

## Expensive Political Costs in the 2024 Simultaneous Elections

**Muhammad Misbahudholam Ar**  
STKIP PGRI Sumenep  
[misbahudholam@stkipgrisumenep.ac.id](mailto:misbahudholam@stkipgrisumenep.ac.id)

**Rofik**  
[rofikazam86@gmail.com](mailto:rofikazam86@gmail.com)

**Ahmad Hanafi**  
[hanafizempal@gmail.com](mailto:hanafizempal@gmail.com)

Korespondensi penulis: [misbahudholam@stkipgrisumenep.ac.id](mailto:misbahudholam@stkipgrisumenep.ac.id)

### **Abstract.**

*In Indonesia, the central issue of all elections is the management of election money. This issue creates various consequences for election administrators, voters, and voters, so increasing monetary policy practices also becomes a major issue in every election administration. The amount of money circulating in the 2024 election will likely increase from the 2019 legislative election. This is based on several factors. First, the electoral system and mechanism have not changed since 2019. This means that the personal side of elections, or the orientation of competition, still relies on candidates, not political parties. Second, the direction of the 2024 Pileg contestation is still based on the popularity and personality of the candidates. Third, to be elected, each candidate continues to try to increase his popularity, increase campaign activities, and finance himself.*

**Keywords:** Election Funds, Simultaneous Elections.

### **Abstrak.**

Di Indonesia, isu sentral dari semua pemilihan umum adalah pengelolaan uang dalam pemilihan. Isu ini kemudian menimbulkan berbagai konsekuensi bagi penyelenggara pemilu, penyelenggara pemilu, dan pemilih, sehingga peningkatan praktik kebijakan moneter juga menjadi isu utama dalam setiap penyelenggaraan pemilu. Jumlah uang yang beredar pada Pemilu 2024 kemungkinan meningkat dari Pemilu Legislatif 2019. Hal itu didasarkan beberapa faktor. Pertama, sistem dan mekanisme pemilu tidak berubah sejak 2019. Artinya, sisi personal pemilu, atau orientasi persaingan, masih bertumpu pada caleg, bukan partai politik. Kedua, arah kontestasi Pileg 2024 masih didasarkan pada popularitas dan kepribadian caleg. Ketiga, agar terpilih, setiap calon tetap berusaha meningkatkan popularitasnya, meningkatkan kegiatan kampanye dan membiayainya sendiri.

**Kata kunci:** Dana Pemilu, Pemilu Serentak.

## **INTRODUCTION**

General elections in Indonesia are an arena for the public to judge and try elected representatives and leaders after working for five years/ one period (Najih & Wiryani, 2020). Elections are an agenda to make changes by selecting new leaders. The elections, held every five years, bring hope that these leaders can bring about meaningful changes to the nation and bring Indonesia to a better state. Indonesia's election journey has undergone many long transformations since the independence era (Pradhanawati, Tawakkal, & Garner, 2019). Even more so when the Indonesian people could directly elect their regional heads and the President. In Indonesia, one of the crucial topics in every general election is money management in elections (Dirwan, 2019). The role and function of money in elections are very important in studies in the social sciences, especially political science, law, and economics. This topic is closely related to various issues of transparency and accountability to encourage the realization of elections with integrity (Diprose, McRae, & Hadiz, 2019). The upholding of the principles of transparency and accountability has yet to be fully implemented in the elections that have been held in this country, both in the direct presidential and vice-presidential election (pilpres), in the legislative election (pileg), and the regional head election (pilkada). Simultaneously. The issue of transparency and accountability is caused by at least three factors: limited existing regulations, weak enforcement of rules, and still weak political will from all stakeholders (Nuna & Moonti, 2019).

General elections (Elections) are one of the important milestones representing people's sovereignty, so it can be said that there is no democratic country without providing opportunities for general elections to be held systematically and periodically. Therefore elections are also classified as the most important element in a democratic system (Harun, Mir, Carter, & An, 2019). Suppose a country has carried out the electoral process properly, transparently, fairly, regularly, and continuously. In that case, that country can be said to be a country with a good level of democracy, but vice versa if a country does not carry out elections or is unable to carry out its elections properly, where various frauds occur, discrimination, then the country is also considered as an anti-democratic country (Prihatini, 2020). In the Indonesian political system, elections are a political process carried out every five years to elect members of the legislature and to

elect members of the executive. Legislative members elected in the five-year elections consist of members of the central legislature/parliament, which in the Indonesian constitution are usually referred to as the DPR-RI, then the Provincial DPRD, and the Regency/Municipal DPRD.

Meanwhile, in the context of elections for executive elections, the people have been allowed to elect their President, Governors, and Regents/Mayors. The magnitude of the people's right to determine the leaders in the executive and legislative institutions at this time is inseparable from the changes and political reforms that have been rolling in this country since 1998, where in previous times, people's political rights were often discriminated against and used for political interests (Luluardi & Diniyanto, 2021). only the rulers by way of mobilization. However, the people themselves are not given full political rights to select leaders, criticize policies, and have critical dialogic processes so that people can channel their aspirations and interests (Hardiansyah & Mas'odi, 2022). Political participation, a manifestation of people's sovereignty, is fundamental in the democratic process. If the community has a high level of involvement, then Indonesia's political development and democratization practices will run well (Hardiansyah & Mulyadi, 2022). One of the manifestations of democracy at the local level is by carrying out post-conflict local elections in the regions. However, not all manifestations of democracy run smoothly. There are still many polemics regarding grassroots participation, which can affect the election process. The electoral system implemented at this time caused many problems in society, including money politics, mass mobilization involving children, fraud in the implementation of elections to justify any means to win elections, and the irrationality of candidates in election endeavors, thus eliminating the principles of justice and equality. Not a few turmoil, riots, disputes, and quarrels among the community as if it has become habitual among the community as a factor of the electoral system adopted (Hardiansyah & Zainuddin, 2022).

One of the challenges in the election is the tendency for the widespread practice of money politics, which takes place at almost all levels of the general election. (Cahyadi & Hermawan, 2019) states that money politics is one of the factors causing high-cost democracy. Meanwhile, (Tilome, Andi Agustang, Jasruddin, Syukur, & ASRIFAN, 2020) noted that everyone knows that cases of money politics are common in post-reform elections. Although all candidates will always say they are not involved in money politics

when asked, citizens will soon be able to pinpoint how these candidates use the money to “buy votes” in their constituencies. According to (Prihatini, 2019), money politics is a link to forming political cartels. Representative democracy that relies on votes is easily turned into a commodity, which will be sold when it has been obtained and bought when it has not been received. Purchased all the techniques during the general election and dealt with all the methods. This negative phenomenon appears in the transition to democracy in Indonesia. (Barus, Matondang, Angelia, & Batubara, 2019) indicates this phenomenon is a hybrid in transitional democracies. This phenomenon of hybrid democracy is a mixture of democratic elements with non-democratic elements that can be found simultaneously in a political system. Larry Diamond gives a signal that is not much different. There is a phenomenon that he calls pseudo-democracy (pseudo-democracy). The indicator is that democratic mechanisms do not guarantee true democracy. Money politics (money politics) is one of the negative phenomena of the electoral agency in democracy. In immature democracies, such as Indonesia, money politics is used to mobilize support.

The flourishing of money politics cannot be separated from the permissive perspective of the electorate towards money politics. In the democratic process in Indonesia, including democracy at the grassroots level (parkades), the practice of money politics thrives because it is considered normal for society to be insensitive to its dangers. They let it go because they don't feel that, normatively, money politics is a behavior that should be avoided. For example, (Aminuddin & Attamimi, 2019) study in the Suruh sub-district found that giving money (money politics) was common in every parkade in the past in the local community. This was seen as a symbol of compassion. Regarding money politics from the point of view of voters in regional elections, (Mukti & Rodiyah, 2020) also has an explanation. According to him, money politics occurs because of the strong perception that provincial elections are a celebration, a culture of short-term pragmatism, weak dialectics to seek ideal values and build a shared vision, weak rules of the game, and so on.

The things mentioned by Sutoro Eko can at least be seen from the research of (Subrata, 2022), which found that voters preferred the open campaign form, and most of them suggested that those who participate in the campaign should be given an allowance of around Rp. 50,000-Rp. 100,000 per campaign. Since the Reformation era, Indonesia

has held various types of general elections (elections) regularly. Legislative elections (pileg) for DPD, DPR, provincial DPRD, and regency/city DPRD have been held since 1999, 2004, 2009, and until 2014. Meanwhile, presidential elections (pilpres) have taken place in 2004, 2009, and 2014. Regional head elections (Pilkada) have also been held directly since 2005, and simultaneous regional elections have been held since 2015, 2017, and 2018 (Müller & Morton, 2021). In 2024, Indonesia held the presidential and legislative elections simultaneously for the first time.

Money politics in the 2024 election can increase from the 2019 general election. This is based on several things. First, the electoral system and mechanics have not changed since 2019. This means that the personal side or orientation of election competition is still based on legislative candidates rather than political parties. Second, the orientation of the 2019 Legislative Election competition remains based on the popularity and personality of the legislative candidates. Third, to be elected, each legislative candidate will still try to increase their popularity, campaign activities, and personal finance. The KPU in 2019 noted in its report related to campaign funds by 16 political parties worth IDR 427,151,741,325. The total contribution of the legislative candidates is IDR 337,856,293,303, or 79.10 percent. While the party is 20.09 percent, the rest are individual contributions. 79.10 percent received campaign funds from legislative candidates, consistently showing that personal orientation in the 2019 Pileg is as strong as in the 2014 Pileg (ICW Report 2019). This issue related to the large circulation of money in every election event in Indonesia brings various consequences for election participants, election administrators, and the voter's side, so the widespread practice of money politics also becomes a major issue in the implementation of every election. This certainly has a crucial impact on upholding the main function of elections, namely as an instrument for the circulation of power in the context of recruitment to fill public positions.

## **METHOD**

This study uses the library research method to elaborate on various kinds of literature in the form of books, journals, and literature that is relevant to the theme of the writing. This library method was chosen because it wanted to combine the findings of the same theme as preliminary studies with contemporary studies (Satriawan & Ramadhani, 2022). This is intended to verify previous studies and find elements of novelty in future research.

## **FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Election System and Mechanical**

Democracy that has been built should run without any disturbances and will produce a democratic system in society, but if it is created as a political arena, it is practically unethical, then it is tantamount to building a house in the desert. The essence of democracy is public participation in determining public officials in making public policies, democracy without direct involvement by the people is a form of denial of democracy itself. This assumption underlies that the direct election of political officials is more democratic than representation. The quality of the democratic system is also determined by the quality of the selection process for representatives, including those with the mandate to lead the government. Thus direct general election is an alternative that can be chosen to increase the legitimacy of government. Elections are arenas of competition to fill government political positions based on eligible citizens' formal choices. In this modern era, elections occupy an important role because they are related to several things; First, elections occupy an important position for the continuation of representative democracy. Second, elections are an indicator of a democratic country. Third, elections are related to broad implications where Huntington calls elections a means and goal of democratization. This statement departs from the fact that authoritarian rulers have fallen as a result of elections that they sponsor themselves because they try to renew legitimacy through elections (Pradhanawati et al., 2019).

Elections are an example of political participation, namely the activities of ordinary citizens in influencing government policy. In essence, general elections are the ways and mean available to the people to determine their representatives who will sit in people's

representative bodies to exercise people's sovereignty. Elections are very meaningful for everyone; elections are an indicator of the democracy of a country. To maintain the continuity of governance formed through the mechanism of general elections, community involvement is needed as the energy of democracy itself. General elections, with their democratic meaning, are places where political parties compete, which in general, can be a place of learning for elites and other components of the nation. In addition, general elections are also related to the participation of the community in providing support to existing candidates and political parties (Hardiansyah, Muhammad Misbahudholam, & Hidayatillah, 2022). The design of simultaneous elections in most other countries shows that the legislative and executive election systems in a multi-party presidential system must combine simultaneous implementation times, a proportional system in legislative elections, and a plurality system in determining the winner of the presidential election (Hardiansyah, 2022). The plurality system itself tends to produce a few presidential candidates. During presidential elections, the supporters of candidates in this system tend to ignore non-competitive (non-viable) candidates to focus on the top two candidates. This propelled the inter-party coalition process from the start, as only one round of elections existed. Parties that should nominate their candidates but whose candidates are less competitive tend to drop their candidates and endorse one of the two most competitive candidates in the hope of getting political concessions after the presidential election. The reductive impact of the plurality system does not affect the simplification of parties in the legislature, assuming that legislative elections are carried out with a proportional system (Najih & Wiryani, 2020). This plurality mechanism involves parties when it is held simultaneously with legislative elections. Parties tend to nominate one of the two most competitive candidates, which ends up gathering the support of the legislative parties for these two candidates. When one of the candidates wins the presidential election, the support for the president in the legislature tends to be a majority or close to a majority. Thus a combination of a plurality presidential election system implemented simultaneously with legislative elections is the most likely to help strengthen a multi-party presidential system (Harun et al., 2019).

A presidential election system with a majority runoff, on the other hand, tends to have an inflationary impact on the number of parties, even if it is held simultaneously

with legislative elections. Parties and candidates competing in this system are more focused on advancing to the second round. As long as there is no very dominant candidate, a candidate who obtains at least a third of the votes can go to the second round (Cahyadi & Hermawan, 2019). The Constitutional Court (MK) decision No.14/PUU-XI/2013 is a test of Article 3 paragraph (5), Article 12 paragraph (1) and paragraph (2), Article 14 paragraph (2), and Article 112 of Law No. .42 of 2008 concerning the General Election of the President and Vice President. Some of these articles regulate the provisions for the Election of Members of the Representative Body and the Presidential Election, carried out separately. However, based on the decision of the Constitutional Court, the provisions of several of these articles were declared contrary to the 1945 Constitution and did not have binding legal force. The cancellation implies that the simultaneous National General Election or the Election of Members of Representative Institutions and the Presidential Election will be held simultaneously starting in 2019 and subsequent years (Prihatini, 2020).

So that the growth of people's participation in political matters will increase, for citizens with common political knowledge and middle to lower economic conditions, it will be very difficult for them to avoid money politics because this is an unavoidable necessity. Whether we realize it or not, money politics has become increasingly widespread in society, so people are increasingly passive towards political life and even tend to be indifferent. This is driven by the perpetrators of prospective state leaders who are mushrooming and fighting to get the most votes and become the winner, not prioritizing functional democratic aspects. They are future leaders using various methods to become winners in elections by sacrificing their assets to buy people's votes. Even though they realize it or not, they are the seeds of corruption. In the end, money politics has become an appropriate arena and is commonly carried out whenever there is an election / local election in society without any prevention or action from the community and the government (Cahyadi & Hermawan, 2019).

Politics and money are different things, but they cannot be separated. To do politics, people need money, and with money, people can do politics. The term 'money politics' (in English: "money politics") is perhaps one of the terms that have been heard very often. This term refers to using money to influence certain decisions, whether in elections or other matters related to important decisions. In this sense, "money" is a "tool" to control

someone in making decisions. Of course, with this condition, it can be ascertained that the decisions taken are no longer based on whether they are good for others but on the benefits derived from them. The practice of money politics in the 2019 Simultaneous Elections is expected to increase. This condition was triggered by an open proportional election system, coupled with grown political actors running as legislative candidates (called), so competition will certainly be increasingly stringent. On the other hand, the attention of the public and mass media in this simultaneous election has been drawn more and more to the presidential election (pilpres) so that the battle at the grassroots level in the legislative election contestation (pileg) is expected to become more brutal (Prihatini, 2019).

The simultaneous election system in 2024 uses an open-list proportional system, so the practice of money politics will likely become a new normality because the mechanism is still the same as the election system for the previous period. In research conducted by the Indonesian Political Indicator (IPI) 2018, the practice of money politics in Indonesia is concerning because it is in the third largest position in the world. On average, 28.6 percent of voters in Indonesia admit to accepting money politics. The highest number using various methods of asking respondents in 2014 was 33 percent. This means that one in three Indonesians takes money politics. That's equal to 60 million people. This fact, there is also an increasing trend compared to the previous elections. In the 2009 election, the practice of money politics only reached 10%, then in the 2014 election, it rose to 33%. Meanwhile, this practice of money politics targets people close to political parties. So that relatively people close to the party are targeted by money politics, but in absolute terms, money politics occurs in swing voters (Barus et al., 2019).

### **Competition Orientation Based on Popularity and Personality**

Political life in Indonesia is no longer a secret when entering the political arena requires quite a lot of capital. For example, you must be smart, credible, accountable, have an extensive network, be moral, trustworthy, and have lots of money. However, the latter (money) has always been a problem, especially for those who have just been involved in practical politics and lack resources. They are eliminating opportunities for quality leadership to emerge. Money and politics are like food (rice) and side dishes. Both must always go hand in hand and tune. Rice without side dishes that accompany it will

only make the meal tasteless. Likewise, plunging into the world of practical politics without having money will only take the imagination of power further away. Funds and power are two sides of a coin, complementary and mutually reinforcing. Funds become capital to seize power; power of attorney became an important tool for raising funds. And so on, so that no power holders are unwilling to collect funds; conversely, no financier can ignore power. This is where the relationship between political parties and money becomes inseparable. As power-seeking organizations, political parties need money to make their mission successful; then, when they succeed in holding power, political parties continue to accumulate cash so they can continue to survive. In a democratic political system, the need for political parties for money becomes unavoidable because the basis for the legitimacy of power is the support of the people, which is reflected in the election results. Political parties need large amounts of campaign funds to win the people's votes.

However, political parties need campaign funds and funds to move the organization around the clock between two elections. Funds of this type are also not small because to maintain people's trust; political parties must continue to exist through various activities: office operations, political education, regeneration, public exposure (public expose), as well as organizational consolidation involving management at the central, regional and remote village levels. Initially, political funds, operational funds for political parties, and campaign funds were obtained from contributions from political party members. As a means of ideological struggle, the strong romantic relationship between members and political parties causes members to donate to political parties voluntarily. Mass-based parties, of course, get large funds even though the contribution value per member is small. However, as the romantic relationship between members and the party dimmed, the character of mass-based political parties began to fade. The need for political parties for funds has never decreased; it continues to increase. In line with the development of mass communication technology on the one hand and political freedom to access power on the other, the competition for people's support through elections has become very tight. The first is marked by the development of campaign methods that utilize mass media, such as newspapers, radio, and television, which require money; the second is characterized by the emergence of interest groups that turn into political parties so that competition between parties becomes more fierce.

As a result, efforts to seize and maintain the influence of political parties in society require a lot of operational funds for political parties; Likewise, campaigns to win people's support through elections require large funds. In conditions where membership fees cannot be expected anymore, political parties inevitably turn to donors, both individual, group, and institutional donors, especially business entities. This is where political parties face a big dilemma: on the one hand, to maintain influence and win people's votes, political parties need large funds; on the other hand, the large amount of donations makes political parties dependent on donors, so political parties can be trapped in the interests of donors and forget their mission of fighting for the interests of the people.

This means that those who want to get involved in politics must have enough Money. Because Money is one of the determinant factors in advancing in the political arena. So in political science, it is important to question how important Money is in politics and to what extent Money influences political life in Indonesia. It is undeniable that Money plays an important role in political processes. How come? Someone who was previously unpopular and did not have the capacity and credibility can easily reach the power that many people are fighting over with only an object called Money. In the realm of Money, politics is a very important factor. Money can provide a very significant influence on the establishment of a democratic balance. However, Money can also be a disaster when its utilization is not based on formal legal rules and tends to fund illegal activities. In such a context, Money often becomes a tool to buy votes (money politics). Or as a means of buying and selling positions carried out by several individuals to pursue momentary political interests. The reality in Indonesia shows that for those who have much Money, Money often becomes a tool to achieve power. Meanwhile, for those who have no money, they will justify any means to get the Money. The conditions above confirm that Money does not always have a positive impact. The influence of Money in the world of politics provides a very vulnerable risk.

At least the Office of Democracy and Governance (2003) notes that four types of potential risks are likely to arise. First is the "uneven playing field." In this context, Money impacts unhealthy competition between one group and another. The assumption is that sportsmanship in political games becomes increasingly rare when a handful of groups only use Money, so this condition impacts limited space for other groups who do not have enough Money. The second is "unequal access to the office." This condition indicates that

Money has created discriminatory conditions against representation politics. This happens because power is only monopolized by a handful of people with very large financial contributions. The third is "co-opted politicians." Money creates an unequal relationship between the government (the party receiving the Money) and donors (the party giving the Money). Ironically, the government would be in a weak position. Such conditions will occur for those who have injected their funds. They will easily co-opt and intervene against bureaucrats and politicians so that the wheels of government are no longer independent. Fourth is "tainted politics." Money risks the birth of a government system that is corrupt and overrides the existence of law. In this context, the wheel of government can run. However, government authority and the rule of law are rare. Based on this phenomenon, to control the rampant practice of misappropriating Money in the world of politics, there must be goodwill and commitment from all parties to try hard to stem this prohibited practice. Rules that include the spirit of credibility and accountability alone are not enough, so the moral aspect must be placed at the forefront. Morality contributes quite a lot to stem the dirty practices that often appear in politics.

Among the many factors important for a functioning democratic system, few are widely debated regarding campaign financing in general elections (pemilu). For some, money in the political arena serves as a form of expression of free speech and an effective instrument for informing voters and building an inclusive democracy. However, for some others, the uncontrolled use of money in politics can erode the function of democracy because it can lead to excessive campaigns, unequal access to power, and politicians who are tied to special interest groups (Najih & Wiryani, 2020).

In practice, almost every country with political pluralism has adopted some political finance regulation ranging from the obligation to inform the source of contributions and the authority to disclose these donations to formula requirements for limiting campaign contributions and spending. Marcin Walecki's research even describes that of 60 democratic countries, 25 countries already have regulations regarding limits on campaign funds. Some of these countries include Canada, France, Ireland, Israel, Italy, New Zealand, Spain, and the United Kingdom, including England (Müller & Morton, 2021) Countries such as Canada and the United Kingdom have even limited campaign spending by parties and individuals over the past decades. Currently, political parties in Canada can spend only 73.5 cents per elector in the districts in which they compete. In the United

Kingdom, spending legislation has existed since the Prevention of Corruption Act 1883. In the 2005 general election, campaign spending at the national level was limited to around US\$ 42,000 per constituency contested (Tilome et al., 2020).

Recent facts even state that two-thirds of Organization for Economic Co-operation and Development (OECD) countries already have regulations regarding limits on campaign spending for parties or candidates (Speck, 2013: 17). One of the few exceptions among developed countries is the United States, where the United States Supreme Court in *McCutcheon v. The Federal Election Commission* has ruled that campaign finance restrictions are unconstitutional and potentially violate the right to free speech. The United States Supreme Court in mid-2014, in the case of *McCutcheon v. The Federal Election Commission*, rescinded its provision on limiting the overall amount that donors can give to political campaigns. Under terms of restrictions on campaign finance, donors can make as many donations to candidates and political activities as they wish, provided the total amount does not exceed \$123,300. The decision was taken by a ratio of 5 to 4 judges who opposed it. The five justices who agreed came from the Conservative party and were appointed by the president from the Republican Party, while the president from the Democratic Party appointed the other four justices from the Liberal party. Chief Justice of the Supreme Court, John Robert, in the decision, even rejected the opinion of President Barack Obama's administration that restrictions on donations were needed to fight corruption in politics. John Robert said, "Spending large sums of money in connection with elections, but not in connection with an effort to control the exercise of an officeholder's official duties, does not give rise to such quid pro quo corruption. Nor does the possibility that an individual who spends large sums may garner "influence over or access to" elected officials or political parties. And because the Government's interest in preventing the appearance of corruption is equally confined to the appearance of quid pro quo corruption, the Government may not seek to limit the appearance of their influence or access" (Dirwan, 2019).

In Indonesia, the funds spent have increased after the fall of the New Order regime; likewise, the wave of funds circulating in the implementation and contestation of regional elections. The increase in the number of funds does not only occur in the implementation costs charged to the APBN and APBD but also campaign costs that must be borne by political parties, legislative candidates, presidential candidates, and regional head

candidates (Diprose et al., 2019). In addition, the increase in the basic price of campaign needs due to annual inflation automatically increases the total cost of campaign needs. Likewise, the addition of the number of voters, the number of seats contested, and the number of candidates resulted in a doubling of the total campaign costs. In addition to these economic and demographic factors, the increase in campaign funds was also caused by political factors. Changes to the electoral system or electoral system instruments have multiplied campaign costs. The 1999 election used a closed list of candidates, and the 2009 election, which used an open list of candidates, doubled their campaign funds. In the 1999 election, campaigns were only carried out by political parties, whereas in the 2009 election, apart from political parties, candidates for legislative members also campaigned; the same thing also happened in the 2014 and 2019 elections.

(Luluardi & Diniyanto, 2021) stated that money politics differs from cost politics. According to him, money politics is the giving of money, goods, or certain facilities and promises to certain people so that someone can be elected, whether, for example, to become a regional head/deputy regional head. While political costs, for example, campaign costs incurred by a candidate to win a position, costs for the candidate to hold meetings with guests and supporters, or if the candidate comes to a place to campaign for his victory, it can be said that this is political money or political costs. Furthermore, (Luluardi & Diniyanto, 2021) stated that money politics had been a new phenomenon in the last two elections. In the polls during the New Order era, corruption in elections was dominated by manipulation of vote counts and voters, which the electoral committee and the government bureaucracy carried out. In the past, efforts to influence voters were carried out by the ruling party (the ruling party) in the use of public facilities, such as the construction of populist government projects ahead of the election. This development has to do with the increasing openness of holding elections because they are run by a relatively independent institution and not by the government bureaucracy as in the past. The magnitude of the political influence of the ruling party on the holding of elections is also decreasing. Thus, corruption in elections has shifted to areas involving money, for example, in the form of vote buying, either directly or indirectly.

Finally, campaigns in electronic mass media, especially television, which are increasingly expensive, also have a direct impact on increasing campaign costs. In this case, political parties and candidates cannot avoid campaigning on television because

television is the most extensive media in reaching the public and the most effective in convincing voters. Campaign costs that continue to increase eventually lead to inequality or injustice among political parties participating in elections and candidates. Political parties and candidates with large funds can maximize their campaigns to win voters' votes, while political parties and candidates with mediocre funds are forced to campaign as they are, making it difficult to win the hearts of voters. From election to election, it shows the big role of television in influencing voters' votes so that political parties and candidates who can afford to buy more campaign advertisements on television tend to win votes. Not all political parties and candidates can buy campaign advertisements on television to the fullest (Hardiansyah & Wahdian, 2023).

If, during the election period, the amount of campaign funds causes injustice among political parties participating in elections and candidates. In addition, the post-election campaign funds money has led to corruption among political officials. This happened because political party cadres who held political positions had to collect funds to finance the activities of political parties and prepare campaign funds for the next election. This obligation to collect funds encourages them to abuse their authority as public officials to use or take the state funds they manage. The continued increase in campaign funds, on the one hand, has created injustice among election participants and candidates; on the other hand, it has encouraged corruption among political officials. Of course, this cannot be allowed to continue because, in the end, it will make people distrust elections as an instrument of democracy, causing disbelief in democracy as an order that humiliates humanity at the very least. Therefore, there must be real efforts to control campaign funds to create justice in campaigning and prevent it as early as possible so that political officials resulting from elections are not involved in corruption. The easiest effort to make, as well as the most effective results, is to limit campaign funds (Dirwan, 2019).

Currently, regulations limiting campaign funds in terms of income or donors have proven incapable of determining campaign funds, causing inequality among political parties participating in elections and candidates and encouraging corruption among post-election political officials. There are several examples of corrupt practices linked to efforts to obtain campaign funds, for example, the case of the arrest of Buol Regent Amran Batalipu, who was involved in a bribery scandal with a businessman and member of the Democratic Party, Hartati Murdaya. Hartati was interested in managing the right to

cultivate plantations and gave bribes to the Regent Amran worth Rp. 3 billion, who happened to be a contestant in the 2012 local elections (Harun et al., 2019). Apart from the potential for corruption, the regulation of election campaign funds which is currently unraveled, especially in KPU Regulation No. 5 of 2017, in fact still leaves various problems such as the possibility of non-bank transferred based donations which opens opportunities for undocumented and unreported gifts. There are maximum restrictions on campaign fund contributions from candidates and political parties, which opens up space for the emergence of a mode of reporting donations by other parties as campaign funds from candidates or political parties (to avoid the provisions of the restrictions), an inadequate campaign finance audit system, and yet the connection of election supervisors with other institutions that have relevance in examining campaign funds, for example, the tax office and banks.

In Indonesia, the election for legislature members is held before the presidential election. The level of political participation from the people in the legislative election in the 2009 election was 71%, while in the presidential election, it fell to 72.09%. In the 2014 election, voter participation for legislature members was 75.1%, while in the presidential election, it was 69.58% (Tilome et al., 2020). This decline in voter turnout can be avoided if simultaneous elections are held. Thus, simultaneous elections between the legislative and presidential elections will increase participation. The argument for simultaneous elections will increase voter participation, in addition to reasons of time, energy, and cost efficiency for voters to come to polling stations. (Prihatini, 2019) stated that simultaneous elections would provide a psychological boost; they considered that they elected two high-ranking officials simultaneously.

Simultaneous elections provide an opportunity to create a stronger and more stable presidential system of government. This is because the coalition formed to nominate the pair of candidates for President and Vice President was carried out earlier and was based on the same vision and mission, not solely to win elections. This is as stated by (Nuna & Moonti, 2019) that simultaneous elections benefit parties supporting the president and reduce fragmentation between the legislature and the executive. Thus, the coalition that is built will become more solid. The alliance with majority support in parliament and wins the presidential election will likely struggle to win the pilkada. Equal power at the national

and local levels will make it easier for the president to coordinate and organize a tiered government so that the government will also be more effective.

## **CONCLUSION**

Democracy is not a cheap system, including financing elections; other countries that adhere to democracy also experience it. Sri Lanka's presidential election in 2015. A total of 15 million registered voters in the election. In holding the elections, the Sri Lankan government allocated funds of up to 1.3 billion rupees, or the equivalent of US\$9.29 million. In the 2017 Kenya election, for example, as many as 19 million voters will determine the president and members of the legislature simultaneously. The election, which claimed to be the largest in the history of the African continent, spent a budget of up to US\$ 480 million. Another example is that the US superpower had a fantastic budget for the 2016 presidential and congressional elections, namely US\$ 6.5 billion. The funds were used to accommodate as many as 137.5 million voters. When compared to the US, Indonesia's election budget is relatively small. However, the value of IDR 24.8 trillion is not a small number. For election financing reform to be carried out properly, at least two important things must be considered. First is setting political goals (political goals) from regulations and implementation regarding election financing. The actors' agreement in determining political goals must be an important part of being implemented together. In contemporary Indonesian, these political goals are not yet visible when read in existing regulations. Second, in carrying out election financing reform, we need to consider the context of existing political institutions, for example, the electoral system, the pattern of organizing political parties, the party system, and the model of representation in parliament working in a country also need to be taken seriously. All of these factors should have synergy so that we can aim at the same goal.

Simultaneous elections are expected to be both mechanistic and technocratic instruments and part of political education as a solution to public apathy. Simultaneous regional elections are a field of political contestation with rules that do not automatically produce transformational leader figures. Therefore, the public must have the democratic capacity to filter these elites. Simultaneous direct elections are the biological children of the reform movement; of course, there are still many problems, but moving forward and

improving through regional election regulations is a good process. Because actually, our democracy is the best of the worst choices, and it is only fitting that we continue to learn without having to go back.

## REFERENCES

- Aminuddin, M. F., & Attamimi, N. H. (2019). From retail to grocery: money politics in 2014 Indonesian legislative election. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 4(1), 99–120.
- Barus, R. K. I., Matondang, A., Angelia, N., & Batubara, B. M. (2019). Politics and Political Participation of “Grass-Roots” in General Election 2019, Bandar Selamat Regency, Medan, Indonesia. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, 2(1).
- Cahyadi, R., & Hermawan, D. (2019). Strategi Sosial Pencegahan Politik Uang di Indonesia. *Jurnal Antikorupsi Integritas KPK RI*, 5(1), 29–41.
- Diprose, R., McRae, D., & Hadiz, V. R. (2019). Two decades of reformasi in Indonesia: its illiberal turn. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, 49(5), 691–712.
- Dirwan, A. (2019). The effect of education against corruption in Indonesia. *OIDA International Journal of Sustainable Development*, 12(01), 53–64.
- Hardiansyah, F. (2022). Snowball Throwing: A Method To Uplift Elementary School Students’ Responsibility on Environment. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 14(3), 3853–3864. <https://doi.org/10.35445/alishlah.v14i3.1966>
- Hardiansyah, F., & Mas’odi, M. (2022). The Implementation Of Democratic Character Education Through Learning Of Social Science Materials Of Ethical And Cultural Diversity In Elementary School. *Journal of Innovation in Educational and Cultural Research*, 3(2), 234–241. <https://doi.org/10.46843/jiecr.v3i2.101>
- Hardiansyah, F., Muhammad Misbahudholam, A. R., & Hidayatillah, Y. (2022). IPAS Learning Assessment To Measure Science Process Skill In Elementary School. *International Journal of Elementary Education*, 6(4), 612–623. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.23887/ijee.v6i4.54217>
- Hardiansyah, F., & Mulyadi. (2022). Improve Science Learning Outcomes for Elementary School Students Through The Development of Flipbook Media . *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan IPA*, 8(6 SE-Articles &quot;Regular Issue&quot;), 3069–3077. <https://doi.org/10.29303/jppipa.v8i6.2413>
- Hardiansyah, F., & Wahdian, A. (2023). Improving Science Learning Outcomes Through the Development of the Magic Card Box Learning Media. *AL-ISHLAH: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 15(1), 823–833.

- Hardiansyah, F., & Zainuddin, Z. (2022). The Influence of Principal's Motivation, Communication, and Parental Participation on Elementary School Teachers' Performance. *Al Ibtida: Jurnal Pendidikan Guru MI*, 9(2), 319. <https://doi.org/10.24235/al.ibtida.snj.v9i2.9936>
- Harun, H., Mir, M., Carter, D., & An, Y. (2019). Examining the unintended outcomes of NPM reforms in Indonesia. *Public Money & Management*, 39(2), 86–94.
- Luluardi, Y. D., & Diniyanto, A. (2021). Political Dynasty in Law and Political Perspective: to what extent has the Election Law been reformed? *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 2(1), 109–124.
- Mukti, H. H., & Rodiyah, R. (2020). Dynasty Politics in Indonesia: Tradition or Democracy? *Journal of Law and Legal Reform*, 1(3), 531–538.
- Müller, K., & Morton, T. (2021). The space, the time, and the money. Wind energy politics in East Germany. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 40, 62–72.
- Najih, M., & Wiryani, F. (2020). Learning the social impact of corruption: a study of legal policy and corruption prevention in Indonesia and Malaysia. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 11(4), 175–189.
- Nuna, M., & Moonti, R. M. (2019). Kebebasan Hak Sosial-Politik Dan Partisipasi Warga Negara Dalam Sistem Demokrasi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ius Constituendum*, 4(2), 110–127.
- Pradhanawati, A., Tawakkal, G. T. I., & Garner, A. D. (2019). Voting their conscience: Poverty, education, social pressure and vote buying in Indonesia. *Journal of East Asian Studies*, 19(1), 19–38.
- Prihatini, E. S. (2019). Women's views and experiences of accessing National Parliament: Evidence from Indonesia. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 74, 84–90. Elsevier.
- Prihatini, E. S. (2020). Islam, parties, and women's political nomination in Indonesia. *Politics & Gender*, 16(3), 637–659.
- Satriawan, I., & Ramadhani, F. S. (2022). The Impact of Money Politics to the Indonesian Democratic System: With Special Reference to South Kalimantan Governor Election 2020. *International Conference on Sustainable Innovation on Humanities, Education, and Social Sciences (ICOSI-HESS 2022)*, 3–16. Atlantis Press.
- Subrata, T. (2022). Ancaman Pidana Bagi Money Politic Dalam Pemilihan Anggota Legislatif Terhadap Keberlangsungan Demokrasi Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 9(2), 44–60.
- Tilome, A. A., Andi Agustang, A. A., Jasruddin, J., Syukur, M., & ASRIFAN, A. (2020). Social Exchange of Political Elites in the Regional Leader Election of Gorontalo

Province, Indonesia. *Solid State Technology*, 63(5), 521–531.