

Problems of Democratic and Dignified Election in Indonesian Simultaneously Electoral Era

Prasetio¹, Lego Karjoko¹, Lita Tyesta Addy Listya Wardhani², Siti Marwiyah³, I Gusti Ayu Ketut Rachmi Handayani¹, Abdul Kadir Jaelani^{4,*}, Ach. Tahir⁵ and Sholahuddin Al-Fatih⁶

¹Faculty of Law Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, Indonesia

²Faculty of Law Universitas Diponegoro, Semarang, Indonesia

³Faculty of Law, Universitas DR. Soetomo, Surabaya, Indonesia

⁴Faculty of Law Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Surakarta, Indonesia

⁵Faculty of Sharia and Law Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Kalijaga, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

⁶Faculty of Law Universitas Muhammadiyah Malang, Indonesia

Abstract: This research was motivated by the section material in Act No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Election that not arranged in a structured, systematic and massive, so it appears the section material that overlaps with Constitutional Court and the Constitution of 1945. The purpose of this study is to analyze the problems of simultaneous elections in 2019 in order to bring democracy with dignity and integrity in the next election. The research type is a literature study. This research uses laws and conceptual approach. The main data of this study is obtained from primary and secondary law materials. The result showed that the problems in the section material of Electoral Law implicate to the practice, namely the chaos in updating of the voter list led to manipulation fraudulent of the voters list, 10,520 polling stations had a shortage of election supplies, ballot boxes Voting Organizing Group received that not sealed as many as 6,474 polling stations, ballot papers that exchanged between Electoral District as many 3,411 Voting place and 527 Voting Organizing Group officer died and 11 239 sick.

Keyword: Election, Democracy, Dignified.

INTRODUCTION

The two things which can not be isolated are democracy and elections. Vote is viewed as a tool for achieving democracy and transferring people's sovereignty to a certain individual in order to hold political positions. Article 22E(2) of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945 provides that the elected members of the House of Representatives (DPR), the Council of Regional Representatives (DPD), the President and Vice-President, and the Regional House of Representatives shall be elected (DPRD). Direct, public, free, confidential, truthful, and equitable are the values. The values are consistent with an aspect of a democratic state, namely the presence of free and fair elections (Fadjar, 2013).

Elections are regarded by modern democratic states as the key process in the stage of state and government creation implementation. Elections are seen as the most visible manifestation of people's vested sovereignty, as well as the concrete form of involvement of the population in state administration. The main issues, therefore, are still processes and

elections. It is anticipated that government from, by and for the people will eventually be realized through the reform of the structure and the standard of elections (Gaffar & Budiarti, 2012). Indonesia has passed four presidential and vice presidential elections since the reform process (2004, 2009, 2014 and 2019) and five times the legislative elections (1999, 2004, 2009, 2014 and 2019). Currently, a simultaneous general election in 2019 just passed the national constitutional practices that the order is different from the previous elections. Since the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia No. 14/PUU-XI/2013 received its decision, both presidential elections (Pilpres) and legislative elections (Pileg) have been held concurrently. The decision negates the previous decision of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Decision No 51-52-59/PUU-VI/2008, specifying that, following the legislative election, presidential elections are held on the basis of a constitutional convention replacing the provisions of the statute, so that enforcement is recognized and respected as constitutional (Prasetyoningsih, 2014).

At the same time, the presidential election is defined as coinciding with the House of Representatives election. Therefore the candidates for president and vice president, representatives of the DPR, DPD and

*Address correspondence to this author at the Faculty of Law Universitas Slamet Riyadi, Surakarta, Indonesia; Tel: 087738904981; Fax: 0271642595; E-mail: abdulkadirjaelani@student.uns.ac.id

DPRD are chosen at the time of voting, at a time behind the voting booth. The first simultaneous election in Indonesia is the 2019 election. There are still a number of homeworks that need to be addressed either by shaping legislation or election organizer while representing the previous elections, and in 2019. Basically, as the legal framework, which then has consequences for practice, the issue of the election has taken root. On the other hand, however the probability that the lack of electoral management can also be started by the results of electoral management is not excluded (Solihah, 2018).

The uncertainty and problems of Election 2019 are not just the simultaneity between Pileg and the presidential elections, but also a lot of the section material on General Elections in Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 7 of 2017, which then has repercussions for practice. In the *first*, Article 173(3) of the verification of the political party opposed to Decision No. 52/PUU-X/2012 of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia. It claimed that Article 8(1) and the clarification of Article 8(1) of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No 8 of 2012 on the general election of the DPR, DPD and DPRD were contrary to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia on the ground that political parties were discriminated against in order to take part in elections (Zain & Basuki, 2019).

Second, Article 222 of Law of the Republic of Indonesia No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections states that candidate pairs are proposed by the Political Party or Coalition of Political Parties Elections that meet the requirements of seats at least 20% (twenty percent) of the total seats in DPR or a 25% (twenty five percent) of the valid votes nationally on election of members of the previous Parliament (Karjoko, Maret, & Riyadi, 2019). It will also be meaningless when the nomination threshold of a political party or alliance of political parties is decided on the basis of the results of the previous year's legislative elections. In addition, citing Saldi Isra's opinion in the dissenting opinion of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, Decision No. 53/PUU-XV/2017, using the election results of legislators as criteria to fill the role of chief executive (chief executive or president) has undermined the logic of the presidential form of government, it is the logic of executive positions filling the parliaments (Ghoffar, 2018).

Third, Implementation of Article 240 paragraph (1)(f) of the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No 7 of 2017 on the establishment of Regulation No 20 Year 2018 of

the Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia on the selection of Members of Parliament, of the Provincial Government of the Republic of Indonesia and of the Regency/City. General Election Commission Regulations is in violation of Article 240 paragraph (1)(f) of Law No. 7 of 2017 and Article 28J(2) of the Constitution of 1945, which provides that natural rights and freedoms are protected. The General Election Commission Regulations are in violation of Article 240(1)(f) of Law No. 7 of 2017 and Article 28J(2) of the 1945 Constitution which provides for the defense of natural rights and freedoms, (Fatimah, Iswanto, Basuki, Saputra, & Jaelani, 2020). All shall be subject to the limits laid down by law solely for the purpose of ensuring the recognition and respect of the rights and freedoms of others and of fulfilling the conditions relevant to the considerations of morality, religious principles, security and public order in a democratic society. *Fourth*, Article 351 paragraph (8) Law No. 7 of 2017 states that the witness referred to in paragraph (7) trained by Bawaslu. The provision is very burdensome for Bawaslu, remembered the number of areas and that too many witnesses. On the other hand, Law No. 7 of 2017 instructs to Election Organization to implement the election based on the principle of independence (Iswanto, Fatimah, Tahir, & Jaelani, 2020).

Fifth, Article 217 The Election Commission is required by Act No. 7 of 2017 to recapitulate the final list of voters (DPT). The provision is applicable under Decision No 860/PL.02.1-Kpt/01/KPU/IV/2019 of the Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia on the Recapitulation of the Domestic and Overseas Voters List, The Third Improved Results of the 2019 National Level Election Year. This decision defines the Domestic DPT as 190,779,969 and the Overseas DPT as 2,086,285, so that the number is 192,866,254. However in Decision No 601/HK.03.1-Kpt/07/KPU/III/2019 of the Election Commission of the Republic of Indonesia concerning the number of printed ballots in the 2019 general election, 187,027,477 were for domestic and 2,100,256 were for overseas voters, so that the total number of printed ballots was 189,127,733, so that the number of printed ballots was minus (-3,738,521) of the DPT collection, so that DPT became a problem from the appeal (Jaelani, Handayani, & Karjoko, 2020a).

The substance issues then have implications for the administration of elections, namely the chaos of 10,520 polling stations experiencing a shortage of election logistics, ballot boxes not sealed of KPPS received as

many as 6474 polling stations, ballot papers were exchanged between Electoral District or inter-TPS as many as 3,411 TPS and 527 KPPS officer died and 11,239 of them fell ill. A large number of KPPS officer who died and fell ill, presumably because the heavy workload of the administration of simultaneous elections in 2019 (Ardipandanto, 2019).

METHOD

This type of research is a juridical normative and gives priority to the literature (library research). According to Soerjono Soekanto, normative legal research is the study of the principles of law, the legal systematics, synchronization of law, legal history and comparative law (Soerjono Soekanto, 2018). The approaches that used are the legislation approach, the historical approach, and conceptual approach. Approach of legislation is done by studying related legislation by election, The historical approach is done by examining the background, the legal and sociological arguments related by simultaneous elections 2019 (Jaelani, Ayu, Rachmi, & Karjoko, 2020). Then, the conceptual approach is done by studying the concept of democratic legal state to realize the democratic and dignified simultaneous elections 2019. The research data and legal material use secondary data sources consisting of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials (Peter Mahmud Marzuki, 2013).

FINDINGS

Voter List in the Election: Recurring Problem

Although the electoral event has been held in Indonesia many times, the topic remains a difficult challenge to overcome. Not only does the question of voting data have consequences for the result of the vote, but also for the rights of voters. The question of voting data has always been the focus of Parliament's right of inquiry since the 2009 legislative elections. The explanation is that the fundamental rights of people to exercise their voting rights can not be elected. Despite having been registered on the ID card-el, which was formalized by the Constitutional Court by Decision No 102/PUU-VII/2009, people often do not use their voting rights, since the right of citizens can not be waived for administrative or technical reasons. However one of the basic requirements for a new liberal democracy is the channelling of citizens' engagement with voting rights (Harun, 2016).

Learning from the 2009 and 2014 elections, the question of the voting list emerged during the preparation of the voting list because there was no coordination between data from the General Election Commission (KPU) with data from the Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) and the preparation by the Ministry of Home Affairs, and in particular the Directorate-General, of data on the Possible Population Voters Election (DP4) by the Ministry of Home Affairs, and in particular the Directorate-General. At least 40 percent of voters lost their voting rights in the 2009 elections because it was not presented in the list of voters, although voting data changed dramatically in the 2014 election. In the Temporary Voters List (DPS), the number of potential voters registered as many as 187,977,268 individuals, while the DPT was reduced to 186,842,533 and 186,351,165 after being processed by the Voter Data Information System (Sidalih) (Prayudi, 2018).

Based on the number of ballots printed up to 187,027,477 in the general election of 2019, although the number of permanent voters list as up to 192,866,254, it indicates the absence of ballots up to 3,738,521. Decision of the election commission of the Republic of Indonesia Number: 1185/PL.01.09-Kpt/06/KPU/VI/2019 concerning the Stipulation of the Elected Candidate Pair of President and Vice-President in the 2019 General Election states that 154,257,601 national votes are valid. That is, the invalid vote letters or abstentions or not receiving C6 by resolved permanent voters list on April, 2019 in Election 2019 and determined national valid votes on June 30, 2019 were 38,608,653. In addition, there are also "voters stealth", i.e. names of voters who have died, voters who have moved long ago, people who are not eligible to vote, voters were also registered in two or more other places, and voters were also registered in two or more other areas. They were not removed from the electoral list (DPT). Updating the list of voters should not be treated as a trivial problem. In practice, the door that leads to the potential for electoral fraud is voter data. As such, fraud may be probable (R Surbakti, D Supriyanto, 2011):

a. Voters Not Registered in the Voters List (DPT)

Since decided Constitutional Court Number 102/PUU-VII/2009, in fact, voters not registered in DPT can come to the polling stations (TPS) using the ID card. However, according to Titi, because it is not well-informed, people prefer not to use the right to vote, so that their voices are vulnerable to abuse.

b. C6 Form are Not Distributed

C6 is a notification form to vote which usually will be given to citizens to inform them of polling locations. But in practice, as in the case of DPT, many are reluctant to exercise their voting right that is susceptible to abuse of the voice, but did not get the C6 does not mean it can't exercise their voting right.

c. Double Voting

Double voters can choose more than one time because it is listed on the DPT more than one occasion. Double voting can occur due to improper data collection by the Commission or there are certain parties who deliberately create multiple identities. It is also vulnerable to abuse of the voice, as happened in the district of West Pasaman, West Sumatra, in the 2014 legislative elections.

d. Ghost Voter

Ghost voter means using another person's identity to exercise their voting right as happened in the 2015 elections in Muna, Sulawesi Tenggara, which also involved double voting.

e. Foreign Voter

The Ministry of Home Affairs (MOHA) found there were 101 of 1,680 Data foreigners (WNA) in the voters list (DPT). However, the Election Supervisory Body (Bawaslu) found 158 foreigners in the voters list in 2019. The chaos of this problem resulted in violation of Article 201 of Law No. 7 of 2017 on General Elections states that the government and local governments provide population data in the form of aggregate data on population by district, population data of potential voters of Election and the data of Indonesian citizen who resides in overseas.

According to Refly Harun, from the synchronization or collaboration between the Commission and the Ministry of Home Affairs, in particular the Directorate-General of the Civil Registry, to the improvement of the accuracy of the synchronization process of the DP4 list of potential voters and the last permanent list of voters, the updating of the voter data may be initiated (DPT). The number of permanent voters, the number of polling stations (TPS) and voice letters should be determined. Legally, at present, the data collection method for voters based on Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning the general election (Act No. 7/2017) has been very sluggish compared to the previous law. The system refers to Article 204(1) of Law No. 7 Year 2017, which is based on a continuous register or list system, i.e.

updating the voting data by means of a permanent list of last-elected voters, which continues to be updated (Harun, 2016).

The efforts of organizers who have to work together to update the data of the voters in order to minimize the issue of the data of the voters should be appreciated. Nevertheless, it should be recalled that data collection should be properly archived by developing voting list information systems which have at least three key functions, namely the preservation of voting list data, the updating of the voting list accessible to the voter, and the transfer of information from the Voting Committee to the Regency/City General Election Commissions, from the Regency/City General Election Commissions to the Provincial General Election Commissions. The efficacy of policy problems also collides with the lack of expertise and skills in optimizing technology providers during this period. He hoped that with the help of stakeholders, it could be resolved (Arrsa, 2014).

Problematic of Presidential Threshold in Simultaneous Election Era

Presidential threshold became one of the conditions determining for president and vice president candidates who can compete in the presidential election. Conditions of presidential threshold are stipulated in Article 222 of Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, states that the nominated candidates by political parties or coalition of political parties participating in the election that meets the requirements of seats at least 20% (twenty percent) of the total seats in the House or acquire 25% (twenty five percent) of the valid votes in a national election before the Parliament members (Jaelani, Handayani, & Karjoko, 2020b). Conditions After the enactment of Law No. 23 of 2003 on the general election of President and Vice-President (hereinafter 'Act No. 23 of 2003') on Article 5(4), the presidential threshold has been adopted, which reads: 'A pair of candidates as referred to in paragraph (1) can only be nominated by political parties or by a coalition of political parties with a turnover of at least 15% (fifteen percentiles)

This clause was renewed in 2008 in order to face the presidential election in 2009, explicitly in Article 9 of Law No. 42 Year 2008 concerning the general election of President and Vice-President (hereinafter 'Law No. 42 of 2008'), raising the threshold, namely securing at least 20% (twenty%) of the total seats in the House of

Representatives or 25% (twenty-five%) of the total seats in the House of Representatives. This provision was also used earlier in the 2014 presidential election as a prerequisite. The Constitutional Court ruled on judicial cases relating to this topic well before the latest presidential threshold debate. By ruling No 51-52-59/PUU-VI/2008 of the Constitutional Court, the provisions of that threshold are referred to the delegation of the provisions of Article 6A(2) of the Constitution of 1945, as set out in Article 6A(5) of the Constitution of 1945, which states that 'Election procedures for president and vice-president are further governed by law' and is related to Article 22E(5) of the Constitution of 1945, which states that 'Election procedures for president and vice-president are further regulated by law'

In other words, this clause is an open legal policy, one of the provisions interpreted by the Court consistently as open legal policy and adhered to as *stare decisis* in order to apply the provisions of the Constitution Threshold of 1945. Not only the presidential threshold, the electoral threshold and the parliamentary threshold are also considered an open legal policy that provides lawmakers with an open legal policy (Harun, 2015). Still in the same verdict, the presidential threshold is expressed as reflecting their initial support for the presidential and vice-presidential candidates, recalling that the prerequisite of the election of president and vice-president pursuant to Article 6A, paragraph (3), of 1945 is that more than 50 per cent of the total votes cast in the election be endorsed.

Initial support is said to be the support of the people by a political party that through elections, has acquired legitimacy and has not yet been held simultaneously. In the Constitutional Court Decision No. 53/PUU-XV/2017, checking the laws relating to the conditions of the next presidential threshold, the Court added the presidential threshold proposal as a mechanism to improve the presidential system of government as one of the five main political agreements after the reform period in Indonesia. According to the Court, there are two justification bases for improving the presidential system with a presidential threshold, namely, first the adequacy of efforts to comply with the voice support of the presidential and vice-presidential candidates of the political party or alliance of political parties; and, second, the simplification of the number of political parties (Zuhri, 2018).

In applying the presidential threshold paradigm, there are many irregularities and errors, especially in

the simultaneous construction of elections. It is possible to sum up irregularities into three key claims. First, Article 6A(2) of the 1945 Constitution, which reads: 'A pair of presidential and vice-presidential candidates shall be chosen by a political party or alliance of political parties participating in the pre-general elections,' suggests that the presidential and vice-presidential election structure in Indonesia has not implemented a nomination threshold system. In essence, the claims of transparent legal policy can be violated by the meticulously logical Constitutional Court by interpreting Article 6A (2) of the Constitution of 1945 as the constitutional rights of the political party or alliance of political parties in proposing candidates for president and vice president who will struggle for the aspirations of the political party (Satriawan & Lailam, 2019). In fact, as a result of the presidential threshold, four new political parties that have been confirmed as a participant in the 2019 election violated his constitutional right to nominate candidates for president and vice president, namely Partai Solidaritas Indonesia (PSI), Partai Persatuan Indonesia (Perindo), Partai Berkarya, and Partai Gerakan Perubahan Indonesia (Partai Garuda). Such a clause should be defined explicitly in the constitution as part of constitutional engineering or constitutional engineering to achieve particular objectives (Harun, 2019).

It is not possible to compare political parties involved in elections in the current cycle with participants from the previous period. Perhaps the participants in the legislative election will change. The proof is that four new political parties, PSI, Perindo, Partai Berkarya, and Partai Garuda, have been confirmed as participating in the 2019 election. In addition, these parties had to go through the factual verification process, i.e. the verification process or controls to ensure that the conditions of the political parties participating in the election were met, as confirmed in the same judgment by the checking of the presidential threshold in Decision No. 53/PUU-XV/2017 of the Constitutional Court. This would also be insignificant when deciding the nomination thresholds of a political party or alliance of political parties based on the outcome of the previous year's legislative elections. In addition, citing Saldi Isra's opinion in a dissenting opinion of Constitutional Court Decision No. 53/PUU-XV/2017, using the election results as conditions for filling the role of chief executive (chief executive or president) has undermined the logic of the presidential system of government, it is the logic of filling executive positions in the parliamentary system (Al-Fatih, 2019).

The presidential threshold, in practical order, can lead to problems with election violations. At least three things need to be illustrated, namely (1) the ability to act as a 'buy-sell ship' (candidacy buying); (2) an instrument to avoid political opposition; and (3) the ability to generate a single candidate. The third procedure is crystallized by the electoral tradition of the district leader and deputy head (regional election), which is usually the same as the presidential election. The fact that executive election practices often become a way of buying candidacy is no surprise to anyone. buy-sell ship"buy-sell boat" Furthermore an effective weapon to remove political rivals is the presidential threshold. There are no everlasting rivals or allies in politics, only lifelong interests. Political parties now in opposition will only be allies if a common aim is to be accomplished.

The parties will form a coalition with these presidential threshold terms and a significant percentage of the threshold to rule out the creation of another coalition, to bring the presidential and vice presidential candidates since the coalition can not meet a predetermined threshold. There has been a lack of alternatives to such leadership in the 2019 presidential race. The old characters, namely Joko Widodo-Ma'ruf Amin and Prabowo-Uno, were reprinted by Contention. The PDI-P, Golkar Party, PKB, PPP, Nasdem Party, and Hanura Party endorsed candidate Joko Widodo-Ma'ruf Amin. Meanwhile the Gerindra Party, the Democratic Party, the PAN and the PKS endorsed the Prabowo-Uno candidates. The practice of the presidential threshold should be abolished on the basis of the reasons listed above, while the Constitutional Court Decision Number 49/PUU-XVI/2018, which was read on October 25, 2018, rejected the presidential elimination threshold. The presidential threshold requirements are likely to continue to apply in the 2024 election and could theoretically hinder the growth of the restoration of national leadership.

Problems of Restricted Ex-Inmates Corruptor Legislator

As specified in General Elections Commission Regulation No. 20 Year 2018 concerning the selection of Members of Parliament, Provincial DPRD and Regency/City (PKPU No. 20/2018), the issuance of ex-convict corruption rules forbidden by the Commission from a nominee member of the legislature is a type of populist entrapment policy. In the one hand, the society can theoretically accept it, and on the other it can boost the prestige of the institution or official that made it

(Akhmaddhian, Hartiwingsih, & Handayani, 2017). Article 4, paragraph (3) of the PKPU requires that in the selection of candidates democratically and openly conducted by the political parties, notto include former convicted drug dealers, sexual crimes against children subjects, and corruptors. In other words, the rules cover the possibility for the former prisoners of the three extraordinary crimes to dispute in the elections, the concerned person has been run or spend his sentence (Astomo, 2014).

Although receiving a lot of support from the group, not only substantively, but also procedurally, the rule is not free from errors. First the norm in the Commission's regulations significantly violates the Constitution and legislation of 1945, as well as the instruments for the defense of human rights. Article 240(1)(f) of Law No. 7 Year 2017 provides that no candidate has ever been sentenced to imprisonment by a court decision which has gained permanent legal force for the commission of a criminal offense punishable by imprisonment of five (5) years or more, unless the public has been publicly and honestly notified that he/she was the ex-convict concerned. The same prerequisite to become a member of the KPU, a member of the Bawaslu and a member of the DPD is included in those provisions (Fahmi, 2015). Also in Constitutional Court Decision No. 42/PUU-XIII/2015 concerning the judicial review of Law No. 8 of 2015 concerning the amendment of Law No. 1 of 2015 concerning the Stipulation of Government Control in Amendment of Law No. 1 of 2014 on the Election of Governors, Regents and the Mayor, it became law that prohibitions on former convicts running for municipal office are a form of reduction Hence, constitutional parole was found by the Constitutional Court. The Constitutional Court also ruled that the revocation of the right of a citizen to vote can only be performed as an extra penalty with the judge's ruling (Karjoko, Winarno, Rosidah, & Handayani, 2020).

Legislation alone cannot abolish the right of a person to vote, but merely imposes restrictions which do not conflict with the Constitution of 1945, in particular Article 28J(2), which states that restrictions can be imposed solely for the purpose of securing due recognition and respect for the rights and freedoms of others and of fulfilling equal demands in accordance with moral considerations (Asshiddiqie, 2016). Then, restriction on political rights of citizens is actually possible if done rationally. This is supported by Article 28J of the 1945 Constitution, which can be transmitted by means of statute laws, government regulations in

lieu of law, and the judge's decision (vonnis). Even more specifically, restriction on political rights can only be limited by the judge's ruling as an additional punishment. Limitations imposed by the Election Commission has ruled out recognition, guarantees, protection and legal certainty and equal treatment before the law (Article 28D paragraph [1] 1945) and equal opportunities in government (Article 28D Paragraph [3] 1945),

Second, The Commission's procedural or structured, policy-setting power exceeding the Commission's limitations on human rights is not a parallel product of statutory law or of a judge's decision (verdict). Planning and planning for elections is a significant role of the Commission. It became clear from the scrutiny of the provisions regulating the duties and the authority of the Commission that the working area of the KPU was concerned with technical matters relating to elections, with the shaping of the rules of procedure or mechanisms for the administration of elections, the execution of elections, and the monitoring of elections. Even if a regulation is formed by the Commission, the content relates to the technical and procedural matters of elections, which have been assigned directly by the above regulations, to the key legislation.

CONCLUSION

Based on the description that has been discussed before, it can be concluded that complexities and problems of democratic and dignified Election 2019 is not only the simultaneity legislative and presidential election, but a lot of the section material in Act No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, namely the preparation was not done in a structured, systematic, massive and overlap between the rules with each other regulations. So that, the products such regulations create uncertainty and inequality of treatment before the law which then have implications for the practice, namely in updating of the voters list led to fraudulent manipulation of the voters' list, as many as 10,520 polling stations experiencing a shortage of election supplies, ballot boxes not sealed that KPPS received as many as 6,474 polling stations, ballot papers were exchanged between Electoral District as many 3,411 voting place, and 527 Voting Organizing Group officer died and 11,239 fell sick.

RECOMMENDATION

The authors include suggestions based on the above findings, including:

1. Revisions to Law Number 42 of 2008 affecting the general election of the President and Vice-President should be given priority because of the simultaneous holding of elections. This revision also strengthens the authentication of political parties, the conditions for members of the DPR, the DPD and the DPRD to become candidates, and the determination of permanent voter data in the upcoming 2024 elections.
2. The abolition of the general election threshold in Article 222 of Law Number 7 of the Year 2017, which states that political parties nominate candidate pairs or joint contesting political parties that meet the criteria for obtaining seats for at least 20% (twenty percent) of the number of DPR seats or 25% (twenty-five percent) of the nationally valid votes in th It would also be meaningless whether the determination of the nomination threshold by political parties or political party coalitions is based on the outcome of the previous year's legislative elections.
3. It is hoped that in reviewing the constitutionality of standards, the Constitutional Court should refer to the notion of constitutional supremacy in such a way that in constitutional practice, decisions which are detrimental to efforts to foster democratic consolidation in Indonesia are not caught up in it.

REFERENCES

- Akhmaddhian, S., Hartiwingsih, & Handayani, I. G. A. K. R. (2017). The government policy of water resources conservation to embodying sustainable development goals: Study in Kuningan, Indonesia. *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(12), 419–428.
- Al-Fatih, S. (2019). Akibat Hukum Regulasi tentang Threshold dalam Pemilihan Umum Legislatif dan Pemilihan Presiden: Kajian Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 52/PUU-X/2012 dan Nomor 14/PUU-XI/2013. *Jurnal Yudisial*, 12(1), 17–38. <https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v12i1.258>
- Ardipandanto, A. (2019). Permasalahan Penyelenggaraan Pemilu Serentak Tahun 2019. *Info Singkat: Kajian Singkat Terhadap Isu Aktual Dan Strategis*, XI(11), 25–30.
- Arrsa, R. C. (2014). Pemilu Serentak dan Masa Depan Konsolidasi Demokrasi. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 11(3), 515–537.
- Asshiddiqie, J. (2016). *Putusan Monumental Menjawab Problematika Kenegaraan*. Malang: Setara Press.
- Astomo, P. (2014). Pembentukan Undang-Undang dalam Rangka Pembaharuan Hukum Nasional Di Era Demokrasi. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 11(3), 577–599.
- Fadjar, A. M. (Abdul M. (2013). *Pemilu Perselisihan Hasil Pemilu dan Demokrasi: Membangun Pemilu Legislatif, Presiden, dan Kepala Daerah dan Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hasil Pemilu Secara Demokratis*. Malang: Setara Press.
- Fahmi, K. (2015). Sistem Penanganan Tindak Pidana Pemilu. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 12(2), 264–283. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1224>

- Fatimah, S., Iswantoro, Basuki, U., Saputra, R., & Jaelani, A. K. (2020). The public policy of local government in protecting geographic indication as a leading regional product. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(4), 1576–1580.
- Gaffar, J., & Budiarti, R. (2012). *Politik Hukum Pemilu*. Jakarta: KONPress.
- Ghoffar, A. (2018). Problematika Presidential Threshold: Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi dan Pengalaman di Negara Lain. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 15(3), 480–501. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1532>
- Harun, R. (2015). Rekonstruksi Kewenangan Penyelesaian Perselisihan Hasil Pemilihan Umum. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 13(1), 1–24. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1311>
- Harun, R. (2016). *Penyelesaian Sengketa Pemilu*.
- Harun, R. (2019). *Meneropong Problematika Pemilu Tahun 2019*. Yogyakarta.
- Iswantoro, Fatimah, S., Tahir, A., & Jaelani, A. K. (2020). Existence of customary delict in Indonesian legislation. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(4), 1571–1575.
- Iswantoro, Fatimah, S., Tahir, A., & Jaelani, A. K. (2020). Existence of customary delict in Indonesian legislation. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(4), 1571–1575.
- Jaelani, A. K., Ayu, I. G., Rachmi, K., & Karjoko, L. (2020). *The Impact of Corona Virus on Supply Chain of Halal Tourism Management in West Nusa Tenggara*. 9(5), 823–831.
- Jaelani, A. K., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2020a). Development of halal tourism destinations in the Era of regional autonomy in West Nusa Tenggara Province. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(12), 765–774.
- Jaelani, A. K., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2020a). Development of halal tourism destinations in the Era of regional autonomy in West Nusa Tenggara Province. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 12(12), 765–774.
- Jaelani, A. K., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2020b). Development of tourism based on geographic indication towards to welfare state. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(3 Special Issue), 1227–1234.
- Jaelani, A. K., Handayani, I. G. A. K. R., & Karjoko, L. (2020b). Development of tourism based on geographic indication towards to welfare state. *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(3 Special Issue), 1227–1234.
- Karjoko, L., Maret, U. S., & Riyadi, U. S. (2019). *Executability of the Constitutional Court Decision Regarding Grace Period in the Formulation of Legislation*. 28(15), 816–823.
- Karjoko, L., Maret, U. S., & Riyadi, U. S. (2019). *Executability of the Constitutional Court Decision Regarding Grace Period in the Formulation of Legislation*. 28(15), 816–823.
- Karjoko, L., Maret, U. S., & Riyadi, U. S. (2019). *Executability of the Constitutional Court Decision Regarding Grace Period in the Formulation of Legislation*. 28(15), 816–823.
- Karjoko, L., Winarno, D. W., Rosidah, Z. N., & Handayani, I. G. A. K. R. (2020). Spatial planning dysfunction in East Kalimantan to support green economy. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 11(8), 259–269.
- Karjoko, L., Winarno, D. W., Rosidah, Z. N., & Handayani, I. G. A. K. R. (2020). Spatial planning dysfunction in East Kalimantan to support green economy. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 11(8), 259–269.
- Peter Mahmud Marzuki. (2013). *Penelitian Hukum* (Cetakan ke). Jakarta: Kencana Prenada Media Group.
- Prasetyoningsih, N. (2014). Dampak Pemilihan Umum Serentak Bagi Pembangunan Demokrasi Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 21(2), 241–263.
- Prayudi. (2018). Mengapa Masalah DPT Terus Terjadi? *Info Singkat: Kajian Singkat Terhadap Isu Aktual Dan Strategis*, X(18).
- R Surbakti, D Supriyanto, H. A. (2011). *Meningkatkan Akurasi Daftar Pemilih*. Jakarta: Kemitraan bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan.
- Satriawan, I., & Lailam, T. (2019). Open Legal Policy dalam Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi dan Pembentukan Undang-Undang. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 16(3), 559–584. <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1636>
- Soerjono Soekanto. (2018). Penelitian Hukum Normatif: Suatu Tinjauan Singkat. In *Rajawali Press*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.
- Solihah, R. (2018). Peluang dan Tantangan Pemilu Serentak 2019 dalam Perspektif Politik. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.14710/jiip.v3i1.3234>
- Zain, F., & Basuki, U. (2019). Problematika Pendaftaran Partai Politik Peserta Pemilu di Era Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 2017 tentang Pemilihan Umum. *Jurnal Wacana Hukum*, 25(1). <https://doi.org/10.33061/1.jwh.2019.25.2.3035>
- Zuhri, S. (2018). Resultan Politik dan Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 14/PUU-XI/2013 dalam Politik Hukum. *Jurnal Konstitusi*, 15(2). <https://doi.org/10.31078/jk1525>

Received on 13-10-2020

Accepted on 28-11-2020

Published on 14-12-2020

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.6000/1929-4409.2020.09.193>

© 2020 Prasetio et al.; Licensee Lifescience Global.

This is an open access article licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution Non-Commercial License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/3.0/>) which permits unrestricted, non-commercial use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the work is properly cited.