

The Regional Representative Council of The Republic of Indonesia and Civil Security Governance: Bridging Political Polarization in The Special Capital Region of Jakarta

Abdul Aziz Hamdi¹

¹Republic Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

Pujo Widodo²

²Republic Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

Eko G. Samudro³

³Republic Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

Rachmat Setiawibawa⁴

⁴Republic Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

Ariifuddin Uksan⁵

⁵Republic Indonesia Defense University, Indonesia

Corresponding Author: abdul.hamdi@kn.idu.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the role of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) in civil security governance and its contribution to mitigating political polarization in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta. Drawing on Collaborative Governance Theory, the study conceptualizes security and political stability as outcomes of coordinated interaction among representative institutions, security actors, and governance processes rather than hierarchical control. Using a qualitative descriptive approach based on document analysis of official records, policy reports, and relevant academic literature, the study analyzes how the DPD RI exercises oversight, coordination, regional representation, and policy advocacy in security-related and politically sensitive contexts. The findings indicate that the DPD RI contributes to civil security governance by institutionalizing non-operational oversight, facilitating inter-institutional coordination, and enhancing democratic accountability within the security sector. In addition, the Council plays a bridging role in mitigating political polarization by articulating regional aspirations, maintaining center–region balance, and advancing non-partisan policy recommendations that address structural sources of political division. The study concludes that representative institutions



operating outside party-based competition can significantly support civil security governance and political cohesion through collaborative and facilitative governance mechanisms in plural democratic settings.

Keywords: Collaborative governance; civil security; political polarization; regional representation

INTRODUCTION

Political polarization and civil security governance have become increasingly salient issues in metropolitan regions, particularly in capital cities where political competition, symbolic power, and public visibility converge. In Indonesia, the Special Capital Region of Jakarta represents a governance context marked by high population density, socio-political heterogeneity, and recurrent political contestation. Previous studies on Indonesia's bicameral system highlight that regional representation remains a critical yet underexamined component in managing governance complexity at the national and metropolitan levels (Nurlia et al., 2024).

Empirical research on the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) demonstrates that the institution is formally mandated to articulate regional interests, conduct oversight, and provide policy recommendations related to regional governance, law, and political affairs (Cipto Handoyo, 2024; Maulana et al., 2023; Wartoyo, 2023). Unlike party-based legislative bodies, the DPD RI operates as a non-partisan representative institution, which positions it as a potential mediator in contexts of political fragmentation. Studies examining the supervisory and representational functions of the DPD RI indicate that its activities frequently involve the collection of regional aspirations, evaluation of governance performance, and communication of regional concerns to central government institutions (Maulana et al., 2023; Wartoyo, 2023; Wartoyo & Prasetyo, 2023).

Between 2021 and 2026, Jakarta has undergone significant political and institutional transitions, including changes in its administrative status and ongoing debates surrounding democratic representation and governance reform. Research on DPD RI provincial offices suggests that the Council's engagement with regional stakeholders constitutes an important channel for conveying local concerns related to governance stability, legal order, and public trust (Maulana et al., 2023). These dynamics are particularly relevant in Jakarta, where political polarization has frequently extended beyond electoral competition and influenced public discourse, social cohesion, and perceptions of institutional legitimacy.



Scholarly analyses of Indonesia's legislative structure further note that while the DPD RI does not possess direct executive or coercive authority, its institutional role contributes to governance processes through deliberative, advisory, and representational mechanisms (CosmoGov, 2024). This indirect yet strategic role aligns with broader findings in governance studies, which emphasize that political stability and civil security are not solely outcomes of enforcement capacity, but also of inclusive representation, institutional dialogue, and coordinated governance arrangements (Sutan et al., 2025).

This study is grounded in Collaborative Governance Theory, which conceptualizes governance outcomes as the result of coordinated interaction among state institutions, representative bodies, and societal actors. Ansell and Gash (2008) argue that collaborative governance emerges when public institutions engage diverse stakeholders in consensus-oriented decision-making processes. Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) further conceptualize collaborative governance as a system dependent on shared motivation, principled engagement, and institutional capacity. Within this framework, representative institutions such as the DPD RI can function as facilitative and bridging actors that mediate competing interests and enable inclusive dialogue across governance levels.

In the context of Jakarta, the DPD RI's representational and advisory functions can therefore be understood as part of a broader collaborative governance architecture. Rather than exercising direct control over security institutions, the DPD RI contributes to civil security governance by channeling regional perspectives into national policy deliberations, promoting institutional coordination, and advocating governance arrangements that emphasize inclusivity and political cohesion (Handoyo, 2024; Wartoyo, 2023). Recent studies on collaborative governance in Indonesia confirm that multi-actor coordination has become an increasingly prominent framework for addressing complex public issues, including political polarization and governance legitimacy (Sutan et al., 2025).

Despite the growing empirical relevance of the DPD RI in governance practices, existing literature has largely focused on its constitutional position or legislative limitations, with limited attention to its role in civil security governance and the mitigation of political polarization, particularly in metropolitan contexts such as Jakarta (CosmoGov, 2024; Maulana et al., 2023). This study seeks to address this gap by descriptively examining (1) to analyze the role of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) in the governance of civil security in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta, (2) to examine the contribution of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) in bridging political polarization



through its regional representation function and policy recommendations.

METHODS

This study adopted a qualitative descriptive research approach to examine the role of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) in civil security governance and its contribution to mitigating political polarization in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta. The qualitative descriptive design was selected because the study did not seek to test hypotheses or develop new theoretical propositions, but rather to provide a systematic, contextual, and empirically grounded description of institutional roles, governance practices, and policy-related interactions as documented in official records and scholarly sources. This approach is particularly appropriate for governance and public policy research that emphasizes institutional processes and representational functions within real-world political settings.

The study relied on document-based qualitative data drawn from authoritative and verifiable sources. These included official documents issued by the DPD RI, such as committee reports, policy recommendations, press releases, and formal statements related to regional governance, political affairs, and public order. In addition, the study incorporated relevant government regulations and legal documents concerning regional governance and the special administrative status of Jakarta, as well as official reports and policy publications produced by national institutions addressing political stability and civil security governance. To strengthen analytical depth and contextual understanding, peer-reviewed academic literature published between 2021 and 2026 was also included, particularly studies examining regional representation, political polarization, and collaborative governance.

Data collection was conducted through a systematic document review process. Relevant materials were identified using targeted keyword searches related to the DPD RI, civil security governance, political polarization, regional representation, and Jakarta's governance context. Documents were screened based on their institutional relevance, publication timeframe, and direct alignment with the research objectives. Only materials that explicitly addressed governance practices, representational mechanisms, policy recommendations, or political dynamics relevant to Jakarta were retained for analysis. The selected documents were then organized chronologically and thematically to facilitate a structured and transparent analytical process.

Data analysis followed a thematic descriptive procedure aimed at maintaining close alignment with the source materials. The analysis began with data reduction, in which relevant text segments were identified and extracted based on their substantive relevance to the research



questions. These segments were then grouped into descriptive themes reflecting key aspects of the DPD RI's institutional role, including representational mediation, inter-institutional coordination, policy advisory functions, and engagement with political polarization. The final stage involved synthesizing these themes into a coherent descriptive narrative that captured how the DPD RI contributes to civil security governance and political stabilization without making causal or normative claims.

To ensure analytical rigor and trustworthiness, the study applied source triangulation by comparing information across multiple types of documents, including official institutional records, government publications, and academic literature. Consistency across sources was used as an indicator of credibility, while discrepancies were examined to enhance contextual interpretation. The exclusive use of publicly accessible and institutionally produced documents further supported the dependability and transparency of the findings, minimizing subjective interpretation.

Ethical considerations were addressed by restricting the study to publicly available documents and excluding any form of human subject involvement or confidential data. As a result, formal ethical clearance was not required. Nonetheless, ethical research standards were maintained through accurate representation of source materials and appropriate acknowledgment of all referenced documents and scholarly works.

FINDINGS

The Role of the Regional Representative Council (DPD RI) in Civil Security Governance and the Mitigation of Political Polarization

a. Oversight and Coordination with Security Institutions

The Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) exercises oversight and coordination functions with state security institutions as part of its contribution to civil security governance in the Special Capital Region of Jakarta (Wartoyo, 2023). Through its constitutional mandate of supervision and regional representation, the DPD RI facilitates communication between regional interests and national security policy frameworks, which reflects a collaborative rather than purely hierarchical mode of governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Within this perspective, the Council can be conceptualized as an intermediary institution that helps bridge institutional interests through policy dialogue and coordination mechanisms (Burris et al., 2005; Emerson et al., 2012). This intermediary function enables the alignment of local public order concerns with broader state governance objectives without converting the DPD RI into an operational security actor (Born & Hänggi, 2004). In this sense, the DPD RI's role corresponds to



governance arrangements in which security outcomes emerge from coordinated institutional interactions rather than command-and-control authority (Burris et al., 2005).

Rather than exercising direct command over security forces, the DPD RI emphasizes monitoring, evaluation, and policy alignment in security-related matters, which is consistent with the institutional logic of collaborative governance (Emerson et al., 2012). Ansell and Gash (2008) explain that complex public issues, including security and political stability—often require cross-institutional coordination, negotiated problem-solving, and facilitative roles that bridge competing interests (Ansell & Gash, 2008). From the standpoint of democratic security governance, legislative and representative bodies are expected to oversee the security sector through deliberation, hearings, and recommendations while refraining from operational interference (Born & Hänggi, 2004). In the Indonesian context, Wartoyo (2023) shows that the DPD RI operationalizes its oversight through committee-based mechanisms that include policy evaluation, aspiration aggregation, and institutional communication. Accordingly, Committee I becomes a key channel through which the DPD RI performs security-related oversight and coordination in a governance-oriented manner (Wartoyo, 2023).

Oversight and coordination are concretely conducted through Committee I, which holds working meetings with the Indonesian National Police and the Attorney General's Office as part of institutional monitoring and policy feedback processes (Wartoyo, 2023). For example, a working meeting in September 2020 assessed how these institutions supported regional governments, including in securing simultaneous local elections and implementing public health protocols during the COVID-19 pandemic (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia, 2020). Such meetings function as accountability forums that strengthen feedback loops between national institutions and regional governance needs, which Emerson et al. (2012) identify as central to collaborative governance capacity. Conceptually, this reflects a nodal governance configuration in which security is produced through coordination among multiple “nodes” with different functions, where representative institutions shape policy direction while operational agencies execute enforcement (Burris et al., 2005). The resulting recommendations—such as prioritizing preventive approaches, strengthening local government support, safeguarding governance integrity, and widening local recruitment opportunities—illustrate oversight without command and reinforce democratic control principles in security governance (Born & Hänggi, 2004; Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia, 2020).



b. Initiatives of DPD RI Members in Community-Based Security

Members of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) from Jakarta have been directly involved in initiatives aimed at strengthening community-level security and public order. These initiatives reflect a participatory approach to civil security governance in which security is co-produced through collaboration between state institutions and community actors rather than delivered solely through state coercion (Johnston & Shearing, 2003). By engaging local organizations and community actors, DPD RI members contribute to preventive security practices that address social disorder at its early stages (Crawford, 2009). Such involvement demonstrates how representative institutions can extend their influence beyond formal policy arenas into socially embedded security practices (Moncada, 2016). This approach complements institutional security mechanisms by reinforcing social cohesion and trust at the grassroots level (Putnam, 2000).

A prominent example of this engagement is the initiative led by Fahira Idris, a DPD RI senator representing Jakarta, through the mobilization of the community organization Bang Japar (Kebangkitan Jawara dan Pengacara) (Idris, 2026). Under her leadership, Bang Japar has partnered with state security institutions to support the maintenance of public order across Jakarta, illustrating a network-based model of community safety governance (Crawford, 2009). This partnership has been operationalized through state-defense training programs and the establishment of the Bang Japar Task Force (Satgas Bang Japar). Fahira Idris has consistently emphasized discipline, ethical conduct, and respect for the rule of law among task force members to ensure alignment with formal governance norms. These principles are crucial in preventing community-based security initiatives from drifting into informal coercion or vigilantism (Burris et al., 2005).

The Bang Japar Task Force has been positioned as a local security node responsible for maintaining neighborhood order, providing assistance during emergencies, and resolving community disputes through deliberation and consensus. From a nodal governance perspective, such community actors are considered legitimate contributors to security as long as they coordinate with state institutions and operate within legal and normative boundaries (Burris et al., 2005). Task force members are encouraged to respect local customs and cultural norms while maintaining close coordination with the Indonesian National Armed Forces, the National Police, local government officials, and religious and community leaders. Through these practices, the task force functions as a mediator that reduces the risk of conflict escalation in densely populated and politically sensitive urban environments (Moncada, 2016). Consequently, the direct involvement



of DPD RI members in community-based security initiatives strengthens civil security governance in Jakarta through a collaborative, socially embedded, and legitimacy-driven approach (Putnam, 2000).

c. The Role of the DPD RI in Security Sector Reform

The contribution of the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) to civil security governance is also evident in its involvement in national-level security sector reform initiatives that have direct implications for Jakarta. In November 2025, Prof. Jimly Asshiddiqie, a DPD RI member representing the Special Capital Region of Jakarta, was appointed by the President as Chair of the Commission for the Acceleration of Police Reform (Kantor Staf Presiden Republik Indonesia, 2025). This appointment signaled institutional recognition that regional perspectives, including those from Jakarta, are essential in addressing structural challenges within the national police force. The leadership role of a DPD RI senator in such a strategic commission underscores the Council's relevance beyond legislative and supervisory functions. It also highlights the integration of regional representation into national security reform processes.

The Commission for the Acceleration of Police Reform was mandated to formulate policy recommendations aimed at improving the professionalism, accountability, and public responsiveness of the Indonesian National Police (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Uhr, 2006). These reform efforts are expected to strengthen civil security governance by enhancing institutional performance across all regions, including metropolitan areas such as Jakarta. Through this commission, the DPD RI indirectly contributes to shaping security sector policies that affect everyday public order and trust in law enforcement (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Uhr, 2006). The involvement of a DPD RI member ensures that reform proposals take into account regional security dynamics and public expectations. In this way, the DPD RI supports a more responsive and adaptive model of civil security governance through participation in national security sector reform (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Uhr, 2006).

d. Legislative Engagement of the DPD RI in Special Regional Security Governance

In addition to the roles outlined above, the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) is also involved in legislative functions related to the governance and security of special regions (PSHK, 2024). The DPD RI provides formal considerations on



legislative initiatives that directly affect Jakarta, including the Capital City Law (IKN Law) and the Draft Law on the Special Capital Region of Jakarta (RUU DKJ) following the relocation of the national capital. The Council has participated in deliberations on the RUU DKJ alongside the House of Representatives and the government, seeking to ensure that post-capital governance and security arrangements for Jakarta are regulated in a clear and democratic manner (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Uhr, 2006). In these discussions, the DPD RI has emphasized that institutional restructuring should not diminish citizens' democratic rights, such as the direct election of the Governor to maintain accountability and public participation (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Uhr, 2006). This legislative engagement reflects the DPD RI's role as a channel for Jakarta residents' aspirations in safeguarding democratic civil security governance while maintaining both local and national political stability.

The Contribution of the DPD RI in Bridging Political Polarization through Regional Representation and Policy Recommendations

a. Inclusive Representation of Regional Aspirations

The Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) was institutionally designed as a non-partisan representative body, enabling it to articulate regional interests without direct affiliation to political parties (Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia, 2026). This institutional neutrality positions the DPD RI as a mechanism for mitigating political polarization by mediating differences between central and regional perspectives as well as among diverse social groups. Through its representational and advisory functions, the DPD RI channels regional concerns into national policy deliberations, thereby promoting more inclusive and balanced governance outcomes (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Handoyo, 2024; Lijphart, 2012; Pitkin, 1967). These functions serve as institutional tools for reducing political fragmentation by ensuring that policy decisions reflect the diversity of regional interests. As such, the DPD RI plays a stabilizing role within Indonesia's plural political landscape.

Empirical evidence from 2021 to 2026 illustrates the DPD RI's active role in inclusively representing regional aspirations. In early 2026, the DPD RI Sub-Region of Western Indonesia II, which includes the Special Capital Region of Jakarta, documented a total of 1,143 regional aspirations submitted as inputs for national policy agendas. Among these, issues related to politics, law, and human rights accounted for 93 aspirations, while oversight of the implementation of the Disaster Management Law accounted for 77 aspirations. From this process, the DPD RI identified 12 priority agendas, which were subsequently distributed to relevant



institutional bodies, including Committees I to IV and the Regional Legislation Drafting Body (BULD). This structured aggregation process demonstrates the Council's capacity to identify strategically sensitive issues, including potential sources of political polarization, through neutral and systematic representation (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Handoyo, 2024; Lijphart, 2012; Pitkin, 1967).

The advocacy of regional aspirations by the DPD RI contributes to reducing interregional disparities and mitigating center–region polarization. By promoting issues such as equitable development, fair law enforcement, and the protection of indigenous and local community rights, the DPD RI helps to address grievances that often underlie political tension. These representational efforts aim to prevent perceptions of marginalization among regions and foster a sense of inclusion within national governance (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Handoyo, 2024; Lijphart, 2012; Pitkin, 1967).. The significance of this role has been publicly acknowledged by President Prabowo Subianto, who noted that the DPD RI has produced more than 50 institutional decisions and has played an active role in safeguarding democratic processes and advancing national development (Ansell & Gash, 2008; Handoyo, 2024; Lijphart, 2012; Pitkin, 1967). Such recognition underscores the tangible contribution of the DPD RI's policy recommendations and institutional decisions in bridging competing political interests and promoting more equitable and cohesive national policymaking.

b. Maintaining Center–Region Balance and Social Cohesion

The Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) strategically functions as a bridging institution between the central government and regional authorities. The Vice Chair of the DPD RI, GKR Hemas, has emphasized that strengthening the Council's role as a center–region connector is essential for formulating national development policies that are aligned with the needs of communities across Indonesia. This role is particularly relevant in addressing persistent challenges related to interregional inequality and center–region political polarization (Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004). By conveying regional perspectives to the national level, the DPD RI contributes to a more balanced distribution of political attention and development priorities. In doing so, the Council helps prevent excessive centralization of political and economic decision-making (Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004).

Through its representational mandate, the DPD RI amplifies the voices of less-developed regions and areas outside Java within national political discourse. This function ensures that national policies are not disproportionately shaped by central or metropolitan interests alone



(Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004). Beyond policy representation, the strategic mandate of the DPD RI also includes fostering social cohesion and strengthening national unity across diverse regions. During the 16th anniversary of the DPD RI in 2020, the Chair of the Council, AA LaNyalla Mattalitti, called upon all senators to uphold the dignity of the institution by acting as statespersons, maintaining solidarity, and consistently advocating for regional aspirations. Such appeals underscore the Council's normative commitment to inclusive and cohesive governance (Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004).

The role of the DPD RI in maintaining political balance has also been acknowledged by national executive leaders. Vice President Ma'ruf Amin publicly recognized the Council's contribution to building harmonious and inclusive inter-institutional political interactions, which generate positive social energy and reflect national solidarity (Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004). This recognition highlights the importance of non-partisan representative institutions in sustaining democratic stability. By operating outside party-based competition and embracing the principle of "From the Regions for Indonesia," the DPD RI contributes to mitigating political polarization arising from center–region disparities and majority–minority dynamics (Emerson et al., 2012; Handoyo, 2024; Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004).. Through these mechanisms, the Council plays a meaningful role in preserving social cohesion and safeguarding the unity of the Republic of Indonesia.

c. Policy Recommendations as Instruments to Mitigate Political Polarization

As a non-partisan representative institution, the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) frequently issues policy recommendations and institutional viewpoints intended to bridge divergent political perspectives (Born et al., 2003; Born & Hanggi, 2004a). In the context of national elections and political polarization, the Chair of the DPD RI, AA LaNyalla Mattalitti, has publicly criticized the direct presidential election system, arguing that it has consistently generated social division and political antagonism since the reform era (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002). He has highlighted how repeated presidential contests have intensified polarization and public hostility, thereby weakening social cohesion. According to this perspective, the adoption of a liberal, individualistic democratic model is seen as misaligned with Indonesia's plural and deliberative political culture (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002). As a result, the DPD RI has advocated for a critical evaluation of the direct presidential election system as a means of addressing persistent political fragmentation (Hanggi



& Bryden, 2004).

These policy recommendations reflect the DPD RI's willingness to propose alternative institutional arrangements aimed at reducing polarization (Born & Hanggi, 2004a). LaNyalla has suggested that constitutional amendments be considered to explore leadership selection mechanisms based on representative deliberation rather than direct competition (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002). From this standpoint, political polarization is viewed not merely as an electoral byproduct but as a structural issue that undermines national ethics and unity (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002). By advancing such proposals, the DPD RI positions itself as an institution capable of articulating long-term governance solutions beyond short-term political interests (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002). These recommendations illustrate how the Council seeks to correct policy designs that may inadvertently exacerbate social division.

In addition to institutional reform proposals, the DPD RI has also emphasized the importance of inclusive representation in national leadership (Development, 2007). The Vice Chair of the DPD RI, Sultan B. Najamudin, has criticized the perceived dominance of Java-centric political representation in the composition of presidential candidates for the 2024 election. He proposed alternative models such as an electoral college system involving both the House of Representatives and the DPD RI, or the inclusion of multiple vice presidents, to enhance geographical inclusivity. Although such proposals would require constitutional revision, they reflect concerns about the concentration of political power within limited regions or groups (Hills, 2014). Overall, these policy perspectives and recommendations demonstrate the DPD RI's role in mitigating political polarization by promoting representative balance, institutional inclusivity, and national cohesion (Born & Hanggi, 2004b; Hills, 2014; Tsebelis, 2002).

d. *Neutrality in the Legislative Process as a Balancing Mechanism*

In exercising its legislative functions, the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) frequently serves as an objective balancing institution amid competing political interests within the House of Representatives. (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Wartoyo, 2023) Because DPD RI members are not affiliated with political parties, the Council is institutionally positioned to provide more neutral input on controversial legislative proposals that may generate political division. This non-partisan character allows the DPD RI to frame its views primarily around regional interests and public concerns rather than party ideology. As a result, the Council contributes to moderating legislative debates that are prone to polarization



(Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Wartoyo, 2023). This role reinforces the DPD RI's function as a stabilizing actor within Indonesia's legislative system.

A notable example of this balancing role emerged during deliberations on the Draft Law on the Elimination of Sexual Violence (RUU PKS), which generated intense public and political controversy (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Wartoyo, 2023). In discussions within Commission VIII of the House of Representatives, the inclusion of neutral perspectives, including those from the DPD RI, was considered necessary to bridge polarized positions among stakeholders. Through its delegation, the DPD RI provided inputs grounded in regional perspectives and constituent interests, without the pressure of partisan alignment. Similar approaches have been observed in deliberations on other sensitive legislative issues, such as the Draft Laws on Regional Autonomy and Natural Resource Management. Across these contexts, the DPD RI has consistently emphasized principles of regional justice and inclusivity, positioning itself as a counterbalance to elite political polarization in the legislative process (Lijphart, 2012; Russell, 2013; Tsebelis, 2002; Wartoyo, 2023).

DISCUSSION

The Role of the Regional Representative Council (DPD RI) in Civil Security Governance

The findings indicate that the DPD RI's role in civil security governance in Jakarta is primarily institutional and facilitative rather than operational. Its contribution is realized through oversight, coordination, and policy alignment that connect regional concerns with national security frameworks, thereby shaping security outcomes via accountability and inter-institutional interaction rather than command authority. This pattern suggests that civil security in Jakarta is produced through structured governance processes in which representative institutions help synchronize public order priorities, institutional responsibilities, and democratic controls, especially within a politically sensitive metropolitan context.

Viewed through the lens of Collaborative Governance Theory, this role accords with the proposition that complex public problems are best governed through coordinated engagement among multiple actors rather than hierarchical control (Ansell & Gash, 2008). The DPD RI's emphasis on monitoring, dialogue, and alignment reflects the core components of collaborative governance—principled engagement and institutional capacity—where outcomes depend on sustained interaction, shared problem framing, and reciprocal accountability (Emerson, Nabatchi, & Balogh, 2012). Within this framework, the DPD RI operates as a facilitative and bridging institution that aligns local security concerns with broader state objectives while respecting the



division of authority between representative and executive actors.

This interpretation is consistent with scholarship on democratic security governance, which underscores that legislative and representative bodies contribute to security primarily through deliberation, hearings, and policy recommendations rather than operational intervention (Born & Hänggi, 2004). Research on nodal governance further reinforces this view by demonstrating that security is increasingly generated through networks of differentiated institutional nodes, where representative institutions shape policy direction and legitimacy while operational agencies carry out enforcement functions (Burris, Drahos, & Shearing, 2005). Empirical work in the Indonesian context likewise shows that the DPD RI exercises its oversight through committee-based mechanisms that facilitate policy evaluation and institutional communication, thereby embedding regional perspectives within national security governance without encroaching on executive authority (Wartoyo, 2023).

Taken together, the discussion suggests that the DPD RI's contribution to civil security governance in Jakarta lies in institutionalizing coordination, oversight, and democratic accountability within the security sector. By functioning as an intermediary between regional interests and national security institutions, the Council enhances responsiveness and legitimacy while maintaining clear boundaries from operational control. This role illustrates how representative, non-partisan institutions can support civil security governance in plural urban environments through collaborative engagement and governance-oriented mechanisms rather than coercive power.

The Contribution of the DPD RI in Bridging Political Polarization through Regional Representation and Policy Recommendations

The findings suggest that the DPD RI plays a significant role in mitigating political polarization by institutionalizing inclusive regional representation within national policymaking processes. Rather than competing within partisan arenas, the Council channels regional aspirations into policy deliberations through structured aggregation and advisory mechanisms, allowing diverse regional interests to be articulated without ideological polarization. This mode of representation indicates that political polarization in Indonesia is not addressed through confrontation or electoral competition, but through institutional mediation that emphasizes inclusivity and balance. By translating regional grievances and priorities into national policy inputs, the DPD RI contributes to reducing fragmentation arising from center–region disparities and perceived political marginalization.



From the perspective of Collaborative Governance Theory, this role reflects the capacity of representative institutions to function as *bridging actors* that facilitate principled engagement among heterogeneous stakeholders (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012) argue that collaborative governance depends on institutional arrangements that enable shared motivation and inclusive participation, particularly in politically sensitive contexts. The DPD RI's non-partisan design strengthens its legitimacy as an intermediary institution capable of mediating between central authorities and regional communities without being constrained by party competition. In this sense, regional representation becomes not merely a constitutional function, but a governance mechanism that dampens polarization by reframing political conflict as a problem of coordination and inclusion rather than ideological rivalry.

The discussion also aligns with classical and contemporary theories of political representation, which emphasize that democratic stability in plural societies depends on the effective articulation of diverse interests within institutional channels (Pitkin, 1967; Lijphart, 2012). Comparative studies demonstrate that inclusive and non-majoritarian representational mechanisms are particularly effective in reducing polarization in heterogeneous political systems, where exclusion and centralization often generate conflict (Hooghe & Marks, 2016; Rodden, 2004). In the Indonesian context, empirical studies have similarly shown that the DPD RI's role in aggregating and advocating regional aspirations contributes to balancing political attention between metropolitan and peripheral regions, thereby mitigating center–region polarization and reinforcing social cohesion (Handoyo, 2024; Wartoyo, 2023).

Beyond representation, the findings indicate that the DPD RI's policy recommendations function as instruments for moderating political polarization by addressing structural sources of division. Scholarship on democratic governance and institutional design suggests that non-partisan actors can reduce polarization by proposing long-term, system-oriented policy alternatives that are less responsive to short-term electoral pressures (Born, Fluri, & Johnsson, 2003; Tsebelis, 2002). The DPD RI's engagement in debates on electoral systems, leadership representation, and constitutional arrangements illustrates how policy advice can serve as a deliberative corrective to political systems that inadvertently intensify polarization. Such interventions align with studies emphasizing that polarization is often rooted in institutional design rather than ideological disagreement alone (Hills, 2014).

Taken together, this discussion demonstrates that the DPD RI contributes to bridging political polarization in Indonesia by combining inclusive regional representation with non-partisan policy advocacy. Through its institutional neutrality, the Council reframes political conflict



as a governance challenge that can be addressed through mediation, deliberation, and structural reform rather than partisan contestation. This role reinforces the argument that representative institutions operating outside party competition can enhance democratic stability by fostering cohesion, balancing competing interests, and sustaining inclusive policymaking in plural political systems.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the Regional Representative Council of the Republic of Indonesia (DPD RI) plays a meaningful role in civil security governance and the mitigation of political polarization through governance-oriented, non-partisan institutional mechanisms rather than operational authority. In addressing the first research question, the findings demonstrate that the DPD RI contributes to civil security governance in Jakarta by institutionalizing oversight, coordination, and policy alignment among security-related actors. By functioning as an intermediary between regional interests and national security institutions, the Council strengthens accountability and responsiveness within the security sector while preserving the division of authority between representative and executive institutions. This confirms that effective civil security governance in a democratic and plural urban context can be achieved through collaborative and facilitative institutional arrangements rather than command-based control.

With respect to the second research question, the study concludes that the DPD RI contributes to bridging political polarization by embedding inclusive regional representation and non-partisan policy advocacy within national governance processes. Through the systematic aggregation and articulation of regional aspirations, the Council mitigates center–region tensions and reframes political conflict as a coordination and inclusion challenge rather than a partisan contest. Its policy recommendations further function as deliberative instruments that address structural sources of polarization, particularly those arising from institutional design and representational imbalance. In this way, the DPD RI enhances social cohesion and democratic stability by promoting representative balance and long-term governance considerations beyond short-term political competition.

Taken together, these conclusions highlight the significance of representative institutions that operate outside party-based competition in sustaining democratic governance within politically diverse societies. The DPD RI exemplifies how non-partisan representation can support both civil security governance and political cohesion by facilitating dialogue, mediating competing



interests, and reinforcing inclusive policymaking. This study thus contributes to the broader literature on collaborative governance and democratic representation by demonstrating that security and political stability are not solely dependent on coercive capacity or electoral mechanisms, but also on the quality of institutional mediation and regional inclusion within national governance frameworks.

REFERENCES

- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Public Administration Review*, 68(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2008.00925.x>
- Born, H., Fluri, P., & Johnsson, A. (2003). Parliamentary oversight of the security sector: Principles, mechanisms and practices. Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.
- Born, H., & Hanggi, H. (2004a). The democratic control of armed forces: A handbook for parliaments. Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.
- Born, H., & Hanggi, H. (2004b). The use of force under international auspices: Parliamentary accountability and democratic deficits. *European Security*, 13(2), 155–173. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09662830490499923>
- Burris, S., Drahos, P., & Shearing, C. (2005). Nodal governance. *Regulation and Governance*, 1(1), 37–55. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1748-5991.2007.00010.x>
- Cipto Handoyo, B. H. (2024). The Regional Representative Council (DPD RI) and Checks and Balances in Indonesia's Legislative Process. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 9(3), 542–563. <https://doi.org/10.26623/jic.v9i3.10633>
- Crawford, A. (2009). Governing through networks: Community safety and security. Willan Publishing.
- Development, O. for E. C. and. (2007). OECD DAC handbook on security system reform: Supporting security and justice. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. <https://doi.org/10.1787/9789264027862-en>
- Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia. (2026). Serap 1.143 Aspirasi Daerah, DPD RI Matangkan Agenda Prioritas Sub Wilayah Barat II.
- Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An integrative framework for collaborative governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 22(1), 1–29. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011>
- Handoyo, B. H. C. (2024). Fungsi representasi Dewan Perwakilan Daerah dalam sistem



- ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 9(2), 115–132.
- Hanggi, H., & Bryden, A. (2004). Reforming and restructuring security institutions. In *Reforming the security sector* (pp. 5–24). Geneva Centre for the Democratic Control of Armed Forces.
- Hills, A. (2014). What is policing. *Policing*, 8(1), 7–17. <https://doi.org/10.1093/police/pat035>
- Hooghe, L., & Marks, G. (2016). *Community, scale, and regional governance: A postfunctionalist theory of governance*. Oxford University Press.
- Johnston, L., & Shearing, C. D. (2003). *Governing security: Explorations in policing and justice*. Routledge.
- Kantor Staf Presiden Republik Indonesia. (2025). Presiden Prabowo Subianto lantik keanggotaan Komisi Percepatan Reformasi Polri.
- Lijphart, A. (2012). *Patterns of democracy: Government forms and performance in thirty-six countries*. Yale University Press.
- Maulana, A., Saptawan, A., & Semil, N. (2023). Organizational Rightsizing Analysis of the Existence of the DPD RI Office in the Provincial Capital of South Sumatera. *Jurnal Public Policy*, 9, 148. <https://doi.org/10.35308/jpp.v9i3.6746>
- Moncada, E. (2016). *Cities, business, and the politics of urban violence in Latin America*. Stanford University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9780804790120>
- Nurlia, E., Trio Santoso, N., Lokman, A., Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa Jl Raya Palka Km, U., & Serang Provinsi Banten, K. (2024). CosmoGov: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan REINFORCEMENT OF INDONESIA'S REGIONAL REPRESENTATIVES COUNCIL FOR A BETTER FUTURE OF THE INDONESIAN PEOPLE'S REPRESENTATIVE INSTITUTION. 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.24198/cosmogov.v10i2.57950>
- Pitkin, H. F. (1967). *The concept of representation*. University of California Press.
- PSHK. (2024). Pembahasan RUU Daerah Khusus Jakarta: Jangan Mereduksi Demokrasi dan Tak Perlu Terburu-Buru.
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rodden, J. (2004). Comparative federalism and decentralization: On meaning and measurement. *Comparative Politics*, 36(4), 481–500. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4150164>
- Russell, M. (2013). *The contemporary House of Lords: Westminster bicameralism revived*. Oxford University Press.
- Tsebelis, G. (2002). *Veto players: How political institutions work*. Princeton University Press.
- Uhr, J. (2006). *Deliberative democracy and the institutions of accountability*. Australian Journal of



- Political Science, 41(1), 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10361140500507876>
- Wartoyo, F. X. (2023). Implementasi fungsi pengawasan Dewan Perwakilan Daerah Republik Indonesia dalam sistem ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 20(2), 245–264. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk2023.20.2.245>
- Wartoyo, F. X., & Prasetyo, T. (2023). DPD Performance Implementation in The Supervision Function Based on The Dignity of Justice. *MANDALIKA : Journal of Social Science*, 1, 7–11. <https://doi.org/10.56566/mandalika.v1i1.56>

