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Abstract: The relationship between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders often creates conflicts to disharmony. Reduced harmony between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders occurs in many regions in Indonesia. This study discusses the factors that cause disharmony between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the Government System and the Ideal Position of Deputy Local Leaders in the Decentralization System. The data collection method used in this study is library research. Literature research collects relevant data and information by books, magazines, articles, journals, writings, and legislation relating to the issues raised in this study. The research and discussion results in this study are the factors that cause disharmony between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the Local Government System are First, Political Maturity. Second, the unequal distribution of power and race to politicians. While the duties of Deputy Local Leaders regulated in Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Local Government, where most of the first, assisting Regional Heads in Leading the implementation of local government affairs, Secondly, giving advice and consideration to Local Leaders in carrying out Local Government affairs. Third, carry out the Local Leaders’ daily tasks if the Local Leaders serve a period of detention or temporarily unavailable. Fourth, carry out other duties and authorities by statutory regulations.
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1. Introduction

Local Leaders is someone who is given the mandate or task to run a government in the region. The Local Leaders of a province is called the Governor. For a city, the Local Leaders is called the Mayor, and for a district called the Regent (Syafrudin & Na’a, 2015).

Each region has a leader or Local Leaders and is assisted by one representative. The provisions of Article 18 paragraph (4) of the 1945 Constitution state that Governors, Regents, and Mayors as respective heads of provincial, regency and city-regional governments shall be democratically elected and directly elected by the people through Local Elections or elected by members of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) which fills its membership through the Legislative General Election, while the position of Deputy Governor, Deputy Regent and Deputy Mayor as Deputy Regional Head in the 1945 Constitution is not regulated. Therefore, regulations regarding the status, duties, and functions as well as filling and dismissal of the level of Deputy Local Leaders submitted to the Act (Attamimi, 2016).

Apart from being the representative of the central government in the regions, the regional head is also a pair of public officials selected based on political recruitment or the direct election model and carry out the people’s mandate. The Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders positions are likened to an inseparable pair, both as public officials and administrators and holders of leadership powers in the regions (Yunus, 2016).

The main task of a Local Leaders is to lead and take full responsibility in implementing everything that goes on in the region. Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders must synergize and harmonize in terms of thinking, acting, and acting, prioritizing the nation’s interests, state, and local community compared to personal or group interests. Regional Heads must be neutral, honest, wise, prudent, and fair in implementing the policies made, and the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders must meet the rules contained in the Legislation (Nasution, 2014).

Delegation of authority is also given with clear instructions to avoid mistakes in the implementation. Leaders are required to guide, direct, coordinate, and supervise their members (Benjamin, 2012).

Regional government management will be more effective in implementing the division of authority between the Local Leaders, and his Deputy is based on Legislation and written down (formal juridical). The division of tasks, functions, and power is carried out in the initial stages (planning) of the implementation of regional government so that performance that refers to clear rules will be able to increase the effectiveness of the administration of local government (Solihat & Nugraha, 2016).

The Local Leaders (Pilkada) took place for the first time in 2005. The elections have created a working relationship between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders (Wijayanti, 2016). This relationship is established simultaneously with each candidate’s election to go forward in the elections; each cadre has a Deputy Local Leaders who will carry out the vision and mission made before serving as Local Leaders. Deputy Local Leaders’ appointment is only as an assistant to the Local Leaders in carrying out government tasks. Based on Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, Election of Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders are elected in a package (Sularno, 2006).

The context of the relationship between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders, Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning local government, has failed to harmonize the relations between the two, thus disturbing government stability in the regions. Revisions to acts are needed, including those that regulate how deputy regional heads should be elected, so as not to create instability in local governments (Guyanie, 2015, p. 37).

Good relations and cohesiveness between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders are evident at the time of the nomination, the campaign until the inauguration, and the taking of oaths to celebrate the pair of Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders.
Leaders. There are a good relationship and compactness between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders, which only lasts a few years or a few months until the compactness slowly disappears. Perspectives position of Deputy Leaders of the local government system, Deputy Local Leaders, or Deputy Leaders of the Institute should be removed, parts and functions of the Deputy Local Leaders must be replaced with the secretary (Haruni, 2013).

The relationship between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders often creates conflicts to disharmony. Reduced harmony between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders occurs in many regions in Indonesia. Some things that became the conclusion of a joint venture between the Regent and Deputy Regent were: Internal aspects of the party that only focused on one candidate as regent. The party’s external factor is another offer to form a more likely coalition, and one of the district head candidates has a reasonably extensive network. One of the candidates for regent's political steps were very rational, so they decided to split a joint venture (Taqwa, 2017).

Disharmonization of local leaders can undoubtedly disrupt the wheels of government, that one of the factors driving the increase and effectiveness of leadership is a harmonious relationship.

Research by LIPI (Indonesian Institute of Sciences) mentions the large percentage of pairs of Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders conflicts and conflicts that are not harmonious due to:

a. Because the coalition is built only by strengthening political support only on the post-conflict election, the alliance did not build on the main objectives, namely stability. As a result, the strength of the government did not last long.

b. So far, it carries the coalition that has been built out by a combination of two or more political parties, a variety of two different ethnic groups, or a combination of two other religious groups.

c. There is no firmness about the division of authority between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the Law on Regional Government to take power from each other.

d. Local Leaders were overly dominant in decision making. On the other hand, there is no awareness of the Deputy Local Leaders about his position. Both of them felt the same struggle during the elections, giving rise to the desire to equalize the division of tasks, especially on projects, or equal in decision making on the placement of officials on decolonization, and moving the duties (Civil Servants (PNS) of their respective supporters.

Because of a powerful image, making a Local Leaders is only a means of popularizing himself. Deputy Local Leaders did not hesitate to challenge his Local Leaders in the next Local Elections when it was popular.

The disharmony and disunity between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the province, district/city, has occurred a lot before and after the elections (Agustina, 2019b). The Local Leader’s pair split naturally causes the community service to be suboptimal, and disharmony relationships that affect the bureaucracy. Some bureaucracies are loyal to the Local Leaders, and there are also loyal ones to his Deputy. Besides, there can be differences of opinion between the Local Leaders and his Deputy in every policy decision. This difference of opinion raises a long time to make a policy decision. The disharmony problem between the Local Leaders and his Deputy results in sub-optimal government services and the people are disadvantaged.

Disharmony between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders then worsens leadership pattern in carrying out governance in the region. Harmonization between the Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders is essential to the government’s running, especially for the community’s benefit. The community will certainly feel its impact on the disrupted government process due to the lack of cohesiveness of the Local Leaders and Deputy Leaders in his area. Relationships between Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders are not harmonious, so the process of governance and local
development will not run well, nor will it improve the welfare of the community (Agustina, 2019a).

Whereas according to the law, Deputy Local Leaders has exact duties, authorities, obligations, and functions, namely oversight, consultative, coordinating, and executive functions. Although this does not fully indicate that power-sharing between the Local Leaders and his Deputy is ideal. Corrections are still needed relating to the strict division of authority between the Local Leaders and his Deputy, not to cause political tension.

But it is also not entirely true. It was concluded that the fracture of the relationship between the two is due to the struggle for authority. The most prominent issue at the root of the problem is the mechanism for filling the position of Deputy Local Leaders. With the people's direct election mechanism, some Deputy Local Leaders have more political power than their Local Leaders. That is, the Deputy Local Leaders may only be used as a vote gatherer in some cases. In other cases, the Deputy Local Leaders were only used as a cash machine and "ATM" during the campaign (Fleiner & Fleiner, 2009).

On the other hand, the direct election of Local Leaders or direct democracy provides direct political education to control the local government. Fleiner & Fleiner believe that with direct democracy, the people can exercise maximum control over the regional budget. While Fleiner states:

"The exercise of political rights through direct democracy enables the citizens to control the income and expenditure of their municipal authorities. Citizens elect their representatives to the local parliament and the municipal executive. It is at the local level that young politicians have to prove themselves. Municipalities often serve as an experimental field for many political initiatives. It is the arena in which citizens can develop their social and political competence".

Fleiner also believes that autonomy at the provincial and district or city level is also an arena of political experimentation to test Local Leaders and Representatives' competence and regeneration. The success of local leadership - including harmony between the Regional Head and his Deputy - becomes the capital for national political leadership success. Based on the description, the study's objectives were as follows: (1) Factors that cause disharmony between Local Leaders and deputy Local Leaders in the government system; (2) The Ideal Arrangement of Deputy Local Leaders Position in the Decentralization System.

2. Methods
The types and sources of data needed in this study were secondary data obtained through literature studies or various literature by examining books and articles on the internet, legal journals, and legislation relevant to the problem researched. At the same time, the data collection method used in this study is library research. Literature research collects appropriate data and information by reading and studying books, magazines, articles, journals, writings, and legislation relating to the issues raised in this study.

3. Results and Discussion
3.1. Factors Cause Disharmony Between Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the Government System
According to Hoogewarf, decentralization is the recognition or transfer of authority by higher public bodies to lower public bodies independently and based on their interests and make decisions in regulation and government. Meanwhile, according to Rondinelli, Nellis, and Shabbir Cheema, "decentralization is the transfer of planning, decision-making, administrative authority from the central government to its field
organizations, local government, or non-governmental organizations." (Darumurti & Rauta, 2003).

Decentralization is the formation or strengthening of sub-national government units whose activities are substantially beyond the central government’s control (S. N. Wijayanti & Satriawan, 2009). Meanwhile, in general, the definition of decentralization itself is usually divided into three purposes, namely:

a. Decentralization in deconcentration.
b. Deconcentration in delegation of authority.
c. Decentralization in devolution or transfer of functions and powers.

It is further explained that decentralization in the sense of deconcentration is the delegation of tasks or workloads from the central government to representatives of the central government in the regions without being followed by authority delegation. Conversely, decentralization in the sense of delegation of authority contains the transfer of power to make decisions from the central government to local governments or local government organizational units beyond the central government’s control.

Meanwhile, decentralization in devolution is the transfer of government functions and central authority to regional governments. With this handover, the local government becomes autonomous without controlling the central government, which has handed it over to the regions.

In essence, decentralization itself can be distinguished in terms of its characteristics, namely:

a. Territorial decentralization which the transfer of government affairs or the delegation of authority to carry out a government affair from a higher government to lower government organizational units based on local aspects.
b. Functional decentralization which the transfer of government affairs or the delegation of authority to carry out governmental affairs from a higher government to lower government units based on the aspect of its objectives (such as Subak in Bali).
c. Political decentralization is the delegation of authority that gives rise to the right to take care of one’s household interests for political bodies in areas elected by the people. This is also related to territorial decentralization.
d. Cultural decentralization which the granting of rights to certain groups to carry out their cultural activities. For example, educational activities by embassies of foreign countries, villages’ autonomy in carrying out their cultural activities, etc. In this case, it does not include regional government affairs.
e. Administrative decentralization, namely the delegation of part of the authority to the instruments or self-government units in the regions. The meaning is identical to deconcentration.

The six characteristics of decentralization can be related to the objectives and benefits obtained from the enactment of decentralization and deconcentration policies, which are essentially policies needed to overcome the tendency for power to accumulate in one center of power.

Some several objectives and benefits are commonly associated with decentralization and deconcentration policies, namely (Wijayanti, 2016):

a. In essence, decentralization can prevent the occurrence of a concentration of power and a centralized authority that can lead to tyranny.
b. In terms of politics, decentralization is a vehicle for democratizing government activities.
c. In terms of organization, decentralization can create a more effective and efficient government.
d. In terms of social perspective, decentralization can open up opportunities for more active participation from below and develop responsible leadership regeneration because the decision-making process is scattered in power centers throughout the region.
e. In terms of culture, decentralization is carried out to pay full attention to those in the regions explicitly. Cultural diversity can be preserved and used as an asset that encourages development in other fields.

f. In terms of economic development interests, because local governments are considered to have more knowledge and are directly related to regional attractions, with the decentralization policy, economic development can be carried out more precisely and at a lower cost.

Based on cause and effect, of course, disharmony between the Local Leaders is undoubtedly a cause, and there are consequences. In many cases, the elected regional heads usually only feel 3-10 months in harmony, then disharmony will follow. Many observers say the factors causing conflict are political maturity, uneven distribution of power, and a thin nationalism state. Apart from being good at politics, political elites must also have political maturity. The political maturity of the political elites, especially in the regions today, is of great concern. After being elected, the Local Leaders usually carry out their duties; ideally, regional heads should complement each other. When the task is not equal, political maturity will decrease. The head of the region usually regards his deputies only as "Reserves," not his partners. It causes regional representatives to be often "not considered" and intend to compete in future elections.

The division of tasks and functions, in the local government law No. 23 of 2014, it is obvious to specify the duties and functions of Local Leaders and deputy Local Leaders. But, at every political moment, the head of the region often buys this activity, meaning that even the region's deputy head is often not allowed to cut off the inauguration tape. It usually happens near the next election. The Local Leaders entered the last year as if "spying" deputy Local Leaders so as not to use his position to rival the Local Leaders—what an unintelligent political situation (Diamantina, 2010).

Impact of this disharmony, many effects will arise from the conflict of Local Leaders. The first thing that sacrificed the most is Society. In a campaign, the local government's head and deputy leaders generally change their "sweet" promises and will be fought together between the head and deputy head of the region. Still, because of "broken joints," these promises remain memorable. Another thing that will emerge is the ineffectiveness of tasks and functions. Because the regional heads have "elbowed" each other and do not trust each other, certainly, the government will no longer be effective. And again, the victims are the people. Back at the heart of the problem is that an initial analysis can be drawn because of the government system, especially the election with a "package" that is not optimal and individual and state of nationalism.

In several government studies, several options had put forward to minimize this disharmony. One of them is the establishment of governance systems.

a. The first option is that the regional head is no longer elected as a "package" but instead is chosen individually so that the division of tasks is clear and the local leaders are no longer struggling to "spy on" the deputy Local Leaders who will compete in the next election. If took this option, the regulations and laws must be changed, improving the system itself.

b. The second option is because the regional head is filled with individuals, then the deputy local leaders are taken from civil servants (PNS). The argument is that because civil servants are career positions and will not wrestle in the political field. Civil servants are also very understanding of governance; this option is very logical. And the essential thing is civil servants (PNS) will not compete with the regional head in the next election, as is the case in many regions. Technically, the deputy head of the region is taken from the civil servants at least with the rank of echelon I B, which can then be appointed as deputy Local Leaders on a proposal from the ministry of the interior and approved by the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD).

The disharmony of local leaders is very dangerous and has a complex impact, both politically and administratively. Suppose this disharmony cannot be inhibited through
3.2. Ideal Position of Deputy Local Leaders in the Decentralized System

In the Acts of Local Government, which replace acts No. 32 of 2004, declared that the position of Deputy Local Leaders, including how the mechanism of filling the place, really experienced a very revolutionary change.

In the draft, Deputy Local Leaders is a state echelon level IIB for deputy governor, and echelon IIA level for Deputy Regent or Deputy Mayor. However, the Deputy Local Leaders stopped simultaneously with the Regional Head. It shows that the Deputy Local Leaders is not a political office as in the previous law.

Indeed, there was a lot of encouragement, especially from the Regional Representative Council, which suggested that the Deputy Local Leaders was not elected in pairs with the Regional Head. Because from the beginning, the position of Deputy Local Leaders was as a companion to the Local Leaders. Ideally, the Deputy Local Leaders are elected by the elected Local Leaders, not selected in pairs directly.

In the Bill, the Governor proposes the Deputy Governor candidate twice the number to the president through the minister. This also applies to candidates for Deputy Regent or Deputy Mayor, presented by the Regent or Mayor to the Minister through the Governor (Suhardin, 2007).

Even in the new draft law, not every region, both provincial and regency or city, has a Deputy Regional Head. For provinces with a population of less than 3 million, there is no Deputy Governor position. Whereas regions with a population of 3 million to 10 million have one deputy governor. For areas with a population of over 10 million, there are two deputy governors.

The draft shows that the Deputy Governor’s position is based on each provincial region’s needs, which is undoubtedly different. The deputy governor’s role is not a political position, which must exist in each region regardless of its urgency.

Likewise, deputy regent or deputy mayor is not owned by a regency or city whose population does not reach 100 thousand inhabitants. But if the population is above 100 million, then there is one deputy regent or deputy mayor (Sudrajat et al., 2018).

Do not let the same political legitimacy source cause political existence between the Local Leaders and his deputy. Local Leaders are elected directly by the people, their representatives are also directly elected by the people, but their authority is different. Local Leaders more “exist” and get the stage and wetlands, while their representatives do not get a commensurate ration with the regional head.

But do not let appointing the deputy Local Leaders as the elected regional head is not objective. It means that standards, indicators, and variables can be used to determine candidates for the region’s deputy head from among the local bureaucrats. Seeing its implementation during the New Order, it tends to abandon the principles of law and justice. In the New Order era, determining regional heads and their deputies depended on the choice of the center, even not following the aspirations of the local community. At the beginning of the reform, the Local Leaders and his deputy were in the shadow of the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) power because it determines whether or not a candidate becomes the Local Leaders.

In the draft proposal for the Regional Government Bill (Hafidz, 2012), the Deputy Local Leaders has the task: first, to assist the Local Leaders in:

a. Leading the implementation of local government affairs.

b. Coordinating the activities of the local government Unit (SKPD), Vertical Agencies in the area, following up on reports and or findings of supervision officers.

c. Monitor and evaluate the implementation of Regency and City Government affairs for the Deputy Local Leaders of the Province.

d. Monitor and evaluate the administration of government in the district, sub-district and/or village area for the Deputy Local Leaders of a regency or city.
Second, provide advice and consideration to Local Leaders in carrying out Local Leaders affairs. Third, carry out the Local Leaders daily tasks if the Local Leaders is serving a period of detention or being temporarily unavailable. Fourth, carry out other duties and authorities in accordance with statutory regulations.

Most of the above tasks are still the same as those of the Deputy Local Leaders regulated in Law No. 23 of 2014 (Abdullah, 2007). So it needs to be reviewed whether re-identification is needed related to these tasks, so that they are relevant to the context of the idea of changing the Law on Local Government.

In addition to carrying out the above tasks, the Deputy Local Leaders carry out other governmental duties and obligations granted by the Local Leaders determined by the Local Leaders decision. In carrying out the above tasks, the Deputy Local Leaders is responsible to the Local Leaders (Bilder, 1989).

The division of tasks and authority between the Local Leaders and his Deputy must be firm and clear to avoid dualism and overlap. With the division, as stated in the RUU above, it means that the Deputy Local Leaders becomes the Local Leaders’ assistant and is responsible to the Local Leaders.

Currently, changes to the law to improve the legal politics of the relationship between the center and the regions are in sight, including materially governing the position, authority, and mechanism of filling the position of Deputy Local Leaders, which is an ideal decentralized system. Moh. Mahfud, M. D., changes that constitute a state demand must also be responded to in arranging local government as long as the changes do not change the legal. Political foundations outlined in the constitution, namely the traditional politics of the unitary state and the politics of broad autonomous law with a decentralized and deconcentrated system that pays attention to the original rights of the region (M. D., 2010).

That is the Indonesian people’s dream with the vast territory and diversity of its population to build a harmonious unitary Republic of Indonesia both vertically and horizontally.

Article 30 of Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning the Local Government states that “A regional head leads each region as the head of the executive assisted by a deputy Local Leaders.” So, in Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government, deputy regional heads’ existence has been regulated. Where local leaders and deputy regional heads are indirectly elected, in this case, they are elected by the Regional House of Representatives (DPRD).

Article 24 paragraph (1) and (3) Law No. 32/2004, states that: “a Local Leaders of government leads each region called the Local Leaders, who are assisted by one deputy regional head. Furthermore, the deputy Local Leaders can be divided into provinces called deputy governors, districts called deputy regents and for cities called deputy mayors. The said regional heads and deputy Local Leaders are directly elected as a pair by the people in the region concerned.”

So, the position of deputy regional heads in Law No. 32 of 2004 concerning Local Leaders, which states that each region is led by a Local Leaders and assisted by a deputy regional head. Regional leaders are representatives of the central government in the areas, and public officials are elected based on political recruitment or direct election models and carry out their mandate.

In the discussion of regulating the authority of Local Leaders and deputy Local Leaders, we will look at the laws and regulations that have been in effect and have been positive in Indonesia.

1) The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia

Considering the constitution of Article 18, paragraph 4 of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia does not include a deputy Local Leaders. So constitutionally, it also does not regulate the authority of the deputy Local Leaders.
2) Law No. 5 of 1974 About the Administration in the Regions

Article 25 paragraph (1) and paragraph (2) “Deputy Local Leaders assists the regional head in carrying out his daily duties and authorities according to the guidelines set by the Minister of Home Affairs; If the regional head is absent, the deputy regional head performs the day-to-day duties and powers of the local leaders.”

Based on the above provisions, the deputy Local Leaders' duties are indeed to assist Local Leaders and what the deputy Local Leaders will do based on the guidelines for the requirements of the Minister of Home Affairs. At that time, there were not many problems considering that the deputy Local Leaders were appointed and came from employees who met the requirements. Not all regions had deputy Local Leaders because their existence depended on the needs of each region.

3) Law No. 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government

Article 57 paragraph (1) states that: “Deputy Local Leaders have the following tasks:

a. Assist Local Leaders in carrying out their obligations.

b. Coordinating the activities of government agencies in the regions.

c. Carry out other tasks assigned by the Local Leaders.

Article 57 paragraph (2) states that: “Deputy Local Leaders are responsible for Local Leaders”.

From the above provisions, it shows that the position of the deputy Local Leaders is weak. Where the duties of the deputy Local Leaders depend on the responsibilities assigned by the Local Leaders so that if the Local Leaders does not ask for help from his deputy, it means that the deputy Local Leaders is not functional. On the other hand, the deputy Local Leaders will report all of his duties are to the Local Leaders, considering that the deputy Local Leaders is responsible to the Local Leaders.

So, if we look closely at Law No. 32 of 2004 Article 26, paragraph (1) into Law No. 12, so if we look closely at Article 26 paragraph (1) of Law 32 of 2004 into Law No. 12 of 2008 on Local Government regulates the position of representatives Local Leaders are minimal and depend on the generosity of Local Leaders. The assigned tasks are positioned as nothing more than a compliment. It only helps the head of the region. Regarding how technical procedures allow him, it is not regulated by laws or other regulations. Apart from assisting duties, the deputy Local Leaders can also act as a substitute for the Local Leaders if the superior cannot carry out his duties, either temporarily or permanently. So, this condition gave rise to an unhappy relationship on the way the two of them led the government.

According to Melfiansyah, at least three reasons became the basis for the government to propose a gubernatorial election via the Regional People's Representative Council to suppress people's psycho-political fatigue, reduce money politics practices and save funds for holding gubernatorial elections. Meanwhile, the deputy governor's election from the bureaucracy is to observe the widespread phenomenon of the division of partnerships between governors and deputy governors. The plan to prohibit the participation of incumbent families in the Local Elections (Pilkada) is to minimize the opportunity for candidates to take advantage of the bureaucratic network and the Regional Budget (APBD) to win the election (Melfiansyah, 2012).

The current government system needs a more in-depth evaluation. We have indeed agreed with democracy (rule by majority) and the republic (rule by law). However, the democratic government system has various forms that can be taken and applied according to our society's culture. Say, if we like to form parties, then parliamentary might be more suitable; If the community believes in the charismatic leadership and wisdom of the elderly in their area, while professionals carry out development, then also adopt meritocracy (rule by best) with the council-manager form of the government system. So, we can not only eliminate unnecessary political positions but also choose a government system that is more suited to our needs.
3.2.1. Position and Urgency of Deputy Local Leaders in the Decentralized System

Before 1903, the Dutch governmental system in "directly controlled areas" was centralized in personnel. At that time, the Dutch East Indies area was divided into administrative regions called: Gewest, Afdeling, Onderafdeling, Regentschap, Districts, and Onderdistrikt. A Dutch civil service employee heads each of these areas, namely: Gouverneur or Resident, Assistant Resident, Controleur, Gezaghebber, or controlled by Indonesian civil service employees: Regent, Wedana, Assistant Wedana in Java and Madura, Leaders of District, Head of Electricity in outside Java and Madura. So definitively, there is no known position as Deputy Local Leaders with clear duties and functions.

Likewise, when the Decentralization Law (Decentralisatie Wet) was issued, which gave autonomy and Zelfbestuur rights to regions to manage themselves, the position of Deputy Local Leaders had not yet emerged. When government decentralization was expanded in 1922 at the time of the birth of a government change or called "Bestuurhervorming." Including during the Japanese colonial era, this position did not yet exist.

The first Law born after the proclamation of independence was Law No. 1 of 1945 concerning the National Committee's Position, which also regulates the Local Government in Indonesia. Therapy of the Act is straightforward, so it also does not restrict Deputy Local Leaders.

Then, Law No. 22 of 1948 on Regional Government was born, which has regulated the position of Regional Head, with weak authority. However, the Deputy Local Leaders also has not appeared in the Law. Likewise, when Law No. 44 of 1950 concerning the Local Government of East Indonesia was born, it had not occurred to him to regulate the position of Deputy Local Leaders.

It was only on January 17, 1957, by the Indonesian government that Law No. 1 of 1957 on the Principles of Local Government issued. It begins to mention the position of Deputy Regional Head but is still limited to the Deputy Leaders of a particular region. Even that is not necessary. Article 26 of the Law is written.

"If a Deputy Leaders of the Special Region is not appointed in a Special Region, then the Leaders of the Special Region, if he is absent or resigns from his position, is represented by the Deputy Leaders of the Local Government Council elected by and from the members of the Local Government Council."

When the Presidential Decree No. 6/1959 concerning Local Government abolished part of Law No. 1/1957, the position of Deputy Regional Head began to be considered urgent. According to C. S. T. Kansil, in general, the Swatantra regions do not have Deputy Local Leaders. However, for some autonomous regions at level I, the position of Deputy Local Leaders is held considering the importance and role of the Daswati. This is regulated in Presidential Decree No. 2 of 1960. This Presidential Decree only regulates the Deputy Head of Region level I because this is not regulated in Presidential Decree No. 6 1959. Holding the Deputy Local Leaders was for the smooth running of the regional government and regional development.

So, for a certain level, I Daswati (apart from the Yogyakarta Special Level I Region), it is necessary to open the possibility to appoint a Deputy Leaders of the Level I Region. The Deputy Leaders of the Region assists the Local Leaders in carrying out his daily duties and responsibilities. For this reason, since April 1960, the Level I Swatantra Regions: Greater Jakarta, West Java, Central Java, East Java, and North Sumatra had appointed for each of these regions a Deputy Regional Head.

Based on Law No. 18 of 1965, for regions at the level I, II, and III, all have a Deputy Regional Head. The Deputy Local Leaders is appointed from among at least two and a maximum of four Regional House of Representatives (DPRD) candidates by:

a. President for Level I Regions
b. The Minister of Home Affairs with the President’s approval for Level II Regions
c. The Head of a Level I Region with the approval of the Minister of Home Affairs for a Level III Region that is in the Level I Region concerned.

The requirements for being appointed as regional heads also apply to deputy Local Leaders. Likewise, prohibitions for regional heads also apply to deputy Local Leaders. Meanwhile, according to Law No. 5 of 1974, the Deputy Local Leaders is appointed as a Civil Servant based on the prevailing regulations. Given the different local conditions, the implementation of filling the position of Deputy Local Leaders will be held according to need.

4. Conclusion

Disharmony between Local Leaders and Deputy Local Leaders in the Government System is First, Political Maturity. Political elites, apart from being politically savvy, should also have established political maturity. The political maturity of the political elite, especially in the regions today, is very worrying. After being elected, the Local Leaders usually carry out their tasks; ideally, the heads of regions must complement each other. When the mission is not equal, political maturity will decrease. The Local Leaders usually regards his deputies only as “Reserves,” not as his partners. It causes regional representatives to be often “not considered” and intend to compete in future elections. Second, the unequal distribution of power and racial nationalism thin. The division of tasks and functions, in the Regional Government Law No. 32 of 2004 has very clearly specified the regional head and deputy regional head’s duties and functions. But in reality, usually, at very political moments, the Local Leaders often buy this activity. The impact of this disharmony many effects will arise from the conflict of the Local Leaders. The first thing that is sacrificed the most is Society. And The tasks of the Deputy Local Leaders regulated in Law No. 23 of 2014 concerning Local Government:

a. Assisting the Local Leaders in Leading the implementation of local government affairs, Coordinating the activities of Local government working unit (SKPD), Vertical Agencies in the region, following up on reports and findings of the results of supervision of the supervisory apparatus, monitoring and evaluating the implementation of the official duties of the Regency Local Government and Cities for Deputy Local Leaders, Monitor and evaluate the administration of government in the district, village office or village areas for Deputy District or city Local Leaders.

b. Provide advice and consideration to Local Leaders in carrying out local government affairs.

c. Carry out the Local Leader’s daily tasks if the Local Leaders serve a detention period or temporarily unavailable.

d. Carry out other duties and authorities by statutory regulations.
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