

Social Pathology, The State, and Power: A Sociological Analysis of Community Organisation Thuggery from the Perspective of Michel Foucault

Asmoro Aji

Master of Sociology Study Program, Jenderal Soedirman University, Purwokerto,
Indonesia, asmoro.aji@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

Corresponding Author: asmoro.aji@mhs.unsoed.ac.id

Abstract

This study examines the changing role of community organisations in Indonesia, where their rapid growth has been accompanied by affiliations with organised thuggery. Drawing on Michel Foucault's poststructuralist perspective, organised thuggery is understood not as an objective social pathology but as a discursive construct produced through power/knowledge relations. This study explores how the state constructs community organisations affiliated with organised thuggery as objects of security intervention through governmentality. Using a qualitative approach, the research applies Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) to analyse state regulations, government policy documents, and police telegrams issued between 2024 and 2026. The findings show that the state establishes a regime of truth by classifying community organisations into "normal" and "deviant" categories, framing intimidation, extortion, and violence as threats to public order and the investment climate. This strategy is institutionalised through the Integrated Task Force established under the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree No. 61 of 2025, integrating cross-sectoral coordination, administrative oversight, law enforcement, and organisational guidance. The study concludes that controlling organised thuggery relies not only on repression but also on administrative knowledge that legitimises state intervention and normalises organisational behaviour to maintain security, public order, and a sustainable investment climate

Keywords: Community Organisations; Governmentality; Organised Thuggery; Power/Knowledge; Foucauldian Discourse Analysis.

A. INTRODUCTION

Law Number 16 of 2017 asserts that community organisations (hereafter referred to as ormas) are a manifestation of the rights to freedom of association, assembly, and expression, as guaranteed by Article 28E, Paragraph (3) of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Within the framework of a democratic state based on the rule of law, community organisations function as a vehicle for community empowerment to enhance the capacity, participation, and independence of citizens, while simultaneously serving as instruments to achieve social justice by gathering and developing various social,

religious, cultural, and political interests. Along with the increase in public participation in democratic life, the number of community organisations continues to grow. Based on manual data and the Community Organisation Information System of the Directorate General of Politics and General Administration at the Ministry of Home Affairs as of April 20, 2026, there are 656,375 registered community organisations in Indonesia, averaging more than 1,000 organisations per regency or city. This situation underscores the importance of an effective system for data collection, mapping, and governance regarding the existence and activities of community organisations.

In the development of post-reform democracy, community organisations have experienced increasingly complex dynamics alongside changes in social, political, and institutional configurations. Although community organisations play an important role in community empowerment, these dynamics have paradoxically led to a functional shift in some organisations. Kartono (2013) views this phenomenon as a form of social pathology reflecting a deviation from the ideal functions of organisations. Over time, the practices of community organisations associated with thuggery are no longer understood merely as matters of street criminality; rather, they are constructed within national security discourse as threats to security, stability and public order. This construction has subsequently become the basis for the state to formulate various security and public order management policies targeting organisations perceived to be involved in practices affiliated with thuggery.

This phenomenon has intensified in the reform era, during which democratic spaces opened up widely, and the state faced challenges in controlling non-state actors. Hadiz (2010) explains that post-reform, various informal groups emerged, capitalising on the decentralisation of power and the weakness of state institutions to build political and economic influence at the local level. Thuggery, consequently, did not merely develop as

street-level criminality but transformed into an organised socio-political force through the medium of community organisations. In several cases, certain community organisations have even been involved in project security practices, illegal levies, land disputes, control of parking spaces, and political mobilisation during elections. Empirically, various incidents involving community organisations in acts of violence and disturbances to public order and security remain frequent in Indonesia.

The state's response to this phenomenon is no longer limited to law enforcement but has evolved into more systematic policies, such as the Thuggery Eradication Operation (Operasi Berantas Premanisme) conducted by the Indonesian National Police (Polri) under Police Telegram Number STR/1081/IV/OPS.1.3./2025. Through this operation, Polri maps community organisations deemed to be affiliated with thuggery across various jurisdictions and constructs them as threats to public security. Throughout 2025, Polri recorded 15,410 cases involving 4,016 suspects, with West Java, DKI Jakarta, North Sumatra, East Java, and Central Java classified as high-risk regions. These findings align with Sampson (2012), who asserts that regions characterised by high population density, urbanisation, and intense economic activity tend to be more vulnerable to social problems and legal violations. From the perspective of Michel Foucault, these mapping and classification practices do not merely generate administrative knowledge; they also form a regime of truth that defines specific groups as security threats. Thus, the production of knowledge becomes part of the power/knowledge mechanism that legitimises the establishment of state objects, categories, and modes of intervention.

The state's construction of community organisations affiliated with thuggery is dynamic and follows shifts in political configurations, government regimes, and the rationality of security provision. During the New Order era, certain community organisations were positioned as threats to political stability, directing control toward

maintaining regime order. Entering the Reform era, the expansion of freedom of association shifted the state's attention toward violence, conflicts, and public order violations involving some community organisations. The strengthening of regulations through Law Number 17 of 2013 and its amendments in 2017 further constructed a regime of truth that placed specific organisations as threats to state ideology, social order, and national interests. Post-2024, this discourse has shifted again, constructing community organisations affiliated with thuggery as threats to public order, legal certainty, and the investment climate. This change demonstrates that the category of "problematic community organisations " is not a naturally inherent identity, but rather the result of discursive construction through administrative and political classifications that change according to the government context.

From the perspective of Michel Foucault, the state is not understood merely as an institution performing legal functions, but as a network of government practices (governmentality) operating through regulation, administrative classification, institutional coordination, surveillance, and knowledge production to manage the population. Through these mechanisms, the state constructs social categories regarding groups deemed "normal" and those constructed as threats to security and order. In the Indonesian context, this practice of governmentality is reflected in the duties and functions of the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs as regulated in Presidential Regulation Number 141 of 2024, specifically in coordinating and synchronising cross-ministerial and agency policies in politics and security. One implementation of this is the establishment of the Integrated Task Force through the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree Number 61 of 2025 as a mechanism for cross-sectoral coordination among ministries, agencies, law enforcement, and local governments in controlling community organisations affiliated with thuggery. Through such coordination, administrative

classification, and surveillance, the state generates information and categories regarding groups perceived to have the potential to disrupt security. Within the power/knowledge relation, these practices not only produce administrative knowledge but also define the boundaries between categories considered normal and deviant (normalisation), thereby constructing community organisation thuggery as an object of government requiring policy intervention.

Various previous studies have examined the thuggery of community organisations from diverse perspectives. Hadiz (2010) highlights the emergence of informal actors in post-reform politics, Siregar (2021) analyses power relations within social organisations, while Seputra and Suyatno (2024) emphasise the legitimacy of community organisation power. Pramono (2015) explains that the transformation of community organisations into actors of violence is influenced by changes in collective interests, group identity, and the dynamics of social organisations. However, these studies remain focused on actors, power relations, and social practices, thus failing to explain how the state, through policies, regulations, and government mechanisms, constructs the category of "community organisations affiliated with thuggery" as an object of control. Therefore, this study addresses this gap by analysing the construction of the discourse of community organisation thuggery through Michel Foucault's perspective of governmentality to explain how power/knowledge relations function to shape objects of governance in the security sector.

Based on this exposition, this study conceptualises community organisation thuggery not as an objective social pathology, but as a discursive category produced through power/knowledge relations within government practices. From Michel Foucault's perspective, the practice of governmentality enables the state to establish a regime of truth through regulation, classification, surveillance, and institutional coordination, constructing

certain community organisations as threats to public security and order. Based on this framework, this study aims to analyse how the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs constructs the discourse of community organisation thuggery through governmentality practices in public security and order control policies.

B. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach using Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) to analyse how the state constructs the discourse regarding community organisations affiliated with thuggery through Michel Foucault's power/knowledge relations and governmentality practices. The research data consist of purposively selected secondary documents, including legislation, government policies, Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree Number 61 of 2025, the Chief of National Police Telegrams, Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs press releases, reports from the Integrated Task Force, official publications of ministries/agencies, scientific articles, and relevant media coverage from the 2024-2026 period - a timeframe characterized by the intensification of government policies regarding the management of community organizations affiliated with thuggery. Data collection was carried out through documentation and literature studies. Data analysis was performed by identifying statements (enonces) related to community organisations thuggery, tracing the formation of discursive structures (discursive formations), interpreting the power/knowledge relations that construct the category of "community organisations affiliated with thuggery", and explaining the practices of governmentality that legitimise surveillance, guidance, and law enforcement as mechanisms for managing public security and order. The credibility of the findings was enhanced through source triangulation, comparing government documents, academic literature, and relevant media publications.

C. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

1. The Construction of Social Pathology Discourse

To understand the knowledge construction underlying the management of community organisations (community organisations) affiliated with thuggery, this section traces the development of the social pathology discourse and Strain Theory as regimes of knowledge that shape how the state identifies, classifies, and manages social deviance. This exploration is not intended to position these two perspectives as universal explanations of deviance, but rather as historical constructions that evolved through intellectual and institutional dynamics before being adopted into government practices. The concept of social pathology itself is rooted in medical analogies subsequently applied to social life, whereby deviance is constructed as an "abnormal" condition that threatens order and provides a basis for legitimising various social control mechanisms (Kartini Kartono, 2013; Gillin & Gillin in Soekanto, 2005; Hasibuan, 2021).

This rationality is reinforced by Robert K. Merton's Strain Theory, which posits that deviance arises from the tension between cultural goals and limited access to legitimate means of achieving them (Merton, 1968). Under such conditions, some individuals adopt an innovation strategy through deviant means, such as extortion, illegal levies, intimidation, or violence, leveraging the legitimacy of organisations to secure economic gains (Effendi et al., 2024). From a structural-functional perspective, these practices not only reflect institutional dysfunctions that disrupt social stability but also increase economic costs, undermine legal certainty, and reduce business confidence. In this study, both perspectives are positioned not as objective representations of social reality, but as regimes of knowledge adopted by the state to construct categories of deviance while legitimising practices of surveillance,

guidance, and control over community organisations constructed as affiliated with thuggery.

From Michel Foucault's post-structuralist perspective, the concepts of social pathology and Strain Theory are understood not as objective representations of social reality, but as components of power/knowledge relations that shape how society understands, classifies, and manages social deviance. Consequently, categories such as "normal," "pathological," or "deviant" are not viewed as natural characteristics inherent to individuals or groups, including community organisations. Instead, these categories are historical constructions produced, reproduced, and legitimised through specific discursive, institutional practices, and government mechanisms (Foucault, 1980). Within this framework, theory functions not merely as an analytical tool to explain social reality, but also plays a role in constructing objects of knowledge and generating subject categories that subsequently become the targets of various regulatory, disciplinary, and power intervention practices.

Based on the Chief of National Police Telegram Number: STR/1081/IV/OPS.1.3./2025, which instructs all Regional Police (Polda) and Resort Police (Polres) offices to execute law enforcement supported by intelligence, pre-emptive, and preventive measures against thuggery practices that are increasingly rampant, disturbing to the public, and disruptive to security stability and the national investment climate. This operation represents part of Polri's commitment to maintaining security and order and supporting national economic growth. In the context of social pathology generated by the construction of community organisations thuggery, Polri focuses its law enforcement efforts on intimidating actions, extortion, and violence carried out by individuals or groups under the guise of community organisations.

Within this framework, the concept of mixed deviance put forward by Kamanto Sunarto (2007) is positioned not as a neutral sociological analytical tool, but as a form of knowledge that acquires legitimacy and becomes institutionalised in government practices. Through various administrative technologies such as the formalisation of organisational data collection, mapping of areas categorised as conflict-prone, identification of organisational networks, and codification of information in security reports—the state not only manages information regarding community organisations but also constructs classifications that differentiate organisations deemed compliant with norms of order from those constructed as risky or threatening. Thus, these administrative practices can be understood as mechanisms for producing government categories that serve as the foundation for state surveillance, control, and intervention regarding community organisations.

The Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs has issued policy recommendations to ministries and agencies related to community organisations thuggery activities. This recommendation, Number B-109/KM.00.00/10/2025 dated October 7, 2025, constitutes a policy for strengthening security stability through the management and guidance of community organisations affiliated with thuggery activities that disrupt public security, order, and the investment climate in 2025. One of the recommendations emphasises the need to strengthen the role of local governments in conducting guidance and surveillance of registered community organisations indicated to have committed deviance, in order to encourage the transformation of these organisations toward more positive activities.

From the perspective of Foucauldian Discourse Analysis, this recommendation from the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs illustrates how the state constructs community organisations thuggery as a discursive category through

administrative classification practices. The use of the phrase "registered community organisations indicated to have committed deviance" does not merely describe an empirical condition but forms an object of knowledge that can be recognised, monitored, and intervened in by the state. Through this categorisation, community organisations are sorted into "normal" and "deviant" categories, generating legitimacy for guidance and surveillance practices as mechanisms of social management. Within Foucault's framework, this process indicates that social pathology is positioned not as an independent reality, but as the result of state discourse constructions that define certain behaviours as deviance while establishing the forms of intervention deemed legitimate to restore the organisations to desired norms.

This bureaucratic classification process operates within the framework of establishing a regime of truth, which is the mechanism determining the forms of knowledge that acquire legitimacy to define and manage social problems (Foucault, 1980). In this context, sociological knowledge does not only function as a conceptual tool to understand social deviance, but is also adopted and institutionalised as one of the foundations supporting government practices. Through this process, the construction of community organisations thuggery is formed as an object of knowledge that enables the state to formulate, justify, and implement various security governance strategies, including cross-sectoral intelligence coordination, administrative surveillance, and the strengthening of regulatory instruments. Thus, the discourse of social pathology is understood not as a final explanation of criminality, but as part of governmentality that provides a framework for the state to identify, classify, monitor, and manage community organisations as objects of policy intervention.

In the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs Press Release Number 59/SP/HM.01.02/POLKAM/04/2025 dated May 6, 2025, the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs stated that the activities of problematic community organisations have disrupted the investment climate and lowered business confidence, leading to the government's commitment to take firm action against all forms of thuggery. From a social pathology perspective, particularly social disorganisation theory, this practice is viewed as a form of deviance that disrupts the order of the social system. When some norms shift from participatory functions to become instruments of organised extortion, social disorganisation occurs, characterised by the weakening of compliance with legal norms and the strengthening of group interests over the public interest. This condition drives the formation of informal institutions that rival state authority, weaken the rule of law, and create uncertainty for the business sector.

Based on the foregoing discussion, it can be understood that social pathology in the context of community organisation thuggery is not merely a sociological concept explaining deviance; rather, it functions as a regime of knowledge shaping how the state defines, classifies, and manages groups perceived as threats to social order. Through the adoption of various perspectives, such as Strain Theory and social disorganisation, the state constructs a regime of truth that legitimises administrative classification, surveillance, guidance, and law enforcement practices against community organisations constructed as affiliated with thuggery. From Michel Foucault's perspective, this process demonstrates that the category of "problematic community organisations" is not a natural social fact, but the product of discursive construction generated through power/knowledge relations. Thus, the discourse of social pathology serves as the rational foundation for governmentality practices,

which are subsequently manifested through various public policy and governance mechanisms in managing public security and order.

2. The Role of the State in the Governmentality Regime over Community Organizations

According to Foucault (cited in Adriani, 2024), power and knowledge share a reciprocal relationship, in which the exercise of power produces knowledge, while knowledge serves as both the basis of legitimacy and the means of operationalising power. Through discourse, individuals and groups are not only defined but also formed, controlled, and disciplined via various physical and symbolic mechanisms of control (Eriyanto, 2001). In the context of community organisations, a synthesis of various studies shows that organisational legitimacy relies not only on formal legality but also on the ability to construct a discourse representing public interests and obtaining public acceptance. Discourse becomes an arena of knowledge production as well as a power struggle, where narratives, data, and experiences are deployed to build legitimacy, maintain power relations, and determine which forms of knowledge are recognised as truth (Aini & Putra, 2026; Irdiansyah, 2021; Pratama, 2021). Consequently, the legitimacy of community organisations is produced through the interaction of discourse, knowledge, and power, rather than solely by its legal status or organisational structure.

The Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs plays a role in coordinating national policies in politics and security to maintain the stability of public security and order. As a follow-up to controlling thuggery practices, the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs established the Integrated Task Force for the Management and Guidance of Community Organisations Affiliated with Thuggery through Coordinating Minister Decree Number 61 of 2025. The

establishment of this Task Force responds to mounting public and business concern over thuggery practices that disrupt security, public order, and the investment climate. The Task Force is mandated to coordinate the management, guidance, and law enforcement concerning community organisations affiliated with thuggery, strengthen synergy among ministries/agencies and local governments, and formulate policy recommendations to improve management effectiveness.

Through the establishment of the Integrated Task Force, the government demonstrates its commitment to eradicating various thuggery practices and community organisation activities that have the potential to cause order disturbances, social unrest, and barriers to investment or economic activity. This step represents a tangible manifestation of state presence in providing protection to the public by generating a sense of security, guaranteeing freedom of activity, and maintaining a healthy and competitive business climate. Additionally, as a constitutional mandate, the government is obliged to safeguard public space from being dominated by acts of intimidation, violence, or coercion perpetrated by specific groups.

The establishment of the Integrated Task Force for the Management and Guidance of Community Organisations Affiliated with Thuggery through the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree Number 61 of 2025 reflects the practice of governmentality as conceptualised by Michel Foucault. In this perspective, the Integrated Task Force functions not merely as an inter-agency coordination mechanism, but also as a technology of power operating through processes of classification, surveillance, and normalisation of the target groups. Through discursive constructions that position community organisations affiliated with thuggery as threats to security, stability, public order, and the investment climate, the state shapes a regime of truth that legitimises systematic institutional intervention.

The power/knowledge relation is evident in the utilisation of administrative knowledge such as mapping, databases, and reports as a basis for identifying, guiding, and enforcing the law against groups categorised as deviant. The Integrated Task Force executes not only repressive functions but also manages the population through a combination of guidance, management, and law enforcement strategies, thereby constructing community organisations thuggery as an object of government requiring sustained intervention to establish a social order considered normal, secure, and conducive to political stability and economic development.

According to the performance report of the Task Force on Community Organisations Affiliated with Thuggery Activities, it was noted that community organisations have experienced social dysfunction and abuse of legality, creating space for them to shift toward thuggery that is predominantly negative, as follows:

Table 1.

Challenges in Community Organisation Governance and Thuggery Practices	
Indicator	Challenges
Socio-Economic Factors (Unemployment/Social Inequality)	Unemployment and social inequality conditions drive some members of society to join or utilize community organisations as a means to obtain income, including through deviant practices.
Weak Supervision of Community organisations	Suboptimal supervision leaves community organisations activities largely unchecked, opening opportunities for deviance and acts of thuggery.
Abuse of Organizational Legality	The legal status of community organisations is frequently used as a shield to carry out activities outside their social functions, making it difficult to distinguish between legitimate and unlawful actions.
Lack of Deterrent Effect in Law Enforcement	Inconsistent enforcement or lenient sanctions fail to deter perpetrators, who tend to repeat their offenses.
Potential Linkages with Specific Political/Economic Actors	Relationships with interested parties can provide informal protection, complicating the enforcement process and reinforcing the existence of thuggery practices.

Source: Author's Work, 2026

According to data from the Integrated Task Force on Community Organisations Affiliated with Thuggery as of July 2, 2025, the establishment of the Task Force has been expanded to the provincial, regency, and city levels as part of the implementation of the national policy on managing thuggery. Regional Task Forces are tasked with executing early prevention, socialisation, guidance, surveillance, and enforcement against individuals and community organisations indicated to be engaging in thuggery activities. This institutional expansion is reinforced by a Ministry of Home Affairs Circular Letter instructing governors, regents, and mayors to establish regional Integrated Task Forces, thereby ensuring that thuggery management is executed in a coordinated manner between the central and local governments.

The establishment of the Integrated Task Force for the Management of Thuggery and Community Organisations Affiliated with Thuggery constitutes a form of governmentality practice because the state creates a cross-ministerial, agency, law enforcement, and local government coordinating mechanism to control social spaces deemed to have the potential to disrupt security and order. Within this framework, the Task Force becomes a governmental instrument that not only penalises legal violations but also produces norms, disciplines social actors, and constructs compliance through a combination of surveillance, guidance, and the legitimacy of public policies. The concept of governmentality developed by Michel Foucault (1991) explains that modern power operates through a governmental rationality that combines regulation, surveillance, and the shaping of public behaviour, rather than solely through domination or coercion. Power is manifested through a network of institutions, policies, procedures, and administrative techniques that allow the state to manage the population effectively. In this context, the population is represented by the practices of community organisations affiliated with thuggery activities.

Mapping the management of community organisations problems still faces various constraints, such as suboptimal coordination between ministries/agencies and local governments, limited integrated data, weak early detection mechanisms, and differing approaches to field management. These conditions underscore the need for a more coordinated and evidence-based governance framework in formulating management policies. Data from Kompas (March 17, 2025) indicates that 51.1% of problems in industrial estates stem from disturbances by NGOs/community organisations, which slow down investment and economic growth. In Michel Foucault's perspective, these statistics function not merely as empirical information but as a technology of knowledge (or technology of power) that shapes the discursive construction of community organisations as objects of risk. Through this knowledge production, the state obtains legitimacy to expand surveillance practices, administrative classification, and institutional coordination as part of the rationality of governmentality.

From Michel Foucault's perspective, the role of the state in managing community organisations affiliated with thuggery is realised not only through law enforcement but also through governmentality practices that combine knowledge production, administrative classification, surveillance, guidance, and inter-agency coordination. Through these various instruments, the state establishes norms regarding legitimate organisations while steering organisational behaviour to align with governance objectives. Thus, governmentality operates not simply through the use of repressive power, but through population management mechanisms that encourage organisations to internalise norms and self-regulate their behaviour. This practice demonstrates that managing norms is a form of modern governmental rationality that seeks to maintain security, stability, public order, and the investment

climate through a combination of regulation, surveillance, and the formation of social compliance.

3. The State, Social Discipline, and Public Order in the Transformation of Social Pathology

From Michel Foucault's perspective, the modern state is no longer understood solely as an institution exercising power through legal instruments and repressive violence, but as an entity managing social life through the practices of disciplinary power and governmentality. Power here is productive, meaning it shapes social norms, directs individual and group behaviour, and generates compliance through mechanisms of surveillance, regulation, administrative classification, and knowledge production. Therefore, the function of the state is not only to penalise violations of the law but also to construct social order by guiding individuals and collectives to act in accordance with norms deemed legitimate. The control of community organisations affiliated with thuggery can thus be understood as an integral part of modern governmentality practices, wherein the state combines various technologies of government to maintain security, public order, and social stability through processes of discipline and behavioural normalisation.

From Michel Foucault's perspective, thuggery is not understood as an objective form of social pathology, but as a discursive category constructed through power/knowledge relations, whereby certain behaviours are defined as deviance requiring state surveillance, disciplining, and intervention. Limited access to employment or difficulties in obtaining a decent livelihood can prevent individuals from meeting their needs through legitimate mechanisms, leading them to choose illicit methods. Beyond individual factors, the inability of social structures and institutions to support healthy personality development also contributes to the

emergence of pathological behaviour. Over time, such behaviour can permeate community organisations and impact the stability of security, public order, and a conducive investment climate.

In the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs Press Release Number 152/SP/HM.01.02/POLKAM/7/2025, it was reported that in the May-June 2025 performance report, the Task Force recorded the handling of 10,771 cases, with 13,585 suspects successfully apprehended. Some prominent cases receiving attention included extortion by Community organisations members in Cilegon, illegal land occupation in South Tangerang and violence against officers in Depok. From Michel Foucault's governmentality perspective, these achievements represent the operation of disciplinary technology through systematic surveillance, sectoral coordination, and the guidance of community organisations. Through the production of administrative knowledge, the state classifies organisations while establishing standards of normative behaviour. Rather than being merely repressive, power here operates productively through normalisation processes that encourage self-regulation (self-regulation) and the internalisation of compliance for the realisation of social order.

One of the considerations for establishing the Integrated Task Force for the Management and Guidance of Community Organizations Affiliated with Thuggery through the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree Number 61 of 2025 is that managing community organisations affiliated with thuggery must be carried out in a coordinated and integrated manner through collaboration among policy stakeholders in ministries/agencies and local governments. This policy reinforces that social pathology is not a natural reality, but a discursive construction shaped by governmental rationality (governmentality). Within the power/knowledge relation, the concepts of social pathology and strain theory function as a knowledge

regime that legitimises the transformation of thuggery into an object of public policy intervention. Consequently, the management approach shifts from a repressive orientation toward preventive and administrative governance through data collection, classification, and cross-sectoral guidance mechanisms. From the perspective of governmentality, these practices are oriented not only toward punishment but also toward population management, the formation of compliance, and the normalisation of organisational behaviour to align with the state's security rationality.

In the Indonesian context, thuggery practices cannot be separated from patronage relations and informal power networks that enable certain community organisations to obtain political protection and access to economic resources (Aspinall & Berenschot, 2019; Wilson, 2018). These conditions prompt the state to strengthen control through cross-sectoral coordination, administrative surveillance, guidance, and law enforcement to maintain security, public order, and the investment climate. In Michel Foucault's perspective, this strategy represents governmentality practices, which are how the state manages the population through norm formation, administrative classification, and mechanisms of social disciplining. Through power/knowledge relations, the state constructs the category of "community organisations affiliated with thuggery" as a discursive object that legitimises policy intervention while aligning organisational behaviour with governmental rationality.

Foucault emphasises that every exercise of power always produces social consequences. Therefore, the classification of community organisations affiliated with thuggery must be implemented in a transparent, accountable, and evidence-based manner to avoid stigmatisation or restrictions on the freedom of association. Within this framework, the effectiveness of control is measured not only by its success in creating stability and order (state security), but also by the state's ability to ensure that

surveillance, guidance, and law enforcement are executed proportionally while guaranteeing the protection of citizens' rights (human security) in accordance with the principles of the rule of law and democracy

D. CONCLUSION

The state constructs community organisation thuggery not as a natural social pathology, but as a category of deviance produced through power/knowledge relations. Through the adoption of sociological knowledge regimes, such as Strain Theory and social disorganisation theory, the state forms a regime of truth that classifies community organisations into "normal" and "deviant" categories. This classification positions intimidation, extortion, and violence under the guise of community organisations as threats to public order and the investment climate, thereby legitimising the application of security policies and disciplinary mechanisms. This practice is manifested through modern governmentality with the establishment of the Integrated Task Force based on the Coordinating Minister for Political and Security Affairs Decree Number 61 of 2025, which integrates surveillance, cross-sectoral coordination, institutional synchronisation, intelligence, and guidance as technologies of power to control community organisation behaviour and align their functions with state norms.

Based on these findings, this study recommends that the Coordinating Ministry for Political and Security Affairs, together with relevant ministries and agencies, strengthen evidence-based governance of community organisations surveillance through cross-sectoral database integration to enhance early detection. Additionally, thuggery control must be complemented by socio-economic empowerment strategies, such as expanding access to employment and strengthening the economic capacity of community organisations members, so that state intervention is not merely repressive and

administrative, but is also capable of addressing the structural tensions (strain) that drive thuggery practices.

Future research is advised to expand the scope of study using a mixed-methods approach to complement Foucauldian Discourse Analysis (FDA) with Social Network Analysis (SNA) to map the informal relationships between community organisations actors affiliated with thuggery and local political or economic elites. Furthermore, future studies should examine the discursive resistance and adaptive strategies of community organisations in responding to technologies of power and administrative classifications applied by the Integrated Task Force at the regional level, thereby providing a more comprehensive understanding of the dynamics of power relations in the implementation of thuggery control policies.

REFERENCES

- Aini, H., & Putra, E. V. (2026). Wacana, pengetahuan, dan kuasa dalam debat Pilkada 2024 di Pesisir Selatan berdasarkan perspektif Foucault. *Perspektif: Jurnal Kajian Sosiologi dan Pendidikan*, 9(1), 99–110
- Andriani, I. (2024). Analisis wacana kritis model Foucault dalam berita “Tangis Goenawan Mohamad dan ambisi kekuasaan Jokowi” pada Kompas.com. *Jurnal Sitasi Ilmiah*, 2(1), 40–49.
- Aspinall, E., & Berenschot, W. (2019). *Democracy for sale: Pemilihan umum, klientelisme, dan negara di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Effendi, T., Perwira, H. T. Y., Siahaan, P. M., Niswah, L. U. K., & Lestari, A. S. I. (2024). *Pendekatan sosial terhadap kejahatan*. Scopindo Media Pustaka.
- Eriyanto. (2001). *Analisis Wacana: Pengantar Analisis Teks Media*. LKiS.
- Foucault, Michel. (2002). *Power/Knowledge: Wacana Kuasa/Pengetahuan*, Diterjemahkan oleh Yudi Santoso. Yogyakarta: Bentang Budaya.
- Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.; C. Gordon, L. Marshall, J. Mepham, & K. Soper, Trans.). Pantheon Books.
- Foucault, M. (1991). *The Foucault effect: Studies in governmentality*. University of Chicago Press.
- Gatot Eddy Pramono. (2015). Transfcommunity organisations i Organisasi Kemasyarakatan (Ormas) menjadi Kelompok Kekerasan (Studi Kekerasan Community organisations di Jakarta). *Jurnal Keamanan Nasional*, 1(2)
- Hadiz, V. R. (2010). *Localising Power in Post-Authoritarian Indonesia: A Southeast Asia Perspective*. Stanford University Press.
- Hasibuan, A. A. (2021). *Buku ajar patologi sosial*. Kencana.
- Irdiansyah, A. R. (2021). Reproduksi pengetahuan untuk kekuasaan: Analisis wacana kritis pada artikel ilmiah dan pidato Megawati Soekarnoputri. *Perspektif Komunikasi: Jurnal Ilmu Komunikasi Politik dan Komunikasi Bisnis*, 5(2), 223–237.

- Kartini, Kartono. (2013). Patologi Sosial Jilid 1. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.
- Keputusan Menteri Koordinator Bidang Politik dan Keamanan Nomor 61 Tahun 2025 tentang Satuan Tugas Terpadu Penanganan dan Pembinaan Organisasi Kemasyarakatan Terafiliasi Kegiatan Premanisme yang Mengganggu Stabilitas Keamanan dan Ketertiban Masyarakat serta Iklim Investasi.
- Merton, R. K. (1968). Social theory and social structure. Free Press.
- Pratama, R. A. (2021). Kekuasaan, pengetahuan, dan hegemoni bahasa dalam perspektif Michel Foucault dan Francis Bacon. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*, 4(1), 33–43.
- Sampson, R. J. (2012). Great American city: Chicago and the enduring neighborhood effect. University of Chicago Press.
- Seputra, H. R., & Suyatno, S. (2024). Kekuasaan sebagai dasar legitimasi hukum dalam pemikiran filsafat hukum. *AL-MIKRAJ: Jurnal Studi Islam dan Humaniora*, 5(1), 1206–1217.
- Siregar, M. (2021). Kritik terhadap Teori Kekuasaan-Pengetahuan Foucault. *Juisspol*, 1-12.
- Soekanto, S. (2005). Sosiologi suatu pengantar. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Wilson, Ian Douglas. (2018). Politik Jatah Preman: Ormas dan Kuasa Jalanan di Indonesia Pasca Orde Baru (Terjemahan: Mirza Jaka Suryana). Tangerang Selatan: Marjin Kiri.