

## Democratic System Strengthening Through Concurrent Election Implementation To Improve Political Stability and National Development

Muhammad Baharuddin Zubakhrum Tjenreng  
Government Science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia  
m.zubakhrum\_tjenreng@yahoo.com

**Abstract:** Indonesian recently held a regional head concurrent elections in the first phase on December 9, 2015. Concurrent elections has been a historic moment for Indonesia to elect regional heads organized and structured massively. Concurrent election significance for Indonesian politics, especially at the local level, not only to read limited local democratic party, but rather an instrument for strengthening the democratic process. This research seeks to examine and analyze the democracy strengthening through concurrent election implementation in order to improve political stability of national development. In carrying out this study, researchers using qualitative methods. Whereabout the main data from this study is the researchers observation result on the concurrent election day, which is supported by several secondary data from the media. Featured models concurrent election (*local concurrent election*) is believed to be the best solution to counter the problems remaining in the elections execution, especially in two important reasons: First, the elections implementation effectiveness in order to realize the elections are more qualified and dignified from both the process and elections outcome aspects; second, the elections efficiency especially from the budget efficiency aspect which must be issued by the state to finance the electoral process.

**Keywords:** *Concurrent elections, the democracy strengthening, political stability, national development*

### 1. Introduction

Political changes in Indonesia after the end of the New Order for 32 years (1967-1998) among others characterized by a constitutional reformation that managed the Indonesia constitutional system. Two important political instrument that became policy, namely democratic elections and a regional autonomy policy or decentralization, whereabouts one of the fundamental steps in the decentralization policy is a local elections implementation to elect regional leader. The Indonesian success from held a national election (since 1999) and the elections (since 2005) by Henk Schulte Nordholt referred as *the consolidation of electoral democracy*, due to an extraordinary ongoing elections in a regency / city, province and national levels (Nordholt, and Hoogenboom, 2006: 1). The elections as such is a political process that is not only a politics mechanism to fill the democratic occupation, but also the regional autonomy implementation or political decentralization. To ensure the local elections conducted democratically as mandated by Article 18 paragraph (4) Constitution NKRI, 1945, popular sovereignty and democracy must be respected as a main elections implementation. But the Indonesian politics realities and dynamics is full of challenges in form of various efforts to suppress the people's sovereignty and undermine the democracy basic principles. Related to the local elections, The Representatives Council of the Republic Indonesia (DPR RI) in the period from 2014 to 2019 for various reasons have been enacted Law No. 22 Year 2014 regarding the Governors election, regents and mayors that regulate local elections mechanism indirectly through The Representatives Council (DPRD). The law has been get a broad resistance from the people, and the decision making process judged not reflect the democracy principles.

Considering the crisis of the political and legal and widespread rejection among the public after the enactment of Law No. 22/2014, the President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono (SBY) in his late period signed Government Regulation of Law (Perppu) No. 1 of 2014 about the governors, regents and mayors election, which essentially restores the people's sovereignty in direct local elections and not by parliament. In his speech, the President stated: *"I respect the parliament decision about the elections law, but let me seek to democracy establishment of the people, by the people, for the people. Direct election is the reforms struggle*

*result. I became president through direct elections by the people in 2004 and 2009*".<sup>1</sup> Compared to developed countries, Indonesia has recently implemented the democracy principles through elections, whether national or local level. The first local elections took place in 2005 after the introduction of Law No. 32 of 2004 about Regional Government. For a decade the election implementation has many success and failed stories enliven the democracy implementation. Elections have resulted a double face in democratic context. In one hand, the elections have answered the people's sovereignty fulfillment demands, but on the other hand, the elections are also have several problematic. There are some inherent disadvantages suspected in the election, namely (1) the expensive election cost considering that not only a burden Budget (APBD) but also a burden for candidates, (2) the intensity of horizontal elections conflicts is quite high even destructive to the family and kinship at the community level, (3) the election does not guarantee the qualified local leaders election.

Implementation of the elections is a shift from selecting leaders from the model that are elitist to populist model. Elections which closely related to the regional autonomy implementation is a unique color in the democracy development in Indonesia and the people are expected to participate actively. The elections are expected to be a catalyst towards the democracy consolidation and the local politics empowerment. Unfortunately, this goal is still far from fire. The elections are not yet fully become a participatory democracy tool. The political elite shifted into *patronage democracy* by using religion, ethnicity, families, and groups issues as a hegemony instrument (Nordholt, and Klinken, 2009: 10). As a result, the election was not a the people party, but the elite and patrons party. The money politics also has become a phenomenon and reality of its own in the elections. Money politics become so ordinary and absolutely essential if the candidate wants to go forward in the election, which starts from the candidate to the party, the candidate to the people and candidates for election organizers. The money politics practice has paved the way for prospective regional leader who have big capital or candidates who receive financial support from major investors in the competition to win the election, while candidates who have a mediocre coffers likely lose the battle. The money politics practice will lead to the "political rent seeking" emergence, where regional leader who won in the elections have to return the money borrowed from investors, or should restore its own capital which has been disbursed during the election process. This rentier political circuit will eventually form a "corruption crimes network" in order to restore large private capital, sponsorship, or supporting political parties into the regional leader.

Departing from the messy election since 2005, the idea emerged to carry out concurrent election in several stages. Two important reasons why the concurrent elections be the best solution to counter the election implementation problems, namely (1) the elections implementation effectiveness reason in order to realize the qualified and dignified elections both from the process and elections outcome aspects; (2) The efficiency elections reasons, particularly from the budget efficiency aspects which must be issued by the state to finance the electoral process (Pahlevi, 2014: 19-20). The concurrent elections first phase stand on legitimate legal basis, the regulation has 1/2015 and later enacted into Law No. 1 of 2015, and refined through the establishment of Law No. 8 of 2015.

## 2. Literature Review

Theorythically, elections are the tools and the same time is the most important democratization instrument. However, democracy realization will be felt in real terms when the electoral process was held in order to determine a leader candidate which worthy of holding power. Without that step, then the truth of democracy as a tools of realizing the people sovereignty still would invite a problem on its own and then open up space for the lawsuit legitimacy emergence of the government in power. The belief in elections as an important instrument for the democratization acquire strong legitimacy from Samuel P. Huntington in his book, *The Third Wave of Democratization in the Late Twentieth Century* (1993). Huntington defines democracy by referring to the opinion of Schumpeter. In the book *Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy*, Schumpeter defines a procedural democracy with elections as the democracy essence. But Huntington added that the democratic system is not enough only with elections. Elections which free, fair,

---

<sup>1</sup> Source:

<http://www.konfrontasi.com/content/nasional/untuk%20anulir%20pilkada%20tak%20langsung%20sby%20keluarkan%20perppu> [Accessed: January, 15, 2016]

and competitive is possible only when there is a freedom of speech, assembly and press, and if candidates and opposition parties can criticize the authorities without fears of retaliation (Huntington in Azhari, 2004: 180). Study about democracy and electoral system covers a very broad spectrum, therefore it is necessary done for firmly classification issues that this study has a theoretical foundation that can be accounted for. The author classifying the issues referred in three theoretical grounds categories, namely (1) democracy in general; (2) the correlation of democracy and elections; (3) Concurrent election / local election.

**Democracy In general:** Etymologically, democracy consists of two Greek words, namely "demos" means people or residents somewhere, and "cratein" or "cratos" which means power or sovereignty. So etymologically democracy is the country state where the government system is sovereignty vested in the people, the supreme power is in the people joint decision, the people in power, the people's government and mandate by the people. Terminologically, democracy meaning as revealed by a number of experts, among others: Schumpeter (2012: 239), democracy is an institutional planning to achieve political decisions in which individuals acquire the power to decide how the competitive struggle on the people's voice. Hook (1975: 685), democracy is a government form where the government important decisions directly or indirectly based on the freely agreement majority given from adult. Schmitter and Karl (Cited by Ubaedillah & Rozak, 2006: 132) democracy is a government system where the government held responsible for their actions in the public by citizens, which act indirectly through competition and cooperation with their chosen representatives. Mayo (2005: 12) democracy as a political system which showed that public policy is determined on a majority basis by the representatives who monitored effectively by the people in periodic elections based on the equality political principle and held in a secured political freedom atmosphere. Gaffar (2004: 7-9) interpret democracy in two forms, namely normative and empirical meaning. Normative democracy is an ideal democracy which be done by a state. While empirical democracy is a democracy manifestation which has existed in the practical politics world. Empirical democracy considered acceptable by the society as perceived in accordance with the norms that exist in society.

There are still a lot of experts who define democracy with individual perspective. Call it like the ancient Greek philosophers (Plato, Aristotle, Socrates, Solon) who introduced the democracy doctrine; thinkers of the Renaissance time up to Abraham Lincoln (former President of the United States, fighters for democracy by enacting legislation against slavery) popularizing democracy as government of the people, by the people and for the people. Democracy is then considered as idealism that must be adopted by a country, so that most countries in the world calling itself a democracy country, even countries that considered not obtain democracy principles. The democracy long journey has also put forth a school or flow democracy, which can be classified into the classical democracy, civic virtue, social contract, and trias politica school (Suhelmi, 2001: 10-20). The classical democracy school emerged in the 5th century BC in Greece. That time the democracy implementation is done directly, people gather at a certain place in order to discuss various issues together. Adherents of this flow is Plato, Aristoteles, Polybus and Thomas Aquinas. In essence, the classical democracy basic principles is the resident should enjoy political equality so that they are free to organize or lead and led in turn. The civic virtue school with the central figure, Pericles (statesman of Athens) develop the democracy principles, namely the citizens equality, independence, respect for the law and justice, and virtue together. The shared virtue principle requires every citizen to devote themselves entirely to the state, placing the republic interests and common interest above personal interest and family. The specifics from this school is the direct democracy implementation, which then is very possible applied because the city-state population is still limited, small area, and simple social structure.

The social contract school evolved and influenced by the ideas of the Enlightenment marked by rationalism, realism and humanism by placing the human being as the world movement center. Adherents of this flow is Hobbes, Locke, Rousseau, in the political analysis start from the human nature concept, then the nature state concept, natural rights and natural law. To avoid intolerance conditions and instability, then the community held a social contract, which formed by free will of all to establish justice and the highest morality fulfillment. Trias politica school with the central figure, Louis Montesquieu want for a power separation so that power is not concentrated in the hands of a king or a single ruler. Montesquieu divides state power into three categories, namely the legislative power to establish laws, the executive power to execute the laws, and the judiciary power to oversee the laws implementation. The power separation intended to maintain political freedom and prevent the domination of one power against the other. In the 20th century, democracy has been

used in the political system, which according to Huntington (1997: 5), the general election is an *entry point* democratization which allows candidates compete freely for votes and all of the adult population is eligible to vote. Thus democracy contains two dimensions namely competition and participation dimensions. In addition to these two dimensions, Sorensen (2003: 15) added political and civil freedoms dimension. Competition means that there is equal opportunity for individuals or groups to compete in occupy position or gain power access through a regular process and without violence. Participation is intended as the involvement of many individuals or groups in the leaders election and policy-making, which is done regularly and without getting rid of the main social groups. Social and civil freedom is a guarantee against the competition and participation, which include freedom of expression, press, and form and join organizations.

From a number of expert opinions about democracy, appears that that democracy so far seen as a society and state system and government that places emphasis on the power presence in the hands of people, both in the state or government administration. Agrees with Abraham Lincoln views, in the end the government power in the people hands contains three terms, namely the people government, government by the people, and government for the people. More details Dahl (1999: 20-25) in his book, *On Democracy*, explained the country's advantages implement the democracy principles to ensure people's lives quality. According to him, there are at least ten democracy benefits: prevent appearance of cruel and cunning autocrat; ensure the rights enforcement of every citizen; guarantees of wider personal liberty; help people to protect their basic needs; guarantees every citizen freedom to determine their own destiny; provides an opportunity to carry out moral responsibility; guarantees citizens develop their potential; upholds every citizen political equality; prevent a war between countries; and provide prosperity guarantee for people.

**Democracy Correlation and General Election:** Huntington's Opinion in his thesis "third wave of democratization" that declared the elections as a democratization entry point was the most referenced view in assessing the correlation between democracy and elections. Election is a mechanism that allows the power rotation based on the public option, the peacefully power struggle institutionalization, and ultimately enable the people to perform control over public policy. A democratic political system allows the citizens constitutional rights protected and guaranteed by the state, public policy based on the people interests, and the power does not go beyond its authority. Furthermore Huntington asserts, the elections which meant not only formal procedural, but as an instrument embed the freedom principles to compete and participate to elect and be elected. In Huntington's perspective, the election is not just allow democracy to be operational in the roots namely allows people to choose according their political preferences, but also the state governance passage legitimately, although theoretically contribution in upholding democratic elections is still limited in the procedural area. One of the procedural democracy-minimalism fulfillment conditions is the political positions occupied by elections, the free and fair elections presence, as well as peacefully power rotation through fair freedom and public contestation, every individual substantially engagement in the power enforcement and adequate guarantee for the social and economic people rights. This is reciprocal with what Held (1987: 10) conceived as democracy autonomy.

In democratic politics, the free and fair elections presence is a necessity. In fact, any country often make elections as a claims of democratic political system that he built. In developing countries the elections often can not be used as a accurate parameter in measuring or not democracy a politics system, as in the praxis election is not obtain using the democracy principle. In this context we need to explore Haynes (2000: 25-30) views distinguishes democracy in 3 levels, namely formal democracy, facade democracy, and substantive democracy. According Haynes, in formal democracy elections which obtain regularly, free and fair, but the election results have no impact in improving the society welfare characterized by economic and political stability. Surface democracy is democracy as seen from the outside is a democracy, but in fact did not have the democracy substance. This model of democracy may be more appropriate if analogically with democracy situation and state in the new order era. While substantive democracy is a democracy that provides more space for the community, for example, an opened space for people to gain accurate information access in understanding important decisions by the authorities. The dynamic flexibility is not only at the political democracy level, but social and economic democracy. This substantive democracy model is a concept that ensures the society economic and social improvement realization. If substantive democracy can be realized, it can be said as a quality democracy because it is able to touch people's basic needs.

Elections determination as a democratic system is an important institutional decisions for countries to enforce civility and quality political system. Because the electoral system will produce a politics logic, obtain bureaucracy, to the civil society growth and development in the system. It became clear that the elections are an important democracy instrument that will determine the quality degree which obtain and determined by the state representatives (legislative and executive). Quality elections will produce a substantive democratic mechanism and quality leaders as well, which in turn will produce a quality policy product. Instead, the elections which were rigged, unfair, dishonest, only produce mild-transactional leaders who make the elections as a tools to retain and accumulate corrupt capital and power.

**Elections / Concurrent Election:** Concurrent election simply can be defined as an electoral system that establishes some election at one time simultaneously (Geys, 2006: 652). The types of these elections include executive and legislative elections at various levels, which stretches from the national, regional and local elections. In the European Union countries, the concurrent elections even included election for supra-national level, namely European parliamentary elections simultaneously with the national elections, regional or local. With variety of factors affecting the concurrent elections operation, then occur several variants partly already implemented and some are still hypothetical. Some evidence suggests that the concurrent electoral system use has a major influence on voting behavior along with the election output. Related to voters behavior, many political scientists concerned with the simultaneous elections effect on voter participation. The concurrent election system application expected to increase the voter level at the ballot box. This expectation is based on two main arguments: (1) increasing the competitions number due to merge with several concurrent elections will increase the media notification and give impact on increasing voters awareness and knowledge about the elections; (2) because the "cost" which borne by the voters to go to the ballot box is fixed, regardless numbers of elections held. On the other side of the voters knowledge level, Andersen found that concurrent elections also have a negative influence on the voters knowledge to the candidates they would choose. The individual ability limitations to process large amounts information makes voters not being able to find or understand any information necessary to determine a good choice on any kind of election. As a result, voters tend to make a priority in determining the choice (Andersen, 2011). Based on longitudinal data for 20 years in the US, Andersen found that voters will tend to focus on the candidates at the national level compared to the candidates at the state level if the both election was conducted at the same time.

Concurrent elections may also have side effects on other candidates in the legislative elections. Concurrent elections have a different effect on the legislator's election at national and regional levels. Based on the results of elections in Brazil, Samuels found that while the popular governor will tend to raise the legislator election level from one party or the party's supporters, the effects were not found in the presidential election (Samuels, 2000). This is because the available resources (be mobilized) by a governor candidate will be able to help increase the affiliated candidates popularity. But not so with elections at the national level. A presidential candidate will not be able to mobilize enough resources to boost the legislative candidates election level that one party with at the national level. Variations concurrent elections can be distinguished by the implementation time and the government level that can affect voter perception of how important these elections. Theoretically, the elections held at the same time between many elections, such as the legislative elections with the presidential election, usually closely linked to the *electoral cycle*, the election utility *mechanical effect*, oppressive regimes, and also the existing models party. According to LIPI (2014), for Indonesian context by relying on empirical and hypothetical variants, there are at least six models of concurrent elections. First, concurrent elections once every five years for all public positions at the national level to district / city. This election includes the legislature election (DPR, DPD, Provincial DPRD and district / city), the presidential election, and the local election. It is often called the seven boxes election or bulk elections. Second, concurrent elections only to the entire legislative positions (central and local) and then followed by the concurrent elections for executive positions (central and local). In this *clustered concurrent election* method, elections for the DPR, DPD, Provincial DPRD and Regency / City implemented as long as coincide done in appropriate time, and then followed by the presidential election, the governor and regent / mayor a few months later.

Third, concurrent elections with interval election by government level, which distinguished the time for national elections and local elections / local (*concurrent election with mid-term election*). In this model, the

presidential and legislative elections for the DPR and DPD conducted at the same time. Then in the second year held the concurrent local elections to choose provincial and district / city parliament as well as the governors election and regents / mayors by grouping certain region or island areas. With this model, each year each party will always work to gain the voters support, and government and political parties can be evaluated on an annual basis by the voters. Fourth, concurrent national elections, followed by the concurrent election in each province based on the time agreement or local election cycle in every province. With this model, then the presidential elections are accompanied with legislative elections for the DPR and DPD. Then after that depends on the cycle or local election schedule agreed jointly held local concurrent elections to choose governors, regents / mayors and provincial and district / city legislators in a province, and then followed by the same local concurrent elections in other provinces so that it could be a year there are several local elections in some provinces. Fifth, concurrent elections to elect members of DPR, DPD and DPRD as well as the president and vice president and then followed after a certain interval coincide time as well as the provincial executive elections. In this election, local concurrent election level is just to elect governors, regents / mayors simultaneously in a province, and the schedule is dependent on the local elections cycle in each province that had been agreed. From the five models concurrent elections variants as a results of LIPI mentioned above, the concurrent elections which held closer to the fifth model variants, with coverage concurrent elections expanded namely the concurrent elections in 6 phases include a number of provinces and districts / cities.

### 3. Methodology

This research was conducted using qualitative methods. The data sources in this research consisted of a main or primary and additional sources or secondary data. Primary data in this research were collected through observation based on the activities and phenomenon. While the secondary data in this study is all the information contained in the mass media, government official documents, as well as results of studies on the implementation concurrent elections 2015 in Indonesia. The data validity test in this study is done through *triangulation* namely data validity testing techniques performed by checking the obtained data correctness. Triangulation is done on data sources that researchers get from the field.

### 4. Analysis

To get a strengthening democratic system idea at local level through local concurrent elections, it is necessary to understand the democracy implementation overview related elections at national level, with the assumption that occur corelative relationship between democracy implementation at the national and local level.

**Problematic Presidential Democracy System:** Indonesia has determined a presidential democracy system as a political choice, especially after end of authoritarian New Order regime in 1998. The political choice was approved by the assembly on election results in 1999 and eventually institutionalized through the changes result constitution (amendments) four stages from 1999 to 2002. While in general the constitutional substance amendment outcome itself tend to be "patchy", but clearly the spirit behind is strengthening effort as well as "purifying" presidential democracy scheme. At least there are four substance changes that ensure amandement result constitutional aims to the presidential strengthening system. First, the president and vice president election is done directly by the people. Second, the president and vice president institutionalization tenure be steady, in this case for five years and two terms maximum. Thirdly, the *locus* diversion legislative function of emphasis as the President authority (with approval of Parliament) to the Representative Council authorities (despite still discussed jointly and approved by the President). Fourth, the position liquidation and assembly role as the highest state institution. The latter changes not only ensure a *locus* political sovereignty diversion which was originally in the Assembly hands became sovereignty vested in the people and carried out according to the constitution, but also Assembly authority liquidation in selecting the president and vice president as well as the state policy outlines establishment.

According to Lijphart (1994) there are actually only three main elements of the presidential system, namely (1) the president or government leader elected for fixed period (*fixed-term*); (2) The president is elected directly by the people or by the board of voters (*electoral collage*) as in the United States; and (3) the

president is the only one chief executive. The experts who study the politics comparative study is already aware of the problematic inherent in the presidential system as practiced in the United States and adopted in the countries of America Latin. Executives stability caused by the fixed presidential term, legitimacy and political president mandate elected directly by the people, and the powers separation which is relatively firmly between government power branches, especially the executive-legislative, are three among numbers of major advantages presidential system. In addition its advantages compared to the parliamentary system, the presidential system has three major disadvantage, namely *the first*, the possibility of paralysis or political deadlock due to executive-legislative conflict. That potential deadlock was even greater if a presidential system combined with multi-party system as feared by Mainwaring (1993). *Second*, systemic rigidity inherent in presidentialism as a result of fixed executive tenure so there is no opportunity to replace the president in the middle of period if the performance does not satisfy the public. Thirdly, "the winner takes all" principle that is inherent in the presidential system which uses majority voting two rounds system, thus giving an opportunity for the president to claim discretion choices on people behalf, rather than parliament dominated by partisan interests from political parties. Linz & Arturo (1994) even say that the powers separation between executive and legislature in a presidential system tends to cause polarization and political instability, so that considered not so fit in adoption by the new democracy countries.

Apart from Linz theoretical position as an advocate and parliamentary system supporter, the experience of America Latin countries shows that the presidential system practice was varies likewise the supporting institutions, so it is not a homogeneous government system. The institutions variety and presidential system practices system among others determined by the presidentialism forma, whether "pure" as practiced in the United States, the power executive scope which owned by the president, party system and its fragmentation and party discipline in parliament. Therefore, the institutional design related the president powers and legislature institution, the party system, and the president's ability to implement agendas become important factors that determines the presidential democracy stability. The powers separation between executive and legislature, for example, on one hand seen as presidentialism excess than parliamentarism, but on the other hand also opens up opportunities "government split formation" (*divided government*), in which the president and parliament is dominated or controlled by different parties. The presidential system problematic generally occur when it is combined with a multi-party system, especially with party fragmentation level and ideological polarization which relatively high. At least three reasons why the multi-party presidential combination has problematic. First, presidential system with based multi-party tends to produce paralysis due to executive-legislative deadlock and impasse that led to the democracy instability. Second, the multiparty system generates ideological polarization than the two-party system, that often cause complications problems when combined with presidentialism. Third, the multi-party and presidential combination posing difficulties to build coalitions between parties in a presidential democracy, so implicated to a democratic stability destruction (Mainwaring, 1993).

**Executive-Legislative relations and Government Effectiveness:** Unlike the parliamentary system in which executive and legislative institutions is basically a single entity, even can be said one body, then in a presidential system, the executive and legislature are separated from each other. Generally, Institutions design and executive and legislature relations reality in the democratic system context characterized two main trends, namely a relations pattern which is dominance from one institution over another, both executive dominance over legislature or vice versa; and a relations pattern based on the power balance between executive and legislative. Extent to which relations tendency pattern between executive and legislature in reality of the presidential system, whether the first pattern, the second pattern, or fluctuate between the two patterns, not only determined by the institutions design which constructed and institutionalized, but also other variables are conditional democracies countries.

The two experiences under President SBY leadership shows that a broad coalition which supporting government formed after the election not only does not guarantee the support parties stability to executive, but also can never guarantee the election results government effectively. About 70 percent of political party in the Representative Council join the government supporting political coalition. In reality, a large coalition government supporters even more a burden to the President SBY rather than a solution for government effectiveness. During the government first period of SBY (2004-2009) even formed the President-Parliament relationship patterns that tend to be conflictual. This was reflected in rise of the interpellation and inquiry

rights proposed use submitted to the Parliament related SBY policies. Ironically, most of the interpellation right proposed and inquiry right have actually contributed filed by parliament which incorporated government coalition. Meanwhile during the second period of SBY government (2009-2014), when the government supporting political coalition covered more than 75 percent of the representatives council power, the proposed use of interpellation and inquiry rights intensity by the Representatives Council was reduced, but it does not go increase the government effectiveness of election results 2009. During two periods of President SBY government even tend to be imprisoned by the grand coalition formation which their built.

In practicing in Indonesia, a large coalition support not fully guarantee the government effectiveness. Many factors which contribute to determine such as Indonesian presidential institution designs that not fully separate the president agency and parliament (DPR), because in establishment the Law, for example, the president jointly participate agreed with the Parliament. Similarly, in the assignation of public officials, not entirely become the president authority because co-decided by Parliament through the consideration mechanism and its approval. Outside the President's leadership factor, the other factors which also determine is weakness of parties dicipline as a result of the coalition feature that is more based on short-term interests rather than ideology, vision, and long-term political platform, as well as the election factors which has not be designed to improve the goverment effectiveness.

**Election Practices in Indonesia:** Indonesian contemporary problem is not only related to political preferences on the presidential system combined with a multiparty system, but also because of the unsincerity political elite in institutionalizing, hence appear "difference" between presidentialism obsession on one hand, and parliamentary practice which tends to be on the other. All this has implications for the presidential democracy practice which is popularly referred as "half-hearted", "parliamentary nuanced" presidential, or other names that describe institutionalization inconsistencies presidential scheme in the political life of Indonesia nation. Indifference and inconsistency in the presidential democracy system institutionalizing was not only recorded in legislation material or substance which often overlap with each other, but can also be seen from the election administration scheme, especially since 2004, namely when the amendment constitutional mandate related to direct presidential elections by the people began to be implemented. As known, the legislative elections held in 2004, 2009 and 2014 ahead of the presidential election (and vice president), whereas the aim of amendment constitution is presidential system strengthened. As a logical consequence choice of the presidential democracy system, the presidential elections organization should precede the legislative elections implementation. If it was not, the presidential elections implementation at least be carried simultaneous with the legislative elections implementation, especially legislative elections at the national level.

The logical consequence of the legislative elections which precede the presidential elections is created political parties dependency towards the parliament election results in preparing the president and vice president nominatio. That addiction was even then institutionalized through the prerequisite mechanism presidential threshold candidacy. As mandated by the President Election Law 2004 and 2009, political parties and / or coalitions must obtain total votes or specific seats nationally in the Representatives Council as a condition submit a presidential and vice presidential candidates. The presidential threshold mechanism nomination requirements is not only be a "prison" for the political parties themselves, but also reflects a nuanced presidential parliamentary practice. In fact, according presidential system scheme, the president institution and the Representative Council are two separate institutions that have different political legitimacy bases, and not depend on each other, and so that president candidacy "dictated" or determined by the political formation of the national parliament legislative election results. In addition, the president (and vice president) generated by the election and the Representatives Council which produced by legislative election have different political mandate and can not be mixed with one another.

Legislative election results became basis for the political parties to form a coalition, both in carried out-vice presidential candidates as well as in government election results for any future candidate pair that won the election . This election schemes is clearly an anomaly in an effort to strengthen presidentialism as a major obsession behind the constitutional amendment. The problem is, the elected president become so dependent on the political forces formation in the Parliament. As a consequence of the presidential system practice based multiparty, presidential elections with two rounds system on one hand produce a president which have

very strong political legitimacy, but on the other hand in dealing with parliament, the president is nothing more than "minorities president", namely president with the support or base minimum politics in Parliament. However, the minimum political base reality of an elected president in presidential scheme based multiparty should not be interpreted as a necessity for the president to rely on the majority support of the Representative Council entirely. It is true, the government policy effectiveness is highly dependent on the parliament political support, but not entirely true that government can not work without political parties support in Parliament. However, the elected president has a legitimacy base and political support which much greater than the fragmented support owned by political parties in parliament. Therefore the problem goes back to the elected president, whether capable managing intelligently, capitalizing and utilizing legitimacy and political mandate of the people who have it or not. If not, then the elected president will imprisoned forever by diverse parties political interests in Parliament.

Presidentialism completion requires the format representation system reconsideration, implementation scheme and electoral system and the party system. In the elections context, arrangement is not only related to changes urgency in the electoral system, particularly the legislative election system, but also a scheme arrangement implementation towards concurrent elections between legislative and presidential elections. The arrangement leads to two elections schemes, namely the national concurrent elections (to elect the President / Vice President, DPR and DPD) and local concurrent elections (to elect members of parliament and regional leaders, provincial and district / city) with a interlude 2,5 years preceded national elections. Through local concurrent separate national elections be expected not only to achieve efficiency goals of budget and time, but can also be realized several changes at once. First, increasing the government effectiveness because assumed concurrent generated by the presidential and legislative elections are more stable as a *coattail effect* result, namely the election of the presidential candidate from particular political party or certain political parties coalition will influence legislature members election of a political party or certain political parties coalition as well. Thus the executive-legislative conflict, instability, and even political deadlock as a complication scheme based multiparty presidential system such as anxiety of Juan Linz and Scott Mainwaring expected not become a reality. That is, concurrent elections held could potentially increase the political support by the Parliament of the elected President.

Second, the political coalition formation that inevitably must be done before legislative elections expected to "forced" political parties to change political parties coalition from short term and tend to be opportunistic become coalition based opportunistic ideology, vision and political platform in common. The next effect is the discipline political parties establishment, so that the political parties orientation expected to be changed from authority hunting (*office-seeking*) to struggle for a policy (*policy-seeking*). Third, national elections separation and concurrent local elections is expected to have a positive impact on three things: (1) there is an interval for people to assess the national government concurrent election results performance; (2) A great opened opportunity for local issues lifting to national level which tended to "sink" by national issues; (3) the growing local political elite opportunities whose leadership managed to compete to be the political elite at national level. Fourth, indirectly expected the party system simplification occur towards a simple multiparty system (moderate). As a result the political party or coalition election which similiar at the presidential and parliament election, the political parties fragmentation in parliament reduced and eventually is expected to culminate in forming moderate multiparty system. Fifth, concurrent separate national elections distinct from local concurrent election is expected to reduce transactional politics potential as a result of political opportunism institutionalization as this lasts. Transactions on short-term interests basis could be reduced if the political coalition foundations based on a common vision and political platform. Sixth, concurrent nationwide elections separated from lokal concurrent elections expected to improve the people's choice quality because voters' attention should not be divided on too many choices at once in a very limited time in voting booth. Because the number of ballots relatively limited in each concurrent elections, national and local, so voters have a little more time to decide which option is mature before ballots or mark the selection.

### **Democracy System Contribution Through Concurrent Election**

**Awakening Central Synergy and Local Government:** If the local concurrent elections held separated in an interval 30 months (two and a half years) of national concurrent elections, then national government synergy with regional administration in a framework of the Unitary State will be created. The synergy is happening at

two levels: the party's coalition partners at national level tend to be the same as the party's coalition partners at local level, and the vision, mission and programs at the regional level will tend to be the same or a translation of mission, vision and national development programs. The synergy can occur for several reasons. First, both national and local concurrent elections be carefully prepared about one to two years before the election. Each party will seek to explore and search for political parties into a coalition partner based on proximity ideologic and based on equality or closeness criteria for president and vice president candidate pairs. If the coalition at the national level is established, political agenda which become a national concurrent election campaign material will be the same , both for the presidential - vice president election and parliament members election. Second, national concurrent elections held earlier than the local concurrent elections so that what has been agreed at national level will be carried out in a local concurrent elections area at the time.

National government synergies with regional governments would happen if every political party can carry out two main political parties functions in representative democracy. First, the parties prepare future leaders and offer prospective leaders to the people during election campaign. For this function, the political parties recruit citizens become a party members, cadres systematically to members, and nominating a candidate member of parliament, local parliament, president, vice president, regional leader and deputy regional head election. And a second function, prepare public policy draft and offer it to the people during election campaign. For this function, the parties must listen and formulate the constituents aspirations, and lays out the political parties ideology to be a public policy pattern and aim in various fields based on the constituents aspirations. Conversely, if the parties more pragmatic orientation either in form "finding and maintaining power" released from a function to prepare leader candidates and in rents politics form, therefore national concurrent elections separated from local concurrent elections will not be able to create government synergies.

**The efficiency and effectiveness election realization:** Concurrent national and local elections also will create efficiency and effectiveness on three things. First, the planning, implementation and process election stages control will be carried out efficiently not only because national elections are separated from local elections but also because of a national election implementation evaluation weakness can be used to improve local election implementation and vice versa. Second, the enforcement cost of an election, especially local organizing committee honorarium will be saved significantly. Savings can be made because of two things: (1) because the number of polling station officials, PPS and PPK across Indonesia reaching more than 4 million people; (2) as honorarium officers before national elections are separated from local elections paid for three elections (parliament members, regents / mayors, and governor election) and will be one election (concurrent elections) after the national elections is separated from the local elections. From many types of election costs, election workers salaries component absorb 65 percent of the election cost. That means the more election is held, the more budget spent to pay officers because officer salaries are calculated based on the organization activities elections number, not by workload of each election. That is, if two or three elections implementation unified, the officers fee keep paid for one election activities. Thus, if only the implementations of legislative, presidential, governors elections as well as regent or mayor elections, united into only two elections, there will be tremendous financial savings. Within the Commission calculated, the cost savings reached Rp 15 trillion in the next five fiscal years.<sup>2</sup> This calculation makes sense because by uniting five to seven elections to just two elections, namely the national and local elections, the budget spent to pay election workers only twice activities. And the third efficiency can be done on the full personnel utilization for five years either member of the Commission, the provincial Election Commission and the Election district / city commision, or central secretariat-general and staff, provincial and district / city. Before the national elections is separated from the local elections, both members and general secretariat staff commision work effectively only three years of five-year tenure. With the national elections separation of local elections, so the secretariat general commision members and staff will work throughout the year.

**The democratic society maturity realization:** Implementation of only two elections (concurrent national and synchronously local elections) will ensure at least two times access for people to declare its sovereignty.

---

<sup>2</sup> Estimated cost savings presented by KPU member I Gusti Putu Artha in various occasions (source: from research observation).

Two things need to be explained in this statement. First, when concurrent local elections held after state officials working in concurrent national election results for at least two years, then voters have been able to assess state officials performance of national elections results. Whether public policy pattern and direction which promised on national elections have been implemented or not. Second, on local concurrent elections, voters will be voting not only based on the parties and candidates performance assessment in local elections but also based on their assessments results on state officials performance from national election of the same political party. And vice versa. In five years, a voter can effectively declare the assessment results of political party or candidate performance based on *punishment and reward* principle: choose another party or the candidate when the performance as promised (*reward*), and leave the party or the candidate if the performance is not accordance with promised (*punishment*). These consequences will be more pronounced when do a politic education series to raise voter awareness for declare sovereignty opportunities. Voting behavior expected to be more rational at least for three reasons: (1) the candidate pair and party that should be considered and have to be separated at national and local level. Thus voters can make smarter choices by comparing a number of candidates pairs and parties with a candidates list at the same level, both at national and local elections. (2) The public policy issue which offered also separates national and local issues. Thus not only issue which considered by voter does not mix but also voters can compare public policy issues both at the same level of national and local elections. (3) Voters not only have at least two opportunities to assert sovereignty but can also demand accountability of the party effectively.

## 5. Conclusion

The elections since it was first held in 2005 from a schumpeterian procedures democratic style standpoint, evidently has succeeded in achieving basic essentially, the first, namely produce local leaders through democratic election mechanism. Second, the election is a continuation from previous elections practice, but at the same time has laid a new basis for the local political elite exchange mechanism in a regular basis. The elections become a new tradition, because there has been a change in the indirect election method by Parliament towards direct elections by all citizens in an area. This change has a serious impact on various local politics aspects and also can be read as a political investment which very important in terms of strengthening democratic system. This last point is closely related to institutionalization process of political (democracy) within the meaning Huntingtonian assumed as the backbone of establishment stability and sustainable development. Third, the elections have laid a new foundation for ongoing political citizens education process more broadly, especially the political education arena regarding "contestation" and normalcy "lost" and "win" in a democratic process that is fair and just. The success elections implementation by Election Commission which relatively independent and neutral from state and political forces, with a few exceptions, has broken the *stereo-typing* understanding on a non-state incompetence strength in politics manage. Nevertheless, as expressed by a variety of cases including that befell the Commission, struggle to uphold the public trust still requires climbing and winding journey. Systematic efforts to deny discrediting and non-state power, especially in political morality terms still occur today. Direct election significance for Indonesia politics, especially at local level and not just be read merely as a local democratic party, but rather an instrument for strengthening the democratic process. As an instrument and *strengthening democracy* process, the elections on one hand is a national elections continuation, but on the other hand is a preparation for the next phase of local political developments, namely *effective governance* creation after the new regional leaders election.

Elections as a strengthening democracy fundamental part can be defined as a dual process that occur in country and society side. In countries terms, the democracy strengthening is development of three ways, namely (1) the mechanism institutionalization (*institutional design*) the trust creation on all political actors in the region include civil society, political society (political parties), including *state apparatuses* (the bureaucracy, the state security apparatus); (2) Strengthening administrative capacity-local government technocratic accompanied the institutionalization that has been created; and (3) the elections have forced a softening coercion character (which is expressed through an emphasis on the regulation and control function) state at local level toward a softer character (through a new emphasis on distributive function and public services). In society terms, democracy strengthening refers to the community penetration institutionalization and strengthening into the realm of formal politics and activities at local level. This is very fundamental in changing politics at local level. The reason is obvious, the citizens institutionalization

penetrative capacity process to the political decision-making territory takes place at a *locus* which for so long was very chewy and immune to penetration. Elections have become a new instrument in public facilitate to engage in permanent negotiations on how and with what resources local politics should be regulated and where local politics should be taken. Furthermore, local concurrent elections which began its first phase in December 2015 is a new policy choice that believe would further strengthen the Indonesian democratic system, and in turn will create political stability and ensure the national development sustainability. Selection of models concurrent election (*local concurrent elections*) is believed to be the best solution to acknowledge the problems that are still left in the election's implementation so far, particularly on two important reasons: (1) the elections implementation effectiveness in order to realize the more qualified and dignified elections in both process and elections outcome aspects; and (2) the elections efficiency, especially the budget efficiency aspects which must be issued by the state to finance electoral process.

## References

- Andersen, D. J. (2011). *Pushing the Limits of Democracy: Concurrent Elections and Cognitive Limitations of Voters*. New Jersey: The State University of New Jersey.
- Azhari, A. F. (2004). Reformasi Pemilu dan Agenda Konsolidasi Demokrasi, Perspektif Ketatanegaraan. *Jurisprudence*, 1(2).
- Dahl, R. A. (1999). *On Democracy*. Yale: University Press.
- Gaffar, A. (2004). *Politik Indonesia: Transisi menuju Demokrasi*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Geys, B. (2006). Explaining Voter Turnout: A Review of Aggregate-Level Research. *Electoral Studies* 25. Berlin: Elsevier.
- Hayness, J. (2000). *Demokrasi dan Masyarakat Sipil di Dunia Ketiga*. Jakarta: Obor.
- Held, D. (1987). *Models of Democracy*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Hook, S. (1975). *The Encyclopedia Americana*. New York: Americana Cooperation.
- Huntington, S. P. (1997). *Gelombang Demokratisasi Ketiga*. Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti.
- Lijphart, A. (1994). Presidentialism and Majoritarian Democracy: Theoretical Observations, in Juan J. Linz and Arturo Valenzuela, (eds.), *The Failure of Presidential Democracy*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Linz, J. J. & Arturo, V. (1994). *The Failure of Presidential Democracy*. Baltimore and London: The Johns Hopkins University Press.
- LIPI. (2014). *Position Paper, Pemilu Nasional Serentak 2019*. Jakarta: LIPI.
- Mainwaring, S. (1993). Presidentialism, Multipartyism and Democracy: The Difficult Combination. *Comparative Political Studies*, 26(2).
- Mayo, H. B. (2005). *Mewujudkan Demokrasi Bermakna: Masalah dan Pilihan Indonesia*. Jakarta: Demos.
- Nordholt, H. S. & Ireen, H. (2006). *Indonesian in Transition*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Nordholt, H. S. & Gerry, V. K. (2009). *Politik Lokal di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor.
- Pahlevi, I. (2014). Pilkada Serentak dalam RUU Pilkada. *Bulletin INFO Kemendagri Brief*, VI(2)/II/P3DI/Jan/2014.
- Samuels, D. (2000). Concurrent Elections, Discordant Result: Presidentialism, Federalism, and Governance in Brazil. *Comparative Political Studies*, 33(1), 1-20.
- Schumpeter, J. A. (2012). *Capitalism Socialism and Democracy*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sorensen, G. (2003). *Demokrasi dan Demokratisasi: Proses dan Prospek dalam Sebuah Dunia yang Sedang Berubah*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Suhelmi, A. (2001). *Pemikiran Politik Barat*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Ubaedillah, A. & Rozak, A. (2006). *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan: Demokrasi, Hak Asasi Manusia dan Masyarakat Madani*. Jakarta: ICCE UIN Syarif Hidayatullah.

## **LEGISLATION**

Law No 22 of 2014 regarding the Election of Governors, Regents and Mayors

Law No. 1 of 2015 on Perppu Determination No. 1 of 2014 On the Election of Governors, Regents and Mayors Become Law

Law No. 8 of 2015 on the Amendment of Act No. 1 of 2015 Concerning Determination No. 1 of 2014 Perppu On the Election of the Governor, Regent, and Mayor of the city Become Law

Law No 9 of 2015 on Local Government

Constitutional Court Decision No.22-24 / PUU / VI / 2008, dated December 19, 2008.

Supriyanto, D., Source: <http://www.rumahpemilu.org/in/read/4679/treshold-dalam%20discourse%20elections> [Accessed: January, 15, 2016].

<http://www.konfrontasi.com/content/nasional/untuk%20anulir%20pilkada%20tak%20langsung%20sby%20keluarkan%20perppu> [Accessed: January, 15, 2016].

<http://www.kpu.go.id> [Accessed: January, 15, 2016].