

Teim



TEIM Election Watch Analysis

ELECTORAL REPORT:

INDONESIA/ Parliamentary elections
9 April 2009

Javier Gil

This observation mission was made possible thanks to support from the Spanish Agency for International Cooperation (*Agencia Española de Cooperación Internacional - AECID*) to TEIM Election Watch.



Latest revision: 2 December 2009

Observatorio Electoral

Taller de Estudios Internacionales Mediterráneos
Universidad Autónoma de Madrid

www.observatorioelectoral.es

ISSN: being processed

www.observatorioelectoral.es

Background to the elections:

These elections were the first act in a series of elections set for 2009, which continued with the first round of the presidential elections on 8 July and the possibility of a second round on 8 September (in the event that none of the candidates attained 50% of the vote in the first round), which was not required in the end.

Forty-four national parties and 6 regional parties competed for office in these parliamentary elections. Among the parties of a nationalist orientation were: 1) the Democratic Party (PD), the party of the current president, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, 2) the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI), the party of the former president Megawati Sukarnoputri and 3) the historic Golkar party, led by the current vice president of Indonesia, Jusuf Kalla. Prominent among the Islamist parties were: 1) the Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) led by Hidayat Nur Wahid, 2) Suryadharma Ali's United Development Party (PPP), 3) the National Awakening Party (PKB) led by Muhaimin Iskandar and 4) the National Mandate Party (PAN), which is led by Soetrisno Bachir.

The regional parties are located in the province of Aceh and they were created as a result of the peace agreement signed in 2005 by the government of Indonesia and the Gerakan Aceh Merdeka (Free Aceh Movement). Among other provisions, the agreement made it possible for the various parties in Aceh province to run for election at national level. Of particular importance among them is the Aceh Party (PA), considered to be the strongest in the region.

These elections were greatly influenced by the economic crisis, the effects of which are, somewhat belatedly, now being felt in Indonesian society and in the country's economy, and also by increasing conflicts in the provinces of Aceh and Papua.¹

Quantitative indices of democracy:

Indonesia was classified in the following democratic performance rankings just before these elections.

Measurement	Name and year of report or database	Institution	Indicator	Points, ranking and classification
Political rights and freedom	Freedom House Report 2009	Freedom House (FH)	PR: political rights CL: civil liberties	PR: 2, CL: 3 (Scale of 1, free to 7, not free) Classification: free
Degree of democracy in earlier elections	Polyarchy 2.0 2004 (in reference to the elections of 1999)	Peace Research Institute of Oslo and Tatu Vanhanen	ID: Synthetic democracy index, Part: participation, Comp: competition	ID: 16.85 max 49 Part: 37.03 max 70 Comp: 45.05 max 70 (Democracy minimum: ID: 5, Part: 10, Comp: 30) Classification: Democratic
Consolidation of authoritarian and democratic institutions	Polity IV 2007	Center for International Development and Conflict Management,	Democracy: consolidation of democratic institutions Autocracy:	Democracy: 8 Autocracy: 0 Polity: 8 (Scale of +10, very democratic to -10, very

¹Jakarta Post "Papua to see more troops after Saturday attack" at <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2009/03/14/papua-see-more-troops-after-saturday-attack.html>

		Univ. of Maryland	authoritarian consolidation Polity: synthesis of both	authoritarian) Classification: democratic
Perception of corruption	Transparency International Corruption Perception Index 2008	Transparency International (TI)	TICPI: corruption perceptions index	TCPI: 2.6 points out of 10, (Scale of 1, very corrupt to 10, not at all corrupt) Rank: 126 out of 178 countries
Management of political and economic change	Bertelsmann Transformation Index (BTI) 2008	Bertelsmann Foundation	MI: Management Index, quality of transformation management	MI: 5.27 points out of 10, Rank: 53 out of 125 países Classification: successful with weaknesses
Democracy, including press status and corruption	World Democracy Audit Oct. 2008	World Audit	World Democracy Rank: political freedom (FH) + press and corruption (TI)	World Democracy Ranking: 70 out of 150 countries, division 3 out of 4

The elections analysed in this profile produced the following electoral democracy quantitative results:

Degree of democracy in these elections ²	Measurement of democracy in these elections according to the Polyarchy 2.0 index, calculated by Observatorio electoral TEIM , 2009	ID: 12.49 max. 49. Part: 50.67 ³ , max. 70. Comp: 24.65 ⁴ , max. 70 (Democracy minimum: ID: 5, Part: 10 Comp: 30)	Classification of the elections: democratic
---	--	--	---

Definition of the electoral system and parties:

In the 2009 parliamentary elections, 560 members of the Representative Council and 132 members of the Regional Representatives Council were elected, and the regional and sub-regional parliaments were also formed.⁵ The electoral system in Indonesia is proportional, meaning that the representatives of each electoral district are assigned according to the number of votes obtained. Therefore, dividing the total number of votes by the number of seats gives the number of elected representatives obtained by each party. However, there is an electoral threshold of 2.5% at the national level, which has introduced changes to how the seats are distributed.

Indonesia has a multi-party system, but in these elections the Democratic Party emerged as the new party leader within the party system, to the detriment of Golkar, which had been the most-voted party in the 2004 parliamentary elections. The party system, then, has 9 political formations within the Jakarta parliament divided into two large blocs, the nationalists and the Islamists. The first bloc includes the PD, PDI, Golkar, Gerindra and Hanura. The second bloc is formed by the PKS, PAN, PKB and PPP.

² This refers to parliamentary elections only.

³ Participation was calculated based on a participation of 121,588,366 voters and an estimated population of 239,945,000 in 2008, according to the Population Reference Bureau (www.prb.org, Washington).

⁴ For the competition calculation, the government formed in 2004 was considered, given that the next executive body would not be formed until after the summer. Based upon this reference, the opposition parties attained 24.64% of the seats.

⁵ This electoral profile includes only data regarding the elections to the national Parliament.

A few additional points should also be mentioned with regard to the changes resulting from these elections. Firstly, only one of the parties already present in the parliament has seen an increase in its votes, although in percentage terms, the PKS also received increased support. Thus, the PD, the party of the current President, Susilo Bambang, became the leader of the nationalist factions and the Prosperous Justice Party (PKS) is now the leader of the Islamist faction. This fact is important because both of these political formations are a new product of the '*Reformasi* era'.⁶ These results would suggest that the electorate has grown tired of the traditional Indonesian parties created during the Suharto period.

In the legislative session that has just begun, nine parties are entering the national parliament, of which two of them, Hanura and Gerindra, are new to the parliamentary arena. With respect to the previous legislature, nine parties did not reach the necessary threshold of 2.5% of the votes, the percentage required to become part of the legislative chamber. The composition of the parliament has thus been reduced from 16 parties to nine.

Impact of the electoral process and size of the constituency on the elections:

In these elections, an important new feature was introduced into the electoral process. For the first time, Indonesian citizens were asked to choose a party or a party candidate, not both options⁷. In other words, if a voter selects a party, s/he cannot select a candidate from the party list and vice versa. This seems like a classic open list system but is not, since the voter may choose not to select a specific candidate.

Once the voting has finished, the seats and certificates of election are assigned. Firstly, the seats are allocated to the parties according to the value of the seat in the district. This value is determined by dividing the number of votes cast by the number of seats to be distributed. Although this system is proportional, another important factor must also be mentioned: the distribution of seats is modified by the introduction of an electoral threshold, limiting the number of parties that obtain seats in the parliament. Thus, votes cast for parties that do not reach the threshold do not count, and the seats that would have been given to those parties are distributed among the parties that did manage to enter parliament. These wasted votes make up 17.64% of the total votes cast and represent around 19 million votes, which makes this feature of the electoral system extremely significant.

Consequently, when the seats are distributed, the final result is not completely proportional. For example, the winning party, the PD, received 20.85% of the vote but has 26.43% of the seats in the Jakarta parliament.

The second step, once the seats have been distributed to the parties, is for seats to be assigned to candidates⁸ according to the number of votes they have

⁶ *Reformasi* is defined as the political period that began in 1998 following the fall of Suharto which heralded the start of the democratic era. This period is still underway and is characterised by the expansion of political liberties and civil rights.

⁷ cf. Stephen Sherlock: "Indonesia's 2009 Elections: The New Electoral System and the Competing Parties" in http://www.cdi.anu.edu.au/research/2008-09/D_P/2009_03_RES_PPS6_INDON_Sherlock/2009_04_PPS6_INDON_Sherlock.pdf

⁸ In Indonesia the voter chooses either a party or a candidate. Once the polling places have closed, the value of the seats in each district is calculated, as per above. This value is used to allocate representatives to the parties. Once the seats have been assigned to the parties, certificates of

obtained. Thus, if a party obtains 3 seats, these seats will be assigned to the 3 candidates with the most votes on the party's list. If the party is allocated more seats than its number of candidates with votes, the party leaders designate who will occupy the seats.

It should also be noted that the value of the seats varies considerably depending on the magnitude of the constituency. The district magnitude varies in each of the country's 77 electoral districts, ranging from 3 to 10, with an average magnitude of 7 and a mode of 8. Thus, a seat in Western Java, the most heavily populated province in Indonesia, is much more 'expensive' than one in the electoral district of Papua, in the sense that more votes are needed to obtain it.

Election results:

- Registered voters: 171,068,667⁹
- Participation: 70.96%
- Votes cast: 121,588,366
- Valid votes: 104,099,785
- Spoilt votes: 17,488,581
- Abstention: 29.03%

Chart of election results

(Nationalist parties in red and Islamist parties in green)

Party	In the 2004-2009 government	Number of votes	% Of vote	Number of seats	% Seats
Democratic Party (PD)	YES	21,703,137	20.85	148	26.43
Party of Functional Groups (GOLKAR)	YES	15,037,757	14.45	108	19.29
Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI)	NO	14,600,091	14.03	93	16.61
Prosperous Justice Party (PKS)	YES	8,206,955	7.88	59	10.54
National Mandate Party (PAN)	YES	6,254,580	6.01	42	7.5
United Development Party (PPP)	YES	5,533,214	5.32	39	6.96
National Awakening Party (PKB)	YES	5,146,122	4.94	26	4.64
Great Indonesia Movement Party (GERINDRA)	NO	4,646,406	4.46	30	5.36
People's Conscience Party (HANURA)	NO	3,922,870	3.77	15	2.68
TOTAL		85,051,132	81.71	560	100

Source: Author's compilation based on results published by the General Election Commission http://mediacenter.kpu.go.id/images/mediacenter/berita/SUARA_KPU/HASIL_PENGHITUNGAN_SUARA_SAH.pdf

election are given to candidates according to the number of votes each candidate obtained directly from the voters. This procedure was incorporated into these elections to increase the competitiveness among candidates and parties. For more information see General Election Commission "Peraturan KPU no. 15 tahun 2009" at http://www.kpu.go.id/index2.php?option=com_docman&task=doc_view&gid=81&Itemid=78

⁹ Official newsletter of the General Election Commission (KPU) about the April 2009 parliamentary elections.

Qualitative analysis of the elections:

Participation:

Voter turnout was 70.96%, lower than in previous elections, indicating a slight decrease in the Indonesians' interest in these elections. It is worth remembering that in the 2004 parliamentary elections, participation was 76.7%. An important fact regarding participation in this year's elections is that it was quite homogeneous throughout the country, with no significant differences between areas. It must also be noted that the number of spoilt votes was far too high at 17%.

Competition:

Forty-four parties participated in the elections but only 9 of them managed to enter parliament. This demonstrates that the degree of competition is not very high, as the expectations that parties will reach the electoral threshold are not very high either. It is also important to note that no party was excluded from the elections, except those that did not meet certain minimum requirements.

The main changes that occurred with respect to the 2004 elections are the following:¹⁰

Firstly, Golkar, the majority party in the previous parliament, lost around 7% of its electoral support, having obtained 14% of the vote. This translates into a loss of 20 representatives.

Secondly, the PD,¹¹ the party of the current President of Indonesia, gained strength within the Indonesian political arena, moving up from 7.5% and 57 seats in 2004 to 20.85% and around 148 seats this year. This increase was at the expense of its two great adversaries in the nationalist camp, Golkar and PDI. The losses of these two parties, 7% and 5% respectively, benefited the PD and brought about a reordering within the nationalist arena.

Thirdly, as in the nationalist camp, there was also a change of leadership in the Islamist camp. The PKS, formerly the fourth most powerful among the Islamist parties, has become the strongest party, increasing its vote by about 0.5% and its number of seats by 14. And finally, the Islamist vote fell with respect to the nationalist vote. This phenomenon can be explained by the sudden rise of the PD within the nationalist arena and by the continuous internal battles within the Islamist parties.

Transparency:

These elections were transparent although some problems did arise, mainly with the electoral roll, where some citizens did not appear on the register. The exact number of voters who were unable to exercise their right to vote remains unknown today, although the General Election Commission¹² has stated that the figure represents less than 1% of the census, i.e., around 1,500,000 people. This fact becomes very significant when the figure is added to the number of spoilt and wasted votes, producing a total of 38,000,000 votes.

¹⁰ Lampung Post "SBY Syaratkan Kontrak Koalisi" at <http://www.lampungpost.com/cetak/cetak.php?id=2009041108113411>

¹¹ Jakarta Post "Democratic Party tops election" at <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2009/04/10/democratic-party-tops-election.html>

¹² Antara News "KPU Temukan Satu Persen Pemilih Ganda" at <http://www.antara.co.id/arc/2009/5/18/kpu-temukan-satu-persen-pemilih-ganda/>

In addition, there were some problems in the distribution of ballots¹³ and polling stations in a few isolated areas of Papua¹⁴, the Nias Islands, etc., but in the end, except in some places where voting took place later, the elections proceeded normally.

The greatest problems in terms of the transparency of the elections took place during the campaign period. According to Bawaslu,¹⁵ the body that supervised the campaign, there were 2,228 allegations and complaints made about the following issues: infringing the official length of the rallies (1,273 occasions), children participating in rallies (372 occasions), extending the length of rallies (89 occasions), making use of public places and equipment (68 occasions), not reporting changes in the campaign method (for example, distributing propaganda at a market instead of holding a rally at the market) (57 occasions), holding rallies outside of the established hours (51 occasions), the existence of what is known in Indonesia as 'money politics'¹⁶ (42 occasions) where some parties, mostly Golkar, were accused of granting favours to voters in exchange for their vote. These favours included: massages, small sums of money, gifts, etc.

On the other hand, these elections, unlike previous ones, were the object of an agreement between 8 parties to guarantee transparency. The PDI, however, did not sign the agreement, although the rest of the parties that entered parliament did. The purpose of the agreement was to keep a better watch on the election process and enable the signatories to monitor it appropriately.

Party representation and debate during the elections:

The elections were representative of current Indonesian society. The nine parties that will make up the parliament represent the country's two large political poles: the nationalist and the Islamist camps, as well as members of the most important religions: Muslims, Catholics, Protestants, Buddhists and Hindus.

In the specific case of Aceh, where 6 local parties stood for election, the Aceh Party (PA), according to the final results, was the clear winner with 46.93% of the vote.

Although these elections are representative of contemporary society, the fact that the new parliament received only 49.71% of the total vote diminishes the representativeness and especially the legitimacy of the institution. This figure can be explained by the fact that the spoilt votes, 17,488,581, along with the votes for parties that did not reach the electoral threshold, 19,048,653, add up to 36,537,234 votes, which is 30.04% of all the votes cast.

Furthermore, debate during the campaign centred largely on two main issues: the deteriorating economic situation and corruption. In addition to these topics, a series of issues¹⁷ emerged that gave rise to important disputes among the parties, such as the following: 1) the government's direct economic

¹³ KOMPAS "Logistik Masih Masalah" at

<http://nasional.kompas.com/read/xml/2009/04/05/0421081/Logistik.Masih.Masalah>

¹⁴ Jakarta Post "KPU worried ballots won't arrive on time" at

<http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2009/04/06/kpu-worried-ballots-won%E2%80%99t-arrive-time.html>

¹⁵ For more information see the official website of the Bawaslu (Election Supervisory Board) at

<http://www.bawaslu.go.id/>

¹⁶ KURNIAWAN Ismi Wahid "Violations in plain sight" in Tempo, April 7-13, pp.22-23.

¹⁷ LEE Lynn "Indonesian campaign season draws to an end" in

<http://www.asianewsnet.net/news.php?id=5032&sec=1>

assistance to the poor, strongly criticized by Megawati Sukarnoputri for being a masked form of vote buying; 2) the price of rice, which all parties have promised to keep low; 3) polygamy, accusations of which were made by women's groups against various parties, mainly in the Islamist camp but also Golkar, for having representatives with more than one wife; 4) the Islamist parties harshly criticized the eroticism present at some of the parties' rallies, where female singers gave racy performances before the speakers started their speeches.

Openness:

The results indicate a high degree of openness, in that it was difficult to predict what the results would be. In this regard, the surveys published indicated a likely victory for the PD, as was finally the case, but such a significant increase for this party was not expected.

Other questions were also at stake. The first was how the vote would be distributed among the three large nationalist parties. Also of interest was how the parties within the Islamist camp would fare. At the same time, it was expected that the two new parties, Hanura and Gerindra would enter Parliament, as did in fact occur.

Significance:

The significance of these elections is great. Although the change will not be remarkable in terms of national power, since soon afterwards President Susilo Bambang was re-elected, the rise of the PD as the main party in Indonesia is very important, as it lessens the relevance of the two parties that have dominated the country's politics over the past 50 years, the PDI and Golkar. Also important is the fact that, despite predictions of poor results, the Islamist parties, albeit with diminished support, managed to keep hold of a significant amount of power, especially the PKS, which even obtained more seats than it had before.

Consequences and impact on the political system:

The results of these parliamentary elections highlight several political developments that had already appeared in the 2004 elections but whose effects are now greater.

In the first place, the profound restructuring of the Indonesian political system, which began in the previous elections, has continued. This means that the three large parties that dominated political life during the Suharto era from 1965 to 1998 – Golkar, the PDI and the PPP – have been replaced by two new parties that now occupy and share the political arena formerly occupied by the older political groups. Thus, within the nationalist camp, Susilo Bambang's Democratic Party has become the unquestionable leader, at the expense of the two long-standing powers, Golkar and the PDI. Likewise, the United Development Party (PPP), the sole representative of Islamism during Suharto's rule and one of the main Islamist groups following the last elections, took a beating and now occupies one of the lowest positions.

In the second place, two new parties burst onto the Indonesian political scene: Hanura and Gerindra, both of which represent generals who were in power under Suharto. It remains to be seen whether these two parties will be able to stay afloat or if they will be eliminated from the political map in the next elections. Their entry into the future government will be key in their survival.

In the third place, the number of parties in the Jakarta parliament has gone down considerably, from 16 to 9. This will facilitate parliamentary operations and lend stability to the future government, since the resulting coalition will not be as numerous or complex as in the past.

International political reaction:

The European media, with the exception of Holland, did not closely follow the elections in Indonesia but they were of interest to the United States and all of Indonesia's neighbouring countries (including Australia, Singapore, Malaysia and Japan). On the political level, both the government of the United States and the European Union congratulated the Indonesian government for how the elections were conducted and expressed their interest in maintaining good relations.

Conclusions:

These elections furthered the country along the democratic path undertaken in 1999. The largest Muslim democracy in the world once again voted calmly, demonstrating that the often-questioned relationship between Islam and democracy is in fact possible.

The elections brought three significant changes that will no doubt mark the development of this third legislative term: 1) the rise of the PD and PKS, and the reordering of the party blocs; 2) the appearance of new parties; and 3) the diminution of the Indonesian political spectrum. Only the events¹⁸ that occurred in Papua and Aceh clouded these elections. In the case of Aceh,¹⁹ some acts of intimidation took place during the campaign and a member of the Aceh party was shot dead.²⁰ As for Papua, on the day before voting, Papuan separatists attacked a police post and 4 people were killed. With these elections, the first step in a busy election year was taken. The results of these parliamentary elections suggest that Indonesia will most likely continue to support the path of reform begun by Susilo Bambang in 2004.

Reference to two other Internet analyses of these elections:

- South Asia Analysis Group "Indonesia: Elections 2009 – Will it be SBY again?" in <http://www.southasiaanalysis.org/%5Cpapers32%5Cpaper3168.html>

- TANUWIDJAJA Sunny "Indonesia's 2009 parliamentary election: the old and the new" in <http://www.eastasiaforum.org/2009/04/14/indonesias-2009-parliamentary-election-the-old-and-the-new/>

¹⁸ PRIMANITA Arientha "Pre-Election Violence Hits Papua, 4 Killed" at <http://www.thejakartaglobe.com/news/article/15973.html>

¹⁹ SIMANJUNTAK Hotli "Aceh polls run smoothly despite tense run-up" at <http://www.thejakartapost.com/news/2009/04/10/aceh-polls-run-smoothly-despite-tense-runup.html>

²⁰ Kompas "Partai Nasional di Aceh Utara Minta Pemilu Diundur" at <http://regional.kompas.com/read/xml/2009/04/01/18562298/Partai.Nasional.di.Aceh.Utara.Minta.Pemilu.Diundur>