

[DOI: 10.20472/IAC.2015.017.028](https://doi.org/10.20472/IAC.2015.017.028)

EDBERT GANI

University of Indonesia, Indonesia

PRATICKO GENIO

University of Indonesia, Indonesia

ARIEF NUGRAHA

University of Indonesia, Indonesia

INDONESIA STILL WANT TO VOTE

Abstract:

Indonesia is a country that puts the elections as fundamental to reflect the country's democracy. This is shown by the regulation of elections in the state constitution (UUD 1945) which is the basic law of the state. In Suharto's authoritarian regime (called New Order), Indonesia also held regular elections. The existence of regular elections is used as a tool in countries such as Indonesia to show the world that the democratic system has existed in this country. Procedurally democratic elections marked by still survive up until the time of the current reform. But if we want to see democracy substantially, then there needs to be more in-depth research about it

In 2004, Indonesia recorded an achievement in terms of democratization. In that time, Indonesia for the first time can select the president and vice president directly. This achievement was followed by doing direct local elections. Quite revolutionary change occurs only six years since the reform carried out Suharto's authoritarian regime.

At the end of 2014 there were intense debates in Indonesia about local elections. Indonesia is a country that is very much holding elections because people have to choose from the level of the central government, provincial, city and county up. During this time to select the area of the district and provincial level conducted through direct elections. This began in 2004 with the issuance of Law (UU) No. 32 of 2004 which regulates the election of Regional Head directly. In 2014, the problem arises because the House intends to revise that law. This is done by issuing a bill on local elections that convert directly to indirectly elections again. Local elections at the provincial level are returned to the mechanism covered by parliament while the district level fixed by direct election

Outside of the debate about the interests of the relevant political actors with the election system, there are other important things that need to be answered in this problem. When we look to other democratic countries in the world, actually local elections do not have to be directly. The United States is an example where the local elections conducted indirectly. The main question of our paper is how importance a direct local elections with the quality of democracy in a country such as Indonesia. Whether significant or does not.

Keywords:

Local elections, democracy, Indonesia

JEL Classification: D72, N95

The Election Law of 2008 regarding the implementation of Regional Head Election (Pilkada); it shows the government is very ambitious in creating such a democratic country, as a system that could meet aspirations of the people. The political system of democracy and general election could not meet demands and choices of citizens as the broaden options that are given by market mechanism (Stoker, 1991:238-245). Regional Head Election is a product which is produced by a government for the creations of democracy at all levels of government. This implementation of Regional Head Election heads for realizing democracy inside the government in a regional; in this case the executive is the result of a collective agreement through Regional Head Election in determining its leaders based on the principles of Pancasila and the Constitution (Lukum, 2008: 1). Local Direct Election itself is a representation of an implementation of democracy at the local level in determining a leader or Regional Head and Vice Regional Head that are chosen by the people themselves, as well as the meaning of a democracy is a sovereignty vested in the hands of people.

According to Joko M. Prihantoro (as cited in Adhani, 2009: 27), Regional Head Election forms a political recruitment that is the selection of people to the personages who ran themselves as Regional Head; both as Governor / Deputy Governor and Regent / Vice Regent or Mayor / Deputy Mayor. Along with the comprehension described above, it appears, that whoever becomes the winner in a Regional Head Election organized by the Regional Election commission (KPUD)¹ people should respect the results obtained, for the purpose of an implementation of Regional Head Election was looking for someone who can be trusted to carry the trusteeship of people in a whole. By being aware of what the purpose of Regional Head Election is, it should be able to give a positive influence for all people, without any unwanted actions. Supposedly, people can accept what has been a choice of entire people of Indonesia in the election instead of judging those who win. This is a kind of attitude that would impede democratization process through the implementation of Local Direct Election, with the result that it will not fit the goals and ideals in building a democracy at the local level.

The implementation of Local Direct Election is a significant momentum for the development of local politics in Indonesia to steer its politic more democratic in a way. Regional Head Election has become a hope of any Indonesian people for the sake of a politic that is far better in any terms; foremost public welfare which is especially in a regional, because a Regional Head is closer to people who give him a strong legitimation of people. In order of elected directly by the people as happened in Presidential and members of DPR/DPD² election, then everything be any movements or policies taken by local political leaders should be an embodiment of the aspirations of the people for people are sovereign. In other words, such election is a key of political development to open participation of people in determining their leader at its widest. And as a political competition, Regional Head Election has become the main target of the elite to mutual conflicts of interest from various sectors. The actors who play in it, from local level to national level, they will bring each other down for the sake of

¹ Regional Election Commission or its abbreviation KPUD is an agency specifically authorized by the Law to administer an election of Regional Head, Vice Regional Head, in each province and city

² People's House of Representatives or its abbreviation DPR is an high institution of a country in the state system of Indonesia that is a representative institution of people, as for House regional Representatives or DPD is a representative institution of regional people that its position as an executor of regional government in province/regency/city in Indonesia

obtaining the political positions available which in majority are seen based on economic perspectives.

In its history, Indonesia had done election of any political positions at national level through People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) or indirectly by the people. In 2004, the constitution was changed with the President was no longer elected by MPR but directly by the people instead. This event is really significant for political sovereignty that is political party before moved to the people who now determine who is proper to lead this country. The accomplishment of Indonesia to directly elect its leader is indeed an extraordinary achievement from the moment of Reformation. But if we return to the topic of this paper, should the election for Regional Head also be done directly as well as in electing president and vice president? Does the Local Direct Election become something fundamental in a democratization process? Various academicians who analyze politics of Indonesia have not reviewed a lot about the matter of Local Direct Election. Any books on democratization in Indonesia are still engaged on the rank of central government. Then it makes interesting to look back on whether the Regional Head Election becomes something significant in the democratization process in Indonesia.

The changes that occur at national level are implicating to local level. During the time of New Order, the head regional government, either level one or two, its candidates were chosen by DPR. This appointment of Regional Head didn't pass through a process as it is now. As seen in its political aspect, the appointment of Regional Head by central government can be seen in three things which are: the government's political strategy in establishing his authorities, the efforts to avoid any conflicts in a region and the efforts of structuring the system of local politics (Sultan, *Jurnal Al-Fikr*, Volume 15 No.2, 2011: 156). Furthermore in the era of Reformation, an election process is heading more to the Center which is selection of the members of the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD).

However, such thing makes the process of democracy in Indonesia is stepping towards the creation of regional autonomy, which means a region can organize their own respective needs. The ratification of Law no. 32 year 2004; it is written that Regional Head level one or two is elected directly by the people. It indicates that people have already held the full sovereignty and there is an appearing of a democratic system. Regional Head Election that shows people are sovereign; it provides a very broad space for the people to voice their aspirations toward the leader they have chosen. This thing also makes any leaders in regions are no longer standing as an extension hand of the central leader; they are also become political region leaders as the result of legitimation coming from the people in a Regional Head Election.

The Law which orders the Regional Government is Law No. 32 Year 2004; it states that, Regional Head (Regent, Mayor and Governor) is elected directly by the people. Before this Law was made, the mechanism of the election of Regional Head was carried out by the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD). Then the result of such election by DPRD turned out to be a bad impact for the people. According to Lili Romli (*Jurnal Poelik*, Vol.1 No.1, 2008:1), it mentions the three problems of Regional Head Election by DPRD, namely:

“Because, firstly, the political oligarchy being done by DPRD in choosing a Regional Head, where the interests of the party, even the interests of party elites, they are often manipulating the people's interest. Second, the mechanism of the election of Regional Head tends to create a dependency of one Regional Head to DPRD. Which

is the impact is the Regional Heads are more accountable toward DPRD instead of the public. The impact in further is collusion and money politic, especially in the process of such election, between the candidates and legislators. Thirdly, there is a 'removal' and/or overacts of the legislators towards the Regional Head, as seen in a case in Surabaya and South Kalimantan, which affects the turmoil and political instability and also the local government.”.

With the Local Direct Election, people are participating directly in determining the regional leaders. According to Amien Rais (quoted in Kusumah, dkk., 1999: 82) the democracy practice, Local Direct Election in this case, has a quite interesting principal, which one of them is the efforts of how one country encourages the people to be involved directly in the country's decision-making that is different from the decision of a ruling elite group. Local Direct Election is also a tangible manifestation of the basis of responsibility and accountability. Through such election, a Regional Head should be directly responsible of the people. Local Direct Election is more suited to the climate of democracy as it is now, as the people do not have to elect through DPRD. The people can make their own choices based on clear and transparent criteria.

Before we dive into the good and bad side of Local Direct Election to democracy in Indonesia, we wanted to show the theoretical context of the democracy that happens in Indonesia. Contextually seeing democracy, in this case is in Indonesia, it becomes important to not be biased by directly marrying it to indicators of liberal democracy that is currently accepted in universal.

Democracy in theoretical and context of Indonesia

Need we agree before that democracy and democratization as a theory and a concept ther are still evolving until today. The theoretical studies to date arguably can not really give a rigid definition about democracy. In general, democracy is defined as a system that will give the people sovereignty with the existence of general election to do a routine leadership change and there is a sovereignty of law as well as the recognition of civil rights. Democracy becomes a term that is so strong with Indonesia after the reformation happened. But the keaders of the past era such as Sukarno and Suharto also used democracy as a term to name after their political system. Soekarno with 'guided democracy' and Suharto with 'Pancasila democracy'. That in fact, both these past presidents are actually implementing a system that can't be called democratic, and even can be said as authoritarian. But the use of terms of democracy in calling political systems and even the type of a country did not only happen in Indonesia. We can see North Korea which call themselves as Democratic People's Republic of Korea, or Vietnam also once named by Ho Chi Minh as the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

Laurence Whitehead sees those phenomenon as the hegemonic form of democracy in the political science study after the end of Cold War. But what interesting is how Whitehead views the situation of various ways of democracy itself in some countries. In other words, the concept of democracy is not a single concept and quite dynamic depends on the contexts of ots country (Whitehead, 2002). Therefore every country as included in the discourse of democracy in its diverse levels. This kind of situation makes a lot of political scientists who intend to innovate with different concepts of democracy. A study from David Collier and Steven Levitsky is good enough in giving us a picture about this innovation. According to Collier and Levitsky the innovation that has been done by any scientists is to specify different forms of democracy in every

country to comply with the framework they wanted. Both writers take a note that there are at least 550 democracy terms with adjectives, currently (Collier dan Levitsky, Makalah, 1996). Such a large number shows many scientists in political science that talk about democracy by specifying which democracy that is meant in question.

Many types of democracy become a reflection on the conditions in each different country. However, the western-style of liberal democracy is branded as the main indicator of discussion about democracy. The famous argument from Fukuyama said that liberal democracy became the winner after the end of the war of ideology. Ariel Armony and Hector Schamis assess what is discussed when we are speaking about democracy today is indeed liberal democracy. Many of political scientists also noticed that there was another development that emerged in addition to western-style of liberal democracy. In general, many political scientists use any indicators of form of polyarchy of Robert Dahl in seeing democracy that is universally accepted. What Dahl emphasized is the importance of elections that are free, honest and fair as well as the importance of maintaining the political freedom and social freedom. Dahl's theory is widely used in the discussion on democracy that has been consolidated within a country. Many also provide a polyarchy overview as the main indicator of a liberal democracy. One of the alternatives of liberal democracy are the studies of deliberative democracy that often appeared and are led by, for example, the case of Latin America in Porto Alegre or Kerala in India. In a deliberative democracy, participation of the people are active in political life, regardless of the time we vote while in elections, it becomes the main thing.

It is obvious from the discourse of current democracy that there is nothing underlines the importance of directly electing a Regional Head. We have seen from what has been explained previously that the way each people interpret democracy are very different depending on the context. In the Indonesian context, there is a condition that requires the people to put the Direct Local Election as strengthening for democratization that is being undertaken. Yet before that, it is needed for us to see the situation of democracy in Indonesia in advance.

The era of New Order have a very huge effect with what the condition of Indonesia is today. Starting from that era, there are oligarchic factions appeared which involve the relation of family business or politicians who exploit the existing bureaucratic alienation. The conglomerate rulers that were born of the New Order is believed by Vedi R. Hadiz as the source of the coming crisis in 1998 due to the inability to control the law and excessive investment of this group (2005: 113). But what interesting is it turned out that these groups are not dissolved after Suharto's fall, just as predicted by many political analysts. This culture of oligarchic political in Indonesia has been so strong with an incredibly high level of corruption. Right after Suharto's fall, these groups are no longer be able to simply rely on the strength of centralistic power that used to give such high favor of them. Therefore, as a result, these groups adapted well to the new conditions and were trying to get into the electoral competition to be able to get their business self-interests (Hadiz, 2005: 114). So the business interests that had been on the outside of the bureaucracy or parliament, they instead entered the level of policy formulation in the government. So the democracy which is formed is oligarchic democracy, where the actual control of the election is the conglomerates that have their own interests of big business.

Thus in view of the state of democracy today, particularly in Indonesia, the transition in the context of democratization is no longer so important. As expressed by Armony

and Schamis (2005), it is now more important to discuss how to strengthen the practice of democracy that occurs within existing democratic system. Most of the existing democratic system today would show a non-compliance with the principle of democracy itself. According to both of them there are two major factors that affect the problems of democracy today. They are about the plan of the form of the institutions and citizens (*democratic citizenship*) (Armony & Schamis, 2005: 114). The high amount of corruption practice and also the oligarchical problems which still exist in Indonesian politics make the people feel the need of an alternative to oversee the existing power. One of its way is bringing up their pressure to keep the right to vote their own Regional Heads rather than hand it over to their representation in the regional parliament or DPRD. So in time when we look back, there is a crisis of representation that descend the democracy in Indonesia. The trust that put on representatives to vote the Regional Heads is really low because of corruption that plagued the political parties and parliament. As for the problem of the crisis of representation, it will be discussed in the next section.

The implementation of Local Direct Election can be interpreted as an affirmation of regional autonomy. It was realized from the autonomy of the people in determining alone of who would be their leader (Chalid, et al., 2005:11). The existing of a direct election, whether in a presidential or regional head election, creates the spirit to bring the government closer to the people. Along with the direct election an elected leader, they can be said to get a strong legitimation from the people. This legitimation itself comes directly from whom without a need to be represented first to the party elites. We cannot remove decentralization alone from the agenda of democratization. Vedi R. Hadiz (2005) sees democratization as an effort to push equitable development in the areas that have been left behind caused of the centralized government in Suharto's era. Yet however, decentralization with this regional autonomy can actually have a negative impact in a certain degree due to an over exploitation of regional government who still uses the same political culture as in the New Order. But that topic of discussion will not be the focus in this paper. What we would like to highlight is that Regional Head Election indeed opens the participation of the people more widely. One of the determining things that can be done by regional people is to determine who would lead their region area. An impetus toward Local Direct Election is currently directly supported by the fact of emergences of populist leaders who win the Regional Head Election in their respective areas. The most striking example we can see is the winning of former Governor of Jakarta, who now serves as a President of Indonesia, Joko Widodo on *incumbent* candidate Fauzi Bowo. The most striking example we can see is the winning of former Governor of Jakarta, who now serves as a President of Indonesia, Joko Widodo on *incumbent* candidate Fauzi Bowo. The populist figure of Joko Widodo comes with his habit of doing *blusukan*, which provides a result of an outstanding self-branding.³ Moreover, besides Joko Widodo there is a populist Regional Head appear in Surabaya through the figure of Risma who was also born from a Local Direct Election. In this context democracy of Indonesia, besides its oligarchy situation, is also very strong with high populism. A figure image becomes a really important point to win the heart of the public.

³ Blusukan is often interpreted as an activity done by the leader of the people to directly see and involve the condition happens in lower stage. This act gets a very positive respond from public and it becomes an important political modal for Joko Widodo in winning the Regional Head Election in Jakarta and even in the presidential election.

One important point we cannot separate it from the explanations above is that today's democracy system in Indonesia is a form of powerful elite consolidation. The transition process going on from an authoritarian regime to a democracy cannot be separated from agreement of the political elites of Indonesia to take advantage of opportunity to gain power. Juan J.Linz dan Alfred Stepan (2001) opine that there are three main things in seeing a consolidated democracy. *Behaviorally*, the absence of political actors who are trying to get their own interests by pushing to a non-democratic rezime. *Attitudinally*, the opinion belief of majority towards democracy to be able to accommodate the joint interests of the people. The third, *constitutionally*, where all sorts of interests are contesting in a sovereign realm of law. Then it is clear of it that it is important an elite factor to be able in creating a democracy in a country which had previously been in a transition.

This opinion then later is very likely to be contested by any political scientists who seek to see the importance of political participation of the people into a study of democracy. If democracy is seen as a system that emphasizes the direct participation of the people, there will be no harm to the public for they will be involved more in choosing their Regional Head. Yet on the other hand, there is the fact that see a strengthening of democracy is not merely a matter of public participation, but its weight more to the political direction of the ruling elites. This is true a weakness of Western political scientists who analyze and study on democracy. Democracy that is happening in Indonesia not necessarily can be explained by a variety of conditions that happen to be a reference of liberal democracy. The role of the elites is precisely so strong and which even brought the people of Indonesia towards the electoral democracy which is still in progress. The pressure to keep doing the Local Direct Election is a form of the people's effort in trying to maintain their participation gap and balance the power of the elites that have been in power. But it is exactly this argument would be a weak point of the movement to encourage the direct election itself, because basically they have chosen the representatives in a parliament who become their political representation. It becomes a problem due to a strengthening of a true democracy goes hand in hand with strengthening of political parties. This case of Indonesia may be a reflection of how the existence of certain condition in a political elite in the country that makes the people need an alternative for themselves to participate in politics. And while related to this issue, we cannot let go of the democracy contexts in Indonesia with its fact of political representation. These two concepts are believed as not a single entity, yet in our argument, both affect each other and generate a pressure as the direct Regional Head Election has been done in Indonesia.

Representation Problems

The politic representation that we had meant was the giving of mandate to a representative of the people who were chosen via general elections to sit on the parlement. There are three elements in representation, which are: The representative, the voter, and authority. Perruzoti said that representation were relevant with general elections and the representatives have a freedom in making decisions according to their own instinct. Truth is, not many agreed with what Perruzoti had said. Researchers who studied about representation have two different opinions on the matter of a representative's role. There were two roles for the representatives. Those roles were *trustee* and *delegate*. In being a *delegate*, the representative must answer to the constituents and that mean the constituents held the most power. In other words, the

representative must bow to the will of the constituents. In other hand, there were those who thought that the representative must use their own instinct in making decisions. Those people believed that the representatives were *trustee* as they gave the representatives their trust. They need a good reasoning skill and they should be able to make a decisions that could help the constituents. Though the policy they made might not be what the constituents had wanted, if the representatives thought that the policy have benefits on the constituents' goodwill, then the policy would still be erected. This means that the representatives hold the most power. (Soeseno 2013, 31-35)

Hanna Pitkin said that there are four point of views of representation. Those were formal representation, symbolic representation, descriptive representation, and substantive representation. In this case, we will further discuss about formal representation. Formal representation was a representation that were regulated by the Act and they have two dimensions, authorization and accountability. Authorization in here means on how a representative got into their position (via general election). Accountability means on how the constituent punish the representatives for neglecting their responsibility.

When representation and democracy met, they create a unique paradox. Democracy was a system where all countrymen could participate in rotating the wheels of the country and it was inclusive. On the other hand, representation were exclusive because the constituent vote their representative to represent themself in the parlement. (Soeseno 2013, 54). Although they create a paradox, representative democracy can be something that could be practiced in the modern world considering the growing number of people in the world. In representative democracy, we could clearly see the connection between a representative with the constituent. Representation could go well if the representative could fulfil their responsibility, which is :

1. *Investigating complaints from Citizens about poor government service*
2. *Advocating from citizens who needs service from a government agency*
3. *Receiving input from citizens or NGO relating to pending legislation*
4. *Assisting local government entities in your district in getting service from the national government*
5. *Informing the public about layout your activities in parliament*

Beside what Patrick Cadle had said, Andrew Rahfeld also mentions a few points of Representative Democracy, though he saw it from the negative point of view : (Soeseno 2013, 215)

1. Representative were chosen through unorthodox rules
2. The rules of the election heed not to the voter's voting power.
3. The representatives does not represent those who can authorize them to act.
4. The side who could claim the accountability was not the side represented by the politic representation.
5. Politic representations have non-feasible purposes in upholding their duty.

Indonesia was one of the country with a Representative Democracy because the people's delegates were chosen by the people, executive and legislative. Indonesia used direct election to vote the representative of the people, starting from the top (The seat of Presidency) all to the bottom (To the regency), all caused by decentralization of autonomy rules of the region. The problem in Representative Democracy in Indonesia was caused not by the failings of birocracy, but was caused by a lack of trust from the Indonesian people. Like what Andrew Rahfeld had said, the people believed that the representatives could no longer go with the constituent's wishes. It was not unheard for a representative of a region to fail in allocating the funds needed for the advancement of a region. The funds were 'leaked'. Decentralization hold an important role in this downfall for it gave an unlimited freedom, away from the prying eyes of the provincial jurisdiction as what was stated in Law number 22 year 1999. Until Law number 32 year 2004 gave the province back the power over region's autonomy.

This temporary lost of provicial control over a region's autonomy caused the emergence of local political elites who nearly always use the regional budget (APBD) for their own ambition⁴, which further worsened by the not-so-transparent government. We can see the example of these failings by looking at Batam and Kutai Kartanegara. The two regions were given a big budget, yet we hear little about their advancement. There's also a matter of working relation between executives and legislatives who take the role of a broker so businessmen must pay more than the usual to the regional government. Syaukani, as the regent of Kutai Kartanegara, was arrested for act of corruption by KPK⁵ which costed the country no more than 120 Billion Rupiahs. This happens because of the process of Regional Head Election that makes the government's need to untighten their grip on their own prerogative rights and also open the funding door which is tended at first to an area development.

The Positive and Negative of a Direct Regional Head Election

According to Legowo (As cited by Wardhani, 2005:12) there are five positive outcome in holding a direct Region Head Election. *First*, the possibility of a political participation by the people. *Second*, the competitors could compete in a fair competition. *Third*, the head of region's standing could be more legitimate. *Fourth*, a little less manipulation and unfairness. *Five*, a raise in the accountability of the Regional Head in the eyes of the people.

Overlooking the positives, we can also see the negatives in holding a direct Regional Head Election. When first introduced back in 2004, direct election in Indonesia were assessed as being unable to overcome problems of the past and it is not even influential in some cases that have negative impact and even cause a drop in an increase of service and also public confidence. (Strachan, GSDRC Research Report, <http://www.gsdrc.org/docs/open/HDQ1073.pdf>, accessed 11 April 2015). Not only that, Harris said (As cited by Anugrah, 2005: 1030) that the Regional Head Direct Election could cause an abuse in power by the Central Government.

We can compare our own representative politic with that of the country of Indian. The legislatives in the country were more responsive with the need of the constituents. This

⁴ Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Daerah (Regional budget)

⁵ An institution in Indonesia which has a role in taking care of corruption cases

of course have an effect on the legislatures of the region in that they feel the need to help each other. They understand that general election would bring benefits for them. On the other hand, they knew of loyalty and they understand that every legislature has a history of being loyal to their political parties. They realize that their own popularity would have little effect on their chance to get re-elected and it was implicated that the officials would have little incentives to increase their response to the people's need (Acosta, *et al.*, 2013: 17). We can also see a unique type of general election in Turkey in which the country uses two different systems. Those systems are *majoritarian system* and *proportional representation system*⁶. Majoritarian system for the local council and Proportional Representational system for mayors (Bozlagan, Jurnal Al-Jazeera Center For Studies, 27 Oktober 2013: 4). Both Indonesia and Turkey have the same office period which is 5 years. The local government in Turkey was the key of the growing economy with large scale investments. This differs with France which employed a Representative Democracy system. The officials in the legislative and executive office were voted by the people (Direct or Indirect) and by the already chosen officials. The uniqueness in election of the Regional Head in France is that the candidate must give details about income and outcome which was limited to only 38.000 Euros (Anonymous, Elections 2012: A User's Guide, 2012: 30).

According to Triwibowo (2012: 16-17) a direct election would increase the responsiveness and also force the candidate to be more responsive to answer the need of the people. He also added that a direct election made the issue of public service to be more popular with the candidates, because facts about public services were important for the would-be voters. There's also some who mentioned that the rights of choosing the Regional Head should be returned to the parliament for reasons. According to Fitriyah (*Analisis CSIS*, Vol. 34, Number 3, 2005: 1-2) there are three reasons why the rights should be returned to the Parliament.

"First, a direct Regional Head Election were inefficient. Second, an election like that would trigger a horizontal conflict between the people. Some people even see that the end-product of direct election were no better than those who was chosen by the parliament. Third, a direct Regional Head election would encourage unhealthy competition and cheaters would emerge."

With so many positives and negatives from a Regional Head Election, we can also find the similarities in both of them. The similarities were written in The Law of 1945 chapter IV Regional Government article 18 (4) which is:

"Governors, Regents and Mayors as the respective heads of provincial governments, counties, and cities are elected democratically. There is no word of direct elections, as in article governing presidential elections and there are no words election of Regional Head indirectly or through Parliament. In a democratic state representative or indirect democracy, then meet democratic rule if the election of Regional Heads elected by Parliament. Likewise in the State of direct democracy direct election of regional heads meet democratic rule as a form of implementation of the sovereignty of the people. "

And article 24 (1) Number 32 Year 2004 about Regional Government which is:

⁶ Majoritarian System is a system that is used to vote one parliament candidate to represent his constituent area. Proportional Representation System is a system to vote few parliament members to represent their constituent area. (<http://www.democracy-building.info/voting-systems.html>)

"Explain that each region is led by the Regional Head administration called the Regional Head. Systematically central government and local governments have good relations of hierarchical relations coordination, supervision and guidance as described in Article 38 paragraph (1) of Law No. 32 2004 About Local Government stated that the position of the governor as a representative of the central government in the region has a function of coaching, supervision and coordination of government affairs in the area as well as co-administration. "

A direct Regional Head Election was a two sided coin. A potential to reinforce democracy, accountability, and participation in elections can and will strengthen the positive trend of Regional Head Election in Indonesia. On the other hand, if the effort to change the mindset about how democracy was rotten is non-existent, a direct Regional Head Election won't lead democracy into a better future.

Conclusion

A direct Regional Head Election were not something that should be a must for a democratic country. But as a democratic country, Indonesia still use the same direct election system for reasons such as to maintain and to reinforce democracy inside the country.

Elections, be it direct or indirect, basically have the same principality which is democracy. In an indirect Regional Head Election, when the parliament vote the representative, the people indirectly voted them as well because the officials who sat on the parliament were voted by the people. A direct Regional Head Election was also democratic because it gave people the freedom to vote their own leader. The election would further legitimate a chosen leader's standing in the eyes of his/her people.

When the two system of elections were both democratic, then the next thing to see is how far the people believe in the parliament to make the right choice for them. In this stage, a lot of Indonesian doesn't believe that the parliament would vote the best for them. The practice of corruption in Indonesia, especially in region levels, was so high and it stained the name of the parliament. For this reason, some people declared that an indirect Regional Head Election was the kind of election they need.

A direct Regional Head Election could be an alternative for the people to control themselves. With a direct election, at least they could vote who's their own leader and they could also refrain from choosing a candidate with a stain on their background (Like a history of being corrupt.). In an indirect Regional Head Election, the parliament's decision might not go well with the people's wish.

The consolidation in an indirect Regional Head Election was a consolidation that didn't include the people in it. Until now, Indonesian would still like to be included in the political process of their country. That's why a direct Regional Head Election's still a choice that could be accommodated for the people. A consolidation of the political elites and running a campaign both cost a lot of money. The real reason for holding a direct Regional Head Election was not to save money, but to give people a chance to vote their own leader.

A direct Regional Head Election sometimes can be a way for political parties to increase their popularity. The parties compete with each other, giving good words about their own candidates so that the people may vote them. Up until now, Indonesian

people believed that a direct Regional Head Election's the best kind of election for them because they could sort the candidates and refrain from picking those with a bad history. That is the reason why Indonesia is still willing to continue to vote.

References

- Anggraini, Novi., *et.al.* 2014 . *Elections in Indonesia*. Jakarta: The Asia Foundation
- Aspinall, Edward. 2005. *Opposing Suharto : Compromise, Resistance, and Regime Change in Indonesia*. Standford, California: Standford University Press.
- Bozlagan, Recep. 2013. *The Local Elections in Turkey and Their Importance to Turkish Politics*. Turkey: Al-Jazeera Center for Studies.
- Bubandt, N. 2014. *Democracy, Corruption, and the Politics of Spirits in Contemporary Indonesia* . New York: Routledge.
- Chalid, P. e. 2005. *Pilkada Langsung: Demokratisasi Daerah dan Mitos Good Governance (Direct Local Elections: Local Democratization and Good Governance Myth)*. Jakarta: Partnership for Governance Reform in Indonesia & Pusat Kajian Politik.
- Diamond, L., & Plattner, M. . 2001. *The Global Divergence of Democracies*. Baltimore & London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Hadiz, V. R. 2005. *Dinamika Kekuasaan: Ekonomi Politik Indonesia Pasca-Soeharto (Power Dynamics: Indonesia's Political Economy in Post Soeharto)*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Heryanto, Ariel and Mandal, Sumit K. 2004. *Menggugat otoriterisme di Asia Tenggara (Charging Authoritarianism in South East Asia)*. Jakarta: Kepustakaan Populer Gramedia.
- Hidayat, Syarif and Gismar, Abdul Malik. 2010. *REFORMASI SETENGAH MATANG (A HALFWAY REFORMATION)*. Jakarta: Hikmah (PT Mizan Publika).
- Kusumah, Mulyana W. *et.al.* 1999. *Wacana Politik Dan Demokrasi Indonesia (A Discourse on Political and Democratization of Indonesia)*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka
- Lukum, Roni. 2014. *Pilkada Langsung dan Implikasinya Terhadap Perubahan Perilaku Masyarakat dalam Menuju Pembangunan Demokrasi di Indonesia (Local Direct Election and Its Implication Towards Society's Behaviour Concerning Democracy Development in Indonesia)*. Fakultas Ilmu Sosial Universitas Negeri Gorontalo.
- McLeod, Ross H. and MacIntyre, Andrew. 2007. *INDONESIA Democracy and the Promise of Good Governance*. Singapore: Institute of SouthEast Asian Studies.
- Soeseno, Nuri. 2013. *Representasi Politik, Perkembangan dari Ajektiva ke Teori (Political Representations, An Expansion from Adjective to Theory)*. Jakarta: Puskapol FISIP UI.
- Stoker, Gerry. 1991. *The Politics of Local Government*. London: Macmillan Education Ltd.
- Whitehead, L. 2002. *Democratization: Theory and Experience*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Scientific Journal

- Armony, A. C., & Schamis, H. E. 2005. "Babel In Democratization Studies." *Journal of Democracy* , 113-128.
- Fitriyah. 2005. "Sistem dan Proses Pilkada Langsung." (A System and Process of Direct Local Election) *Analisis CSIS*, Vol. 34, No. 3.
- Romli, Lili. 2008. "Kecenderungan Pilihan Masyarakat Dalam Pilkada." (Society's Preference on Their Vote in Regional Head Election) *Jurnal Poelitik* Vol.1 No.1.

Internet

- Anonim. 2012. *Elections 2012: A User's Guide*. www.ambafrance-uk.org/IMG/pdf/kit_election_2012_EN.pdf (accessed on 1st May 2015 at 22.00)
- Acosta, A. M., Joshi, A. and Ramshaw, G. 2013. *Democratic accountability and service delivery: A desk*

review. International IDEA. Retrieved from:
<http://www.idea.int/resources/analysis/loader.cfm?csModule=security/getfileandpageID=55694>

Others

- Adhani, Hani. *Proses Penyelesaian Sengketa Pilkada Pasca Perubahan Kedua Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintah Daerah (An Arrangement Process on Regional Head Election Dispute Post Revision of Law Number 32 Year 2004 On Local Governance)*. Tesis Magister, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 2009.
- Evaquarta, Rosa. 2010. "Politik Dalam Pusaran Modal." (Politics in Capital Rotation) *Bisnis dan Politik di Tingkat Lokal dalam Era Otonomi Daerah: Studi perbandingan Batam dan Kutai Kartanegara (Business and Politic in Local Level of Regional Autonomy Era: A Comparative Study Between Batam and Kutai Kartanegara)* 8-22.
- Rachmatika, Siswantana Putri. *Peralihan Wewenang Penyelesaian Sengketa Hasil Pilkada dari Mahkamah Agung ke Mahkamah Konstitusi (Authority Shift of A Settlement on Regional Head Election Results, From Supreme Court to Constitutional Court)*. Tesis, Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Depok, 2009.
- Strachan, Anna Louise. 2014. *Direct Elections and Responsiveness in Indonesia*. GSDRC Helpdesk Research Report
- Sultan, Lomba. 2011. "Sistem Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah dalam Perspektif Politik Hukum Islam di Indonesia." (Regional Head Election System in a Political Perspective of Islamic Law in Indonesia). Jakarta: Al-Fikr Volume 15 Nomor 2
- Undang-Undang 1945 Bab IV Pemerintahan Daerah Pasal 18 (4) dan Undang-Undang 1945 Bab IV Pemerintahan Daerah Pasal 18 (4) (1945 Law Chapter IV on Local Government Article 18 (4) and 1945 Law Chapter IV on Local Government Article 18 (4))