

Regional Head Direct Election to strengthening Democracy And tourism Economic power

Zaenal Abidin¹, Rifki Khoirudin², Mulya Rafika³, Samsudin⁴, Rahul Chauhan⁵

¹Perbanas Institute, Indonesia. Email: zaenal@perbanas.id

²Universitas Ahmad Dahlan, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

³Universitas Labuhanbatu, Indonesia. Email: mulya_rafika@yahoo.co.id

⁴IAIN Bengkulu, Bengkulu, Indonesia

⁵Parul University, India

Abstract

Direct Regional head election has indeed provided wide opportunities for Indonesian citizens who have the right to vote directly for their regional head. However, this does not necessarily strengthen democracy. Regional head election has become a contest of tourism economic power. The contestants of Regional head election are powerful capital owners. Finally, the winner who succeeded in gaining power was the powerful capital owner too. Actually there is no problem if the powerful capital owners hold authority, as long as they are able to provide welfare for the people. The people do not only need Regional head election. The people need prosperity and democracy that provides opportunities for broad political participation to express their interests.

Keywords: regional head election, democracy, political participation, people's welfare, economic power

1. INTRODUCTION

In the history of Balinese politics, Buleleng is known as the "Hot Earth" which often burns in every political celebration [1]. Strengthening this nickname, a book on political violence in Buleleng was written, "The Genealogy of Violence and Subaltern Upheaval, Bara in North Bali". Why not, the political world in Buleleng is often colored with violence, from burning houses and offices until murder that sacrifice human lives. In the 1965 tragedy, as it happened in Bali as general, Buleleng was smoldering and there was a massacre. In 1971, Buleleng was also hot. People who did not want to join Functional Groups (Golkar) were pressured, cow sheds, houses were burned to frighten people who did not want to join Functional Groups (Golkar). If it doesn't work to be feared in this way, then violence will be carried out even to the murder. This incident is known as "Buleleng". In 1999 there was a reversal, Buleleng burned again, government offices were burned, the crowd was angry because Megawati, the General Chair of the Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) as the winning party in the General Election was not elected as President of the Republic of Indonesia. Then in 2003, just before the 2004 general election, two Functional Groups (Golkar) Party cadres were killed in Petandakan Village, 15 km southeast of Singaraja City, because of political grudge. Thus the political violence that has occurred in Buleleng due to political grudge. Who is in power he is the one who suppresses and silences those who are not in power, so that those who are not in power are unable to speak out [2].

The political celebration of the Regional head election in Buleleng took place relatively safely, even the Regional head election was seen as the safest political celebration in Buleleng's political history, although there were small ripples and sparks, but it did not burn again. Small ripple and sparks in Regional head election, the Agriculture Service Office was engulfed in flames toward

of voting. After being investigated, indeed there was someone who intentionally burned it [3]. Regional head election which had just taken place was also marked by sparks. Pasar Mumbul located in the middle of Singaraja city caught fire toward of voting. But supposedly not because it was burned.

Thus was Buleleng's Regional head election although there were sparks but not burning, also not to happen the Casualties as political violence. Buleleng's Regional head election indeed appropriate as the safest Regional head election in the political history in Buleleng. The voters have cast votes for four pairs of candidates nominated by political parties which provided in Buleleng [4]. As a result, one pair of candidates received the most votes, namely 54.80%. Does the direct Regional head election in Buleleng strengthen democracy, and Buleleng society are aware of politics and democracy, and have the opportunity to freely express their interests? What lessons can be learned from Buleleng's Regional head election which is safe about democracy?

2. Buleleng's Regional head election

One of the important functions of political parties is the political recruitment function to place group members in administrative and political positions, in addition to the function of interest articulation, interest aggregation function, political socialization function, and political communication function [5]. Political parties in Buleleng district, including small political parties that do not have representatives in District Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD), seem to take advantage of the political recruitment function in the Regional head election by carrying or joining to carry the candidate pairs, as shown in table 1.

Table 1

Candidates pairs of Buleleng's Regional head election, the Supporting Party and the Supporting Party Representatives in the Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD), Buleleng district

| No | Name of candidate pairs | Supporting party | Vice of Supporting party in Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) | |
|----|---|---|---|------------|
| | | | People | Percentage |
| 1 | Gede Ariadi, S.Kom. MBA dan I Wayan Arta, SH | Party of Functional Groups (Partai Golkar) National Care Functional Party (PKPB) National Mandate Party (PAN) | 9 | 20,00 |
| | | | 6 | 13,33 |
| | | | 1 | 2,22 |
| 2 | Tutik Kusuma Wardani, SE, M.Kes dan I Komang Nova Sewi Putra, SE | Democrats Party (Partai Demokrat) | 7 | 15,56 |
| 3 | Putra Agus Suradnyana, ST dan Dr. Nyoman Sutjindra, Sp. OG | Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) | 14 | 31,11 |
| 4 | Drs. I Wayan Gede Wenten | People's | 3 | 6,67 |

| | | | |
|---|---|----|--------|
| Suparlan dan Drs. Ida Bagus Djodhi, MM | Conscience Party (Hanura) Greater Indonesia Movement Party (Gerindra) Indonesian Justice and Unitary Party (PKPI) Pelopor Party (Partai Pelopor) Indonesian National Populist Fortress (PNBK) Indonesian peace officer democratic party (PPDI) Democratic Renewal Party (PDP) | 1 | 2,22 |
| The number and percentage of viceof the supporting parties in Regional House of People’s Representatives (DPRD) | | 41 | 91,11 |
| The total number of Regional House of People’s Representatives(DPRD) members | | 45 | 100,00 |

Source: Regional General Election Commission (KPU) Buleleng district (data processed)

Data in table 1 shows that there were four candidate pairs competing in the Buleleng’s Regional head election. It is interesting to discuss the genealogy of the four candidate pairs to get a glimpse of the competition map. Candidate pair number 1 was carried by a combination of three parties which had 16 (35.55%) representatives in the Buleleng Regency Regional House of People’s Representatives(DPRD). One of the supporting parties, Functional Groups(Golkar), won of the second general election in Buleleng district in the general election. Regional head candidate number 1, Gde Ariadi, S.Kom, MBA., Is a professional who works in the private sector. He is the eldest son of the Regent who is currently serving during the Regional head Election. A position like this is considered advantageous in political competition, because it is considered to have an equal advantage with an incumbent. In the history of politics in Bali there are two examples of similar positions competing in the Regional head election, namely the son of the Jembrana Regent in Jembrana and the daughter of the Regent of Tabanan in Tabanan. However, the son of the Regent of Jembrana was unable to compete in Jembrana, while Eka Wiryastuti, the daughter of the Regent of Tabanan, won the competition and now currently serving as the Regent in Tabanan.

Candidate pair number 2 is carried by a party that has seven (15.56%) representatives in the Regional House of People’s Representatives (DPRD) Buleleng District. The party that carries this pair of candidates, Democrats Party (Partai Demokrat), is the third winning party in Buleleng District in the general elections. The candidate for regional head number 2, Tutik Kusuma Wardani, SE, M.Kes., Has political experience while serving as a member of District Regional House of People’s Representatives (DPRD) Bali Province as a representative of the Democrats Party. This candidate for regional head number 2 is also known as an entrepreneur who has

penetrated several business sectors including the health sector. Long before running as regional head, he had made political investments to help society in the medical field.

Candidate pair number 3 was carried by a political party that had 14 people (31.11%) representatives in Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) Buleleng District. The party that carries candidate number 3, Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) is the number one winning party in Buleleng district in the General election. Candidate for regional head number 3, Putu Agus Suradnyana, has political experience as a member of Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) Bali Province for three terms as a Representative of Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) the local election of Buleleng District. This candidate of Regional head number 3 is also known as a successful entrepreneur in various sectors who provide many jobs to the population.

The candidate pair number 4 is carried by a combination of seven political parties. Of the seven bearing parties, only two had representatives, namely four (8.89%) representatives in Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) Buleleng District. Regional head candidate number 4, Drs. Wayan Gede Wenten Suparlan, a Buleleng-born person with experience in the government sector, has held echelon II positions outside Buleleng.

Thus, voters in Buleleng district were treated to four pairs of candidates by political parties to be elected in General head election of Buleleng District.

Observing the genealogy of the four pairs of candidates, one can vaguely see the competition map. To compete for voters' votes, the actual competition only occurs between three pairs of candidates, namely the candidate pairs number 1 to 3. While the candidate pair number 4 is not included in the competition calculation. Apart from being promoted by small parties, the candidate of regional head number 4 is not well known among voters in Buleleng district.

There was fierce competition between the two pairs of candidates, namely serial numbers 1 and 3. Both pairs of candidates both had advantages. The candidate of regional head number 1 is the son of the currently serving Regent because it is often referred to as the Crown Prince (PM) and it is promoted by a coalition of parties who have significant representatives in Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD). While the candidate of regional head number 3 has three-period of political experience as a member of the Bali Province Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) from the voting region of Buleleng district, vice of Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) and was promoted by Indonesian Democratic Party of Struggle (PDIP) which was the winning party of General election number one in Buleleng district in the General election.

In the end, people as the voters who determine the winner as a form of democracy, in accordance with the philosophy of democracy that teaches, freedom (free individuals to make choices), equality (one person, one vote, the vote of a regent is equal to the voice of a worker in a democracy) and sovereignty of majority vote [6].

3. Regional Head Direct Election: Strengthening Democracy

Regional Head Direct Election in which the regional head is elected directly by the people who have the right to vote according to law, is implemented based on Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government. Are Regional Head Direct Election by people, not by the Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD), a sign of efforts to strengthen democracy in Indonesia? In order to answer this problem, it is necessary to clarify the meaning of democracy and the practice of democracy in Indonesia.

Democracy has a broad meaning. Various countries with different political systems call themselves democracies. Because of the broad meaning of the word, to make it more specific, democracy is given an adjective that marks the type of democracy in question. Liberal democracy is a political system in which individual rights receive special protection of constitutional so that the majority group cannot oppress the minority. Social democracy is a political system in which apart from providing protection to individual rights as in conventional liberal democracy, there is also collective action to achieve social and tourism economic equality [7]. Totalitarian democracy, which implements Marxism, is a political system controlled by a centrally ruling party. In Marxism political rights such as those in liberal democracy have no

value, the political rights as like which is in liberal democracy not having value, the political rights seen not more than the power of the bourgeois superstructure that creates inequality [8].

The difference between the three types of democracy actually lies in the power and participation of the government and the people in the prevailing political system [9]. In a liberal democracy, individual rights are very prominent and people's participation in politics to fight for their interests is very broad. Meanwhile, in a totalitarian democracy, the role of government is very prominent and individual rights are very limited.

Social democracy, although highly respecting individual rights, there are collective actions to achieve socio-tourism economic equality [10]. So, if it is placed to one line, the political system of social democracy exists between liberal democracy and totalitarian democracy, although it is closer to liberal democracy. In terms of tourism economic progress, initially countries that followed liberal democracies, namely countries in North America and Western Europe, were more advanced than countries that followed totalitarian democracies, namely countries in Eastern Europe and Asia such as China [11]. But lately the dichotomy seems to be no longer valid with China's tourism economic progress which is spectacular.

Strong state control in China over political life can go hand in hand with tourism economic liberalization, which is even capable of spurring impressive tourism economic growth [12]. The Chinese phenomenon can invalidate the thesis that tourism economic growth and progress requires political democracy as liberal democracy. China is able to tread the path to prosperity by taking its own path, the "Chinese model democracy".

Perhaps the Chinese model that has succeeded in achieving tourism economic [13] progress and prosperity can be used as a lesson by Indonesia, which has also tried to develop its own model.

Indonesia, has a democracy model of "Pancasila", a democracy with Indonesian characteristics that are not classified into the aforementioned types of democracy. During the "Old Order" era of Indonesia, especially since the Presidential Decree of 5 July 1959, "Pancasila" democracy was interpreted and practiced as "guided democracy" which was said to be a democracy that carried the character of the nation. What was called "guided democracy" during Indonesia's "Old Order", was actually a totalitarian democracy, where power was centrally in the hands of the president. Those who differed from politics with the government were considered opponents and were imprisoned. The guided "Pancasila" democracy model in the "Old Order" style did not survive. It was preceded by an tourism economic collapse with inflation reaching 600% and a shortage of basic goods.

During Indonesia's "New Order" era, the interpretation of "Pancasila democracy" was also monopolized by the state by the ruling government. The pendulum of power is in the hands of the state. Indeed the general elections are held, but the regional elections are held by the government to legitimize power [14]. Those with different political views are considered enemies: anti-Pancasila, anti-development. So, nothing more than totalitarian democracy. Only when the government needs the participation and support of the people does the government give democracy life. For example, when the decreased of funds government source that originating from petroleum, the government needed development financing sources from the private sector and people's support, so deregulation and debureaucratization was carried out since the early 1980s. In order to attract popular support and private sector participation, the faucet of democracy was opened a little. People's participation in the form of criticism through the media can be tolerated as long as it is seen as not disturbing Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and development. If these three things are disturbed, criticism will be silenced. The "New Order" government was still too strong, if there was democracy, the existing democratic life would only be a manifestation of the government's "compassion" trickling down. The government only lends democracy to the people, since democratic life lent to the people does not interfere with the interests of the government. This democracy can be withdrawn at any time, if the government considers that it is being used inappropriately, according to government criteria [15]. The withdrawal of the people's right to participate cannot be prevented, because the existing social forces are still too weak to compete with the power of the government.

The Asian tourism economic crisis that reached Indonesia in 1997 devastated Indonesia's "New Order" regime, and the "New Order" model of "Pancasila" democracy practiced by the regime in power for 32 years did not appeal to the reform regime that replaced the "New Order" [16].

Regional head direct election implemented by the reform regime. Indonesia today, is more influenced by liberal democracy, at least procedurally. This means that individual procedures are given the right and freedom to elect the regional head, each individual has equal voting rights, and sovereignty is in the hands of the majority.

However, in political practice, the implementation of Regional head election does not fully give political rights to the people in determining their choice. There is still the behavior of the political elite who intimidate and force the people to elect certain candidates. In various cases of Regional head election, Civil Government (PNS) who are classified as educated people face a completely wrong dilemma: supporting certain candidates is wrong, not supporting is wrong, even being neutral is wrong. Although Civil Government (PNS) should be neutral, if they are neutral there are also risks. After the Regional head election, whoever wins often considers Civil Government (PNS) that neutral do not "sweat" to contribute to victory, so they do not get priority in occupying office. Civil Government (PNS) confusion in the Regional head election is caused by the behavior of dominant elites who are often more concerned with groups rather than applying the merit system in placing people in positions. If Civil Government (PNS) who are classified as educated people face a dilemma in the Regional head election, then what will happen to the common people? There are indications that in areas where general facilities have been damaged for years, the majority of the population are not supporters of the ruling political elite.

Thus, do Regional head direct election strengthen democracy? If the aim of every government is to manifest the welfare and prosperity of the people, is it not possible to adopt Indonesian-style democracy to manifest the welfare and prosperity of the Indonesian people, as China has succeeded in pursuing the "Chinese way" to achieve its prosperity?

4. Contestation of Tourism economic Power

The political costs of in Indonesia that are borne by regional head candidates are relatively high compared to the salaries received by regional heads during their five-year term of office. According to the Director of the Lampung Institute for Strategy and Policy Studies (Pussbik), the costs incurred by a candidate for the level of regional head election at the district / city are estimated at Rp. 10 billion to Rp. 30 billion, while for the gubernatorial election maybe around Rp. 50 billion to Rp. 100 billion. After being elected as a regional head, apart from receiving allowances and others, the salary he received was around Rp. 7 million to Rp. 15 million per month. So, even if elected, they may not be able to return the investment that has been issued with the salary earned during their tenure.

Considering the huge political costs incurred by a regional head candidate in the Regional head election, the regional head candidate must have assets as tourism economic power to cover the expenses.

In the Regional head election of Buleleng District, candidate pairs had assets that were fantastic compared to the average assets of the population of Buleleng District. The assets of the candidate pairs in Regional head election of Buleleng District are presented in table 2.

Table 2
Assets of Candidate Pairs in Buleleng's Regional Head election

| No | Name of Candidate Pairs | Assets | Debt |
|----|--------------------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| 1 | Gede Ariadi, S.Kom., MBA | Rp. 5.765.000.000,- | Rp. 1.224.600.000,- |
| | I Wayan Arta, SH | Rp. 899.721.027,- | |
| 2 | Tutik Kusuma Wardani, SE., M.Kes. | Rp. 3.208.857.000,- | |
| | I Komang Nova Sewi Putra, SE | Rp. | |

| | | | |
|---|------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| | | 5.290.179.598,- | |
| 3 | Putu Agus Suradnyana, ST | Rp. 43.535.647.406,- | Rp. 4.000.000.000,- |
| | dr. Nyoman Sutjidra, Sp.OG. | Rp. 3.073.676.078,- USD 116.452,- | Rp. 134.450.000,- |
| 4 | Drs. I Wayan Gede Wenten Suparlan | Rp. 12.403.393.213,- | |
| | Drs. Ida Bagus Djodhi, MM., C.D.R. | Rp. 28.652.500.000,- | |

Looking at the data in table 2, it can be seen how significant the wealth of regional head candidates and vice of regional head is when compared to the per capita income of the population of Buleleng District. At the end of 2010 the per capita income of the population of Buleleng District was only Rp. 12,084,500. This means that a resident of Buleleng district who has an average income, if all of his income is saved, it will take more than 3000 years to match the assets of the Regional head candidate of the Buleleng district with the highest assets and it will take more than 240 years to match the assets of the prospective regional head with lowest treasure. Even though the life expectancy of Indonesian people is currently only 70 years.

It appears that the Regional head election is a contestation of tourism economic [16] to obtain to gain power as regional head. Thus, if there is no change in the Regional head election system, for example limiting the political costs incurred by regional head candidates, it is almost impossible for ordinary people with average income [17] to become regional head candidate. In a democracy like this power will be held from generation to generation by strong capital owners through a contestation of tourism economic [18] power in General election that involve the people to vote. So what is the difference with feudal countries where power is hereditary held by aristocrats on the basis of heredity?

5. Voters Choice

Voters have chosen the candidate pairs that are nominated by political parties in the Regional head election of Buleleng district. The Regional head election took place safely, even among the safest General elections that have occurred in the history of Buleleng politics. The votes acquired by each pair of candidates are presented in table 3.

Table 3
Legitimate Vote Acquisition of the Candidate Pairs of Regional Head and Vice Regional Head election of Buleleng District

| No | Name of Candidate Pairs | The acquisition of valid voting | Percentage of valid voting |
|-------|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | Gede Ariadi, S.Kom., MBA I Wayan Arta, SH | 77,440 | 22,72 |
| 2 | Tutik Kusuma Wardani, SE., M.Kes. I Komang Nova Sewi Putra, SE | 73,663 | 21,61 |
| 3 | Putu Agus Suradnyana, ST Dr. Nyoman Sutjidra, Sp.OG. | 186,814 | 54,80 |
| 4 | Drs. I Wayan Gede Wenten Suparlan Drs. Ida Bagus Djodhi, MM., C.D.R. | 2,979 | 0,87 |
| Total | | 340,896 | 100 |

Source: Regional General Election Commission (KPUD) Buleleng district

Observing the data on the vote acquisition of candidate pairs presented in table 3, there are significant questions related to the votes acquired by candidate pairs number 1 to serial number 3. First, why candidate pair number 1 only received 22.72% votes, much lower than the legislative percentage. in District Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) the joint supporting parties? Second, why the candidate pair number 2 was able to gain 21.61% of votes exceeding the percentage of the legislative in District Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) of the supporting party? Third, why the candidate pair number 3 was able to get the highest vote of 54.80%, far beyond the percentage of the legislative in District Regional House of People's Representatives (DPRD) of the supporting party?

The answers to these questions can be based on the expectations of the voters, the genealogy of the pairs of candidates, the way the pairs of candidates approach the voters, and the performance of the local government that is currently in charge of fulfilling the people's welfare. First, candidate pair number 1 carried the slogan "continue" during the campaign. This is inseparable from the position of candidate number 1 as the "Crown Prince", the son of the currently ruling Regent. Meanwhile, on the other hand, the voters want change. They are not satisfied with the performance of local governments in tourism economic development and do not like the ways that the regent transfers officials in the bureaucracy who are seen as disloyal to supporting "the Crown Prince". The support from the joint party supporting the candidate pair becomes insignificant, because in this case the voters who are sympathizers of the supporting parties do not place loyalty to the party, especially since the regional head candidate is not a cadre of the supporting party.

Second, the candidate pair number 2 is able to gain a percentage of votes that exceeds the percentage of the legislative party supporting it, because in addition to the loyalty of the party supporters, the candidate for regional head number 2 is the cadre of the supporting party who is diligently involved in the community [19] providing medical assistance along with the hospital he has had for a long time before becoming a regional head candidate. Thus, the voters society, at least those who have experienced its assistance, whether they are party sympathizers or not, see an opportunity to gain welfare if this pair is elected to be regional head and vice regional head. Although in the end this candidate did not get enough votes to win the competition.

Third, pair number 3 is able to gain the highest votes far beyond the percentage of the party's legislative bearers, because in addition to being promoted by the winning election party in the district, this regional head candidate number 3 as a party cadre has three-term political experience as a legislative member in the province, representing the supporting party. This regional head candidate number 3 is also diligent in working with the society with his tourism economic ability to provide assistance to the society [20]. As a politician, he promised and admitted that he would be able to lobby the center to bring central funds to Buleleng. As an entrepreneur [21], he promised and admitted that he would be able to attract investors to invest in Buleleng if he was elected as regional head. He also promised to concentrate as a regional head and relinquish his positions in the companies he owns.

Thus the voters have cast their votes for the pair of candidates who according to their judgment will be able to fulfill their interests [22]. If then the elected leader does not fulfill the people's interests, then the voters will use their voting rights to "punish" such leaders by not voting for him in the next General Election or Regional head election. The Regional head election only provides an opportunity [23] for voters to exercise their right to vote and submit their interests every five years. But democracy should provide opportunities for the people to present their ideas and interests at any time.

6. Political Promises of Candidate Pairs and Their Meanings

All pairs of candidates convey political promises through their vision and mission to get votes. All candidate pairs also promised to build Buleleng to realize people's welfare.

Candidate pair number 1 promised to build Buleleng to realize people's welfare with the slogan, "Continue". What is meant is that if this pair is elected it will continue the "success" of the previous regent.

Candidate pair number 2 also promised to build Buleleng to realize people's welfare. Because the regional head candidate number 2 is a woman, it will give extra attention to women. The

motto conveyed in Balinese by his supporters is, "Pang taen ngelah bupati luh" (I once had a female regent).

Candidate pair number 3 promises to realize people's welfare, build Buleleng with togetherness through communication, coordination and openness. The motto is, "Invite Lan Duenang Titiang Ngewangun Buleleng" (Invite and make me part of you in building Buleleng).

Candidate pair number 4 also promised to create people's welfare by building a better Buleleng. But the campaign for candidate pair number 4 was not as intense as the campaigns of the other candidate pairs.

Seen from the perspective of the symbolic interactionism theory of political promises [24], the slogans and campaign slogans of the candidate pairs are meaningful symbols. Candidates may hope that voters will respond to what is promised. However, voters may not respond according to the expectations of the promising candidate pair [25]. The actions or actions taken by voters are determined by their interactions with symbols (promises, slogans and slogans). Voters give meaning, interpret the symbols and then act on the basis of that meaning. If the voters interpret the promise as positive, true, or capable of being carried out by the one who promised, then the voter's response to the promise will be positive [26]. On the other hand, if the voters interpret the promise as untrue, dishonest, and will not be able to be fulfilled, then the voters will respond negatively [22]. That's why people need to be careful about making promises.

If it is assumed that voter choices are influenced by political promises and campaign slogans, in addition to other variables, namely the bearer party and others [27], it means that voters interpret the promises and campaign slogans of candidate pair number 3 positively. So that voters vote for candidate pair number 3. Textually the campaign slogan, "Invite Lan Duenang Titiang Ngewangun Buleleng" (Invite and make me a part of you in building Buleleng), is a humble expression. The pair of candidates who appealed to the voters [28]. The voters who are sovereign in building Buleleng, not the candidate pairs. How humble that expression would be, if it was actually carried out [29]. Because of that, the voters may have made their choice of candidate pair number 3. The voters want sovereignty, want to determine the direction of Buleleng's development to realize its welfare.

For candidate pair number 3 who came out as winners of Regional head election, the campaign promises and slogans that have been responded positively by voters should be interpreted as responsibilities that must be fulfilled. If that promise is broken, then it is true that Anthropologist Bawa Atmadja's statement on various political discussions in Singaraja was that in politics in Indonesia the people are only used as begesting boards (molded boards and concrete supports) when constructing buildings. After the building stands, the begging board is removed. If the voters are only used as a buffer for the power building during the General Election, and after the Regional head election the people are not paid attention to, the people will find their own way to "punish" such leaders.

7. CONCLUSION

Regional head direct election in Buleleng has provided wide opportunities for voters to elect their regional head and vice regional head with four pairs of candidates to be elected. Regional head direct election does not in itself strengthen democracy. Voters also need more than just democracy in Regional head election. They need welfare and their interests are heard, not only during General elections. Taking into account the wealth of candidate pairs, the Regional head election of Buleleng district is a contestation of tourism economic power to gain power as regional head. It is impossible for ordinary people in Buleleng district to compete as candidate pairs in the Regional head election, because of high political costs. Voters have cast votes to the pair of candidates who in their judgment are best able to meet their needs and are ready to accommodate their aspirations.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Muhammad, A. A. The Transitional Democracy Trap: Democracy, Complexity, and Local Oligarchy in Bali. In *Security, Democracy, and Society in Bali* (pp. 155-175). Palgrave Macmillan, Singapore.

- [2]. Bandiyah, B., & Ginting, R. T. (2020). The Response of Balinese Society on 2019 Indonesian Simultaneous Elections. *Politik Indonesia: Indonesian Political Science Review*, 5(1).
- [3]. Apriani, K. D., & Raffiudin, R. (2019). Gender Stereotype and the Voting Behavior of the Balinese Society in the 2014 Legislative Election. *Politeia: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 11(1), 49-59.
- [4]. Pinatih, I. A. D. S., Joniarta, I. W., & Dewi, N. L. Y. (2019, November). Accountability of Bali Regional Officers in Applying Good Governance Principles. In *Iapa Proceedings Conference* (pp. 378-386).
- [5]. Rahayu, L. R., Lesmana, P. S. W., & Sulandari, S. (2019, December). Factors Influencing The Election Of Female Candidates For Legislative Councils In Bali In 2019. In *International Conference on Law and Social Sciences and Education* (Vol. 1, No. 1, pp. 186-193).
- [6]. Dharma, F., Syakhroza, A., & Martani, D. (2019). Effects of Educational Performance, Political Competition and Regional Financial Capacity on the Incumbents' Votes in Indonesian Local Elections (A hierarchical regression analysis).
- [7]. Xu, H., Wang, K., & Song, Y. M. (2020). Chinese outbound tourism and soft power. *Journal of Policy Research in Tourism, Leisure and Events*, 12(1), 34-49.
- [8]. Gorbuntsova, T., Dobson, S., & Palmer, N. (2019). Diverse geographies of power and spatial production: Tourism industry development in the Yamal Peninsula, Northern Siberia. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 76, 67-79.
- [9]. Balderas-Cejudo, A., Patterson, I., & Leeson, G. W. (2019). Senior Foodies: A developing niche market in gastronomic tourism. *International Journal of Gastronomy and Food Science*, 16, 100152.
- [10]. Gillen, J., & Mostafanezhad, M. (2019). Geopolitical encounters of tourism: A conceptual approach. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 75, 70-78.
- [11]. Akadiri, S. S., Alola, A. A., & Uzuner, G. (2020). Economic policy uncertainty and tourism: evidence from the heterogeneous panel. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(20), 2507-2514.
- [12]. Chon, K., Park, E., & Zoltan, J. (2020). The Asian paradigm in hospitality and tourism. *Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Research*, 44(8), 1183-1202.
- [13]. Bosak, K., & McCool, S. F. (2019). Tourism and Sustainability: Transforming Global Value Chains to Networks. In *Sustainable Global Value Chains* (pp. 585-595). Springer, Cham.
- [14]. Akadiri, S. S., & Akadiri, A. C. (2019). Examining the causal relationship between tourism, exchange rate, and economic growth in tourism island states: evidence from second-generation panel. *International Journal of Hospitality & Tourism Administration*, 1-16.
- [15]. Ali, H., Limakrisna, N., & Jamaluddin, S. (2016). Model of customer satisfaction: The empirical study at Bri in Jambi. *International Journal of Applied Business and Economic Research*.
- [16]. Işık, C., Sirakaya-Turk, E., & Ongan, S. (2020). Testing the efficacy of the economic policy uncertainty index on tourism demand in USMCA: Theory and evidence. *Tourism Economics*, 26(8), 1344-1357.
- [17]. Maseleno, A., Huda, M., Jasmi, K. A., Basiron, B., Mustari, I., Don, A. G., & bin Ahmad, R. (2019). Hau-Kashyap approach for student's level of expertise. *Egyptian Informatics Journal*, 20(1), 27-32.
- [18]. Cheng, L., & Zhang, J. (2020). Is tourism development a catalyst of economic recovery following natural disaster? An analysis of economic resilience and spatial variability. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 1-22.
- [19]. Cornelisse, M. (2020). Peru case study: power relations in community-based tourism. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 18(4), 437-454.
- [20]. Akadiri, S. S., Lasisi, T. T., Uzuner, G., & Akadiri, A. C. (2020). Examining the causal impacts of tourism, globalization, economic growth and carbon emissions in tourism island territories: bootstrap panel Granger causality analysis. *Current Issues in Tourism*, 23(4), 470-484.
- [21]. Santamaria, D., & Filis, G. (2019). Tourism demand and economic growth in Spain: New insights based on the yield curve. *Tourism Management*, 75, 447-459.
- [22]. Pemayun, A. G. P., & Suderana, I. W. (2019). Shifting social and economic structural community: rapid development of tourism sector. *International journal of social sciences and humanities*, 3(1), 115-124.

- [23]. Khan, A., Bibi, S., Ardito, L., Lyu, J., Hayat, H., & Arif, A. M. (2020). Revisiting the Dynamics of Tourism, Economic Growth, and Environmental Pollutants in the Emerging Economies—Sustainable Tourism Policy Implications. *Sustainability*, 12(6), 2533.
- [24]. Ferreira, F. A., Castro, C., & Gomes, A. S. (2020, October). Positive and Negative Social-Cultural, Economic and Environmental Impacts of Tourism on Residents. In *International Conference on Tourism, Technology and Systems* (pp. 288-298). Springer, Singapore.
- [25]. Khalid, U., Okafor, L. E., & Shafiullah, M. (2020). The effects of economic and financial crises on international tourist flows: a cross-country analysis. *Journal of Travel Research*, 59(2), 315-334.
- [26]. Wijijayanti, T., Agustina, Y., Winarno, A., Istanti, L. N., & Dharma, B. A. (2020). Rural Tourism: A Local Economic Development. *Australasian Accounting, Business and Finance Journal*, 14(1), 5-13.
- [27]. Amalia R, Gunawan A. 2020. Transfer Pricing and Mangerial Ownership Against Tax Avoidance in Manufacture Companies on The Indonesia Stock Exchange. Proc 3rd IntConfAdvSciInnov. doi: 10.4108/eai.20-6-2020.2300633.
- [28]. Maya S, Noermijati N, Rofiaty R, Rofiq A. 2020. The Resilience of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises towards Economic Turbulansi: Is Entrepreneur Orientation a Determinant? (Literature Review Based on Intelligent Software). Proc 3rd IntConfAdvSciInnov. doi: 10.4108/eai.20-6-2020.2300707.
- [29]. Indrasari M, Riyadi S, Purnomo BR. 2019. Implementation of empowerment program for person with disability in indonesia. *J Adv Res Dyn Control Syst* 11(7):298–303.