

Worrying Political Democracy in 2024 National Elections on the Behavior of Election Managers

Osbin Samosir^{[a],*}

^[a]Lecturer of Political Science at Indonesian Christian University in Jakarta, Jakarta, Indonesia.

*Corresponding author.

Received 10 September 2022; accepted 30 October 2022

Published online 26 December 2022

Abstract

Election organizers in Indonesia's general elections are often accused of being an obstacle to the growth of democracy. The position of election administrators is a very serious problem for the growth of Indonesian democracy. The reason is very simple: Indonesia's democracy failed during the New Order era which was supported by election administrators. The New Order was an opaque democracy for Indonesia's democracy because election administrators were inseparable from the authoritarian regime. Even in the early days of reform, election management was very disappointing and became a source of new problems. When the election organizers namely the General Election Commission - KPU (*Komisi Pemilihan Umum*) were asked to supervise their work by establishing the Election Supervisory Body – *Bawaslu* (*Badan Pengawas Pemilihan Umum*) in 2008 it was real evidence of poor performance that. The emergence of the third election organizing body, namely the Honorary Election Organizing Council - DKPP (*Dewan Kehormatan Penyelenggara Pemilihan Umum*) is a sign that election administrators behave badly in building a dignified election process. The big concern is the difficulty of holding dignified general elections in the 2024 national simultaneous elections.

Key words: Democracy; General election; Election organizer; Professionalism; Dignity

Samosir, O. (2022). Worrying Political Democracy in 2024 National Elections on the Behavior of Election Managers. *Higher Education of Social Science*, 23(2), 56-62. Available from: URL: <http://www.cscanada.net/index.php/hess/article/view/12763>
DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.3968/12763>

1. INTRODUCTION

The performance of election organizers in Indonesia is very worrying if they welcome the upcoming 2024 national general election. At least, that is the conclusion that can be drawn from the evaluation of election administrators over the last ten years. Even though it is very possible that Indonesia is the only civilized country in the whole world that tries or decides whether or not the ethical behavior of election organizers is guilty, the process is carried out in a courtroom open to the public, just like the general court for criminal or civil cases since ten years ago, namely since 2012 (Jimly, 2021). It's not just about the behavior of election organizers that are open to the public for public viewing. The administration of elections in Indonesia is handled by three different institutions, of which there is only one in the world, namely KPU, Bawaslu, and DKPP.

The personal ethical behavior of every election administrator at all levels in general elections in Indonesia is a public affair that is open to the public. The presence of this ethical institution in order to ensure 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: , confidential, honest and fair every five years. However, it turns out that the attitude of the election organizers in holding elections in Indonesia did not satisfy the citizens. It can be seen from Table 1 that very many election administrators were asked to have their behavior checked according to the code of ethics.

Table 1
Complaints to the Code of Ethics against Election Organizers from 12 June 2012 to October 2022

No.	Year	The Number of Complaints
1	2012	99
2	2013	606
3	2014	879

No.	Year	The Number of Complaints
4	2015	478
5	2016	323
6	2017	304
7	2018	521
8	2019	506
9.	2020	454
10.	2021	297
11	2022	48
Total		4.515 report files

The data shows that the behavior of election administrators is a very serious problem in the development of democracy in Indonesia.

Table 2 shows the poor performance of TPS officers in relation to the number of TPS officers reportedly voting in national and local elections at the same time, according to their respective times. The data shows that the number of complaints from organizers continues to increase every year. The question is whether the behavior of election officials has changed since the DKPP was founded in the ten years since it was founded in 2012.

Table 2
Decisions on Ethical Cases for Election Organizers for June 2012 to October 2022

No.	Year of Case	Number of Cases	Cases Decided	Court Decision (people)						Total (people)
				R	WW	TS	FS	DP	RES	
1	2012	30	30	20	18	0	31	0	3	72
2	2013	141	141	399	133	14	91	0	28	665
3	2014	333	333	627	336	5	188	3	122	1281
4	2015	115	115	282	122	4	42	2	13	465
5	2016	163	163	376	173	3	46	2	10	610
6	2017	140	140	276	135	19	50	8	5	493
7	2018	319	319	522	632	16	101	21	40	1332
8	2019	331	331	808	552	4	77	17	46	1504
9	2020	196	196	452	286	3	41	16	0	798
10	2021	172	172	399	210	3	14	5	11	642
11	2022	33	30	26	29	2	14	1	8	80
Jumlah		1973	1970	4195	2629	73	695	75	286	7953 People
				Cases	Reported					

Description:
R =Rehabilitation WW= Written Warning
TS= Temporary Stop FS = Fixed Stop
DP=Dismissal from Position RES = Resolution

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND METHODOLOGY

Based on the above main issues, this research answers the question: why is the behavior of election administrators in Indonesia so openly observed? How important is the establishment of an electoral commission for strengthening democracy in Indonesia? What are the results of election administrators' ethical compliance over a decade from the DKPP's founding in 2012 to 2022? What are the biggest problems with EMF ethical behavior? This study will use a qualitative research methodology, namely research focused on the strength of data and arguments from the literature and in-depth interviews with different parties. The literature we will use is data drawn directly from ethics decisions enacted by DKPP government institutions in general since 2011 and the 2021 ethics case decisions in particular. by DKPP in 2012 and how ethical behavior gets better or worse every year. The second source we used were interviews and views of Indonesian election leaders on the

ethical behavior of election administrators, including: Jimly Ashiddiqie a Master of Law from University of Indonesia Jakarta, Nur Hidayat Sardini, Chairman of the Oversight Board for General Elections of the Republic of Indonesia 2008-2011, who is also a Lecturer in Political Science at Diponegoro University in Semarang.

3. ELECTION ORGANIZERS AS THE SOURCE OF DEMOCRACY PROBLEMS

The behavior of election administrators in Indonesia has become a very serious problem. Therefore, since October 2010, before the establishment of the DKPP RI Institute, the ethical behavior of election organizers has been audited. According to Jimly Ashiddiqie, the process is carried out by a team of ethical reviewers who are formed within a certain period of time, i.e., on an ad hoc basis. His organization initially recognized Nur Hidayat Sardini (2022) as chair of the Election Oversight Board and made numerous recommendations to the Indonesian KPU for a

series of alleged ethical violations by election organizers between 2008 and 2012. In practice, there were only three recommendations that were followed up by the KPU, namely regarding ethical behavior towards KPU members in a district in South Sumatra province, a KPU member from Riau Islands province, and one of the leaders of the RI KPU.

Table 3
Number of Election Organizers reported in 2021

Reported Institution	Number of People
Regency/City KPU	550
Regency/City Bawaslu	362
Provincial Bawaslu	85
Provincial KPU	71
Bawaslu of the Republic of Indonesia	23
KPU of the Republic of Indonesia	4
Election organizers at the sub-district level and below	79
Total	1174 people

Data of the DKPP RI, January 8, 2022.

Looking at Table 3, for 2021 alone, the number of election administrators who were reported to the state ethics council for their unsatisfactory performance in holding elections was 1174. This number is certainly very high and very worrying. Strengthening the existence of DKPP in the second period was reformulated in Law Number 7 of 2017, with the additional authority of DKPP to form DPRD in every province throughout Indonesia. Why is it important that ethical processes are publicly available? According to Jimly Ashiddiqie, every alleged violation of the ethics of election administrators is always related to the political interests of the state and the political rights of citizens (Jimly, 2021). In the era of democracy, holding elections is the fourth pillar that helps strengthen and strengthen the democratic process. The position and authority of the election organizers are very likely to damage the social fabric of society, which will be more complicated and full of social conflicts if the election organizers do not organize the election process in a professional and neutral manner.

4. PUBLIC DISSATISFACTION WITH ELECTION ADMINISTRATORS' CONDUCT

Public dissatisfaction with the performance of TPS is very often the scene of social conflict, which leads to the demolition and burning of government buildings and other public facilities, and residents often lose their lives. Similar fluctuations were found, for example, in the North Tapanuli Government, North Sumatra Province, Palembang City, South Sumatra, most of Papua and Eastern Indonesia, and a number of other areas. Election

organizers tend to be tempted by the lure of power, promises of future positions if elected, the ability to donate money, or close family or organizational ties (Budhiati, 2021). As a result of political collusion, it is very possible that the election organizers act unprofessionally and side with one candidate pair or party that has a high chance of winning the political contestation.

Whereas in a dignified democracy, all election administrators do not need to put themselves in the shoes of one of the competing parties because they are organizers, arbitrators, and destroyers of every stage of the election that all voters must obey. Why is there distrust of election administrators as evidenced by the 243 cases decided by the Ethics Court? Because in the democratic process in Indonesia, election management is directly related to determining the circulation of power, especially regarding the election of executive political power at the center and in the regions. In contrast to the general election, which was attended by hundreds or even thousands of candidates, the fierce competition did not feel too heavy because the number of winners was small and the number of parties losing was almost twenty times the number of participants who succeeded. power.

In contrast to the post-conflict local elections, which are followed by an average of two to four pairs of candidates, even the presidential elections of the Republic of Indonesia in 2014 and 2019 were only followed by the same two presidential candidates in two direct presidential elections. Specifically, the election between President Joko Widodo and Prabowo Subianto.

The influence of the few pairs of candidates in the executive branch led to very close competition with the fanfare of their respective supporters. Indonesia's identity-political experiences in the presidential elections of 2014 and 2019 left deep scars, the effects of which can still be felt today. The issue of black politics, each candidate's poor past profile, character assassination, and the use of negative identity politics in the name of religion and ethnicity have polluted public opinion during the presidential election phase. In the 2012 ethical incident, in the early days of the birth of the DKPP ahead of the 2014 parliamentary and presidential elections, one of the biggest ethical incidents was when all members of the Indonesian KPU were sued by Bawaslu because they were considered by the Indonesian KPU number of 18 (eighteen) political parties as unprofessional and unfair who deliberately crossed out their participation as voters. According to Bawaslu, 18 political parties must take a step that the RI KPU has not taken, which is to conduct field verification as the final condition of whether political parties are eligible to participate in the election or not on Election 2014. In a public trial on Friday, November 11, 2012, it was revealed that the KPU RI commissioners were having difficulty fulfilling their duties, which were deliberately obstructed by the KPU RI Secretariat.

At the time, Indonesian KPU commissioner Ida Budhiati said there had been disobedience and an attempt to boycott the 2014 elections by the KPU general secretary. The secretariat does not optimally fulfill its supporting functions in preparation for the election phase. In its Ethics Resolution of November 27, 2012, the Ethics Board decided to fire four key officials from the KPU Secretariat who were not reported by the reporter. The four people are: the General Secretary of the KPU

RI, the Deputy General Secretary of the KPU RI, the Head of the Legal Department, and the Deputy Head of the Legal Department (Code of Ethics in the Case of the Election Organizer No. 23). -25-DKPP-PKE/I/2012). In addition, the DKPP has mandated the RI KPU to carry out a second level of verification, namely an on-the-spot verification for all political parties, especially those who feel disadvantaged.

Table 4
Comparison of the Decisions on the Code of Ethics for 2012, 2017, and 2021

No	Year of Case	Number of Cases	Court Decision (people)						Total (people)
			R	WW	TS	FS	DP	RES	
1	2012	30	20 (27,8%)	18 (25 %)	0	31 (43,1%)	0	3 (4,2)	72 people (100%)
2	2017	140	276 (56%)	135 (27,4%)	19 (3,9%) Dismissed election organizer: 77 orang (15,62%)	50 (10,1%)	8 (1,6%)	5 (1%)	493 people (100%)
3	2021	172	399 (62,15%)	210 (32,71%)	3 (0,47%) Dismissed election organizer: 22 orang (3,4%)	14 (2,18%)	5 (0,8%)	11 (1,7%)	642 people (100%)

Data of The DKPP RI, January 31, 2022

Then, what is the most serious problem with election management violations?

5. CENTRAL LEVEL ORGANIZERS ARE VERY DISAPPOINTING

While election administrators were previously more concerned with what happened at the local level, such as sub-districts and sub-districts/villages, election officials at the central level have recently been heavily involved in election violations. There are at least three election procedures that President Joko Widodo must follow for members of the Indonesian KPU. The three cases include: the case of the Election Organizer's Code of Ethics Number 01-PKE-DKPP/1/2020 concerning the Disrespectful Dismissal of the Indonesian KPU Commissioner on behalf of Wahyu Setiawan; the case of the Election Organizer's Code of Ethics Number 123-PKE-DKPP/X/2020 concerning the Dismissal of the Chairperson of the Indonesian KPU on behalf of Arief Budiman; and the case of the Election Organizer's Code of Ethics Number 317-PKE-DKPP/X/2019 concerning the Disrespectful Disrespectful Dismissal of the Indonesian KPU Commissioner on behalf of Evi Novida Ginting. The 2020 DKPP, which was introduced by President Joko Widodo, has permanently dismissed two commissioners of the Indonesian KPU (DKPP, 2020).

Complaints to other institutions, such as the State Administrative Court (PTUN), are not DKPP decisions but are administrative decisions by other institutions (Jimly, 2019). Because it is directly related to the political rights of citizens, the ethical issues of election administrators must also be open to the public. The public is very disappointed and complains about the performance

of election organizers from the central level to the lowest level, which is certainly one of the sources of difficulties for the growth of democracy in Indonesia. The final disappointment, of course, was the ethical decision to dismiss the chairman of the KPU RI and the two members of the KPU RI. Of course, the most disappointing behavior was caught by a member of the Indonesian KPU, Wahyu Setiawan, in a bribery case with the Corruption Eradication Commission (KPK). The Ethics Council did not hesitate to issue a final dismissal decision as a KPU Commissioner to Wahyu Setiawan as stated in the Case of the Election Organizer Code of Ethics Number 01-PKE-DKPP/1/2020 concerning Disrespectful Dismissal as a KPU Commissioner of the Indonesian KPU.

Another KPU commissioner to be finally dismissed by the honorary council was Evi Novida Ginting in the case of the election organizer's code of ethics No. 317-PKE-DKPP/X/2019 on the disrespectful dismissal as KPU commissioner of Indonesia. Evi was dismissed on the assumption that he had taken an action that harmed one of the candidates and benefited another candidate in the election, whose actions were found to be contrary to the 2019 findings of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia in the In Nebenan case. In addition to the two commissioners mentioned above, the head of the Indonesian KPU was also dismissed in favor of Arief, namely the case of Code of Ethics No. 123-PKE-DKPP/X/2020 regarding dismissal from the post of KPU Chairman. In the Indonesian KPU, Arief Budiman was removed from office for abusing his position.

The three members of the KPU RI who received the above-mentioned dismissal sentence are only a small part of the public's disappointment with the behavior of the election organizers. Central-level Bawaslu commissars have also been sanctioned for their conduct in election

monitoring. Not to mention the behavior of the provincial, district, and city level election officials, including those who are increasingly out of reach, namely the subdistrict and village level election officials, who will, of course, move further away so that the conduct of the elections will not be monitored and controlled will.

Disappointment with the poor performance of election administrators in Indonesia is not a new problem. The origin, of course, lies in the holding of elections since the beginnings of the New Order authoritarian government, which held six elections (1971, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1997) that were purely a matter of form. Election organizers across Indonesia during the New Order era had to win sole power from President Suharto, who was backed by three political machines, namely: the military (ABRI), the bureaucracy, and the political party (Golkar). Suharto's power The New Order Political Party Therefore, when the New Order government fell in 1998, Indonesian election officials were unwilling to act professionally and independently in the elections held during the reform era since 1998. From the decisions of the DKPP, especially in 2021. Of the 243 cases decided by the DKPP in 2021, 71 were reported as ethical cases in 2020 and 172 were filed in 2021. In 2021, 930 people were examined by the ethics agency, of whom 63.1% received a resocialization notice and 31.3% received a written warning.

Meanwhile, the permanent dismissal from commissary status for election organizers is 2.9%, and the dismissal from the post of chairman or head of certain departments is 1.2%. At what level did the organizers arouse the greatest public suspicion? The biggest problem with holding elections is at the district or city level. The data shows that the root of the problem for most code of ethics violations lies in the county/city maelstrom. Firstly, because the district/city is very far from the center of the capital Jakarta, which makes it difficult to reach the voter fraud; and secondly, because the ethics of the organizers are not as good as at the provincial and central levels. Second, the county/city level is an area that will immediately participate in the nationwide simultaneous regional leader elections in December 2020. Third, the limited social space in the county or city allows the organizers of the election to make arrangements with each of the candidates to participate in the Pilkada including election of regents or mayors.

With the three conditions above, election organizers are very likely to be tempted to commit election violations. The data in Table 4 shows that the most central problem areas for violating the code of ethics are in districts and cities. Apart from being very far from the center of the capital city of Jakarta, making it difficult to reach and promote the code of ethics, regencies and cities are also areas that are directly affected by the implementation of the code of ethics. Due to the possibility of an invitation to respect violations of the code of ethics and the limited social space in districts and cities, there is a possibility

that the election organizers will be tempted to conspire against one of the candidates for head of state, regent, or mayor. The very large centers of urban discontent in the districts and cities indicate that the possibility of political power cooperation at the third level is very high. Due to the very far distance from the center of power in Jakarta, which is not necessarily reachable from the provincial level due to the geographical location of Indonesia, which is an archipelagic country, and the transportation facilities for election organizers are not yet adequate, it is very possible for elections to be held. election organizers. Face one of the strongest candidates to overcome the conspiracy.

The possibility of collusion is very high because the election of regional heads, especially regional head elections, involves close family ties, ethnicity, local culture, and local culture of election organizers, the same candidates and voters compete. Cultural similarities and kinship bind strongly in terms of the struggle for political power between candidates and their respective camps to compete because there is cultural pride in the name of lineage or kinship. Therefore, family ties do not allow election administrators to demonstrate their professionalism and fairness.

It must be very different from the general election process in Jakarta, because at the central level in Jakarta and at the level between the election administrator and competitors and voters, it is quite wide, so it is very unlikely that close family relations will occur. and tie. This very serious problem becomes a very urgent job for the central level election organizers to ensure the quality of the selection of district/city level election organizers to face the regional head elections that will be held in the near future.

6. SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH

The holding of elections is a serious problem in the development of democracy in Indonesia. The inability of election administrators to act professionally and independently is the biggest challenge for election administrators. Even the election organizers at the central level have recently embarrassed themselves because they have increasingly acted unprofessionally and proved to be partial. In fact, the existence of the central level election organizers must be an example for lower level election organizers, namely at the provincial, district/city, sub-district, village/kelurahan levels, even to the location of the election organizers at the polling stations. station level (TPS).

Therefore, it is very necessary to uphold the dignity of election organizers through ethical examination sessions that are open to election administrators. This trial pattern follows the general court pattern. This is democracy in Indonesia. The courage to break old patterns and habits becomes a stepping stone to improving the quality of

an increasingly dignified election administration. The leap from ethical scrutiny, which has been considered taboo, into a form of personal ethical behavior for the development of the public, is considered an effort for Indonesia's democracy in the future. DKPP received many challenges and criticisms at the beginning of the Ethics Council session for deciding to hold an open ethics examination session.

The enforcement of democracy has been the beginning of Indonesia since the birth of the Reformation Era in 1998. The form of democracy in Indonesia must first begin with the general election process. Should democracy have at least three aspects of democracy that must always be present in the process and elections? *First*, democratic government is under the real control of the wider community; it does not become an arbitrary force but is open to input and criticism from the public. *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 countries is contrary to the main choice of citizens.

Third, there is a guarantee of democratic rights for all citizens to disagree with what is given by the ruling government, including alternative solutions decided by the government as its political policy. It is hoped that the quality of the implementation of Indonesian elections can be even better, especially since the election stages have begun before the 2024 Simultaneous National Elections for the Presidential Election, Legislative General Election, and Regional Head Elections throughout Indonesia. Hopes for a better quality of Indonesian democracy will begin with a dignified political process carried out by election administrators. The demands of democracy for Indonesia are shown by the need for more dignified elections.

Why does the mind of the election organizers not develop a strong will to conduct elections democratically so that strict and harsh sanctions are needed from other institutions and the format of the trial is open to the public by the national ethics institution? Perhaps the answer is that Indonesia does not have the democracy found in the West and in America, 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 in Indonesia.

The wave of world democracy and liberalism swept across the world at the time, although in Indonesia in 1945, more than 300 royal power systems in local kingdoms still ruled the archipelago. Each local kingdom stands on its own, conquering each other between kingdoms and expanding the territory of their respective kingdoms. Thus, in deciding the form of government in 1945, whether the form of democracy or the form of a kingdom should be chosen, a vote had to be taken among the founding fathers of the nation, and the vote was won by a majority. Democracy.

6. SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER

Action How can we expect so much from the character of an election administrator who acts unprofessionally and can't help but take sides? Therefore, it is very important for the EMB selection process at all levels to use the early stages as a springboard to discover the character of EMBs. The selection process must be truly professional, prioritizing survey organizers who are qualified and have a genuine heart to serve. The characteristics of monetary policy games or promises under any name should be avoided. This includes likes and dislikes, which should be discarded. In the next phase, the election organizers really need a briefing or similar training that is rigorous, disciplined, and includes programming material that the election organizers can really understand.

Public interventions such as the media, democracy activists, and educated circles are very important for monitoring the performance of election officials at all levels. The lack of democratic roots in Indonesia is a reason to understand that the character of the election administrators in Indonesia does not develop a democratic character but rather becomes a job seeker and feels like a temporary ruler. Of course, this research is not perfect for examining the importance of the existence of ethical institutions for Indonesia for a longer future in democratic development. In addition, a more comprehensive and in-depth study of the importance of the existence of an ethics body in Indonesia is needed in the pursuit of an increasingly democratic country. At the same time, it is interesting to conduct further studies to see the context of the growth of democracy in Southeast Asian countries, which are almost completely dominated by the local royal system and culture, which are not far removed from the local Indonesian traditions.

REFERENCES

- Ashiddiqie, J. (2019). Presentation/Explanation of the DKPP Performance Report and the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD) at the Mercure Ancol Hotel, North Jakarta, on Friday 18 December 2018 and Friday 20 December 2019.
- Ashiddiqie, J. (2021, Dec.16.). Presentation and explanation of the DKPP Performance Report and the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD) at the Mercure Harmoni Hotel, Central Jakarta, on Thursday.
- Budiarjo, Miriam. II. Edition, revised set Jakarta, Gramedia Pustaka Utama 2010, p. 54. The case of the Election Organizer's Code of Ethics Number 01-PKE-DKPP/1/2020 concerning the Dismissal of the Indonesian KPU Commissioner on behalf of Wahyu Setiawan.
- Capitalism, Socialism, and Democracy* (2nd ed., p.252). Floyd, Virginia: Impact Book. ISBN 9781617208652.

- 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 on behalf of Dahliah Umar.
- Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 23-25-DKPP-PKE/I/2012 Regarding Dismissal from the positions of Secretary General and Deputy Secretary General of the Indonesian KPU and Return to Institutions of Origin on behalf of Suripto Bambang Setiadi, Asrudi Trijono et al.
- Case of the Code of Ethics for Election Organizers Number 317-PKE-DKPP/X/2019 concerning the Dismissal of the Indonesian KPU Commissioner on behalf of Evi Novida Ginting.
- Case of the Election Organizer's Code of Ethics Number 123-PKE-DKPP/X/2020 concerning the Dismissal of the Chairperson of the Indonesian KPU on behalf of Arief Budiman.
- Dahl, R. A. (1956). *An Introduction to Democratic Theory* (pp.103-107). The University of Chicago Press.
- Data from the DKPP of the Indonesian Experimental Ministry was received on Monday, January 31, 2022.
- Diamonds, L., et al. (Ed.) (1989). *Democracy in developing countries: Latin America, Volume Four* (pp.ix+515). Boulder, CO: Lynne Rienner and London: Adamantine Press.
- <https://www.sindonews.com/>, July 8, 2012, regarding an NGO's rejection of DKPP's ethical decisions.
- Ida Budhiati's testimony will be on Thursday, December 16, 2021, at the National Coordination Meeting of the Regional Examination Team (TPD) at the Mercure Harmoni Hotel, Jakarta.
- In the search for democratic figures, philosophical studies Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama. "Don't Sabotage Democracy," 11/10/2014, www.tempo.co.
- Interview with Nur Hidayat Sardini, Chairman of the General Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia in 2008-2011 and Lecturer in Political Science at Diponegoro University, Semarang, Central Java
- Magnis-Suseno, Franz, and Menuyu Democracy by Hendarmin Ranadireksa (2009). Media Focus, Bandung, p. 55
- Participation and Opposition in Polyarchy Yale University Press, New Heaven (p.2). Data from the DKPP Complaints Office of the Republic of Indonesia was received on January 8, 2022.
- Political and developing countries: comparing experience with democracy. Lynne Rienne, Boulder, Colorado, p. XVI, 6-7.
- Samosir, Osbin (2017). Strong Christian political representation on a strong Islamic base Political Party Studies: PDI-P and the Golkar Party UKI Press, Jakarta.
- Samosir, Osbin (2021). The system of political representation in modern times. UKI Press, Jakarta.
- Samosir, Osbin (2022). Jakarta's 21st Century Political Party: UKIPress. Schumpeter, Joseph A. (2014) [1942].
- Wisnuwardhana University, Malang-East Java, p. 55LPPM EcoSosBudKum Journal Volume 3 Number 2 October 2016 Edition Franz Magnis-Suseno (1995).