

THE EXISTENCE OF WITNESSES IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF GENERAL ELECTIONS IN INDONESIA

DAUR TASALSUL¹, GALANG ASMARA², KAHARUDDIN³ and MINOLLAH⁴

^{1,2,3,4} University of Mataram, Mataram, Indonesia. E-Mail: ¹daurta006@gmail.com

Abstract

This research is motivated by the condition that the existence of witnesses in the General Election process does not have a clear position, while the position of witnesses in the General Election process is essentially very important as the spearhead of the implementation of a just General Election. This study aims to discuss the nature of the existence of witnesses in the implementation of general elections, whether the provisions on witnesses in the laws and regulations relating to general elections have guaranteed the existence of witnesses in accordance with their nature, and what is the ideal construction of the provisions on witnesses in the implementation of general elections in Indonesia. This research is a type of field research type research, with a qualitative form that is exploratory-descriptive in nature by using Philosophical, Statute, Conceptual and Comparative Approaches. The results of this study indicate that, the essence of the existence of witnesses in the implementation of General Elections in Indonesia as guardians of justice and the validity of General Election Results, Informal Legal Supervisors, and guarantors of Political Legitimacy in the Implementation of General Elections. the regulation and implementation of witnesses in the old order era (orla) were still integrated with the organizers of General Elections, the new order era (orba), General Election witnesses were witnessed by the Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia (ABRI), and the Reformation Order and Post-Reformation eras witnesses were still integrated with the organizers of General Elections which degraded the independence of witnesses. The concept of Reconstruction of the existence of witnesses that are just is based on the certainty of just regulations regarding the independence of witnesses. The suggestions that the author can give from this research are: expect the Government to restore the existence of witnesses in accordance with the nature of their existence as guarantors of the validity of the results of the General Election, informal law enforcers, and guarantors of political legitimacy in the implementation of the General Election by making changes to Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections based on certainty and justice.

Keywords: Witness, Independence, Reconstruction.

INTRODUCTION

General elections in Indonesia are regulated in Law Number 3 of 1999 concerning General Elections, then updated by Law Number 12 of 2003 concerning General Elections of Members of the People's Representative Council (DPR), Regional Representative Council (DPD), and Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD). Furthermore, it was updated again by Law Number 23 of 2003 concerning General Elections of President and Vice President. In further developments, with the issuance of Law Number 22 of 2007, the election of Regional Heads and Deputy Regional Heads also became part of the general election regime. Furthermore, in Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 8 of 2012 concerning General Elections of Members of the People's Representative Council, Regional Representative Council, and Regional People's Representative Council became part of the General Election. then the role of witnesses in the General Election is very important and their presence is very important in determining the realization of the above principles, however, until now the existence of witnesses in the

General Election is still questionable, whether witnesses in the General Election are part of the organizers such as the General Election Supervisory Body (BAWASLU), whether witnesses in the General Election are part of the General Election Commission (KPU), or witnesses in the General Election are part of the participants in the General Election, because until now the existence of witnesses in the General Election is still questionable, this is clearly seen in Article 351 paragraph (2) of the Republic of Indonesia Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections which states "The implementation of voting is witnessed by witnesses from General Election Participants.

While in Article 351 paragraph (8) of Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections it states that Witnesses are trained by Bawaslu, so it is not yet certain that the existence or position of witnesses in the General Election is part of the organizers or participants in the General Election.

Given the many General Election disputes submitted to the Constitutional Court regarding several allegations of fraud in the presidential and vice presidential elections, regional head elections, and legislative elections, it should be a major state issue to strengthen the existence of General Election witnesses, this can have an impact on the process of organizing General Elections, if there is General Election fraud, then what is the responsibility of General Election witnesses, if General Election witnesses commit fraud against General Election participants who provide mandates, then what consequences will be received, so the question arises as to what are the jobs of General Election witnesses, who provides salaries or wages.

That in several regions there are General Election witnesses who are forced to leave the voting process in the presidential and vice presidential elections, Regional Head Elections, and Legislative Elections, and there are several witnesses who leave their duties. (Kompas, 2024) So that the article cannot provide a guarantee for democratic practices that are in accordance with the goal of justice for all people in Indonesia.

Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections does not regulate sanctions for General Election witnesses who commit such acts, that General Election witnesses also sign the files that have been prepared by the General Election Commission (KPU) before the vote counting, so that the opportunity to commit fraud is very easy for certain individuals. General Election witnesses until now are part of the General Election process, but their existence is unclear, so that it has shown us that the principles of honesty and fairness have not been realized, because indeed when the General Election process is underway until the vote counting is the time when fraud against the vote acquisition can be carried out by certain individuals.

Thus, the role of a witness from the beginning to the end of the voting process needs to be studied by the compiler to what extent the witness's strength is, and based on Article 351 paragraph (8) of Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, it states that "Witnesses are trained 6 www.Kompas.com, accessed August 18, 2024. VI by Bawaslu"⁷, meaning that the existence of witnesses for the General Election in Indonesia has a great influence on the success of the implementation of the Presidential and Vice Presidential Elections, Regional Head Elections, and Legislative Elections, and what is the legal process (sanctions) for an

officer and/or election organizer who prohibits witnesses from participating in the voting process, because witnesses for the General Election have the right to attend KPPS (Voting Organizer Group) activities.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research method is classified as a normative-empirical research type. The approaches used are: Philosophical Approach, Comparative Approach, Statute Approach, and Conceptual Approach. Types and sources of data are: Primary legal materials, Secondary legal materials and Tertiary legal materials. Data collection techniques use qualitative descriptive analysis methods..

All legal materials obtained from library research are then analyzed and processed by building arguments based on logical thinking, also interpreting various legal materials. (Nasution S, 1992) The legal materials that have been collected will be analyzed thoroughly normative prescriptive by systematically inventorying, classifying and identifying the legal materials that have been obtained.

DISCUSSION

1. The Nature of the Existence of Witnesses in the Implementation of General Elections in Indonesia

From the perspective of General Election law, the main task of witnesses in general elections is to supervise the voting and vote counting process at polling stations (TPS). As guardians of justice, witnesses act as eyes and ears that monitor every stage of the election carefully, ensuring that no violations of the rules or manipulation occur. Witnesses are tasked with ensuring that every voter can exercise their right to vote freely and without pressure, with integrity and transparency in the vote counting process. Not a few international and national provisions were born to protect and guarantee the fulfillment of human rights including the right to participate in voting and being elected, participation in supervision for the implementation of Honest, Fair, Secret and Open Elections including the existence of Witnesses in ensuring the implementation of the essence of the General Election. The International Covenant on Political Rights states: (ICCPR, 1996)

First, every citizen has the right and opportunity without any distinction and without reasonable restrictions. Second, to participate in the running of all public affairs, either directly through freely elected representatives; and to vote in elections and be elected in periodic elections with equal and universal suffrage and control rights and held by secret ballot which guarantees the free expression of the will of the voters.

The realization of a fair and integrity General Election, then the involvement of a systematic supervision mechanism by Witnesses, in addition to supervision in the context of the active role of the community in the participatory supervision process is needed. Active participation supervision in the simultaneous General Election as an important pillar in carrying out the controlling function. In principle, the quality of a good General Election can be measured by

at least five indicators, namely:

- a. The organizers are fair in determining and implementing the provisions or rules of the game and provide equal opportunities to all parties to be involved in each stage of the implementation of the simultaneous General Election.
- b. The high level of voter participation is based on awareness and honesty in determining their choice with a sense of responsibility without coercion.
- c. The selection of prospective candidates is carried out democratically and without using money politics in all stages of the General Election.
- d. General elections produce legislative and executive members who have strong legitimacy and quality.
- e. The government and its government apparatus, from the center to the lowest level, are neutral and independent. (Kadek Cahya, 2019)
- f. Justice for Election Supervisors, in this context Witnesses in protection, both justice in operational financing and dignified financing in accordance with the duties and functions in the process of organizing General Elections.

The role of witnesses as guardians of justice and guarantors of the validity of the results of the General Election in the General Election reflects the principles of procedural justice, where a fair process is a prerequisite for achieving fair results. By overseeing each stage of the General Election in accordance with applicable rules and procedures, witnesses help ensure that every vote is counted and treated equally. In addition, the presence of witnesses also provides confidence to voters that the election process is running honestly and fairly, which ultimately strengthens the legitimacy of the General Election results.

In the Author's opinion, from the aspect of the existence of Witnesses in the realization of General Election justice, it must pay attention to, first, ensuring that every action, procedure, and decision related to the General Election process is in accordance with the legal framework; second, protecting or restoring voting rights as a legitimacy of the validity of the General Election results; and third, ensuring that citizens who believe their voting rights have been violated to file a complaint, because witnesses are the transmission belt from citizens to the General Election organizers to ensure the realization of the principle of a just General Election.

The concept of General Election justice is not only limited to enforcing the legal framework, but is also a factor that needs to be considered in designing and carrying out the entire General Election process. General Election Fairness is also a factor that influences the behavior of stakeholders in the process. (Hairil Anwar, 2019)

The existence of witnesses in overseeing the fair General Election process is in line with public expectations based on the experience of the 2014 General Election, 2019 and the previous direct General Election. By overseeing this process, witnesses help prevent fraud or irregularities that can damage the integrity of the General Election. The presence of witnesses as careful supervisors helps ensure that every step of the election takes place in accordance

with the established rules. By detecting and reporting any suspicious or rule-breaking actions, witnesses play an important role in maintaining the integrity and public trust in the General Election process. These preventive measures not only prevent manipulation of the General Election results, but also ensure that every vote is considered fairly and every voter has an equal opportunity to participate in the democratic process.

The right to obtain equal opportunities for citizens to be directly involved in the administration of government is clearly recorded in Article 27 paragraph 1 of the 1945 Constitution. The a quo meaning of this right is embedded in the legal and governmental fields. Furthermore, Article 28 D paragraph (3) explains about obtaining equal opportunities in government. Regarding the relationship between equality before the law and equal opportunities in true government, the principles of supremacy of law, equality before the law, and due process of law have been inherent in it.

The presence of witnesses in the general election process acts as a supervisor and also as a guardian of transparency and accountability in the democratic process.. In deliberative democracy, introduced by Jurgen Habermas, highlights the importance of dialogue and open public participation in political decision-making. (Jurgen Habermas, 1984) In the context of General Elections, transparency and accountability are key to achieving deliberative democracy that is in accordance with current conditions.

The presence of witnesses ensures that the General Election process takes place openly and transparently. By monitoring each stage of the election, they closely monitor the implementation of voting rules and procedures, thus ensuring that the public interest is prioritized and that there are no irregularities that could harm the integrity of the General Election. The accountability perspective, as explained by Robert E. Goodin in Democratic Accountability, explains that those in power are responsible for their actions and decisions. (E. Goodin, 2003) By reporting any violations or irregularities they witness, witnesses help to encourage accountability of political actors and General Election institutions to the public, thus creating an environment where transparency and accountability are upheld.

In addition, the presence of witnesses is a form of guarantee of political legitimacy in the General Election., as stated by Max Weber, emphasizes the importance of society recognizing and accepting political authority. In the context of general elections, public trust in the election process and its results is key to democratic legitimacy. The presence of witnesses, by ensuring that the general election process is transparent and accountable, helps build public trust in the integrity of the general election.

Transparency and accountability maintained by witnesses not only ensures distributive justice in elections, but also enhances democratic legitimacy by strengthening public trust in the electoral process and its representation. One theory that can support this statement is the theory of political legitimacy, studied by figures such as Max Weber and David Bentham. According to this theory, political legitimacy is closely related to the level of public trust in the political process and the institutions that manage it. In the context of general elections, when the process is carried out transparently and accountably, the public tends to have greater trust in the results

of the General Election and the resulting political representation. Furthermore, the ideals of deliberative democracy, as developed by Jurgen Habermas above, emphasize the importance of open and dialogical public participation in the political decision-making process. The presence of witnesses in elections can be seen as part of this practice of deliberative democracy. By monitoring the election process and reporting any violations or irregularities, witnesses help maintain the integrity of the election process and ensure that the voice of the people is accurately reflected in the election results. This can strengthen the legitimacy of democracy because it shows that the political process is running in accordance with fundamental democratic principles.

In addition, political accountability, as explained by Robert E. Goodin, emphasizes the importance of those in power being held accountable for their actions and decisions. (E. Goodin, 2003) With witnesses monitoring the election process and reporting violations, political actors and election institutions become more accountable to the public. This helps strengthen democratic legitimacy by demonstrating that political authorities are responsible and accountable for their actions.

Overall, the transparency and accountability maintained by witnesses in elections not only ensure distributive justice, but also enhance democratic legitimacy by strengthening public trust in the electoral process and its representation. Political theories that discuss legitimacy, deliberative democracy, and political accountability provide a strong theoretical foundation for understanding the importance of the role of witnesses in strengthening democracy through transparent, accountable, and convincing elections.

In addition to overseeing the election process, witnesses also have the task of reporting violations and submitting objections to events that are considered not in accordance with the rules. This role is very important in the context of the theory of retributive justice, which requires a mechanism to correct errors and punish violations. By providing accurate and objective reports, witnesses contribute to maintaining justice by ensuring that any violations are processed and followed up by the authorities. This not only prevents fraud, but also builds public trust in the General Election system and its results.

2. The Existence of Witnesses in the Implementation of General Elections in Indonesia

The 1955 General Election was the first national general election in Indonesia. Many people call the 1955 General Election a democratic General Election and consider it an ideal General Election. This ideality was built on the freedom and plurality of the General Election, the neutrality of the bureaucracy and the military even though only in concept, there were no riots or mass clashes, all parties were represented in the General Election organizing body and the enthusiasm of voters. The implementation of the 1955 General Election was seen as a brilliant achievement, an affirmation of nationality and a real answer to skeptics at home and abroad who thought the Indonesian nation was incapable of democracy. (Sigit Pamugkas, 2009) However, in terms of implementation, according to Feith, there was intimidation throughout Indonesia in the final stages of the campaign and on voting day. In that case, there were two things that became the point of intimidation, first, many voters were pressured to vote for

Masyumi in Aceh and West Java. Second, in East Java and Central Java, voters were intimidated by PNI village heads and Communist village security guards. (Sigit Pamugkas, 2009) Furthermore, Feith explained that the threat of intimidation was in the form of imprisonment and large fines if they did not vote for PNI, the collection of thumbprints and thumbprints of communist front organization memberships, and the threat of delaying the supply of salt and other necessities that could be distributed. (Sigit Pamugkas, 2009) The legal politics of the General Election in the New Order era were repressive in character. (Mahfud MD, 2010) This then became the antithesis of the characteristics of the General Election in a democratic country. The characteristics of the General Election were built on the basis of free and fair in both legal and applicative terms. The characteristics of the free and fair principle then became the most avoided thing in this era. The implication then was the imbalance of contestation between General Election participants and the results of the General Election did not reflect the aspirations and sovereignty of the people. The monoloyalty of the government, the bureaucracy that sides with the rulers in the context of the Golkar Party, as well as the legal and military apparatus backing up the Golkar Party so that the General Election process with the principle of people's sovereignty is degraded.

General Elections during the New Order era were held 6 times during the period 1971 to 1999. The first General Election was held in 1971 with the legal basis of Law Number 15 of 1969 concerning General Elections. The implementation of the following General Elections, the General Elections of 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and the General Election of 1997; Law Number 15 of 1969 has been updated with Law Number 4 of 1975, Law Number 2 of 1980 and Law Number 1 of 1985. However, there were no significant changes in each change. Voters are citizens who are 17 years old and/or married. The registration procedure is a passive system, namely the government has an obligation to register all citizens who have the right to vote. (Sigit Pamugkas, 2009) The General Election held in 1999 was the antithesis of the General Election held in the New Order era. Efforts to realize a Free and Fair General Election by formulating more than 136 regulations and decisions on the procedures for the General Election under the legal umbrella of Law Number 3 of 1999 concerning General Elections.

Regarding supervision in the implementation of the 1999 General Election, Law Number 3 of 1999 concerning General Elections in Article 24 paragraphs (1) to (5) states that;

- a. In order to supervise the implementation of the General Election, a Supervisory Committee was formed.
- b. The supervisory committee as referred to in paragraph (1) is formed at the Central, Provincial, Regency/Municipal and Sub-district levels.
- c. The membership of the Central, Level I, and Level II Supervisory Committees consists of Judges, Higher Education Elements, and Community Elements.
- d. The membership of the Sub-district Supervisory Committee consists of elements of Higher Education and elements of the community.

- e. The composition of the Supervisory Committee as referred to in paragraph (3) and paragraph (4) is determined by the Chief Justice of the Supreme Court for the Central Level, the Chief Justice of the High Court for Level I, the Chief Justice of the District Court for Level II and the Sub-district Level.

Recognition of direct general elections has a positive impact on the sustainability of embodiment democracy in the Indonesian political system. However, in the process of regulating all elements of the direct General Election organizers, there are still problems that still surround it. In the implementation process, empirically there are still various kinds of fraud, both in the voting process at the Polling Stations (TPS), and during the plenary at the Sub-district level, Regency plenary, Provincial Plenary, to the Central plenary. This can be proven by the issuance of the Constitutional Court Decision which decided on many Re-votes in various Regions.

Process Election In the Legislative General Election or direct Regional Head Election, there are various kinds of problems both in terms of Legislation, the implementation of the General Election or direct Regional Head Election, several problems can be identified as follows;

- a. All stakeholders' readiness involved in the General Election is still very low and the preparation period is not long.
- b. The number of permanent voters list is unclear because the data collection time is often not optimal. So that there is a lot of data whose existence is unclear.
- c. In the case of regional elections, some of the locations where regional elections are held are in areas with very large areas and there is no adequate means of transportation.
- d. The limited time for the implementation of the General Election resulted in the candidate supervision and recruitment process being less than optimal.
- e. The General Election Commission's (KPU) budget standards are limited, so the KPU is required to be creative by breaking its own rules.
- f. From a psychological assessment perspective, legislative or regional head candidates are not yet ready to accept defeat. ((Burhanuddin, 2022)
- g. From this context, in the author's opinion, the weakness in the implementation of the General Election also lies in the regulation of the duties and functions of Witnesses in the process of implementing the General Election.

Burhanuddin further explained that the different characteristics of the regions and the different levels of intelligence of the voters made the problem even more complex so that the General Election Commission did not easily hold the General Election directly both in terms of administration to vote counting, even during the dispute process. Mobilizing public participation to oversee the course of the General Election was also not easy, in the sense that socialization to the community at the grassroots level was not yet optimal. (Burhanuddin, 2022) In addition, supervision of witnesses was not optimal due to various factors.

3. Ideal Construction of Witness Arrangements in General Elections in Indonesia

The formulation of fair norms in the context of the existence of witnesses in general elections in Indonesia requires a holistic and participatory approach. This norm must ensure that the rights of all parties involved in the general election process, including witnesses, are respected and protected. According to John Rawls in *A Theory of Justice*, justice must be seen as fairness, where every individual has an equal opportunity to participate in social and political processes without discrimination. (Rawls, 1971) In the context of general elections, this means that witnesses must be given adequate legal protection and equal access to the information and facilities needed to carry out their duties. In addition, the formulation of just norms must also consider universally recognized human rights principles. Article 25 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) affirms that every citizen must have the right and opportunity to participate in free and fair elections, both as a voter and as a participant in the electoral process. (ICCPR, 1996) In this context, election witnesses play an important role in ensuring the transparency and integrity of the electoral process. Therefore, just norms must include a mechanism for protecting witnesses from threats, intimidation, or undue influence that could interfere with their duties.

To realize fair norms, clear and firm regulations are needed that regulate the roles and responsibilities of witnesses in general elections. These regulations must include the rights and obligations of witnesses, procedures for reporting and handling complaints, and sanctions for parties who violate the rules. Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections in Indonesia stipulates that witnesses have the right to receive a copy of the minutes of the vote counting results and have the right to file objections to the results if there are indications of fraud. This shows legislative efforts to protect the rights of witnesses and ensure that the election process is transparent and accountable. Furthermore, fair norms must also be supported by policies and practices that encourage active and constructive participation of witnesses. Training and education for witnesses on their rights and obligations as well as effective election monitoring techniques are essential to improving the quality and credibility of the election process. A study by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) shows that comprehensive witness training can significantly reduce error rates and increase accuracy in election monitoring. (IFES, 2020) Therefore, investing in witness training programs is a strategic step in realizing fair norms.

Certainty regarding the formulation of fair norms in the existence of witnesses in general elections is a must to ensure that the rights of all parties involved are respected and complied with. This legal certainty includes clear, transparent, and predictable regulations regarding the rights and obligations of witnesses, as well as protection mechanisms against violations. According to Hans Kelsen in his book *Pure Theory of Law*, legal certainty is a basic principle that must exist in every legal system. Legal certainty provides stability and predictability so that individuals can know what to expect and what to do in certain situations. (Kelsen, 1967) Regulations must detail the rights and obligations of witnesses, as well as the procedures to be followed during the election process. This includes provisions regarding witness access to election information and documents, fraud reporting mechanisms, and legal protection for

witnesses. Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections in Indonesia must provide a clear legal framework regarding the roles and responsibilities of witnesses. Witnesses must be given adequate training on their rights and obligations, election monitoring techniques, and how to report fraud. This training is important to ensure that witnesses understand their roles and can carry out their duties effectively.

A study by the International Foundation for Electoral Systems (IFES) shows that comprehensive witness training can improve accuracy and reduce errors in election monitoring. (IFES, 2020) Election monitoring institutions must be strengthened to ensure that regulations related to witnesses are applied consistently and fairly. Effective oversight mechanisms include audits, inspections, and field reviews. Witnesses must be protected from all forms of threats and violence that may interfere with their independence in carrying out their duties. This protection can be in the form of physical, legal, and psychological protection. Articles 356-357 of Law No. 7 of 2017 emphasize the need for protection of witnesses from threats and violence that may affect their duties. Physical and psychological protection for election witnesses is a crucial component to ensure they can carry out their duties without feeling threatened or stressed. A comprehensive protection mechanism should cover two main aspects: physical security and psychological support.

Physical security involves concrete measures to protect witnesses from potential threats or violence. Legal protection is a crucial aspect in ensuring that election witnesses can carry out their duties safely and effectively. According to the Legal Protection Theory, which emphasizes the importance of legal protection for individuals involved in legal or administrative processes, witnesses must have adequate access to legal assistance to safeguard their rights. In the context of elections, witnesses often face legal risks, including threats or lawsuits from parties who may feel aggrieved by their statements or actions. Therefore, the government needs to ensure that witnesses can obtain competent legal services and other legal support. As stated by David Dyzenhaus, "Legal protection for individuals involved in legal processes is key to ensuring the fairness and integrity of the legal system. (Dyzenhaus, 2006)

Access to Justice Theory also supports the need for comprehensive legal protection for witnesses. This theory emphasizes that access to justice and legal protection are fundamental rights that must be guaranteed to all individuals, including election witnesses.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

1. Conclusions

- a. The essence of the existence of witnesses in the implementation of General Elections in Indonesia as guardians of justice and the validity of General Election Results, Informal Legal Supervisors, and guarantors of Political Legitimacy in the Implementation of General Elections.
- b. Regulation and Implementation of the existence of witnesses in the implementation of the General Election can be explained that, First, There is ambiguity in the regulation of the existence of witnesses. Article 351 paragraph (2) states that the implementation of voting is

witnessed by witnesses of General Election participants. While in Article 351 paragraph (8) of Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections it reads "Witnesses are trained by Bawaslu", so it is not certain that the existence or position of witnesses in the General Election is part of the organizers or participants of the General Election. This degrades the independence of the position of witnesses of political parties and General Election participants in the General Election contestation. Second, the implementation of the General Election supervised by witnesses of political parties and witnesses of General Election participants does not receive financial support from the State Budget, and is the responsibility of each Political Party and General Election participant. This is risky because of the lack of supervision and the lack of economic protection from the state. The amount of funding for witnesses is uncertain because it depends on the readiness of political parties and General Election participants. The implication of this is that the integrity and existence of witnesses are not clear both from the level of norms and implementation in the field. Third, the integration of witnesses and Bawaslu as the organizer of the General Election in supervising the General Election has the risk of manipulation and manipulation of votes at the lower level because they have different interests.

- c. The ideal Reconstruction Concept for the regulation of witnesses in the implementation of general elections in Indonesia is based on the certainty of the regulation of guarantees of administrative protection for witnesses, guarantees of adequate economic or income, and guarantees of safety of life.

2. Suggestions

We hope that in the future by returning the existence of witnesses in accordance with the nature of their existence as guarantors of the validity of the results of the General Election, informal law enforcers, and guarantors of political legitimacy in the implementation of the General Election. Reconstruction of Law Number 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections, specifically Article 351 paragraph (2) to paragraph (8) by returning the independence of General Election witnesses based on certainty and justice that guarantees the existence of witnesses in obtaining protection, both administrative protection, economic protection, and protection of the witness's personal safety.

References

- 1) Akhmad Hairil Anwar, Peran Bawaslu dalam Penegakan Hukum dan Keadilan Pemilu, *Voice Justicia: Jurnal Hukum dan Keadilan*, Volume 3, Nomor 2, September 2019.
- 2) David Dyzenhaus, *the Constitution of Law: Legality in a Time of Emergency*, Cambridge University Press, 2006.
- 3) *International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights*. Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights, 1966.
- 4) *International Foundation for Electoral Systems. Electoral Integrity and the Role of Election Observation: The Case of Election Witnesses*. IFES, 2020.
- 5) Jurgen Habermas, *Theory of Communicative Action*, Boston, Beacon, 1984.

- 6) Kadek Cahya Susila Wibawa, Pengawasan Partisipatif untuk Mewujudkan Good Governance dalam Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Umum Serentak di Indonesia, *Jurnal Administrative Law & Governance Journal*, Volume 2, Issue 4, 2019.
- 7) Kelsen, Hans, *Pure Theory of Law*. University of California Press, 1967.
- 8) Mahfud MD, *Politik Hukum di Indonesia*, Rajagrafindo, Jakarta, 2010.
- 9) Muhammad Burhanuddin, *Rekonstruksi Regulasi Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Kepala Daerah yang Bebas Nilai Keadilan*, Disertasi Program Doktor Ilmu Hukum Unissula Semarang, 2022.
- 10) Nasution S., *Penelitian Naturalistik Kualitatif*, Tarsito, Bandung, 1992.
- 11) John Rawls, *a Theory of Justice*, Harvard University Press, 1971.
- 12) Robert E. Goodin, *Democratic Accountability: The Distinctiveness of the Third Sector*. *Archives Européennes de Sociologie/European Journal of Sociology/Europäisches Archiv Für Soziologie* 44, 2003, hlm. 359–96. Dalam <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1111/puar.13417>., Akses tanggal 22 Juni 2023.
- 13) Sigit Pamugkas, *Perihal Pemilu*, Laboratorium Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta, 2009.
- 14) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945*
- 15) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia, Undang-Undang Dasar Tahun 1945*
- 16) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 1953 tentang Pemilihan Umum*.
- 17) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 15 Tahun 1969 tentang Pemilihan Umum Anggota-Anggota Badan Permusyawaratan /Perwakilan Rakyat*.
- 18) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 1999 tentang Pemilihan Umum*.
- 19) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2001 Tentang Otonomi Khusus Papua*.
- 20) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2003 Tentang Pemilihan Umum Anggota DPR, DPD, dan DPRD*.
- 21) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2003 Tentang Pemilihan Umum Presiden dan Wakil Presiden*.
- 22) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 42 Tahun 2008 tentang Pemilihan Umum Presiden dan Wakil Presiden*.
- 23) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2011 tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 2 Tahun 2008 tentang Partai Politik*.
- 24) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2011 tentang Pembentukan Peraturan Perundang-undangan*.
- 25) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 15 Tahun 2011 Tentang Penyelenggaraan Pemilihan Umum* .
- 26) Indonesia, *Undang-undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 tahun 2012 Tentang Pemilihan Umum Anggota Dewan Perwakilan rakyat, Dewan Perwakilan Daerah, dan Dewan Perwakilan Rakyat Daerah*.
- 27) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2016 Tentang Perubahan Atas Undang-Undang Nomor 11 Tahun 2008 Tentang Informasi dan Transaksi Elektronik*, Putusan Mahkamah Konstitusi Nomor 90/PUU-XXI/2023.
- 28) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 17 Tahun 2014 tentang MPR, DPR, DPD dan DPRD*.
- 29) Indonesia, *Undang-Undang Nomor 7 Tahun 2017 Tentang Pemilihan Umum*.