

Reconsidering the Indirect Elections for the Head of Region, Response towards the Current Direct Democratisation Mechanism System in Indonesia

Muhadam Labolo¹ & Muhammad Afif Hamka²

¹ Institute of Governmental Affairs (Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri), Indonesia

² School of Social, Development and Environmental Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, National University of Malaysia, Malaysia

Correspondence: Muhammad Afif Hamka, School of Social, Development and Environmental Studies, Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, National University of Malaysia, Malaysia. E-mail: afif_hamka@ymail.com

Received: April 2, 2012 Accepted: July 6, 2012 Online Published: September 27, 2012

doi:10.5539/ass.v8n13p1

URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.5539/ass.v8n13p1>

Abstract

Local elections are part of the framework of the mechanisms of democracy in Indonesia. In its essence, the purpose of direct democracy through the election mechanism is an open access to the widest possible public participation in determining the government leaders. Direct election is a mechanism that allows the conscious involvement of the people to choose their leaders, as practiced in Polis, Athens. This is what is called as political participation, the involvement of every citizen in the political process.

Since the enactment of the 2005 elections in Indonesia, a number of issues emerged as the implications of the election in achieving the initial objectives. At the operational level, on Field survey there are problems in the aspects of voter registration, registration and establishment of regional head and deputy regional head, campaigning, voting and counting, as well as the establishment and ratification of the selected candidates. The urgency for indirect election seems need to be reconsidered to address a number of major issues that confront the implementation of direct democracy. If direct election is the antithesis of indirect election the other day, it would require an instrument that is able to answer the contrary antithesis raising the fundamental issues of indirect election. Above all the benefits of direct elections, which in turn indicates a failure at the implementation level, it seems require an alternative like switching into indirect election with a number of advantages.

Keywords: local elections, direct democracy, direct election

1. Background

Local elections are part of the framework of the mechanisms of democracy in Indonesia. As part of this, The "*Pemilukada*" or what it stands for as (Pemilihan Umum Kepala Daerah) or The Election For the Regional Head, has to answer a number of essential importance on post-decentralization of regional governance system. The presence the elections was at least driven by five important things, first, the response to the demands of an increasingly wider aspirations of the people due to the high dominance of the party by the local legislative power. Second, emerging of change in the level of constitutional that encourages normative changes to all the arrangements about the election. Third, the election is a democratic learning process at the local level. The raise of the leadership gives hope for the creation of high responsibility through local knowledge. Fourth, the election as a spirit in the implementation of regional autonomy, in which one of the actualization of the rights of the autonomy of the region is being able to elect and be elected directly. Fifth, the election as the nation's educational leadership at every level as well as creating a strong leadership. The five issues above, the question that might rise is whether the reality of direct elections in the last five years has answered this question? If so, what are the indications that show all of them? If otherwise, then should we consider re-election indirectly in the future? What are the advantages and disadvantages in the system of representative democracy?

There are five introductory remarks in the Civil Service Journal entry by Surbakti, Haris, Rowa, Fatoni and Agustino that became a reference for its conclusions and advices offered. A number of questions rose by Surbakti (2005) about the system of *Pemilukada* that are generally have been answered through the implementation of rule and system change since it's rolled out on 2005 to the present. While the record from

Haris (2005) about five potential conflicts in *Pemilukada* are essentially relatively solved through the solutions offered, which is the development of consensus by all stakeholders and the importance of impartiality by the local government. Two potential conflicts that persist to the present are sources of conflict that comes from the political mobilization who claimed their actions on behalf of ethnic, religious, regional, and blood, as well as sources of conflict that arose from the results of the *Pemilukada*. Other interesting note is analyzed by Rowa (2009) about the description of recent problem that prompted the need for revision of *Pemilukada* system by considering its efficiency. Dilemma of the higher cost for applying the democracy systems resulting in a tendency for inefficiencies, but otherwise retrenchment prompted the creation of democratic efficiency. The Democratic *Pemilukada* in his opinion is fulfilling the requirements of legitimacy, while the whole process efficient *Pemilukada* means is walking on efficiency considerations such as time, cost, location and aspect of legality. Analysis by Fatoni (2010) that even only identifying problems of *Pemilukada* in the field, but the surprisingly conclusions and recommendations eventually supporting the development of this writing, in which for every modern country with vast territory and large population, the principles of democracy can be done through a system of representation (Representative Government), another reason that the head of the district and the district representatives as the head of government elected by local parliaments are responsible to the voters in the maintenance of the local government. Agustino endnotes (2010) about the problem of *Pemilukada* through a theoretical approach of stationary bandits who creates what Olson called a roving bandits, concluded that all *Pemilukada* ambition that was packed destination ideal in far from the expectations, but leaves only slogans and stories. Taking the case study in Jambi and Bengkulu Province, it shows that democracy in local level was jailed by the local authority interests. In the end, the overall conclusion contains suggestions on the of change in the system and hope for better understanding of the policy actors at the operational level. If the last three conclusions are integrated, so there will be an indication where the possibility of democratic mechanisms through other alternative can answer the above problems, which is the *Pemilukada* under democratic, efficient, legitimate, participatory, accountable, communicative, and the creation of a system of effective representation and accountability. Standing on all that, the authors means to analyze the alternative through democratic mechanisms of the indirect *Pemilukada*. This review will focus on Theoretical aspects and empirical reality in hope of providing a solid foundation for the alternative ways of indirect election for the district heads in Indonesia.

2. Democracy and Its Mechanism

Without exploring the concept of democracy as a complicated system with a set of definitions that depend on the reality in which he touched, we will only take the most important part that serves to answer the questions about the relevance of direct and indirect democracy. Democracy, as we commonly understand refers to the popular argument by Lincoln (1963) by the people, rule the people and for the people, leaving an endless debate since the great philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristoteles trying to build a frame of mind. According to Hamdi (2002), democracy is at least a point to at least four important senses, namely: firstly, the degree of power and influence over decision-making is important for and to be spread throughout the community (Sidney Verba in Greenstein & Polsby, 1975:306). Secondly, democracy is a set of formal institutions such as free elections and the voting public and a majority in parliament (Felix E, Oppenheim in Greenstein & Polsby, 1975:306). Thirdly, democracy is always some form of meaningful participation in political life in a community (Orlando Patterson in Warren, 1999:156). Finally, democracy is defined simply as a form of government (Huntington, 1993:5). As a form of government, democracy, as reminded by Lipson (1964), not the system of government by the best and wisest, but democracy is a form of the wisest as well as the best government among the forms of government ever implemented. Which makes it unique is the democracy that gives a harmony between visions and missions (Riker, 1982). Therefore, it is not only the goals that must be good, but also how to achieve them. Seymour Martin Lipset on his classical work *Political Man* stated that democracy is not just a way to make each group can achieve their goals, but also democracy is a way to build a good society. Meanwhile, without denying the imperfections of democracy, Aurel Croissant and Wolfgang Merkel in *Democratization* (2004) gave a warning by the term defective democracy. Where democracy might work to build a complex mechanism, but sometimes fail to address the basic problems of society, such as discrimination, inequality between groups, maturation of public behavior, and fail to reach the prosperity and welfare.

An alternative to democratic governance is the system of representative government. This view is to confront the argument that most people are basically able to understand and defend them self, including the interests of on the broad sense, like government. Ordinary with their limitation don't have a capacity to rule them self. It is essential that there are number of people who specifically meet certain requirements to govern, who at least have enough knowledge, as well as qualities that allow them to control the people. This argument is echoed by Aristotle short discussion at the time when there are only very few people and meet the requirements to be involve in the

government. These weaknesses should be covered by a qualified person so as to protect the interests of the people with the attribute possessed. Democracy is not without ability and excellence, but democracy requires expertises that allow the ruler to protect. Knowledge is important in managing the administration, including how to govern and deciding the effective policy. Creation of good governance demand skills and abilities to create a policy rule that would lead to the welfare of the people. How the skills to govern were so important that even sometime we found our government system are the combination between democracy and meritocracy. According to Aristotle, Moral Capacity is the least that one should have; Moral capacity showed an ability to understand the purpose and intent of what will actually be pursued by the government. Without this knowledge is of course most people are being apolitical and will never understand what the purpose and intention of the government. They only understand how a group of people who have adequate ability can quickly fulfill their needs. Even if many people relatively understand the purpose and intention government, the next question is how to realize all these dreams. Strong willingness to realize the intent and purpose of government is what is called the virtue (good capacity). The combination of the two requirements above produce what he called as moral prowess, When two conditions are met, then the last part is how to keep all the intents and purposes can be technically realized effectively. This is the third requirement that must be owned, the technical skills / instrumental (technical capacity). The overall requirement is to create the political skills that allow a representative to be capable to run a government. A good political leader according to Juergen Habermas, a famous thinker madzabh Frankfurt, should meet the qualification of *quantity of participation and quality of discourse*. In the case of local elections, for example, the elected head of the region is ideally a qualified leader as well as the head of the contents of the head. Simply, the elected leader is not only voted by the quantity of people who went vote in the polling station, but also has the vision, mission, concept and skill on how to rule of the area and its people. The number of voter is basically important, as more as more voters, the higher the legitimacy of a candidate would have. Legitimacy is important in order to justify a policy that is run by the head of the region. While like a compass, the basic attribute of the leader is the vision that guides and determines the direction of government. One thing is certain; the head can be solid gain legitimacy, as it is supported by a majority vote. But it must be realized, that the head region with majority support is not automatically able to carry the aspirations of the community. Therefore, the public is demanded to selectively choose their leader, otherwise then the election will only successfully give birth to a leader with many constituents, but without the competence to run the mandate of the people. The problem is, are the people in the areas with low education and low income would be selective choose their own leader on a direct election?

In its essence, the purpose of direct democracy through the election mechanism is an open access to the widest possible public participation in determining the government leaders. In fact, as suggested by John Stuart Mill, the minority participations are valued in democracy. Moreover, no matter how small is their involvement every individual in the democratic process must take full responsibility (Dahl, 1992). Based on the thought, through this system, the new born leader is expected to rise and hopefully will fulfill the aspiration of the people. Thus, the direct election is actually an anticipatory step to minimize the possibility of error on selecting leaders. So no wonder that many people have a high expectation in the democratic system. But democracy does not always meet good wishes, he could also raises anxiety. Socrates even became the first one who was being skeptical at first in such a model democracy. He was worried because this system only provides opportunities for people ignorant, dumb and stupid that happened to be supported by the majority of constituents to become a leader. Socrates understood very well that people do not always support someone who is considered the most capable and intelligent, but more often the most popular yet preferred figure. Conceivably, without any analytical ability, quality, competence and experience of political, the leaders tend to work based on their instinct. Decisions and actions are instinctual, trapped on the regular agenda, fixed procedures (SOPs), business as usual, in which all were designed without a rational yet critical consideration. As a result, each policy in a bureaucratic environment appears to be more as a reflex action, not a product of reflection that is born of refined intellectual discourse.

On the other hand, borrowing the prerequisite from Schumpeter (in Aminuddin, 2009:26), the local democratization process at least fulfill three important situations; political equality, local accountability and local responsiveness. Political equality refers to the creation of check and balance mechanism that allows the partnership to run without the domination of one another. Then the question emerges, whether the system of direct election has prompted the creation of a mechanism intended? Apparently, hope that the creation of partnerships through the mechanism of *check and balances* in the direct election has not been fully proven. One thing occurred was only a shift of *legislative strong* to the *executive strong*. Local legislature seems only a complementary sequence in a special meeting, with no effective power to annul any policy decided by the local leader. At the operational level, the LKPJ of the local leader is only a progress report, not the instrument of impeachment. Political communications are expected emerge by itself in a direct election was not showing its

positive signs, what was shown was the power of from the campaign team as a profit taker from the democracy feast (election) on the local level. Secondly, local accountability refers to the expectations of society in which the head of the region can be accountable for its policies before the public. In fact, although the mechanism is available, none of regional heads who are openly carrying their responsibilities for its policies on the community. Finally, the only hope is to represent the local legislature. However, many regulations that weaken the role of the local legislature on the political supervision turning this term of "Local Leader accountability" into something that merely formality. Third, expectations of the birth of the head area that can respond directly towards the needs of the community, in fact we are dealing with how relatively the elected head of region are not possessing the demanded criteria. As a result, the figure head of the region knows as the "father" as well as a "friend" did not appear much in the community, what shown was the further the distance (dissociative). Again, The Elected Leader will only close to the people in the club of *campaign team* who later gained the advantage. In fact, most of them came from certain groups of bureaucrats who will gain these privileges, not the common people.

Actually, political communication in a small populated area is not difficult. That's why the system of direct democracy (direct democracy) more effectively carried out in small countries (small country). In such conditions, every citizen is enabled to involve directly in decision-making process. Direct election is a mechanism that allows the conscious involvement of the people to choose their leaders, as practiced in Polis, Athens. This is what is called as political participation, the involvement of every citizen in the political process. In countries with a modern political system and has a wider reach, the idea of direct democracy is difficult to be implemented, also viewed as unrealistic (Suhelmi: 2007). The population is so large and the complexity of the political structures in modern states is only possible through a system of representative democracies (indirect democracy).

3. Reality of Elections in Indonesia

To explore and discover the real general elections and direct elections in Indonesia, the collecting information method was being carried out by collecting the news relating to public complaints about reality of elections and also comments about the direct elections in Indonesia that was published in the newspaper / press releases. In order that this information could be accounted for, the statements from people who become voters also taken their statements (interviews) and local general / direct elections officials were also interviewed so that the data obtained become more accurate.

In Indonesia, we are no longer on a debate on what political system that seems appropriate, because the 1945 constitutional amendment has been answered, the system of democratic politics. Which must be discussed is whether the mechanism is more feasible, or we might call it as an inner ideal for Indonesia today.

Since the enactment of the 2005 elections in Indonesia, a number of issues emerged as the implications of the election in achieving the initial objectives. At the operational level, on Field survey conducted by Fatoni (2010) it is mentioned that there are problems in the aspects of voter registration, registration and establishment of regional head and deputy regional head, campaigning, voting and counting, as well as the establishment and ratification of the selected candidates. Empirical reality is so far relatively can be resolved through technical measures in the field. However, on a broader scale there are a number of issues that were previously predicted by observers as on note by Surbakti and Harris (2005). Similarly by the records of Bisri et al (2006) on two crucial issues related to the impact of political liberalization are the presents of strong candidate with powerful "capital" as well as dominance of the executive is because they were elected directly. The presence of the powerful financiers in the election is due to the opening of direct access when the candidates are dealing with the broader community. Without adequate education, people do not expect much from any candidate who will compete, expect the cost of round-trip to the polling station. The domestic investor interest is in the form of financial support that allows them to gain advantages on a number of projects on the future. Foreign investors were only interest privilege on mining crops, mineral until palm oil. On the dark side, some bureaucrats gambled the fate of past bargaining position to ensure the future by staking alignments and mass mobilization. Strengthening the dominance of the executive is not a figment, in fact the overall planning and implementation of budgets were done as a solo career project by elected local chief mate. Parliament has practically no direct access except agreeing with all policy. The LPKJ (project report) that was initially to criticize and evaluate the leader was eventually become a merely formal protocol that filled with jokes and limerick, without any critical notes as public expect. In general, records of the election until 201, implying a 5 major problems, first, the high cost of democracy. Based on the record Fatah (2008), the election held on average about 103 times a year. In terms of the cost of the election, according to Jusuf Kalla (2008), each year the state budgeted cost of more than 200 trillion. According to rough calculations, the general election both presidential and legislative elections took a high cost. With these estimates it appears that the cost of direct democracy through mechanisms that do not cost us a little, But the problem is not solely on that. The question is whether direct democracy has produced a quality

leader so as to fulfill the mandate of the people and transport them to a better life? In fact, the direct election were only produced a dreamer, not a leader. The winners did not even leave anything, unless the local government accounts payable from one regime to the next regime. While the burden of budgets for democracy is climbing, Finally, what we see is what it seems to be a trickle-down effect but trickle up, where the capitalists are able to master the politics of local government.

At the level of the public, the meaning of democracy as a tool or instrument used in the political system to be a channel for the birth of a capable leader in carrying out the mandate is still far from expectations. Democracy is understood as the terminal end, not the system of choice between authoritarian and totalitarian systems. It's possible, for other systems that is essentially offer a more promising path, accommodating and marketable. Lack of effort to save cost in democracy expenses will encourage the creation of inefficiency, in fact a waste. Here, the priority of public interests at stake between the interests of the ruling elite. With the awareness that the election is just one among the democratic mechanisms need to be built, then this process should not be viewed as an end terminal in a democracy.

Another paradox is the tendency to consider the higher quality of the democratic system will be built there is a tendency of low efficiency. However, the mechanism of democracy with all its forms is a good system, possibly even much better and wiser than the other systems, though it has a number of weaknesses. Through analysis of Boediono, democracy has a positive relationship with efficiency.

4. Urgency and Excellence Indirect Election

The urgency for indirect election seems need to be reconsidered to address a number of major issues that confront the implementation of direct democracy. If direct election is the antithesis of indirect election the other day, it would require an instrument that is able to answer the contrary antithesis raising the fundamental issues of indirect election. This needs to be raised as soon as to cover the failure of the indirect election in the past. The only critical note of indirect elections in the past is, people do not feel involved at all. This is understandable, because in this way it's enough for the representative of the people who perform executions and then present it to the central government. If the election is not directly observable in the New Order era, the assumption that the parliament is very dominant in the local elections cannot be approved, because even members of local parliament conduct a voting, but the winner is already determined before the game starts. Only the most influential factor is the approval of the ruling regime. Even if one candidate won parliament regional heads of the two candidates submitted to the central government, it is not impossible that another candidate with the least votes is appointed by the government. With the change from centralized to decentralized system, the possibility of local elections will greatly depend on the dynamics of political parties. Importance of Election indirectly encouraged by the principal reasons: Firstly, the consistency of the constitution and the state philosophy. In line with the constitutional mandate of the amendment to article 18 paragraph 4 (4), the election of Governors, Regents and Mayors carried out democratically. Democratic, indicating that the system can be built through direct election (direct election) and selection (indirect election). As the consequence is the direct election by the people, while the indirect election through parliament. Based on the matter, constitutionally, a local election by the legislature is not a complicated job in regulatory changes. By still taking considering the weaknesses and strengths. When referring to the preamble of the 1945 constitution on fourth paragraph, it is clear that the Constitution implies the importance of the representative system emerged as the sound the principle number (4), Democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations amongst representatives. Based on the philosophy of consciousness and the state constitution, it appears that for this system that is built up even more distant from the primary reference. If the President and Vice President, the House of Representatives, Governor and Deputy Governor, Parliament, regents / mayors were directly elected, then, where is the meaning of the representative government as a constitutional mandate and philosophy of the country can be found? In addition, if you be more construction of article 18 paragraph (4) that underlie local elections, and Article 4 of the 1945 Constitution as the reference and the vice president's presidential election is clearly different. The first norm is only mandated the election of governors, regents and mayors democratically minus the vice governors, vice-regent and deputy mayor. While the second norm explicitly states that the presidential elected in pairs by the people. Consequence of article 18 above implies that the election in the local government level are not necessarily in the form of pairs, could be in the singular (Governors, Regents, Mayors only). This text is if it is associated with the context of Indonesia that has the characteristics of the compound areas at least can be interpreted flexibly in the sense of a small area such as DIY, Bengkulu, Gorontalo is enough with one deputy head. While the broad areas such as East Java, West Java, Central Java may have more than one deputy regional head, even for small cities like Salatiga city, Lubuk Linggau and Padang Panjang did not need to be completed by the deputy head of the region. Second, improve the efficiency of the democracy mechanism, the indirect General Election could reduce the

high cost of democracy. Reality shows that the high cost of elections has a lot to absorb in the proportion of budget every five years, even in later years after the election. Each year the central government should set up the cost of election in a matter of trillions of rupiahs. Not to mention the additional cost in case of re-election after it's being annulled by the Constitutional Court. In indirect elections, draw result is unlikely will happen. In addition, the cost is very low. For indirect election, the absorption of costs only in the context of the executive committee, members of parliament honorarium and security is limited. In contrast, the direct election requires infinite cost of the management aspects of the Election Commission to field operations at the polling station level. Infinity here pertains to the opportunity for re-election if there were a dispute. Third, reduce the horizontal conflict. Because of the election conducted by the Parliament in person, then the conflict can be minimized in such a way. The tendency of the conflict that often extends to the horizontal level can be represented by members of parliament with a limited number. If during the conflict amounted to 1 million people, then it is likely through indirect elections the conflict fairly represented by 25 to 100 people. Thus the conflict over declining due to a decrease due to quantity and quality that disputed on the field. Quantity related to the number of representatives who will determine who heads the area to be selected. While the quality associated with the ability of legislators in the process of determining the regional heads who will be elected. In consideration of sufficient education and income, legislators will certainly be more restraining rather the tendency of anarchism by community supporters who are disappointed with the result. Fourth, through indirect elections, the people expectation is not always provoked by promises and threats if they don't choose the candidate's. The people would be more focused on basic activities. In addition, the clash between the mass of political supporters by itself would be lost, because the candidate would be in the direct contact with legislators, not the masses in the streets. The sterility of the hustle and bustle of the election can not only boost productivity in the elected officials, as well as the community itself. Fifth, through an indirect election, each candidate relatively be under the control of the quality aspect, because the party will do the selection for the cadres who really has the ability. Ability is not solely on financial aspects, but also the capacity of moral, political, and management of power in government. In this context the more effective regulation is needed to create a more transparent selection mechanism. Sixth, through indirect election, it reduces the burden of the Constitutional Court relating to the disputed on the election. The MK (constitutional court) has been busy dealing with the Election dispute till it arrives at a decision to conduct the reelection. Since the election held, the election dispute has resulted in a horizontal conflict, high cost, as well as the emergence of the issue of bribery in the body of the Constitutional Court. This condition can continuously reduce the credibility of the government, particularly the commitment of law enforcement in Indonesia. Seventh, through an indirect election, the accountability of regional heads are more effectively under the control. Relations and the regional head of parliament had been running in the spirit of pseudo partners. Because both are elected directly, then by carrying the same spirit, both have an equal legitimacy, the consequences is many regional head tends not so cooperative in terms of DPRD oversight function. It can be observed in the case of each fiscal assessment year accountability report. If the election cannot be implemented immediately, then certainly the head region is more respect and responsible to Parliament as a representative of the people. Eighth, through indirect elections, the neutrality of the bureaucracy relatively can be assured. In an indirect election, the campaign team is not necessarily come from the civil servants. Therefore, the regional head elected by local legislators, so the linkages between the regional head candidate with the bureaucracy tends to be dissociative. Bureaucracy would be sterile, where the area of public service won't be touched dominantly by the political currents. Basically anyone who would be elected as head of the region, that leader will be followed by the bureaucracy. Ninth, in an indirect election, money politics can be relatively reduced, eliminating money politics to zero in political reality is impossible. All you need do is minimize the chances of money politics as much as possible through a specific monitoring mechanism. As far as there is demand and supply, the market itself will be formed. But in comparison, money politics will only be concentrated on elite political parties as clear and measurable. This is just a consequence of local elections. As an illustration, a person who will advance in an indirect election by the number of members of parliament of 40 people, enough to prepare tribute to 21 people (50% plus 1, the absolute majority). suppose that every vote be rewarded with a value of 200 million rupiahs, then each candidate need only 4.1 M. Logically this fund is reasonable can be returned within a period of five years with average salaries and benefits for head area of 8.5 jt / month. Compared if you fight in a direct election, a candidate must prepare at least 15 M in each round to win the regional head office. Even if won, with salary and benefits for regional head as noted above, it is impossible to be restored within five years, unless by conducting an activity we all reject, namely corruption.

5. Conclusion

If the Excellency of the direct election for regional heads is that the people tend to elect the leader they desired, than the fact shows that he is likely voted because of money. Head of region that is desired by the people are

barely local citizens. If the head of region is considered close to the people, in the reality are just a lot of candidates came from outside the area who recently left his homeland. If the assumptions that the head of the region are understood and to understand the people, in fact a lot of head region did not quite understand the ins and outs of the area, do not even understand the will of the people. If the head of the regional votes can make promises to the people directly and be directly responsible to the people, in the real world most of promise remains promise, and the people don't have a definite mechanism to demand the fulfillment of promises from the head of region. If people can make a correction to reconsider the work of regional head, the fact is people do not have the prowess as well as standard mechanism to control, especially to give punishment when the head of the region conduct violation of moral action. In general, people do not even know the degree of head of region capabilities. Above all the benefits of direct elections, which in turn indicates a failure at the implementation level, it seems require an alternative like switching into indirect election with a number of advantages, such as, consistency in the constitution and the philosophy of the country, the low horizontal conflicts, lack of manipulation in the form of a promise which resulted in the relationship between the head region with the people, rulers and the bureaucracy are distracted, focused the public on the following main activities without neglecting the hierarchical control, increase the efficiency and effectiveness of democracy, the birth of the candidates with relatively have a better quality, reducing the burden of the Constitutional Court, emerging of political parties control to each candidate, increasing accountability at the local head by the people through parliament, ensuring the neutrality of the bureaucracy, as well as reducing the behavior of money politics during the election process.

To ensure the good democracy be conducted in Indonesia, it's essential to alternate the mechanism of direct democracy and indirect democracy, Mechanism should be based on two basics measurement, education and income levels. Education and income levels either affect the mechanism of democratic society directly or indirectly. In this paper the authors conclude that if all the principal measures were met, then direct democracy can be applied (eg, in the capital Jakarta). While the size of the area that do not meet the criteria than indirect democracy is become applicable (representative of government) such as Papua and most of in eastern region in Indonesia. Thus the application of the mechanisms of democracy in Indonesia is not uniform (uniform). Determination can then be done by comparing the ratio of education and income levels per region in Indonesia. At the next level of implementation of the mechanism of direct democracy can be applied gradually until the fulfillment of the above two measures. The second suggestion is to apply the indirect democratic mechanisms at the provincial level, and a direct mechanism at the level of district / city. This pattern may not answer the problem of quality of democracy as a whole, but at least reduce the massive cost of democracy in Indonesia.

References

- Agustino, L. (2010). *Pilkada dan Redistricting: Dinamika Politik Lokal dalam Politik Indonesia yang Terdemokrasi*, edisi 16. Forum Komunikasi Alumni Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jakarta.
- Amirudin dan A. Zaini Bisri. (2006). *Pilkada Langsung, Problem dan Prospek*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Budiardjo, M. (2007). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik*. Jakarta.
- Dahl, R. (1985). *Dilema Demokrasi Pluralis*. Rajawali Press.
- Dahl, R. (1992). *Demokrasi dan Para Pengkritiknya*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Dahl, R. (2001). *Perihal Demokrasi*. Yayasan Obor Indonesia, Jakarta.
- Fatoni, A. (2009). *Pilkada yang Demokratis dan Permasalahan dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Langsung*. Jurnal Pamong Praja, edisi 15. Forum Komunikasi Alumni Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jakarta.
- Halim, R. (2009). *Sendi-Sendi Sosiologi dan Hukum-Hukum Pragmatisasinya*. Puncak Karma, Jakarta.
- Hamdi, M. (2002). *Bunga Rampai Pemerintahan*. Yarsif Watampone, Jakarta.
- Haris, S. (2005). *Masalah dan Strategi Menyuksesan Pilkada Langsung*. Jurnal Pamong Praja Edisi 3. Forum Komunikasi Alumni Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jakarta.
- Koten, Y. K. (2010). *Partisipasi Politik, sebuah Analisis atas Etika Politik Aristoteles*. Ledalero, Maumere.
- Lestari, S. (2011). *Arah Kebijakan Regulasi Pemilihan Kepala Daerah*. Republika.
- Noer, D. (1997). *Pemikiran Politik Barat*. Mizan, Bandung.
- Olson, M. (1993). *Dictatorship, Democracy and Development*, *The American Political Science Review*, (dalam Agustino Leo, 2010).
- Rapar. (1993). *Filsafat Politik Aristoteles*. Rajawali Press, Jakarta.

- Rasyid, R. (2002). *Makna Pemerintahan, Tinjauan dari Segi Etika dan Kepemimpinan*. Yarsif Watampone, Jakarta.
- Rowa, H. (2009). Perimbangan Demokrasi dan Efisiensi Dalam Pemilihan Kepala Daerah. Jurnal edisi14. Forum Komunikasi Alumni Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jakarta.
- Sabine, G. H. (1950). *A History of Political Theory*. Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Suhelmi, A. (2007). *Pemikiran Politik Barat*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.
- Surbakti, R. (2005). Beberapa Pertanyaan Tentang Sistem Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Secara Langsung. Jurnal Pamong Praja Edisi 3. Forum Komunikasi Alumni Institut Ilmu Pemerintahan, Jakarta.

Note

Regulations

UUD 1945 Amandemen Ke 4.

UU No. 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.

UU No. 22 Tahun 2003 Tentang Susunan dan Kedudukan MPR, DPR, DPD dan DPRD.

UU No. 12 Tahun 2003 Tentang Perubahan atas UU 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.

PP No. 6 Tahun 2005 Tentang Pengangkatan, Pengesahan, Penetapan dan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah.

PP No. 3 Tahun 2007 Tentang LPPD, LKPJ dan LIPPD.