Vintage Books, 1979), 185–95.

²⁹ Michael R Dove, "The Panoptic Gaze in a Non-Western Setting: Self-Surveillance on Merapi Volcano, Central Java," (*Elsevier, Journal Religion* 40, no. 2, 2010): 121–127.

³⁰ Hannah Snyder, "Literature Review as a Research Methodology: An Overview and Guidelines," (*Journal of Business Research* 104, no. August, 2019): 333–339.

Results and Discussion

Yogyakarta Monarchy System in Prison of Indonesian Democracy

The government system that existed in Yogyakarta during the last few decades was indeed led by Sultan Hamengkubuwono as Governor and Puro Paku Alaman as Deputy Governor. This is indeed considered as a manifestation of the values of the privileges that exist in Yogyakarta. The special thing about Yogyakarta is not something that simply comes without anything that happened in the past. Yogyakarta has a different history from other regions when it will integrate into the Republic of Indonesia. If we want to study history, Yogyakarta is integrated into the Republic of Indonesia through the Declaration of September 5, 1945.

The edict, which is very sacred in nature, has positioned Yogyakarta as a Special Region within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. In this edict, it is clear that Yogyakarta is a kingdom and has a special status. As stated by Anderson (1972) in (Asichin & Rochwulaningsih, 2018) that the announcement was conveyed by Sri Sultan and Pangeran Pakualam that the people had power and were then given to the Sultan ³¹. So the source of power is not from the king, but from the people so that it is as if the king is only the executor of the mandate of the people so that he governs it.

However, in its development it is still royal in nature, but the implementation of the government that is built is not royal. The Yogyakarta Palace itself has changed or reformed itself in terms of implementing a government system that is leading to modernization, but has not abandoned existing and developing local wisdom or culture ³².

As we know, the practice of monarchy is a government where power is in one hand and there is no distribution of power. If we refer to the conditions that exist in Yogyakarta today, power does not rest in one hand. The power that exists in Yogyakarta is not in the hands of the Sultan himself and it has been explained above that since the early days of independence, Yogyakarta has had a legislative body. It has even embraced the existence of a separation of powers or the concept of trash politics, which divides state power into three branches of power, namely the legislative, executive and the judiciary.

If the “trias politica” concept is drawn into the system prevailing in Yogyakarta, there will be and have been implemented so far. The governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, in this case Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X, holds the power at the executive level. The Sultan has legally and convincingly been appointed and extended his term of office as Governor of Yogyakarta based on the Yogyakarta Special Law Number. 13 of 2012.

³¹ Moch Asichin and Yety Rochwulaningsih, “Perkembangan Demokratisasi Pemerintahan Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta , 1945 - 1955,” (Indonesian Historical Studies Journal 2, no. 1 (2018): 13–23.

³² Asichin and Rochwulaningsih, 13–23.

In carrying out or running the government, the Sultan does not position himself as a King who has unlimited power as in a monarchical government. The Sultan did not limit the rights of the people of Yogyakarta, did not apply tribute to his people like the kingdoms in the past, the Sultan often opened up spaces for his people (pisowanan ageng) and there was freedom for the people speaking out. As research conducted by Ratnawati (2011) states that in terms of governance in Yogyakarta, there is "syncretism" or "marriage" between traditional and modern powers. The bureaucratic model of modern government that is rational and is rooted in the authority of the Republic of Indonesia, is against the remnants of the traditional-patrimonial bureaucracy of the Mataram kingdom in the past³³.

As a consequence of the integration of the Sultanate into the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, the status and position and administration of the Sultanate are carried out based on Indonesian regulations. The Sultanate was changed into a special administrative area and the Sultan became the Head of the Special Region. The Sultanate is part of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. In making regional regulations, the Sultan is always together with the Regional People's Representative Council, Yogyakarta Special Region. We can also see this from the Regional Regulations in Yogyakarta, for example the matter of the Regional Fisheries Port Regulations in the Special Region of Yogyakarta Province in which it is clear that regional regulations are made with the agreement of the Sultan as the Governor and the Regional People's Representative Council.

As the head of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X also implements the regulations and obligations that must be carried out in accordance with the laws in force in this Republic. Law Number 32 Year 2004 Article 27 paragraph (2) requires each regional head to submit an Accountability Statement Report to the Regional People's Representative Council. This is often done by the Sultan as Governor and is no different from other governors in Indonesia. Thus, it can be said that the Sultan always reports his accountability to his people, which in this case is represented by the Yogyakarta Regional People's Representative Council.

Self-supervision and self-discipline are more ideologically acceptable and able to take place in a sustainable manner, as stated by Althusser (1971) about ideological state apparatus³⁴. With ideological apparatuses such as laws, regulations, educational curricula, etc., citizens and subordinate areas can submit and obey without a supervisor who is physically present. The democratic system of government in Indonesia, which is owned by the people is able to supervise and control the Yogyakarta monarchy.

³³ Tri Ratnawati, "Antara 'Otonomi' Sultan Dan 'Kepatuhan' Pada Pusat Di Era Reformasi: Studi Kasus Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta," (Journal of Governance 2, no. 1, 2011): 42-68

³⁴ Douglas M Durham, Meenakshi Gigi and Kellner, *Media and Cultural Studies, Keywords, Representations* (Blackwell Publishing, 2006), 79-87, <https://doi.org/10.1525/REP.2019.145.1.107>.

Apart from the existence of an executive institution that runs the government, in Yogyakarta there is also a legislative body, namely the Yogyakarta Regional People's Representative Council. Legislative institution which is the people's representative and is directly elected by the people to guard the government led by the Governor, in this case Sultan HB X. The duties and powers of the Regional People's Representative Council are: To form a Provincial Regulation to be discussed with the Governor for mutual approval, to determine the Provincial Revenue and Expenditure Budget together with the Governor, to supervise the implementation of Provincial Regulations, to request a Report on the Accountability of the Governor.

Thus, the Regional People's Representative Council has carried out some of its duties and powers as representatives of the people. Yogyakarta Province also has an institution that is judicial in nature or better known as a judicial institution. As the embodiment of the pillar of democracy, Yogyakarta Special Region has a High Court and a Religious Court that is tasked with resolving legal disputes in the Yogyakarta region. In this case the Regional People's Representative Council as a legislative body acts as a supervisory institution as well as self-discipline of the executive led by the Sultan.

What happened in Yogyakarta was different from the constitutional monarchy system in effect in several European countries such as Germany, Denmark or Great Britain. In a parliamentary monarchy, democracy there is a strong dual legitimate element in the parliament and the king needs each other's support to form or stop a government³⁵. The contrasting difference with the Yogyakarta monarchy is that the Sultan as the king as well as the head of regional government has absolutely no power to stop the executive and legislative governments. The Yogyakarta Palace, the government, the political community (political parties and the Regional People's Representative Council), and civil society are bound by the laws in force in the country of Indonesia.

The practice of monarchical governance in the Yogyakarta Palace fully applies and is only implemented within the Yogyakarta Palace environment, outside the Yogyakarta Palace, government is implemented in accordance with the government of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Sultan Hamengkubuwono X is also the King only within the Yogyakarta Palace outside the Yogyakarta Palace, he is the Governor of Yogyakarta who has the same role and position as other Governors in the territory of the Republic of Indonesia.

The existing condition in Yogyakarta today is that power does not rest in one hand. The power that exists in Yogyakarta is not in the hands of the Sultan himself and it has been explained above that since the early days of independence, Yogyakarta has had a legislative body. It has even embraced the existence of a

³⁵ Stepan et al., "Democratic Parliamentary Monarchies Shifting Tides in South Asia Shifting Tides in South Asia Bangladesh ' s Failed Election," 35-51.

separation of powers or the concept of "trias politica" which divides state power into 3 branches of power, namely the legislative, executive and the judiciary.

In carrying out or running the government, the Sultan does not position himself as a King who has unlimited power as in a monarchical government. The Sultan did not limit the rights of the people of Yogyakarta, did not apply tribute to his people like the kingdoms in the past, the Sultan often opened up spaces for his people (pisowan ageng) and there was freedom for the people speaking out.

In making regional regulations, the Sultan is always together with the People's Representative Council of the Yogyakarta Special Region. As the head of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X also always provides a Statement of Accountability Report to the Regional People's Representative Council in accordance with the applicable Law in the Republic of Indonesia, namely Law No. 32 of 2004 article 27 paragraph (2).

From the above explanation, it can be seen how the Governor of Yogyakarta who is also the king of the Yogyakarta Sultanate is a "prisoner" who is always supervised by the Regional People's Representative Council and also the central government through a "tower" in the form of a "state" with supervisors embodied in the form of the Ministry of Home Affairs and the President. Meanwhile, the tool used to conduct self-discipline for the government in the Special Region of Yogyakarta is Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of Yogyakarta.

Under the pretext of decentralization and regional autonomy, Yogyakarta seems to be an example for other regions, that even though there is a monarchy system, the democratic system is still running with some modifications according to local wisdom. The king of a kingdom cannot act like a king if he has become part of a democratic system. The Yogyakarta Palace is nothing more than a historical "monument" that is used as a prison for local rulers. The "special" status assigned to the Province of Yogyakarta was nothing more than a means of self-supervision and discipline for the Sultan to remain obedient and obedient to the central government.

The Yogyakarta monarchy is an appropriate subject for the study of the system of discipline and state supervision, as illustrated by Foucault (1995) with his discussion of "Panopticon Town". The palace has a "revelatory" character with a hereditary succession system following the lineage. The central government created biases and disciplinary practices that were clearly embedded in the democracy-monarchy system in Yogyakarta. This analysis shows that the Yogyakarta palace and the privileged status of the Yogyakarta region actually facilitate supervision and self-discipline for the political elite and citizens in Yogyakarta.

The Sultan, who has dual powers as King as well as Governor is also under double "captivity", namely by the supervision of the House of Representatives and also self-discipline by the central government. On the other hand, the Sultan in Yogyakarta is also supervised by the kraton relatives as a party

to balance power within the palace's internal sphere. This can be seen in the leadership succession process in Yogyakarta which experienced problems of internal conflict, between Sultan HB X and his brothers and sisters. This conflict is still a polemic, due to different interpretations of the leaders in Yogyakarta. The Sultan, who did not have a son, argued that women could be leaders, while, the Sultan's brothers and sisters opposed this opinion. This study of the internal conflict discourse of the Yogyakarta Palace will be presented by the writing team in another scientific article.

Conclusion

From the description of the problems and theories, as well as the discussion above, the authors conclude that the practice of democracy in the Special Region of Yogyakarta can be implemented and integrated with the existing monarchy system. Communities directly or through their representatives in regional parliaments can actively participate in social, political and cultural life. The governor, who is also the Sultan of Yogyakarta must always provide "reports" to the people and the central government as a form of his responsibility in holding political power as well as cultural power. The Sultan is under monitoring and self-discipline carried out by the People's Representative Council of the Yogyakarta Special Region.

Within the framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia, the Special Region of Yogyakarta is currently no different from other regions in running a regional government system. The governor, who is also the Sultan of the Sultanate of Yogyakarta is always supervised by the central government through the "State" watch tower and by means of the 1945 Constitution and Law No. 13 of 2012 on the Privileges of Yogyakarta. In this case, the Yogyakarta Provincial Government and the Yogyakarta Sultanate are in a "prison" that has been built by the State. As Foucault's theory suggests, at the end the central government does not need to always be in the watchtower to keep an eye on Yogyakarta, because there will be self-discipline from the provincial government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, represented by Sultan HB X as the governor as well as the Sultan of the Yogyakarta Palace.

References

Book

Durham, Meenakshi Gigi and Kellner, Douglas M. *Media and Cultural Studies, Keywords. Representations*. Blackwell Publishing, 2006.

<https://doi.org/10.1525/REP.2019.145.1.107>.

Foucault, Michel. *Discipline and Punish ; The Birth of The Prison*. Edited by Alan Sheridan. *Vintage Books*. New York: Vintage Books, 1979.

———. "Power. Vol. 3 of The Essential Works of Foucault, 1954-1984." *SubStance*, 2001. <https://doi.org/10.1353/sub.2001.0025>.

History of the Yogyakarta Monarchy: From the Islamic Kingdom to Being Imprisoned in the Indonesian Democratic System | Author : Catur Nugroho, Wisma Nugraha Ch., S. Bayu Wahyono

- . *Power/Knowledge: Selected Interviews and Other Writings*. New York, 1980. <https://doi.org/citeulike-article-id:798470>.
- . *The Archaeology of Knowledge and the Discourse on Language*. Pantheon Books, 1972.
- Hadiwijoyo, Suryo Sakti. *Menggugat Keistimewaan Yogyakarta*. Yogyakarta: Pinus Book Publisher, 2009.
- Hoppe, Hans Hermann. *Democracy - The God That Failed: The Economics and Politics of Monarchy, Democracy and Natural Order*. New Brunswick: Transaction Publisher, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203793572>.
- . *From Aritocracy to Monarchy to Democracy*. Vol. 53. Auburn: Mises Institute, 2013.
- Mudjanto, G. *Kasultanan Yogyakarta Dan Pakualaman*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius, 1994.
- Purwokusumo, Sudarisman. *Kadipaten Pakualaman*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press, 1985.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A., Josiah Ober, and Robert W. Wallace. *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*. *Origins of Democracy in Ancient Greece*, 2007. <https://doi.org/10.5860/choice.44-6382>.

Article in Journal

- Asichin, Moch, and Yety Rochwulaningsih. “Perkembangan Demokratisasi Pemerintahan Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta , 1945 - 1955.” *Indonesian Historical Studies* 2, no. 1 (2018): 13–23.
- Cunningham, Frank. “Democratic Theory.” In *International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences: Second Edition*, 1–14, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-08-097086-8.93032-0>.
- Dove, Michael R. “The Panoptic Gaze in a Non-Western Setting: Self-Surveillance on Merapi Volcano, Central Java.” *Religion* 40, no. 2 (2010): 121–27. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.religion.2009.12.007>.
- Gökçe, Ali Fuat. “Federal Parliamentary Democracy With A Constitutional Monarchy: Malaysia.” *The Journal of Academic Social Science Studies* 6, no. December (2013).
- Laksono, Fajar, Helmi Kasim, and Nallom Kurniawan. “Status Keistimewaan Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Dalam Bingkai Demokrasi Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 (Studi Kasus Pengisian Jabatan Kepala Daerah Dan Wakil Kepala Daerah).” *Jurnal Konstitusi* 8 (2011): 1059–86.
- Manokha, Ivan. “Article Surveillance , Panopticism , and Self-Discipline in the Digital Age.” *Surveillance and Society* 16, no. 2 (2018): 219–37.
- Philo, Chris, Hester Parr, and Nicola Burns. “The Rural Panopticon.” *Journal of Rural Studies*, 2016, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2016.08.007>.
- Popper, Karl R. *The Open Society and Its Enemies*. American Sociological Review. 5th ed. Vol. I and II. Routledge, 2011.
- Procopé, John. “Greek and Roman Political Theory.” In *The Cambridge History*

History of the Yogyakarta Monarchy: From the Islamic Kingdom to Being Imprisoned in the Indonesian Democratic System | Author : Catur Nugroho, Wisma Nugraha Ch., S. Bayu Wahyono

of Medieval Political Thought c.350–c.1450, 2008.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/chol9780521243247.004>.

Ratnawati, Tri. “Antara ‘Otonomi’ Sultan Dan ‘Kepatuhan’ Pada Pusat Di Era Reformasi: Studi Kasus Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta.” *Governance* 2, no. 1 (2011): 42–68.

Snyder, Hannah. “Literature Review as a Research Methodology : An Overview and Guidelines.” *Journal of Business Research* 104, no. August (2019): 333–39. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039>.

Stepan, Alfred, Juan J Linz, Juli F Minoves, Donald L Horowitz, Adrienne Lebas, and Ali Riaz. “Democratic Parliamentary Monarchies Shifting Tides in South Asia Shifting Tides in South Asia Bangladesh ’ s Failed Election.” *Journal of Democracy* 25, no. 2 (2014).

Ünaldi, Serhat. “Modern Monarchs and Democracy: Thailand’s Bhumibol Adulyadej and Juan Carlos of Spain.” *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs* 31, no. 2 (2012): 5–34.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341203100201>.

Woods, Dwayne. “Monarchical Rule in Swaziland: Power Is Absolute but Patronage Is (for) Relative(S).” *Journal of Asian and African Studies* 52, no. 4 (2017): 497–513. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0021909615596451>.