

An Effort to Build Indonesia's Democracy through Enforcement of the Honor of Election Organizers

Osbin Samosir^{1*}, FX Gian Tue Mali², Indah Novitasari³

^{1,2,3}Lecturers of Political Science, Christian University of Indonesia, Jakarta, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author email: osamosir@gmail.com

Abstract. Election organizers play a very important role in determining whether the democratic process is getting better or worse in Indonesia as a developing country. Election organizers deal directly with all stages of the national election, both for the presidential election, vice president, and for the election of members of parliament. Election organizers are also the implementers of regional head elections, namely governors and deputy governors, regents and deputy regents as well as mayors and deputy mayors throughout Indonesia. In this general election, candidates, both political parties and individuals, or pairs of candidates promoted by political parties, or individuals, compete for the cake of political power. Disputes and social unrest that have resulted in the destruction of public facilities and infrastructure in Indonesia, such as the burning of government-owned office buildings, and even fatalities, are often the targets of the public who are dissatisfied with the performance of election administrators who are suspected of siding with one candidate. There are at least two basic principles that must be adhered to by all election administrators, namely: professionalism in organizing elections, and fairness to all election participants as the courage to act independently and behave equally to all contesting election participants. Indonesian democracy will be better if the two main principles are firmly adhered to in the conduct of elections.

Keywords: democracy, fair election, election ethics, professionalism, independence

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is perhaps the only civilized country in the whole world that judges or decides whether the ethical behavior of election administrators is guilty or not. It's not only about the behavior of election administrators that are open to public viewing, but also that the implementation of elections in Indonesia is handled by three different institutions, there is only one in the world. The examination trial process is carried out in a courtroom that is open to the public, such as a general court for criminal or civil cases (Jimly, 2021). Since its establishment in 2012 to 2021, it has been ten years that the ethics of organizing elections has become a serious problem in Indonesia in an effort to uphold democracy.

Three election-related institutions play a role like the political triad in democracy in a small scope, namely: the General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia (KPU) which is the technical organizer and stages of the general election, the General Elections Supervisory Body of the Republic of Indonesia (Bawaslu) as the supervisor of all stages of the election administration, and The Election Organizing Honorary Council (DKPP) acts as a judge for the KPU and Bawaslu when their ethical behavior is opposed by the public. The

presence of this ethical institution in order to guarantee the implementation of the basic principles of holding general elections in Indonesia which is expressly stated in the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in Article 22E paragraph (1) which reads: "General elections are held directly, publicly, freely, confidential, honest and fair every five years".

The personal ethical behavior of every election administrator at all levels has become a public affair that is open to the public. In a general sense, the ethical behavior of everyone, including the behavior of election administrators, in the history of mankind has always been a private matter. Moreover, in Eastern (Asian) culture which upholds manners, respect, and customs, it is taboo if behavior problems are categorized as open to the public. Therefore, since humans know democracy, especially the birth of the Liberalism era in the 19th century, the ethical behavior of everyone from state institutions, of course, including election administrators, behavior suspected of being considered deviant or violating rules or norms must be investigated. in a closed room by presenting only certain parties (Jimly, 2021).

However, it turns out that the attitude of the election organizers who held elections in Indonesia was considered to be disappointing to the people. It can be seen from Table-01 that there are many ethical reports against election administrators whose behavior is asked to be examined at state ethics institutions. The data shows that the behavior of election administrators is a very serious problem in the development of democracy in Indonesia.

This open examination session is very important because, as Lary Diamond (1990) said, in the practice of democracy, general elections become an arena for parties to compete which includes: a place to compete as contestants who struggle to gain political power, participation of citizens who make political choices. , aspects of political liberalization as a civil right, and the freedom of citizens to choose politics. In this process, the election administrator becomes the most decisive actor in carrying out the election process based on the principles: direct, public, free and confidential. Every adult citizen (one person) is only entitled to use one vote (one vote) whose price is valued (one value) equal to the votes of all other citizens (Samosir, 2022). Democracy, one of which is an election, is an opportunity for all parties, both opposition parties and citizens, to carry out the function of control and supervision of the ruling party and government.

METHODOLOGY

How important is the formation of an ethical election management body when it comes to strengthening democracy in Indonesia? What are the results of the ten years of ethical observance of election administrators since DKPP was formed in 2012 until now? What are the biggest problems with the ethical behavior of EMBs in 2021? The selection of this range is because Indonesia will hold Simultaneous Pilkada throughout Indonesia in December 2020.

This research will use a qualitative research methodology, namely research that focuses on the strength of data and arguments obtained from the literature and in-depth interviews with a number of parties. The literature that we will use is data taken directly from ethical case decisions in general since 2012, and in particular the 2021 ethical case decisions issued by the DKPP as a state institution. DKPP decision data will reveal the most basic ethical issues

that have occurred since the establishment of DKPP in 2012 and how ethical behavior is getting better or worse from year to year.

The second source we use is the thoughts, views, or interviews with Indonesian election leaders regarding the ethical behavior of election organizers, including: Jimly Ashiddiqie's views and thoughts (2018 to 2021), Master of Law University of Indonesia Jakarta and Chair of DKPP 2012-2017; the views and thoughts of Doctor Ida Budhiati, Member of the KPU of the Republic of Indonesia in 2012-2017; Interview with Doctor Nur Hidayat Sardini, Chair of the Election Supervisory Body of the Republic of Indonesia for 2008-2012 and Lecturer in Political Science at Diponegoro University, Semarang; interviews with Alfitra Salamm, Commissioner of the Honorary Council for Elections of the Republic of Indonesia and Senior Researcher on Elections and Democracy at the Indonesian Institute of Sciences (LIPI); Interview with Jeirry Sumampou, Coordinator of the Indonesian TEPI Institute (a non-governmental organization associated with General Elections and Democracy).

Other sources that we use are the thoughts of experts on democracy and political development through elections from Lary Diamond, Robert Dahl, Franz Magnis Suseno, and Miriam Budiardjo.

Maintain The Honor Of Election Organizers

The case of election management behavior in Indonesia has become a very serious problem, so that before the establishment of the DKPP RI Institution, the ethical behavior of election organizers had been tried since October 2010. According to Jimly Ashiddiqie (2019), the first trial was conducted by an ethics examiner team formed within a certain period so that temporary (ad hoc). The existence of this team from time to time is formed by the Indonesian KPU for alleged ethical violations committed by election organizers. The existence of Bawaslu since its birth on April 12, 2008 is very strict in supervising elections at all levels and all institutions that handle elections. So that according to the provisions of Law Number 10 of 2008 concerning General Elections, the RI Bawaslu in the first period, namely 2008-2012, only has the authority to provide recommendations to the RI KPU if there are elements from the ranks of election organizers who are suspected of violating the election code of ethics.

From several follow ups on the results of Bawaslu's recommendations for the 2009-2011 period, there were a number of ethical cases that were examined by the KPU Honorary Council with the chairman of the session, Jimly. Ashiddiqie . The KPU Honorary Council consists of five assemblies, namely: three from KPU elements and two from community leaders. The first ethical case examined by the KPU Honorary Council was an open examination to the public of alleged ethical violations committed by election organizers from one of the regencies in South Sumatra Province in April 2010 (Jimly, 2018). As the former Chief Justice of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Jimly Ashiddiqie conducted the first trial of the code of ethics openly to the public and was covered directly by the media, just like hearings in courts in general. The trial of the first open code of ethics case is no different from the trial of criminal cases, civil cases, and constitutional cases at the Constitutional Court which is open to the public and invites journalists and is watched by all parties who feel the need to be involved in it.

Why is an ethics trial open to the public important? At Jimly Mind Ashiddiqie, all accusations of violating the ethics of election administrators are always related to the political interests of the state and the political rights of citizens. In the era of democracy, holding elections is the fourth pillar that supports strengthening the democratic process (Jimly, 2021). The position and authority possessed by professional and independent election administrators from all the interests of parties fighting for political power will very likely help democracy to grow stronger and more fertile in the archipelago. On the other hand, the behavior of election administrators has the potential to damage the cohesion and social order of society, which will become increasingly complicated and full of social conflicts if the election organizers are unprofessional and side with one candidate. in the conduct of the general election process. Public discontent with the performance of election administrators is very often the scene of social disputes that lead to the destruction and burning of government offices and other public facilities, as well as fatalities. Similar fluctuations, for example, can be found in North Tapanuli, Palembang City, most areas on the island of Papua, eastern Indonesia, and a number of other areas in Indonesia.

Election organizers are very likely to be tempted by the lure of power, promises of future positions if elected, the possibility of giving money, or close family or organizational relationships (Budhiati, 2021). The effect of political collusion is very possible for the election organizers to act unprofessionally and side with one candidate pair or party that has a high chance of winning the political competition. Whereas in a dignified democracy, all election organizers must step aside from one of the competing parties because they are the organizers, arbiters and breakers of every stage of the election to be obeyed by all election participants. So that the position of election organizers must be in the middle, impartial character and carry out all stages in a measurable, accountable and transparent manner with the main characteristic of independence. Electoral administrators must serve all parties fighting for power, and serve the electorate as those who will determine the win or loss of each competing candidate.

Table-01:

Number of Sessions on the Code of Ethics for the 2021 Election Organizers

No	Month	Number of Exam Sessions
1	January	18
2	February	48
3	line up	51
4	April	41
5	Can	3
6	June	6
7	July	5
8	August	17
9	September	14
10	October	10

11	November	2
12	December	2
Total		217 cases

DKPP RI Trial Section Data, January 31, 2022

Table-01 above shows the number of code of ethics cases that will be tried and decided by the ethics court throughout 2021. It is hoped that this DKPP decision can make election administrators act better because the Indonesian democratic party is placed on the shoulders of election organizers in every implementation. The success and dignity of Indonesia's democratic process, one of which is largely determined by the process of holding elections by election administrators. Elections are the most tangible and fundamental democratic process in any democracy. There is no country in the world that calls itself a democracy but does not hold elections. Even a number of countries that are actually authoritarian or communist in character also conduct elections, which of course is very different from the process and objectives of the elections that are understood by countries that glorify democracy (Samosir, 2021).

Election Management and Indonesian Democracy Improvement

The birth of the DKPP ethical court since 2012 is expected to maintain the honor of election organizers at all levels, especially the impartiality of one of the candidates participating in the election. Ida Budhiati (2021) emphasized that the basic attitude of election organizers is not to take sides with any of the election participants. Election organizers are not only not allowed to take sides, they even appear to be taking sides or making gestures that are suspected to be in favor of one of the pairs of candidates are not allowed. The reason is very clear, because all the behavior and movements of election organizers, both proven and suspicious, are always monitored by all politically competing candidates. Efforts to suspect and spy on every election organizer's attitude is a necessity for every election participant because every candidate wants a political victory, and if possible dirty competition will be carried out.

Table-02:

Code of Conduct Case Decisions Throughout 2021

Case Year	Case Decided	COURT DECISIONS					Provision	Total
		R	WW	TS	FS	DP		
2020	71	188	81	0	13	6	0	288 people (31.2%)
2021	172	399	210	3	14	5	11	642 people (68.8%)
Total	243	587	291	3	27	11	11	930 people (100.0%)

Information:

R=Rehabilitation

WW=Written Warning

TS= Pause

FS=Fixed Stop

DP=Dismissal from Position

Because in the democratic process in Indonesia, election organizers are in direct contact with determining the circulation of power, especially regarding the election of executive political power at the center and in the regions. In contrast to the legislative elections which were attended by hundreds or even thousands of candidates, the tight competition was not felt too much because the number of winners was only a few and the number of parties losing was almost twenty times the number of participants. who won power. Unlike the election for executive power, which on average was followed by two to four pairs of candidates, even the presidential elections of the Republic of Indonesia in 2014 and 2019 were only participated by the same two presidential candidates in two direct presidential elections. , namely the rivalry between President Joko Widodo and Prabowo Prabowo.

In the 2012 ethics incident, in the early days of the birth of DKPP ahead of the 2014 Legislative and Presidential Elections, one of the biggest ethical cases was when all members of the Indonesian KPU were sued by Bawaslu because they were deemed by the Indonesian KPU to be unprofessional and unfair to a number of 18 (eighteen) political parties. who deliberately crossed out their participation as election participants. According to Bawaslu, there is one step that must be given to 18 political parties that the KPU has not carried out, namely the implementation of field verification as a final requirement whether or not political parties are eligible to participate in the election. 2014 general election. In an open trial on Friday, November 11 2012, it was revealed that the commissioner of the KPU RI had difficulty carrying out his duties which was deliberately hindered by the secretariat of the KPU RI. At that time, the Commissioner of the Indonesian KPU, Ida Budhiati, said that there was disobedience and an attempt to boycott the 2014 election by the Secretary General of the KPU. The secretariat does not carry out its supporting functions optimally in preparation for the election stage.

In its Ethics Decision, Friday 27 November 2012, the Ethics Council decided to dismiss four main KPU secretariat officials who were not reported by the reporter. The four people are: the Secretary General of the KPU RI, the Deputy Secretary General of the KPU RI, the Head of the Legal Bureau, and the Deputy Head of the Legal Bureau (In the case of the Election Organizer Code of Ethics Number 23 -25-DKPP-PKE/I/2012). In addition, DKPP ordered the RI KPU to conduct a second stage of verification, namely field verification for all political parties, especially political parties that feel disadvantaged. In this case, it is true what Lary Diamond (1990) said that democracy in the form of general elections is a state administration system for the purpose of selecting political parties competitively and regularly. There is universal suffrage for adult citizens, both for the election of members of the legislature and for the election of the chief executive such as president, prime minister, or other designations. However, Larry Diamond identifies that this tendency is only limited to formal procedural democracy, even though what is far more important is procedural guarantees, and the

existence of democratic substance that is not just political claims on behalf of a democratic state.

With the final and binding nature of the DKPP's decision, DKPP has maximized this opportunity by boldly correcting election violations at every step in accordance with the reported ethical violations. The first trial of the code of ethics for the case Number 01 of 2012 which was reported by the PDI-P lawyer against the Chair of the DKI Jakarta Provincial KPU, was the first case of the DKPP decision. As a result, DKPP gave a strong warning to the Chairperson of the DKI Provincial KPU (as a personal ethical decision), but also ordered the DKI Jakarta Provincial KPU to make corrections for the many errors in the Permanent Voters List (DPT) for the DKI Jakarta Pilkada. Election of Governor and Deputy Governor of DKI Jakarta 2012 (Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 1-DKPP-PKE/I/2012).

Table-02 shows the number of election administrators who reported participating in the national and local elections simultaneously according to their respective times. The data shows that the number of teradu continues to increase from year to year. The question is, has there been a change in the behavior of election administrators since DKPP was formed, in the ten years since it was formed in 2012 to 2021 now?

After ten years of the establishment of DKPP, namely in 2021, there has been a real change in the ethical behavior of election administrators. Although the number of organizers who were tried was very large, namely 642 people (100%), the percentage of election organizers who were dismissed was only 3.4% (22 people). This number is much smaller than the percentage of election administrators who were dismissed in 2012 which was 43.1% (31 people) and in 2017 of 15.62% (77 people). Meanwhile, the number of election administrators who were given written warnings in 2021 was much larger, namely 210 people (32.71%) compared to the previous year. The number of rehabilitated election administrators dominated as many as 399 people (62.15%), a very high percentage compared to previous years.

The Challenge of Democracy by The Attitude of The Organizers

The biggest challenge for the growth of democracy from the point of view of election administrators is neutrality and professionalism which is still difficult for election administrators to demonstrate. Almost the process of organizing elections in Indonesia since the New Order era has experienced serious problems due to the side of the election organizers. This attitude was still under way until the birth of the Reformation Era when all election participants tried to achieve power freely with the birth of the era of freedom of political parties. The worst process occurred in the early days of the reform era since the 1999 elections and the 2004 elections when no one could oversee the policies of election administrators . even when Indonesia's efforts to develop democracy were felt to be very important to create a supervisory agency in 2008, it is evident that many complaints to the Election Supervisory Body were due to the fraudulent attitude of the organizers. As soon as the existence of an election organizer does not help the process of democratic growth in Indonesia, it is deemed necessary to create an enforcement agency that maintains the honor of

election administrators who are considered bad enough in helping the establishment of democracy.

So the birth of an honorary enforcement agency, namely DKPP, is expected to return election organizers to the main rail as a professional and independent democracy enforcer from the interests of political parties. The decision of the DKPP regarding the trial for alleged violations of the ethics of election administrators is final and binding. Final nature means that there is no appeal or other higher effort to file a lawsuit related to the ethical behavior of election administrators in Indonesia. While binding means that the DKPP decision must be implemented by all parties as referred to in the relevant ethical case decision. Even the President of the Republic of Indonesia himself must submit to the ethical case decisions issued by the DKPP.

Evidence of the President of the Republic of Indonesia's obedience to the DKPP decision as happened in the case of the code of ethics of the two Indonesian KPU commissioners, namely: The case of the Election Organizer Code of Ethics Number 01-PKE-DKPP/1/2020 concerning Disrespectful Dismissal as Commissioner of the Indonesian KPU on behalf of Wahyu Setiawan and the Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers and the Case for the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 317-PKE-DKPP/X/2019 concerning Disrespectful Dismissal as Commissioner of the Indonesian KPU on behalf of Evi Novida Ginting. The two commissioners of the Indonesian KPU were permanently dismissed by the 2020 DKPP which had been implemented by President Joko Widodo (DKPP, 2020). The lawsuit to other institutions such as to the State Administrative Court (PTUN) is not a DKPP decision but what is being sued is an administrative decision by another institution (Jimly, 2019).

Table-03:

DKPP Code of Ethics Decision 2021

Case Year	Number of cases	Court Decision (person)						TOTAL (Person)
		R	WW	TS	FS	DP	RES	
2020	71	188	81	0	13	6	0	288 (30.97%)
2021	172	399	210	3	14	5	11	642 (69%)
Quantity: 243 cases		587 (63.1%)	291 (31.3%)	3 (0.3%)	27 (2.9%)	11 (1.2%)	11 (1.2%)	930 people (100%)

From the DKPP's decision in particular throughout 2021, it can be seen that of the 243 cases decided by the DKPP throughout 2021, as many as 71 cases were ethical cases reported in 2020 and 172 cases were submitted in 2021 as shown in the figure in Table-03. There were 930 people examined by the ethics agency throughout 2021, and 63.1% of them received a rehabilitation decision and 31.3% received a written warning. Meanwhile, permanent dismissal from the commissioner status of election organizers is 2.9%, and dismissal from the position as chairman or person in charge of certain divisions is 1.2%. The number of dismissals continues to show a decreasing trend from year to year in the last ten years,

especially when compared to the very high number of DKPP in 2012 and 2013 as shown in the table at the beginning of this study.

This most dominant ethical violation proves that there is a serious problem with the performance of election organizers who are not yet professional and have the potential to side with one candidate to become the winner of the election. Even if it is calculated from the voting stages to the determination of seat acquisition and vote recapitulation, the number of violations that occurred during the national election was very high, namely 84.8%. Meanwhile, the most common categories of ethical violations are shown in Table-04.

Table-04:

Code of Conduct Violation Category in 2021

No	Ethical Violation Category	Reported Amount
1	Not Carrying Out Duties/Authorities	88
2	Negligence in the Election Process/Pilkada	73
3	Violation of Neutrality and Partisanship	38
4	Unfair Treatment	31
5	Lack of Effective Legal Effort	21
6	Violation of the Law	22
7	Abuse of Power/Conflict of Interest	15
8	Breaking Social Order	13
9	Voice Manipulation	9
10	Voting Violation	8
11	Voice Cheating	6
12	Bribery	3
13	Job Assignment Confidentiality	3
14	Intimidation and Violence	1
15	Institutional Internal Conflict	1
	Amount	332 people

Regarding the categories of principles that were violated, it can be seen that the principles of the code of ethics for election organizers that were violated the most in 2021 were professional principles with a total of 168 defendants. The next principle that is often violated is the principle of legal certainty, independence, accountability, and justice and openness. Regarding the origin of the complainants, most of the complainants whose complaints were examined and decided by the DKPP came from complaints from elements of the community/voters, as many as 420 reporters. Following in second place are elements of

political parties participating in the election, election organizers, candidate pairs, campaign teams, and legislative candidates. shown in Table-05.

Table-05:

Whistleblower's Origin Data in 2021

No.	origin of the complainant	Number of Reporters
1	Community/voters	420
2	Political parties	63
3	Election Organizer	58
4	Campaign Team	4
5	Candidate Pair	3
6	Candidates for legislative	1
	Total	549 people

DKPP RI Trial Section Data, January 31, 2022

RESEARCH FINDINGS

The trial process for examining the code of ethics for election administrators in an open manner, which exactly follows the pattern of the general court, is a prerequisite for upholding democracy in Indonesia. Patience in tackling old patterns and habits becomes a stepping stone for improving the quality of an increasingly dignified election administration. The leap from the form of ethical examination which has been considered taboo to the form of disclosing personal ethical behavior to the public is actually considered a demand for Indonesia's future democratic development efforts. DKPP received many challenges and criticisms in the early days of serving as the first chairman of DKPP, Jimly Ashiddiqie, who decided to conduct an open ethics examination hearing. And after 10 years, the benefits are obtained at least by finding the behavior of election administrators who are increasingly professional and fair from day to day. All of the above results were achieved because DKPP gave very strict sanctions to every election organizer who was proven to be in favor of one of the candidates, or if there were election organizers who clearly deliberately complicate the election process.

The enforcement of democracy has been a demand for Indonesia since the birth of the Reformation Era in 1998. The form of democracy in Indonesia must first begin with the general election process. Just like Franz Magnis Suseno (2009), professor of Indonesian political philosophy, means that democracy must emphasize the importance of at least three aspects of democracy that must always be present in the process and substance of general elections. *First*, a democratic government is under the real control of the wider community, does not become an arbitrary power, but is open to input and criticism from the people. *Second*, the existence of free elections as an opportunity for all adult citizens to make their choice even though the will of a number of citizens is contrary to the choice of the majority of citizens. *Third*, there is a guarantee of democratic rights for all citizens to have opinions different from those intended by the ruling government, including providing alternative solutions other than those decided by the government as its political policy.

Efforts to enforce the substance of democracy, as expected by Magnis Suseno above, are increasingly finding their form when the percentage of election administrators who receive severe sanctions is getting smaller, while those who receive court decisions who are rehabilitated increasingly dominate. The data illustrates that democratic compliance which was very poor in 2012 underwent a significant change in 2021 after ten years of the birth of the Indonesian Ethics Institute, namely DKPP. It is hoped that the quality of the implementation of Indonesian elections from year to year will increase, especially in the near future, namely ahead of the 2024 Simultaneous National Elections for: Presidential Elections, Legislative Elections, and Regional Head Elections throughout Indonesia. The hope for a better quality of Indonesian democracy will start from a dignified political process carried out by the performance of election administrators.

CONCLUSION

The demands of democracy for Indonesia are shown by the need for more dignified elections. It is very visible, after ten years, the number of election organizers in 2021 whose good names have been restored and who have received a reprimand from the decision of the state ethics court, namely the DKPP, far dominates compared to the same judicial process at the beginning. the birth of DKPP in 2012. Towards a dignified election in the Indonesian context , the behavior of election administrators still needs to be monitored. Thus, the presence of a state ethical institution in Indonesia, namely DKPP, has succeeded in improving the behavior of election organizers in holding elections for the better. The existence of a national ethics body in Indonesia is still very important and its function is to ensure the behavior of election administrators so that it does not deviate further, is very much needed and may become a necessity.

Why does the mind of the election organizers not foster a strong will to hold democratic elections so that strict and harsh sanctions are needed from other institutions, and the format of the examination session is open to the public by the national ethical institution, namely DKPP? Perhaps the answer is because Indonesia does not have a democratic tradition as understood in the Western world and in America as the country where democracy was born. The seeds of democracy in Indonesia are not rooted in the history and local cultural traditions of the archipelago on Indonesian soil. When the founding fathers of the nation decided to adopt democracy as a form of statehood, which was to be established in August 1945, the reason was because the world was developing rapidly respect for human rights and the freedom of human dignity, embodied in a democratic system of government.

Of course, this study is not perfect for examining the importance of the existence of ethical institutions for Indonesia for a longer future in democratic development. Further, broader and more in-depth studies are needed regarding the importance of the existence of an ethical body in Indonesia in the effort towards an increasingly democratic country. At the same time, it is interesting to conduct further studies to look at the context of the growth of democracy in Southeast Asian countries which are almost entirely dominated by local royal systems and cultures, which are not far from local Indonesian traditions. Neighboring countries such as Thailand, Vietnam, Cambodia, Laos, Myanmar, Brunei, and other Southeast Asian countries

do not have a democratic character. Further studies for the ASEAN Region will further complement the importance of a special ethical body for holding elections in countries that aspire to become democratic countries but do not have a democratic tradition, in fact in allied countries in the Southeast Asian region.

Bibliography

1. Ashiddiqie, Jimly. Presentation in the DKPP Performance Report and the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD). The Mercure Harmoni Hotel, Central Jakarta on Thursday, December 16, 2021.
2. ----- . Presentation in the DKPP Performance Report and the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD). Mercury _ Hotel Ancol , North Jakarta on Friday, 20 December 2019.
3. Budiarjo, Miriam. Political Science Fundamentals Edition, Revised Cet. II . Jakarta, Gramedia Main Library, 2010.
4. Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 1-DKPP-PKE/I/2012 concerning the case of the Chairperson of the DKI Jakarta Provincial KPU and Dahlia Umar.
5. Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 23-25-DKPP-PKE/I/2012 concerning Dismissal from the positions of Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General of the KPU RI and returned to the agency of origin, Suripto Bambang Setiadi, Asrudi Trijono, et al.
6. Dahl, Robert A (1956). An Introduction To Democratic Theory . Chicago: University of Chicago. .
7. ----- . (1971). Polyarchy: participation and opposition. New Heaven: Yale University Press.
8. Data from the Complaints Section of the DKPP RI Secretariat was received on January 8, 2022.
9. Data from the Trial Section of the DKPP Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia was received on Monday, January 31, 2022.
10. Diamond, Larry, et al (eds.) (1989). Democracy in Developing Countries: Latin America , Volume Four (Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienne and London: Adamantine Press.
11. ----- . (1990). Politics and Developing Countries: Comparing Experience with Democracy. Boulder, Colorado: Lynne Rienne.
12. <https://www.sindonews.com> , July 8, 2012 regarding the Objection of Non-Governmental Organizations Against the Ethical Decision of DKPP.
13. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=iBRf31hUmC4> regarding the Performance Report of the Honorary Election Organizing Body on December 16, 2021.
14. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=lsxauSGSit8&t=13327s> regarding Submission of the Performance Report of the Honorary Election Organizing Body on 18 December 2018.
15. <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=tcR4TKU0Yn0> regarding the Performance Report of the Honorary Election Organizing Body 19 December 2020.
16. Ida Budhiati on Thursday, December 16, 2021, at the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD) at the Mercure Harmoni Hotel, Jakarta.
17. Interview with Jeirry Sumampou, Coordinator of the Indonesian TEPI Institute (Non-Governmental Organization for General Elections and Democracy) on Monday, 7 February 2022.
18. Interview with Nur Hidayat Sardini, Chair of the Republic of Indonesia Bawaslu for the period 2008-2011 and lecturer in Political Science at Diponegoro University, Semarang, Central Java, Monday, February 7, 2022.
19. Journal of the Constitution, Vol. II, No. June 1, 2009 , PKK Faculty of Law Wisnuwardhana University , Malang-East Java.
20. LPPM EcoSosBudKum Journal, Volume 3 Number 2 Year 2016 October Edition
21. Magnis-Suseno, Franz (1995). Looking for Democracy Figures, philosophical studies . Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
22. ----- . "Don't Sabotage Democracy", in www.tempo.co , October 11, 2014.
23. ----- . "Towards Democracy" in Hendarmin Ranadireksa (2009). Democratic Constitutional Architecture . Bandung, Focusmedia.

24. Samosir , Osbin (2017). Christian Political Representation on a Strong Islamic Base. Study of Political Parties: PDI-P and the Golkar Party . Jakarta: UKIPress .
25. ----- . (2021) Political Representative System in the Modern Era. Jakarta: UKIPress .
26. ----- . (2022). Political Parties in the 21st Century. Jakarta: UKIPress .
27. Schumpeter, Joseph A. (2014) [1942]. Capitalism, socialism and democracy (2nd ed.). Floyd, Virginia: Impact Book. ISBN 978-1617208652.