THE CRIMINAL LIABILITY OF UNREGISTERED CAMPAIGN TEAMS FOR ELECTORAL VIOLATIONS: MONEY POLITICS AND CAMPAIGNS IN PLACES OF WORSHIP

Maulana Bungaran[1], Agus Surono[2], Tubagus Achmad Doradjat[3]
[1]*Universitas Pancasila, Indonesia*
[2]*Rajamangala University of Technology Krungthep, Thailand*
Email : [1]5224230010@univpancasila.ac.id, [2]agussurono@univpancasila.ac.id, [3]bagus2m@gmail.com

Keywords:

First keyword: Campaign team
Second keyword: Money politics
Third keyword: Campaign in places of worship
Fourth keyword: Criminal liability
Fifth keyword: Election Law / General Elections

Article History:

Received: xxxxx
Accepted: xxxxx
Published: xxxxx

ABSTRACT

Elections in Indonesia, as a means of democracy, face serious challenges such as money politics and campaigns in places of worship, which violate ethics and weaken democratic principles. Both are prohibited in the Election Law, but legal loopholes remain for unregistered campaign teams who cannot be held criminally liable. This study uses a normative juridical method with secondary data and qualitative analysis. The results show: first, unclear regulations in the Election Law create legal loopholes that allow violations; second, law enforcement faces obstacles in proof, coordination, and the legal status of perpetrators; third, clearer regulations and stronger supervision are required to ensure fair and democratic elections.

This is an open access article under the CC BY-SA license.

1. INTRODUCTION

General elections (elections) in Indonesia are one of the main instruments in realizing the principles of people's sovereignty and democracy which are carried out based on the principles of direct, public, free, secret, honest, and fair in accordance with the constitution and Law No. 7 of 2017

concerning General Elections (Election Law). General elections are an activity that cannot be avoided in a country that adheres to a democratic system[1]. In terms of the idea of democracy being interpreted as a power that comes *"from the people"*, *"by the people"*, *and "for the people"*, then the holding of democratic elections is an important condition in the management of a country[2]. In the current Indonesian context, elections are intended to elect members of the House of Representatives (DPR), members of the Regional Representative Council (DPD), President and Vice President, and to elect members of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD). Elections are not only an electoral procedure, but also a means of legitimacy of power and space for the people to determine the direction of government for the sake of common prosperity[3]. Elections are a parameter in measuring the democracy of a country, even democracy is simply likened to a system that is chosen through fair, honest and periodic elections[4].

Regarding this money politics, it actually happens in almost all countries. The United States is even as a *champion* of democracy. Money politics is a reality that is hard to avoid[5]. When the United States (US) Presidential Election was held in 2016, a law professor at *Harvard Law School* named Andrian Vermeule even called the US Presidential Election a "Dollartocracy".[6]

In practice, elections in Indonesia face major challenges, such as money politics and campaigns in places of worship, which not only violate ethics but also the law, and erode the basic principles of democracy. Money politics often turns the relationship between voters and election participants into transactional. According to Cindy L. Cohn, money politics is a practice that creates inequality in elections, where the rich can buy votes and influence the outcome of elections.[7] Money politics undermines the basic principles of

[1] Moh. Mahfud MD, Legal Politics in Indonesia, Rajawali Press, Jakarta, 2017, p. 368
[2] Respationo, H.S. (2013). Election of regional heads in electoral democracy. Legal Issues, 42(3), 356-361.
[3] Wicipto Setiadi, "The Role of Political Parties in the Implementation of Aspirational and Democratic Elections", *Indonesian Legislative Journal*, Vol. 5, No. 1, 2008, pp. 29-39.
[4] Tjahjo Kumolo, Legal Politics of the Simultaneous Regional Elections, PT. Mizan Publika, Bandung, 2015, p. 155
[5] Madjid, N. V., & Triati, T. (2024). The judge's consideration in the criminal verdict against the defendant for money politics in the general election. *Ekasakti Legal Science Journal*, *1*(3), 214–221.
[6] Artidjo Alkostar, Political Corruption in the Modern State, FH UII Press, Yogyakarta, 2008, p. 2
[7] Cindy L. Cohn, "Money in Politics and Democratic Integrity", *Journal of Democracy*, 25(3), 2014, hlm. 42.

democracy by turning elections into economic transactions, which no longer focus on the quality of candidates or ideologies, but on the purchasing power of election participants. In various countries including Indonesia, this practice of money politics, although prohibited by law is often difficult to avoid and eliminate completely, given the enormous influence of money in politics that is sometimes difficult to monitor or prove. The buying and selling of votes in the General Election (Election), which is commonly referred to as *"money politics"* or transactional politics, is an invisible obstacle, as well as visible to the naked eye, that candidates, official success teams, and shadow success teams have led Indonesia into ethically undignified democratic practices[8].

Meanwhile, campaigns in places of worship instrumentalize sacred spaces for political purposes. Campaigning in places of worship is the practice of using places of worship as locations for political activities, which is contrary to the principle of neutrality of places of worship. According to Basyuni, using places of worship for political campaigns is a violation of the basic principles of elections which require places of worship to remain neutral and avoid political interests. This practice can lead to religious-based social polarization and threaten the integrity of elections by mixing political activities with religious activities.[9] On the other hand, the Election Law does not provide a firm definition of what is meant by *"places of worship"*, resulting in legal uncertainty in the implementation of the ban on campaigning in places of worship. Therefore, it is necessary to strengthen regulations, increase legal education to the public, and actively involve religious leaders in maintaining the neutrality of places of worship, so as to prevent the recurrence of abuse of places of worship as a space for[10] campaigning. In essence, this legal uncertainty stems from the contradiction between the content of Article 280 paragraph (1) letter h which talks about the use of government facilities, places of worship, and educational places with an explanation that is too ambiguous. The existence of this ambiguity provides an opening for the abuse of power, especially by parties with strong

[8] Hamson, Z. (2021). Money politics in Indonesian elections: An overview. *Journal of Communication Sciences*, *4*(1), 36–44.

[9] Basyuni, M., "Campaign Violations in Places of Worship in Elections: Juridical Studies and Indonesian Legal Perspectives", *Journal of Law and Democracy*, 15(2), 2020, p. 133.

[10] Theresia Katarina, Annisa Fitria, "Abuse of Places of Worship Used as Means of General Election Campaign (Case Study: Decision Number 201/Pid. Sus/2019/PN Pso)", *JCA of Law*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2022, pp. 131-140.

political positions or power, such as incumbents who plan to run for re-election using government facilities without violating campaign rules[11].

These two things, namely money politics and campaigns in places of worship threaten the integrity of elections and the quality of democracy which in the Election Law has been strictly prohibited and also regulated by criminal sanctions for the perpetrators, including election participants, political parties, and even campaign teams involved. In the explanation of Article 269 paragraph (4) of the Election Law, a campaign team is a team formed by a pair of candidates together with a political party or a combination of political parties that are tasked with assisting in the implementation of the campaign and are responsible for the technical implementation of the campaign. The Election Law explicitly states that members of the campaign team are registered with the General Election Commission (KPU) as the election organizing institution in Indonesia.

At this point, legal problems arise because often money politics and campaign violations in places of worship are carried out by campaign teams that are not registered with the election organizers. In fact, they are essentially campaign teams that work for and win candidates, political parties, or combinations of certain political parties. In Indonesia, the Election Law can only reach every violation committed by the campaign team, which is literally the campaign team that has been registered with the election organizer, namely the KPU. The Election Law has not regulated prohibitions and criminal liability for campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers who are suspected or proven to have committed violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship. This creates a legal loophole: campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers can commit violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship without getting sanctioned because of the difficulty of proving that the person concerned is really a member of the campaign team. Often the proof of the truth as a member of the campaign team is only based on checking the names that have been registered with the election organizers. Therefore, any violation committed by every person whose name is not listed in the list of campaign team members who have been registered with the election

[11] Muhsonati, D. (2024). The campaign at Islamic boarding schools is based on the Constitutional Court Decision Number 65/PUU-XXI/2023 from the perspective of siyasah dusturiyah. *ALBALAD: Journal of Constitutional Law*, *5*(3).

organizer, is easily considered as not part of the campaign team. In the end, the benefits that have been obtained from the violation of money politics and campaigns in places of worship do not extend to law enforcement efforts and the imposition of criminal sanctions.

Based on the above background, several problems can be raised as follows:

1. What are the criminal arrangements for campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers who engage in money politics and campaign violations in places of worship in Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections?
2. What are the legal and procedural obstacles in law enforcement against money politics and campaigns in places of worship carried out by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers?
3. How is the criminal law applied to unregistered campaign teams in election organizers who conduct money politics and campaigns in places of worship, to ensure fair and democratic elections?

The research objectives in writing articles according to the title above include the following:

1. To review and analyze criminal arrangements against campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers who carry out money politics and campaign violations in places of worship in Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections.
2. To identify legal and procedural obstacles in law enforcement against money politics and campaigns in places of worship carried out by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers.
3. To review and analyze the application of criminal law against unregistered campaign teams in election organizers who conduct money politics and campaigns in places of worship, to ensure fair and democratic elections.

This research uses a normative legal approach, which is a research method that focuses on the study of existing legal norms and legal principles. This approach examines legal issues by referring to secondary data, which includes primary, secondary, and tertiary legal materials. Primary legal materials include the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, relevant laws and regulations, as well as government regulations and other regulations

related to the topic of this article. Meanwhile, secondary legal materials consist of doctrines, expert opinions, and research results published in scientific journals. Data obtained from these secondary sources, including scientific journals and other sources, will be analyzed using a qualitative analysis approach.

2. DISCUSSION

A. Criminal Arrangements Against Unregistered Campaign Teams to Election Organizers Who Engage in Money Politics and Campaign Violations in Places of Worship in Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections

Law No. 7 of 2017 concerning General Elections (Election Law) regulates the implementation of elections in Indonesia with basic principles that guarantee justice, freedom, and confidentiality of voters. In this context, elections must be conducted fairly and free from practices that undermine the integrity of elections, such as money politics and campaigns in places of worship. These two violations not only hurt the principles of democracy, but also violated the provisions stipulated in the Election Law. Like other laws, the Election Law also contains criminal regulations for violations that occur.

Criminal is a punishment or sanction given by the state to individuals who violate the law or commit acts that are considered criminal acts. The main purpose of criminal justice is to provide a deterrent effect to the perpetrators, uphold justice for the community, and prevent future violations of the law. Criminal penalties can take many forms, such as imprisonment, fines, or other forms of punishment, which are determined according to the type of offense committed. Criminal acts themselves refer to acts that are prohibited by law and can be subject to criminal sanctions. Likewise, violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship are correlated with election criminal provisions.

The problem of money politics in Indonesia is actually not new. History records that the best election actually only happened once in this country, namely in 1955. It is said that this is because at that time the election was held in a very democratic, honest and fair atmosphere and did not know money politics. At that time, the parties participating in the election fought fairly and objectively by not relying on money and power alone, but risking the idea of

Indonesianness and[12]money politics as a practice of giving money or other materials with the aim of influencing voters not to exercise their voting rights or vote for certain candidates or to use their voting rights in a certain way so that their ballots are invalid, which is a form of violation that is expressly prohibited in the Election Law. Money politics creates inequities in elections, where candidates with more funds can buy votes and influence election results. Therefore, the prevention of the practice of money politics is the task of the Bawaslu, Provincial Bawaslu, Regency/City Bawaslu, District Panwaslu, Kelurahan/Village Panwaslu, and Foreign Panwaslu.

The regulation of money political practices in the Election Law uses several terminologies such as *"promising or giving rewards"* and "*promising or giving money or other materials"*. The Election Law has provided limits and the explanation that what is meant by *"promising or giving*" is that the initiative comes from the implementer and the election campaign team who promise and give to influence voters.

In the context of election criminal regulation, violations of money political practices are regulated in the provisions of Article 515 and Article 523 of the Election Law with the legal subject of every person, each implementer, participant, and/or election campaign team. More specifically, the provisions of Article 523 contain criminal provisions with the legal subject of the election campaign team who deliberately promise or give money or other materials in return to election campaign participants and voters either directly or indirectly, or to voters not to exercise their voting rights or vote for certain election participants. Thus, the current criminal regulation in the Election Law has not reached the legal subject of campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers who are strongly suspected of having carried out money politics practices for the benefit of certain candidates, political parties, or combinations of political parties in order to escape the snares of imposing election criminal provisions.

The only election criminal provisions that can be imposed on violations of money political practices committed by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers are election criminal provisions stipulated in Article 515 of the Election Law, which reads:

[12] Ellis, A. (2016). Indonesia: Continuity, agreement and consensus. In A. Reynolds, B. Reilly, & A. Ellis (Eds.), *Electoral system design: An international new handbook of IDEA* (p. 77). Stockholm Press.

> *"Any person who deliberately at the time of voting promises or gives money or other materials to voters not to exercise their right to vote or vote for certain election participants or to use their voting rights in a certain way so that their ballots are invalid, shall be sentenced to imprisonment for a maximum of 3 (three) years and a maximum fine of Rp36,000,000.00 (thirty-six million rupiah)."*

Campaign teams that are not registered with the election organizer may be subject to the provisions of Article 515 of the Election Law which contains the nomenclature of each person (*natuurlijk persoon*) deliberately at the time of voting promising or giving money or other materials even though the members of the campaign team act on the orders and initiatives of other parties.

Furthermore, the practice of campaigning in places of worship involves the use of places of worship for political purposes which is also prohibited in the Election Law, precisely in Article 280 paragraph (1) letter h which through the Constitutional Court Decision Number 65/PUU-XXI/2023 reads: *Implementers, participants, and teams of the Election Campaign are prohibited: h. using government facilities, places of worship, and places of education, except for government facilities and places of education as long as they have permission from the The person in charge of the place in question and was present without the attributes of the election campaign.*

Places of worship, which are supposed to be neutral, should not be used for political purposes because they can trigger religious-based social polarization and undermine the integrity of elections. On the other hand, the unclear definition of "place of worship" in the Election Law has created difficulties in the application of the law to violations of this provision, resulting in legal uncertainty at the practical and judicial levels. This loophole can be used by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers to conduct covert campaigns in places of worship for the benefit of candidates, political parties, and certain political party combinations, especially if the administrators of the places of worship are sympathizers or affiliated with one of the candidates, political parties, or certain political party combinations.

For the events mentioned above, there is no election criminal provision that can be used against campaign teams that are not registered with election

organizers who violate the prohibition on campaigning in places of worship as stipulated in Article 280 paragraph (1) letter h of the Election Law. This is because the only election criminal provisions related to the prohibition in places of worship are only regulated in the provisions of Article 521, which reads:

> *Any implementer, participant, and/or Election Campaign team who deliberately violates the prohibition on the implementation of the Election Campaign as referred to in Article 280 paragraph (1) letter a, b, c, letter d, letter e, letter f, letter g, letter h, letter i, or letter j shall be sentenced to imprisonment for a maximum of 2 (two) years and a maximum fine of Rp24,000,000, 00 (twenty-four million rupiah).*

Based on this nomenclature, it is known that the sanction of criminal provisions for every violation that conducts a campaign in a place of worship (Article 280 paragraph (1) letter h) can only be specifically and limited to the implementer, participant, and/or election campaign team. Thus, there is a legal vacuum, namely that everyone, including the campaign team who is not registered with the election organizer who commits campaign violations in places of worship, cannot be subject to criminal arrangements as referred to in Article 521 of the Election Law.

This is certainly different from money politics violations committed by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers which are still possible to be subject to criminal provisions according to Article 515 of the Election Law, while campaign violations in places of worship committed by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers do not have criminal regulations.

As a result of this ambiguity, unregistered campaign teams can easily engage in campaign practices in places of worship and money politics without the imposition of criminal sanctions. This creates a legal loophole that limits the effectiveness of election law enforcement, especially in terms of criminal liability for unregistered campaign teams of election organizers involved in violations that undermine election integrity. Therefore, there needs to be a stricter and clearer regulation that regulates criminal liability for campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers who are involved in money politics and campaigns in places of worship.

B. Legal and Procedural Obstacles in Law Enforcement against Money Politics and Campaigns in Places of Worship Carried Out by Campaign Teams That Are Not Registered with Election Organizers

Law enforcement against the practice of money politics and campaign activities in places of worship carried out by campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers faces a number of obstacles, both in terms of regulations and implementation procedures. Law enforcement should be seen as a dynamic activity, aimed at realizing the values of substantive justice in the real life of society.[13] According to Lawrence M. Friedman, the success of law enforcement is largely determined by the synergy between legal *substance*, legal *structure*, and legal *culture*. Inequality in any of the three elements will hinder the effectiveness of the legal system as a whole.[14] Meanwhile, according to Soerjono Soekanto, the success of law enforcement depends on five factors, namely the law itself, law enforcement, facilities or facilities, society, and culture.[15]

Normatively, the Election Law has regulated prohibitions and sanctions related to violations of these two things. However, its implementation often does not run optimally due to limitations in legal definitions, evidence, and coordination between election law enforcement agencies.

First, the unclear legal status of the perpetrator. One of the main challenges in law enforcement against money politics and campaigns in places of worship is the legal status of the perpetrator. For the definition of a campaign team, it is regulated in the explanation of Article 269 paragraph (4), where what is meant by *"campaign team"* is a team formed by the Candidate Pair together with a Political Party or Coalition of Political Parties who are tasked with assisting in the implementation of the campaign and responsible for the technical implementation of the campaign[16]. Campaign teams that are not registered with the election organizers have an ambiguous status in the context of election law. This "unregistered" status is often used to avoid legal

[13] Satjipto Rahardjo, *Law*, Bandung: PT. Citra Aditya Bakti, 2000, p. 24.
[14] Lawrence M Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1987, hlm. 15-20.
[15] Soerjono Soekanto, *Factors Influencing Law Enforcement*, Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada, 2008, pp. 5-7.
[16] Kartiwa, M. B., & Sari, A. K. (2022). Law enforcement against cases of campaign banning in places of worship (Case study of Cikarang District Court Decision No. 281/Pid.B/2019/PN.Ckr). *JCA of Law*, *3*(1), 26–29.

trapping, because the enforcement of election rules is generally directed to parties or individuals who have a formal position in the structure of the official campaign team registered with the KPU. This can be explicitly seen from the provisions of the election crime regulated in several articles, including Article 521 and Article 523 which use the phrase "election campaign team". As a result, acts of violation committed by unregistered campaign teams *(on some occasions also called outsiders or freelance volunteers)* are difficult to process directly through election law enforcement mechanisms because only campaign teams registered with election organizers can be sanctioned for election violations, including money politics practices and campaigns conducted in places of worship. In practice, perpetrators who are not formally registered as part of a campaign team are often not subject to legal sanctions despite engaging in activities that violate the provisions. This becomes a loophole used by informal campaign teams or unregistered volunteers to evade law enforcement. Election law enforcers such as the Election Supervisory Agency (Bawaslu) often find it difficult to touch perpetrators who do not have formal positions, even though their activities are clearly violating.

Second, the difficulty of proving it in places of worship. In addition to obstacles related to the legal status of the perpetrator, the problem of proof is also a significant obstacle. Places of worship have characteristics that tend to be more private, and there are usually concerns from witnesses to provide information related to the campaign activities that occur. This is exacerbated by the potential for social pressure or threats that can occur in the environment of the place of worship. In fact, this condition is further complicated by the limited time for handling election cases which are fast and strict, so that if evidence is not collected immediately, the case has the potential to be stopped. According to Article 521 of the Election Law, campaigns carried out in places of worship are a form of violation that can be subject to criminal sanctions. However, to be able to take action against these violations, strong enough evidence is needed, including witnesses who are willing to give valid testimony. In many cases, witnesses who are in places of worship tend to be reluctant to give testimony or not be present as witnesses in legal proceedings.[17] When evidence in the form of witnesses cannot be presented

[17] Imawan Sugiharto, "Reconstruction of Money Political Law Enforcement in the Election of Regional Heads Based on Progressive Law", *Journal of Law Reform*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2016, p. 109.

or verified, legal proceedings against campaigners in places of worship often have to be stopped.

Third, procedural challenges in law enforcement. On the procedural side, coordination between various election law enforcement agencies is also a big obstacle. Although the Integrated Law Enforcement Center (Gakkumdu Center) was established to deal with election violations in an integrated manner, challenges in coordination between Bawaslu, the police, and the prosecutor's office are still often encountered. Each of these institutions has differences in their interpretation of existing regulations, as well as how they view the evidence collected. For example, in dealing with alleged violations of money politics or campaigns in places of worship, Bawaslu may find strong enough evidence but have difficulty in obtaining approval from the police to continue the investigation process. Or conversely, the prosecutor's office may consider the existing evidence not strong enough to bring the case to court. In this case, ineffective coordination can lead to delays or even termination of legal proceedings, which worsens law enforcement efforts themselves.

Fourth, regulations are not adequate enough. Although the Election Law provides a clear legal framework for violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship, implementation on the ground is often hampered by a number of shortcomings in these regulations. For example, there is no clear definition of what a place of worship is. Another example is Article 521 of the Election Law which regulates the prohibition of campaigning in places of worship as referred to in Article 280 paragraph (1) letter h, but the regulation does not expressly regulate sanctions for campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers involved in campaigns in places of worship. This provides space for parties who are not officially registered as campaign teams to commit violations without fear of being entangled in the law.

1. Application of Criminal Law to Unregistered Campaign Teams to Election Organizers Who Conduct Money Politics and Campaigns in Places of Worship, to Ensure Fair and Democratic Elections

In order to keep elections fair and democratic, it is important to strictly enforce criminal law against campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers and engage in the practice of money politics and

campaigns in places of worship. The application of criminal law to such violations is very important to prevent abuse of power and ensure that all parties follow the rules that have been set by laws and regulations by paying attention to the following things:

First, money politics and campaigns in places of worship as violations. Money politics and campaigns in places of worship are two serious forms of violations that not only damage the integrity of elections, but also hurt the moral and social values of society. Campaigns conducted in places of worship, as stipulated in the Election Law, are clearly prohibited because they can affect voter freedom and create injustice in the electoral process. The same applies to the practice of money politics that can influence the outcome of elections in an illegal way and harm people's voting rights. According to Article 521 of the Election Law, deliberately campaigning in a place of worship can be subject to a maximum of 2 (two) years in prison and a maximum fine of Rp24,000,000.00 *(twenty-four million rupiah).* Likewise, money politics which is prohibited under Article 523 of the Election Law can be punished by imprisonment and fines, considering the adverse impact it has on the quality of democratic elections.

Second, the application of criminal law to campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers. One of the main problems that often occurs is the involvement of unofficially registered campaign teams in violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship. Based on the current Election Law, only campaign teams that are registered and recognized by election organizers have the authority to carry out campaign activities. However, in practice, many unregistered parties or volunteers are not listed in the official structure of the campaign, but are involved in these illegal activities. The application of criminal sanctions against those involved in offenses such as money politics and campaigns in places of worship is urgently needed. These sanctions are not only to provide a deterrent effect, but also to make it clear that anyone who violates election rules must be held accountable, including campaign teams who are not registered with election organizers.

Third, the importance of law enforcement for fair and democratic elections. To ensure fair and democratic elections, it is imperative for law enforcement officials to impose strict sanctions on violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship prohibited in the Election Law,

especially those involving campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers. Fair law enforcement not only affirms justice for all parties involved, but also protects voters' voting rights and prevents manipulation in the electoral process. The strict application of criminal law against campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers is expected to prevent the recurrence of violations that undermine the democratic process. In addition, it is also important to strengthen the supervisory system and increase public awareness and stakeholders about the importance of maintaining election integrity. Without fair elections, the democratic system will lose legitimacy because the election results do not reflect the will of the people as the principle of people's sovereignty based on Article 1 paragraph (2) of the 1945 Constitution that sovereignty is in the hands of the people and is implemented according to the Constitution. Fair and democratic elections, according to the 1945 Constitution, emphasize the basic principles that guarantee the right to vote every citizen without discrimination, pressure, or injustice. The election process must be carried out directly, publicly, freely, secretly, honestly, and fairly, as well as with strict supervision so that the election results truly reflect the will of the people. In addition, the 1945 Constitution also provides a legal basis for the election organizing institution, namely the KPU, to carry out its duties independently, transparently, and accountably for the achievement of elections with integrity.

3. CONCLUSION

Based on the description mentioned above, both from the background of the problem, the formulation of the problem to the discussion, it can be concluded as follows: First, that there is a lack of clarity in regulations and legal loopholes, namely the criminal regulation in the Election Law has not explicitly included campaign teams that are not registered with the election organizers, thus providing a gap for perpetrators to avoid criminal sanctions, especially in the case of money politics and campaigns in places of worship. Second, that there are obstacles to law enforcement in the form of violations of money politics and campaigns in places of worship are hit by the difficulty of proof, coordination between institutions, and the unclear legal status of the perpetrators, especially for campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers. Third, that clearer regulations and strengthening the

supervisory system are needed to ensure fair and democratic elections, as well as so that any violations, including those involving campaign teams that are not registered with election organizers, can be processed effectively.

The suggestions that can be submitted are as follows: First, there needs to be an update in the regulations governing campaigns by campaign teams that are not registered with the election organizers, so that actors who are not officially registered can still be subject to appropriate sanctions. Second, it is necessary to increase cooperation between law enforcement agencies, including Bawaslu, the police, and the prosecutor's office, so that the legal process can run more smoothly and effectively. Third, it is also necessary to make efforts to increase public and voter awareness about the importance of maintaining places of worship as a space free from political campaigns and the dangers of money politics.

REFERENCES

Artidjo Alkostar, Political Corruption in the Modern State, FH UII Press, Yogyakarta, 2008, p. 2

Basyuni, M., "Campaign Violations in Places of Worship in Elections: Juridical Studies and Indonesian Legal Perspectives", *Journal of Law and Democracy*, 15(2), 2020.

Cindy L. Cohn, "Money in Politics and Democratic Integrity", *Journal of Democracy*, 25(3), 2014.

Hamson, Z. (2021). Money politics in Indonesian elections: An overview. *Journal of Communication Sciences*, *4*(1), 36–44.

Imawan Sugiharto, "Reconstruction of Law Enforcement of Money Politics in the Election of Regional Heads Based on Progressive Law", *Journal of Law Reform*, Vol. 3, No. 1, 2016.

Kartiwa, M. B., & Sari, A. K. (2022). Law enforcement against cases of campaign banning in places of worship (Case study of Cikarang District Court Decision No. 281/Pid.B/2019/PN.Ckr). *JCA of Law*, *3*(1), 26–29.

Lawrence M Friedman, *The Legal System: A Social Science Perspective*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1987.

Madjid, N. V., & Triati, T. (2024). The judge's consideration in the criminal verdict against the defendant for money politics in the general election. *Ekasakti Legal Science Journal*, *1*(3), 214–221.

Moh. Mahfud MD, Legal Politics in Indonesia, Rajawali Press, Jakarta, 2017, p. 368

Muhsonati, D. (2024). The campaign at Islamic boarding schools is based on the Constitutional Court Decision Number 65/PUU-XXI/2023 from the perspective of siyasah dusturiyah. *ALBALAD: Journal of Constitutional Law*, *5*(3).

Respationo, H. S. (2013). Election of regional heads in electoral democracy. *Legal Issues*, *42*(3), 356–361.

Tjahjo Kumolo, Legal Politics of the Simultaneous Regional Elections, PT. Mizan Publika, Bandung, 2015, p. 155