Comparison of Indonesia-Australia Political and Power Systems

Perbandingan Sistem Politik dan Kekuasaan Indonesia-Australia

Juri [1], Leni Angraeni [2], Mirza Hardian [3], Rike Erlande [4]

[1, 2, 3, 4]Indonesia University of Education

Corresponding Author: jurisaputra85@gmail.com

Abstract

This research compares the political systems and power structures of Indonesia and Australia, focusing on their similarities and This study compares the political systems and power structures of Indonesia and Australia using a qualitative approach through a comparative literature review. Indonesia adopts a presidential republic system. In contrast, power in Australia is distributed among the executive, legislative, and judicial branches under a constitutional monarchy (Westminster system) through a parliamentary model. The primary objective of this study is to identify the similarities and differences in democratic practices, the distribution of power, and the level of public trust in state institutions. The findings indicate that both countries share similarities in democratic practices, such as the regular conduct of elections and the implementation of the principle of Trias politica, which divides power into three main branches: the executive, the legislative, and the judiciary. However, notable differences are evident in their governmental structures. In Indonesia, the president serves as both head of state and head of government. In contrast, in Australia, the monarch plays a ceremonial role, while the prime minister, elected through parliamentary support functions as the head of government. There are also differences in terms of tenure. In Indonesia, members of the legislature serve five-year terms, while in Australia they serve three-year terms. Moreover, the Australian prime minister has no fixed term limit, as tenure depends on continued parliamentary support. In Australia, public trust in state institutions is generally higher due to greater transparency, accountability, and more effective law enforcement. Meanwhile, Indonesia faces ongoing challenges such as corruption and public dissatisfaction with the performance of state institutions, which results in comparatively lower levels of public trust.

Keywords
Comparison; Political System; Power.

Abstrak

Penelitian ini membandingkan sistem politik dan struktur kekuasaan Indonesia dan Australia, dengan fokus pada persamaan dan perbedaannya. Studi ini membandingkan sistem politik dan struktur kekuasaan Indonesia dan Australia menggunakan pendekatan kualitatif melalui tinjauan pustaka komparatif. Indonesia menganut sistem republik presidensial. Sebaliknya, kekuasaan di Australia didistribusikan di antara cabang eksekutif, legislatif, dan yudikatif di bawah monarki konstitusional (sistem Westminster) melalui model parlementer. Tujuan utama studi ini adalah untuk mengidentifikasi persamaan dan perbedaan dalam praktik demokrasi, distribusi kekuasaan, dan tingkat kepercayaan publik terhadap lembaga negara. Temuan menunjukkan bahwa kedua negara memiliki kesamaan dalam praktik demokrasi, seperti penyelenggaraan pemilu yang teratur dan penerapan prinsip Trias Politica, yang membagi kekuasaan menjadi tiga cabang utama: eksekutif, legislatif, dan yudikatif. Namun, perbedaan yang mencolok terlihat dalam struktur pemerintahan mereka. Di Indonesia, presiden menjabat sebagai kepala negara sekaligus kepala pemerintahan. Sebaliknya, di Australia, raja memainkan peran seremonial, sementara perdana menteri, yang dipilih melalui dukungan parlemen, berfungsi sebagai kepala pemerintahan. Terdapat pula perbedaan dalam hal masa jabatan. Di Indonesia, anggota legislatif menjabat selama lima tahun, sementara di Australia mereka menjabat selama tiga tahun. Lebih lanjut, Perdana Menteri Australia tidak memiliki batas masa jabatan tetap, karena masa jabatan bergantung pada dukungan parlemen yang berkelanjutan. Di Australia, kepercayaan publik terhadap lembaga negara umumnya lebih tinggi karena transparansi, akuntabilitas, dan penegakan hukum yang lebih efektif. Sementara itu, Indonesia menghadapi tantangan berkelanjutan seperti korupsi dan ketidakpuasan publik terhadap kinerja lembaga negara, yang mengakibatkan tingkat kepercayaan publik yang relatif lebih rendah.

Kata Kunci
Perbandingan; Sistem Politik; Kekuasaan.

1. Introduction

One of the important elements in the life of the nation and state is politics. This is because politics if studied from an etymological point of view comes from the Greek language, *Polis* which means city-state. In building the city-state, certain tactics or strategies are needed. The strategy in question is a way for leaders to prosper their people through excellent programs to reduce poverty so that the country is prosperous and developed (Alie, 2013; Anggara, 2013; Darmawan, 2004). In addition, leaders who have been given the trust of the people must also try to produce quality human resources so that they can compete with human resources from other countries in building the continuity of social life (Hasanal Bolqiah & Raffiudin, 2020).

On the other hand, if examined in terms of science, politics is closely related to the system of government and power that applies in a country, for example, a country that uses a democratic, parliamentary, royal, or federal system (Lestari, 2024). Countries that use several systems certainly have a unique and quite effective way of running their government, because the state is an organization in which some elements must support each other (Nasution & Sihombing, 2019; C. P. Putri & Purnamawati, 2022; Thoha, 2014).

When leaders in a country perform their duties as servants of the people and place themselves as servants and there is good cooperation, the country will be safe, and the people will be prosperous. Conversely, despotic leaders, asking to be served, selfish, family, group, and group, can ultimately destroy the country and the democratic system (Ismandianto et al., 2023). Therefore, Soekarno in "Soekarno, the mouthpiece of the people" said that the biggest and most dangerous enemy is the people themselves.

In this regard, Machiavelli (2008) said that a Prince in carrying out his duties as a servant of the state must be respected and feared and dare to take decisive action to sacrifice a few people to save the country (many people). The prince is allowed to do anything, as long as the country is safe.

To be a good leader requires certain strategies that are considered good enough. When the leader is weak, the people will also be weak, and the country will be weak. If the leader and the state are weak, the lives of the people are certainly not prosperous (Pramelani & Widyastuti, 2021). Conversely, if a leader is firm (even sometimes authoritarian), has a serving character, and wants to develop, then the people he leads will be prosperous (Tang, 2014; Triananta & Purnomo, 2023). If people's lives are prosperous, it will have implications for the decline in crime rates. Because often the high crime rate is motivated by the high poverty rate (Sudirman & Saidin, 2022).

In the view of Cipolla (2011), Barokah et al. (2022), and Rossa et al. (2024), power is in sharp contrast when led by a Bandit or a Fool. In plain sight, humans who fall into these two categories are not fit to lead. However, the reality is that they exist in every country and always try to become leaders, both at the local and national levels. Bandits are those who resort to various means (at the expense of others) to achieve a goal. On the other hand, fools are those who achieve their goals. Certain harm to others, yet he gains no benefit.

Government structures that are managed with a high level of accountability and transparency are slowly able to produce a democratic system that ensures social justice, improves policy quality, strengthens law enforcement encourages public participation, and fosters trust in institutions (Androniceanu, 2021). A clean democratic system (clean government) is a government with a low level of corruption that increases public trust in state institutions (Sawmar & Mohammed, 2021).

In this context, it refers to how the policy structure affects policymaking, implementation, and outcomes (Aminah & Saksono, 2021). For example, in Australia's parliamentary system, the existence of a checks and balances mechanism between the executive and the legislature can result in policies that are more inclusive and responsive to community needs (Omar & Almaghthawi, 2020). Alternatively, in Indonesia's presidential system, the concentration of power in the president can lead to faster policy issuance but less consideration of input from various parties (Humaidi & Rahmadanti, 2023).

Indonesia is one of the sovereign states that has inward and outward principles. The inward principle relates to the ideals for the welfare of the people through various policies from leaders who refer to the contents of the preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Meanwhile, the outward principle is also regulated in the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, especially about free and active foreign policy. Domestically, the main focus of development, especially in the last 20 (twenty) years has been poverty alleviation, education, health, infrastructure development, and law enforcement based on the principles of justice. While abroad, Indonesia is always involved in various policies that contain the lives of many people, such as human rights, the environment, and world peace (Abrory, 2023; Marpaung, 2018; Sabon, 2019).

This basic principle has always been applied by Indonesia, including in establishing diplomatic relations with other countries, both in bilateral and multilateral scope. This principle means that in establishing diplomatic relations with various countries, Indonesia does not have the authority to interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. However, even so, Indonesia can call for peace to every country in conflict through membership in the United Nations, G20, OIC, APEC, Non-block, OPEC, and others (Bakry, 2017; Ricarvy & Wahyuningroem, 2024; Rosyidin, 2020).

In establishing diplomatic relations with various countries, Indonesia has a legal basis as stated in Article 11 of the 1945 Constitution, the Vienna Convention in Switzerland in 1961, Law Number 37 of 1999, and Law Number 24 of 2000. Meanwhile, in establishing diplomatic relations with Australia, apart from departing from the legal basis that has been described, it also departs from the 2006 Lombok Agreement. This agreement was made in Lombok, Indonesia on November 13, 2006, which generally contains bilateral agreements between the two countries. In particular, this agreement contains several important points, such as sovereignty and territorial integrity, security cooperation, cooperation in the military field, protecting both countries from weapons of mass destruction, disaster, and humanitarian assistance, preventing smuggling and human trafficking, and establishing regular dialogue and consultation.

The Lombok Treaty is a cornerstone of the security relationship between Indonesia and Australia that helps build trust and ensures that both countries can effectively address shared regional security threats. This Agreement strengthening the commitment not to interfere in each other's internal affairs. The agreement also highlights the importance of regional stability especially in Southeast Asia and the Indo-Pacific region, where both countries have strategic interests (Laksmana, 2018).

Australia often also referred to as "The Commonwealth of Australia" is a country with a geographical majority in the form of land, consisting of four seasons and an area of 7.68 million square miles (8,945,000 KM 2). With an area of only 7.68 million square miles, Australia is dubbed as the smallest continent in the southern part of the world. Geographically, the Australian continent is located at 113°-115° East Longitude and 10°-43° South Latitude. This condition causes Australia to be in the South Pacific Islands region, between the Indian Ocean and the Pacific Ocean, stretching to Antarctica and the Southeast Asian Continent, which is also directly

adjacent to eastern Indonesia (Arviansyah et al., 2023; Z. Putri & Pahlevi, 2022). Historically, the Australian continent was discovered in 1770 by a British sailor named James Cook (Sinaga, 2014). Therefore, Australia then became a British colony which caused it to become a commonwealth nation. However, according to the view of Menzies (2012), those who first discovered the Australian Continent were not sailors from Europe but tough sailors from China. This event occurred long before Europeans explored the world, around 1422 AD. This fact can be proven through the discovery of shipwrecks around the Australian Continent, maps made by Admiral Zhou Man when Emperor Zhu Di was in power, and legends told by Aboriginal people (indigenous Australians).

The country consists of six states and ten territories, which are divided into three territories on the Australian mainland and seven territories in the Pacific and Indonesian regions. The capital city is located in Canberra. In 2023, the population reached 26.3 million. The majority of these people are immigrants from other countries, mainly from Europe, Asia, and Africa. Thus, causing Australia to become one of the multicultural countries, both in terms of religion, and culture (Amalia & Ribawati, 2024; Arviansyah et al., 2023; Sabari et al., 2016).

The preparation of this article is inseparable from the contribution of thought (Sapin et al., 2012). His views on foreign relations are quite interesting, especially about the division of the international political system into action, reaction, and interaction. Thus, in the formulation of the concept of foreign policy, the question arises "How and why do national actors perform as they do in international relations"? He argues that, in foreign relations, most.

There are no two important influences, namely subjective factors and potential sources. Subjective factors relate to the perceptions of political actors, such as state leaders, in defining situations that have, are, and will occur. Subjective factors are considered as a channel of objective reality. The subjective perception factor has an important role because, in any situation, the way actors interpret the situation will determine the outcome of the foreign policy-making process.

Potential sources also play an important role as a factor that also needs to be considered in the formulation of foreign policy. These potential sources can come from within the country (internal setting) and from abroad (external setting). Internal settings are related to national politics including public opinion that develops in the country. While the external setting is non-governmental factors and inter-state interactions, including actions taken by a country in making a political decision.

Thus, the writing of this article is done to examine the comparison of political systems and power in Indonesia. Australia in a constitutional and parliamentary democratic system of government.

2. Methods

The approach chosen in this research is qualitative with a comparative study method. Data was collected through a review of official literature relating to the political and power systems of the two countries. Various types of literature deemed relevant were collected and then analyzed.

Data analysis used Virginia Braun and Victoria Clarke's thematic analysis pattern, which they developed in 2006. This thematic data analysis includes several steps, including a) data collection; b) data coding; c) theme development; and d) interpretation.

The data collected were journal articles, both from national and international journals, indexed by Sinta and Scopus. 100 articles were collected. The collected articles were coded to find themes that are relevant to the discussion of this article.

After coding, 60 articles were found whose themes were relevant to the discussion of this article. The 60 articles were interpreted to find a comparison of the political system and power that applies in Indonesia and Australia.

The results of data analysis are in a comparative form, namely, to find similarities and differences in aspects of politics and power, such as the executive, legislative, and judiciary that apply in Indonesia and Australia (Ibrahim et al., 2023; Jones, 2019). The reason for using comparative study in this research is to understand the differences and similarities of the political and power systems of the two countries, evaluate policies and practices, and increase contextual understanding.

3.   Results and Discussion

3.1.   Differences and Similarities of Indonesia-Australia Political and Power Systems

The dynamics of politics in Indonesia are dynamic and always change according to its time. For example, in the colonial era, the value system of struggle that was plotted in politics was more focused on gaining independence, so various political organizations such as the Islamic Trade Association, Boedi Ueotomo, and KAMI emerged. After Indonesia's independence, the political system through various political parties, the value of struggle is more directed to fill the gap between the political system and the society. Independence through development, especially to achieve national ideals, namely standing on one's own feet (Berdikari) (Hauteas et al., 2017; Utami et al., 2024).

Indonesia's political and power system since independence now adheres to a presidential democratic system, in which the President has strong executive powers and is separate from the legislature. However, despite this, the President remains accountable to the DPR through an accountability report submitted on the eve of Independence Day (Thahir, 2023). In addition, the President has a dual function, namely as head of state and head of government. As head of state, the President has the authority, for example, diplomatic functions, namely appointing ambassadors and consuls who will serve in other countries as Ambassadors (Humaidi & Rahmadanti, 2023) as head of government, the President together with the DPR forms and enacts laws. In the lawmaking process, the DPR proposes, discusses, and approves draft laws which are then signed by the President to become valid laws (state gazette). Although the President and the DPR have different roles, they still work together in the legislative process (Asshiddiqie, 2006; Syamsuddin, 2018; Wiratmadinata, 2018).

Before the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia was amended, the President was elected by the MPR and the DPR, as stipulated in Article 6 paragraph (2). This had the effect of weakening the President's power, especially if the ruling party did not have many members in Parliament. This condition meant that the President had to place trustworthy people as members of the MPR/DPR.

This is also conveyed (Bhakti, 2020) that the obscurity of the relationship between the legislature and the executive in the government system is partly due to the obscurity of the government system because the relationship between the legislature and the executive is determined by the pattern of the government system, both Parliamentary and Presidential. The complexity of the relationship pattern makes it not impossible at any time to cause conflict between the DPR and the President, especially if more members in the DPR are not in coalition with the government (Rohmah, 2023).

However, after the amendment, Article 7A of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia states that the President can be dismissed by the MPR. The dismissal, when proven to have violated the law, in the form of treason against the

state (e. g. corruption). Such dismissal can only be done on a proposal from a member of the DPR to the Constitutional Court (article 7B. On the other hand, the President does not have the authority to dismiss the DPR, but they only have the authority to cooperate, article 7C. Likewise, the DPR cannot dismiss the President, without the approval of the MPR.

In addition, the DPR has a supervisory function over the performance of the President and his cabinet. The DPR has the right to request information from the President through the mechanisms of the right of interpellation and the right of inquiry. In the context of the state budget, the DPR also has the authority to approve the Draft State Budget (RAPBN) submitted by the President. Therefore, although executive power is vested in the President, budgetary and legislative policies must be approved by the DPR (Junaidi & Reininda, 2020).

The relationship between the DPR and the President in Indonesia reflects the principle of checks and balances. The DPR oversees executive policies through its legislative and budgetary functions to ensure that the budget is targeted according to its main tasks and functions (Aris et al., 2020). Although the President has significant powers, the relationship with the DPR is key in maintaining the balance of power and avoiding the dominance of either party (Hasibuan, 2019; Syamsuddin, 2018).

However, after the amendment of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, the term of office of the President is only Ten years. As for the House of Representatives, there is no limit; as long as a candidate wins the election, he or she can hold office.

The constitutional presidential system has had a favorable impact on the development of democracy in Indonesia (Humaidi & Rahmadanti, 2023). This is evident, for example, through the change of the electoral system from a representative election system to a direct election system that has been in effect since the 2004 elections (Latief, 2009). The change in the electoral system is due to the assumption that the electoral system through direct elections is no longer by the times and is considered unrepresentative of the will of the people (Suastika, 2020)

The changes in the electoral system as stated by Pahlevi (2014), Al-Fatih (2019), and Al Hadad et al. (2022), depart from the legal basis such as the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia article 22E paragraph (1); Law Number 12 of 2003 concerning General Elections of Members of the DPR, DPD, and DPRD; Law Number 23 of 2003 concerning General Elections of the President and Vice President; Law Number 20 of 2004 concerning the Election of the President and Vice President. Stipulation of government regulations instead of Law Number 2 of 2004 concerning amendments to Law Number 12 of 2003 concerning the General Election of Members of the DPR, DPD, and DPRD; KPU Regulation Number 1 of 2004 concerning the election of presidents, governors, regents/mayors.

The change from the representative system to direct elections also departed from the reform wave marked by the fall of the New Order regime in 1998, where the majority of people demanded a more democratic and transparent government system (Malik et al., 2021). This aims to strengthen democracy, strengthen public participation, and create a government that is more accountable and responsive to the people (Wibowo et al., 2022).

In Australia, the Prime Minister is elected from the House of Representatives by the political party that has the majority of seats in parliament. As long as the Prime Minister has strong support from his party and parliament, he can continue in office. The House of Representatives has a three-year term after which it can be re-elected (Jones, 2019). If deemed necessary (e.g. due to a proven threat to the country) the Prime Minister can ask the Governor-General to dissolve the House before the three-year term is complete and then call an early election (Smith, 2021). This dissolution

is often done to gain a new mandate from the electorate or when the government faces a significant political crisis (Galligan, 2018).

In carrying out their duties as servants of the people, both the Prime Minister and the DPR each have different functions and authorities, and both also have a fairly intensive relationship to ensure the system of government works (Rasnic, 2016). In the Australian Constitution (but not explicitly), it is stated that the Prime Minister has the function of:

a. Head of government. As the head of government, the Prime Minister is responsible for national and foreign policies (made together with the Parliament) and coordinates between ministries to implement the national and foreign policies that have been formulated. In addition, it also sets the agenda for cabinet meetings, especially those that discuss crucial domestic and foreign issues.

b. Legislative policies and guidelines. As the leader of the majority party in the House of Representatives, the Prime Minister has considerable authority in crafting legislative policies that reflect the government's program. This relationship is quite important in directing party support to pass key government laws and policies.

c. Foreign affairs and defense. For foreign relations, the Prime Minister often represents Australia in meetings held overseas. However, before attending such meetings, the Prime Minister coordinates with the Minister for Foreign Affairs. This is mainly to create a good relationship between the two and also to ensure that diplomatic relations continue as they should.

d. Advisor and liaison to the Governor-General. By convention, the Prime Minister serves as the Governor-General's principal advisor on many matters, such as the dismissal of ministers, the dissolution of Parliament, and the approval of legislation. The Prime Minister can also advise the Governor-General on the timing of elections and other issues that require official approval and are considered important.

On the other hand, the duties and functions of the DPR, as contained in articles (1, 24, & 53), include

a. Power of legislation. Article (1) of the Australian Constitution states that the power of the legislature is vested in parliament is represented by the Governor-General, the Senate, and the House of Representatives. In addition, the House of Representatives also plays a role in drafting, debating, and passing bills into law, especially laws relating to tax and finance.

b. Control over laws and regulations (finance). Under the contents of article (53) the House of Representatives has the exclusive power to introduce bills relating to taxes or public expenditure. While the Senate can approve or reject, it cannot initiate or amend these financial bills. This provision gives the House of Representatives the ultimate power in the fiscal sphere, as a form of control over government spending so that finances can be stable and efficient.

c. Representation of the people, accountability, and oversight. Article (24) explains that the DPR acts as the representation of the people, with its members directly elected by the people of each state. Therefore, each state is given representation according to its population. This is to maintain a balance in federal representation so that there is a check and balance of power between the Prime Minister and the DPR.

d. Control and oversight of the executive. To ensure a balance of power, Parliament is authorized to oversee the performance of the executive, particularly through question time and parliamentary committees. During question time, members of parliament can ask questions directly to the Prime Minister, thereby increasing the transparency and accountability of the government and also getting to the

root of the problems that the country has faced and is facing, and then finding solutions so that these problems do not recur in the future.

Australia has a parliamentary democratic political system based on a constitutional monarchy. Australia's head of state is the King/Queen of the United Kingdom, who is represented by the Governor-General residing in Australia. However, ultimate political power rests with the parliament, which consists of two chambers, the House of Representatives and the Senate. In this parliamentary democracy, Australia has a political system that separates the legislative, executive, and judicial powers (although in practice these three powers are mutually supportive), with the parliament having an important role in the formation of laws and oversight of the executive that carries out the laws to ensure that they impact the people (Farrell, 2017; Mackerras, 2020).

The system of government adopted is federal parliamentary, which means that power is shared between the central government and part. This parliamentary system includes two main institutions, the Prime Minister as the head of government and the Governor-General as the representative of the British monarchy. Section II/2 (Rasnic, 2016) states that the Governor-General exercises executive functions on behalf of the Queen and has the power to appoint ministers and sign laws that have been discussed and passed by the Prime Minister with Parliament.

The Prime Minister, who is the head of government, is elected by a majority in the House of Representatives and leads a cabinet of ministers appointed by parliament. Executive power depends more on parliamentary support (Gauja, 2015; Singleton et al., 2013).

Therefore, if the parliament loses confidence in the government because it is deemed incapable of implementing the laws and regulations as well as its vision, then the Prime Minister and his cabinet can be replaced at any time without waiting for an election (A. J. Ward, 2013; I. Ward, 2018).

Australian elections use a preferential system for voting.

House of Representatives, where voters rank candidates (Reilly, 2004). The candidate who receives an outright majority of votes (50%+1) is elected, and if no one a majority, the candidate with the fewest votes is switched according to the voter's second preference, until someone receives a majority (Iversen & Soskice, 2006).

For the Senate, Australia uses a proportional representation system, where seats are distributed based on the number of votes each political party receives, which gives smaller parties a greater chance of winning elections (Farrell, 2017; Rodman, 2024).

Section Two of the Preamble states that the Senate is the upper house of Parliament, with members elected by the states. Each state has an equal number of senators. The House of Representatives is the lower house of Parliament, with members elected by popular vote, with the number of seats based on population. Both the Senate and the House of Representatives are elected directly through elections based on the number of seats reserved from each state. The calculation of the number of seats is based on the population of each state (Rasnic, 2016).

No one system of government is truly superior to another. However, the existing systems of government such as parliamentary, presidential, monarchy, oligarchy, and tyranny are complementary and their good practices are highly dependent on the leaders in a country that implements them (A. J. Ward, 2013). Parliamentary and presidential systems of government are the types of government adopted by Australia and Indonesia (Carlin et al., 2015). These two types of government systems were constitutionally chosen by Indonesia and Australia because they are considered

to have advantages and disadvantages, where these advantages and disadvantages are still far better than other government systems (Matthieß, 2020).

Regarding the advantages and disadvantages of presidential and parliamentary systems of government (Basri et al., 2024; Ganghof, 2018) expressed their opinions, as follows.

The parliamentary system of government has its advantages and disadvantages, although some countries in the world have adopted it as the wheel of government. There are several advantages to a government system that applies parliamentary principles, among others:

a. There is flexibility in the change of government. If the Prime Minister is deemed unable to carry out the people's mandate, the people together with the parliament can easily replace him through a vote of no confidence owned by the parliament.

b. It tends to have better representation. The system is often able to produce coalitions, which reflect the various interests in society. This can often improve representativeness and inclusiveness in decision-making in favor of the people.

c. The level of accountability is relatively high. In carrying out his duties, the Prime Minister is fully and directly responsible to parliament, making it easier to account for his policies and actions to the people who have given him the trust to become a leader.

Besides having advantages, the government system that adheres to the parliamentary pattern also has disadvantages. As for some of the shortcomings of the government system that adheres to the parliamentary pattern, among others:

a. Governments are often unstable. This is because parliamentary systems are more prone to cabinet crises and changes in government. Governments often occur abruptly, which can destabilize short-, medium- and long-term politics and policies.

b. Usually, decision-making tends to be slower. This is because decision-making involves many parties, which can lead to policy implementation, especially if there are differences of opinion between coalition parties.

c. There is an opportunity for party domination. This fact is due to the fact that some large parties in the coalition tend to be more dominant, which tends to ignore the voices of small parties and minority groups in decision-making that is actually based on deliberation between coalition parties.

On the other hand, the presidential system of government also has advantages and disadvantages like the parliamentary system. The presidential government system has advantages as stated by Muhtadi (2015), Slater (2018), and Purwanto et al. (2020).

a. Considerable executive stability is maintained. In a presidential system of government, the term of office of a president is fixed and not entirely dependent on parliamentary support. This can provide better political stability because the President cannot be easily overthrown through a vote of no confidence, thus allowing the planning and implementation of short-, medium--, and long-term work programs to run well.

b. Direct legitimacy. Since the 2004 elections, all representatives have been directly elected by the people, which gives them strong legitimacy to carry out the vision and mission carried out when running for office. This creates a direct link between the people and the government, thus creating accountability of a leader to the people he leads.

c. Appropriate decision-making. As head of state and head of government, a president has great authority to make decisions without having to wait for approval from the legislature. This allows for a faster response to problems that require immediate attention.

d. Clear separation of powers. This system signifies a very clear and firm separation between the executive and the legislature, preventing the concentration of power and encouraging an effective check and balance mechanism between the two state institutions.

Meanwhile, the shortcomings of the presidential system of government according to Muhtadi (2015), Slater (2018), and Purwanto et al. (2020), are as follows:

a. Potential to lead to authoritarianism. Executive power that is too strong can lead to the risk of authoritarianism. Therefore, there needs to be sufficient oversight from the people as the ultimate power holder. Excessive authoritarianism can reduce government accountability and transparency, undermining popular trust.

b. May lead to political deadlock. When the president and the majority of the legislature are from different parties, it can lead to political deadlock, which can stall important decisions due to incompatibility between the president and the DPR.

c. This may lead to unclear accountability. Government accountability is often blurred because power is too centralized in the president, who is both head of state and head of government. If this happens, it can make it difficult for the people to assess the performance of the government as a whole.

4. Conclusion

Despite both adopting democratic systems, Indonesia and Australia have significant differences in the way executive and legislative powers are managed. Indonesia adheres to the presidential system that separates the executive and legislative powers. Australia has a parliamentary system where the two are more integrated. This strengthens the understanding of how different political systems affect day-to-day political decision-making and governance in both countries (Brown, 2020; Jones, 2019).

Different government structures and mechanisms reflect the history and political culture of each country. Indonesia prioritizes executive power in a presidential form, where the President has a dual role as the head of state and head of government. However, despite his dual role, his duties and authority as head of state and head of government are different. Meanwhile, Australia emphasizes the importance of legislative control in a parliamentary system over the executive so that the government can run well. In this case, Australia emphasizes more on legislative power. Therefore, in practice, if the executive loses the confidence of the majority of members of parliament (legislation), then constitutionally they have the right to replace the government (Prime Minister and his cabinet) at any time, not necessarily waiting for the implementation of elections.

Therefore, the differences and similarities between Indonesia and Australia in the political system and power are basically due to historical background. Indonesia's political, power and even legal systems were under Dutch colonization for hundreds of years, so they were more influenced by the Dutch. Meanwhile, Australia because it is a British colony, the government system is more directed to the kingdom / Queen in England. Therefore, the king is only ceremonial, because the real king or queen is in England. In addition, both countries are neighbors, which makes it possible to adopt each other's legal, political, and power systems and so far have quite good bilateral relations, which are incorporated, for example, in CSP, IA-CEPA, IORA, and others.

As such, there are some similarities and differences in the political system and power between Indonesia and Australia, which are described below:

a. Equation

- ▪ Democratic system.

    Indonesia and Australia are both democracies, both of which have regular election cycles to elect representatives of the people who will become leaders. In Indonesia, all people who are 17 (seventeen) years old or married have the right to vote and be elected. Whereas in Australia, people who are 18 (eighteen) years old have the right to vote.

- ▪ Separation of powers.

    Both Indonesia and Australia adhere to the principle of separation of powers in the three branches of government: executive, legislative, and judicial. This system aims to prevent the concentration of power in one branch and ensure a system of checks and balances.

- ▪ Bicameral Legislature

    Both Indonesia and Australia have bicameral legislatures. The Indonesian legislature consists of the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR), which includes the House of Representatives (DPR) and the Regional Representatives Council (DPD). Similarly, Australia has a Federal Parliament, which consists of the House of Representatives and the Senate.

- ▪ Constitutional Government

    Both countries follow constitutions that define their system of government and regulate the relationship between the two countries. Various branches of power. Indonesia's constitution was adopted in 1945, while Australia's constitution has been in place since 1901.

b. Difference

- ▪ Government system.

    Indonesia is a republic with a presidential system, where the president is both head of state and head of government. The president holds and exercises executive power. One of them is authorized to appoint ministers who will assist in running the government for Five years. Australia is a constitutional monarchy with a parliamentary system. The King is a ceremonial head of state. The actual head of government is the Prime Minister. Executive power is exercised by the prime minister and cabinet, who are responsible to parliament.

- ▪ The role of the military in government.

    In Indonesia, the military played an important role in the political system and power, especially during the New Order era. At that time, they even had the right to vote in elections. Whereas in Australia, the military is not involved in government affairs and elections. They only focus on security.

- ▪ Election system

    In legislative and executive elections, Indonesia uses a multiparty system with proportional representation. This means that the number of seats a party wins in Parliament is based on the proportion of votes it receives. In executive elections, political parties often form coalitions to nominate presidential candidates. In Australia, there are only two parties in the electoral system, the Australian Labor Party and the Liberal Party. The electoral system for the House of Representatives is preferential voting, while the Senate uses a proportional voting system. Both systems are designed to ensure fair representation.

4.1. Practical Implications

In this study, there are practical implications, which are:

a. For policymakers. Policymakers are those who are given authority by the people. Therefore, the findings are expected to help them understand the advantages and disadvantages of each system of government that has been implemented in their country. Thus, they can take the necessary positive steps to strengthen the government system by reducing the negative impacts.

b. For academics and researchers. The results of this study are expected to provide a fundamental understanding to explore more deeply the impact of government systems on political stability, political participation, and government accountability. Therefore, future research can be focused on in-depth case studies of how government policies in certain fields in the two systems of government apply in both countries.

c. For the general public. An increased understanding of the different systems of government is expected to increase public participation in the political process. With a high understanding of the political process, people are expected to be more critical in assessing government policies and performance as well as actively participating in elections and other forms of political activity.

For future researchers, several important points need to be done, namely:

a. Comparative public policy. Future researchers can focus on a more specific comparison of public policies between Indonesia and Australia. Some of these public policies are education, health, security, economic, and social. This is expected to provide a deeper insight into the effectiveness of policies in the government system of the two countries.

b. Longitudinal study. Future researchers can conduct longitudinal studies to look at changes and developments in the two countries' governance systems. This can help to understand how political reforms and policy changes affect the stability and effectiveness of the government in carrying out the mandate of the people.

c. Analysis of public participation. Future research could explore the level and form of public participation in the political process in both countries. This will provide insight into how the system of government can influence public engagement and public satisfaction with government services as representatives of the people.

References

Abrory, M. Y. (2023). *Ilmu Negara: Teori Klasik dan Kekinian*. CV. Azka Pustaka.

Al Hadad, A., Kurniawan, A., & Nurdiansyah, I. (2022). The Effectiveness of the Presidential Threshold Concept in the Presidential and Vice-Presidential Election System in Indonesia. *Khazanah Hukum, 4*(2), 92–100. https://doi.org/10.15575/kh.v4i2.18063

Al-Fatih, S. (2019). Akibat Hukum Regulasi tentang Threshold dalam Pemilihan Umum Legislatif dan Pemilihan Presiden. *Jurnal Yudisial, 12*(1), 17–38. https://doi.org/10.29123/jy.v12i1.258

Alie, M. (2013). *Pemasaran Politik di Era Multipartai*. PT. Mizan Publika.

Amalia, D., & Ribawati, E. (2024). Transformasi Identitas: Australia dari Era Immigration Restiction Act 1901 Menuju Masa Multikultural. *Multikultural: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, 2*(2), 16–23. https://doi.org/10.20527/multikultural.v2i2.119

Aminah, S., & Saksono, H. (2021). Digital Transformation of the Government: A Case Study in Indonesia. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication, 37*(2), 272–288. https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2021-3702-17

Androniceanu, A. (2021). Transparency in Public Administration as a Challenge for a Good Democratic Governance. *Administration and Public Management Review, 36*, 149–164. https://doi.org/10.24818/amp/2021.36-09

Anggara, S. (2013). *Sistem Politik Indonesia*. Penerbit Pustaka Setia.

Aris, M. S., Salman, R., & Ristawati, R. (2020). Redesigning a Parliamentary Election System for Strengthening the Presidential System in Indonesia. *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change, 11*(8), 760–772.

Arviansyah, M. R., Hudaidah, & Pahlevi, M. R. (2023). Australia dalam Bingkai Kolonialisasi dan Keterlibatannya dalam Perang Dunia. *Danadyaksa Historica, 3*(2), 118–128. https://doi.org/10.32502/jdh.v3i2.6675

Asshiddiqie, J. (2006). *Pengantar Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara*. Sekretariat Jenderal dan Kepaniteraan MKRI.

Bakry, U. S. (2017). *Dasar-Dasar Hubungan Internasional*. Prenadamedia Group.

Barokah, F., Maryanah, T., Darmastuti, A., & Hertanto. (2022). Disrupsi Politik: Peluang dan Tantangan Partai Politik Baru Jelang Pemilu 2024. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 21*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v21i1.273

Basri, A. R., Sawir, M., Kamaluddin, S., & Pongtuluran, R. (2024). Lanskap Pemerintahan: Memahami Perbedaan dan Implikasi Sistem Presidensial, Parlementer, dan Semi Presidensial. *Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP), 6*(1), 63–73. https://doi.org/10.47650/JGLP.V6I1.1257

Bhakti, T. S. (2020). *Pola Hubungan Presiden dengan DPR Pasca Amandemen UUD 1945*. Univeritas Indonesia.

Brown, P. (2020). Historical Backgrounds of Political Systems in Southeast Asia and Oceania. *Australian Political Review, 28*(1), 22–37.

Carlin, R. E., Love, G. J., & Martínez-Gallardo, C. (2015). Security, Clarity of Responsibility, and Presidential Approval. *Comparative Political Studies, 48*(4), 438–463. https://doi.org/10.1177/0010414014554693

Cipolla, C. M. (2011). *The Basic Laws of Human Stupidity*. Doubleday.

Darmawan, C. (2004). *Pendidikan Politik Warga Negara*. Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Farrell, D. M. (2017). *Electoral Systems and Voter Representation: The Case of Australia's Preferential Voting*. Electoral Studies, 49.

Galligan, B. (2018). *The Structure of the Australian Federation: A Political and Legal Analysis*. Australian University Press.

Ganghof, S. (2018). A New Political System Model: Semi-parliamentary Government. *European Journal of Political Research, 57*(2), 261–281. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12224

Gauja, A. (2015). The State of Democracy and Representation in Australia. *Representation, 51*(1), 23–34. https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2015.1023098

Hasanal Bolqiah, L., & Raffiudin, R. (2020). Dominasi Oligarki dan Ketidakhadiran Partai Politik Hijau di Indonesia. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 19*(2), 151–167. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v19i2.112

Hasibuan, F. (2019). Kewenangan MPR dalam Hubungan dengan Presiden: Pelantikan dan Pemberhentian Presiden. *Jurnal Konstitusi Indonesia, 18*(1), 22–35.

Hauteas, G., Rusmiwari, S., & Setyawan, D. (2017). Hubungan Kebijakan Demokratis dan Transparansi Legislatif untuk Meningkatkan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dalam Mewujudkan Public Policy Excellence. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, 6*(1), 94. https://doi.org/10.33366/jisip.v6i1.376

Humaidi, M. W., & Rahmadanti, I. S. (2023). Constitutional Design of State Policy As Guidelines on Indonesia's Presidential System Development Plan. *Volksgeist: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Konstitusi, 6*(1), 61–76. https://doi.org/10.24090/volksgeist.v6i1.7981

Ibrahim, M. B., Sari, F. P., Kharisma, L. P. I., Kertati, I., Artawan, P., Sudipa, I. G. I., Simanihuruk, P., Rusmayadi, G., Muhammadiah, M., Nursanty, E., & Lolang, E. (2023). *Metode Penelitian Berbagai Bidang Keilmuan (Panduan & Referensi)* (A. F. Amani, Efitra, & Sepriano, Eds.). PT. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.

Ismandianto, Albintani, M., Suprianti, N., & Putri, F. M. (2023). Contestation of 2024 Presidential Candidates of the Republic of Indonesia on Social Media Hashtags #Prabowo, #AniesBaswedan on Twitter. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 22*(2), 137–150. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v22i2.554

Iversen, T., & Soskice, D. (2006). Electoral Institutions and the Politics of Coalitions: Why Some Democracies Redistribute More Than Others. *American Political Science Review, 100*(2), 165–181. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0003055406062083

Jones, M. (2019). *A Study on Governance and Power Distribution: Indonesia and Australia*. Southeast Asian Governance, 17(4), 11–27.

Junaidi, V., & Reininda, V. (2020). Relasi Presiden dan DPR dalam Pembentukan Undang-Undang pada Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial Multipartai. *Jentera: Jurnal Hukum, 3*(1), 216–239. https://jurnal.jentera.ac.id/index.php/jentera/article/view/18

Laksmana, E. A. (2018, October 2). *Reinforcing Indonesia–Australia Defence Relations: The Case for Maritime Recalibration*. Lowy Institute. https://www.lowyinstitute.org/publications/reinforcing-indonesia-australia-defence-relations-case-maritime-recalibration-0

Latief, M. S. (2009). Demokrasi dan Transparansi dalam Pemilu 2004. *Populasi, 20*(1), 1. https://doi.org/10.22146/jp.12292

Lestari, S. I. (2024). Regional Elections and Opportunities for the Political Phenomenon of Dynasty in Expansion Areas: A Case Study of Pesisir Barat District. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 23*(1), 63–72. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v23i1.669

Machiavelli, N. (2008). *The Prince* (R. M. Adams, Ed.; 2nd ed.). W. W. Norton & Company, Inc.

Mackerras, M. (2020). The Political System of Australia: An Overview of Parliamentary Democracy. *Journal of Political Science, 35*(2), 33–48.

Malik, S., Khan, M. A., & El-Sayed, H. (2021). Collaborative Autonomous Driving—A Survey of Solution Approaches and Future Challenges. *Sensors, 21*(11), 3783. https://doi.org/10.3390/s21113783

Marpaung, L. A. (2018). *Ilmu Negara*. Penerbit Andi.

Matthieß, T. (2020). Retrospective Pledge Voting: A Comparative Study of the Electoral Consequences of Government Parties' Pledge Fulfilment. *European Journal of Political Research, 59*(4), 774–796. https://doi.org/10.1111/1475-6765.12377

Menzies, G. (2012). *1421: The Year China Discovered the World*. Transworld.

Muhtadi, B. (2015). Jokowi's First Year: A Weak President Caught between Reform and Oligarchic Politics. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies, 51*(3), 349–368. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2015.1110684

Nasution, M., & Sihombing, E. N. A. M. (2019). *Ilmu Negara*. Penerbit EnamMedia.

Omar, A., & Almaghthawi, A. (2020). Towards an Integrated Model of Data Governance and Integration for the Implementation of Digital Transformation Processes in the Saudi Universities. *International Journal of Advanced Computer Science and Applications, 11*(8), 588–593. https://doi.org/10.14569/IJACSA.2020.0110873

Pahlevi, I. (2014). Dinamika Sistem Pemilu Masa Transisi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Politica: Dinamika Masalah Politik Dalam Negeri dan Hubungan Internasional, 5*(2), 111–135. https://doi.org/10.22212/jp.v5i2.339

Pramelani, & Widyastuti, T. (2021). Persepsi Milenial terhadap Gaya Kepemimpinan Calon Presiden Tahun 2024. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 20*(2), 106–118. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v20i2.196

Purwanto, A., Zuiderwijk, A., & Janssen, M. (2020). Citizen Engagement With Open Government Data. *Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 14*(1), 1–30. https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-06-2019-0051

Putri, C. P., & Purnamawati, E. (2022). *Pengantar Ilmu Negara*. Penerbit Adab.

Putri, Z., & Pahlevi, M. R. (2022). Masuknya Inggris ke Australia dan Dampaknya bagi Suku Aborigin. *Danadyaksa Historica, 2*(2), 97–102. https://doi.org/10.32502/jdh.v2i2.5664

Rasnic, C. D. (2016). The Constitution of the Commonwealth of Australia. *International Journal of Constitutional Law, 14*(4), 1038–1043. https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/mow067

Reilly, B. (2004). The Global Spread of Preferential Voting: Australian Institutional Imperialism? *Australian Journal of Political Science, 39*(2), 253–266. https://doi.org/10.1080/1036114042000238500

Ricarvy, Z. A. K., & Wahyuningroem, S. L. (2024). Feminist Policy Analysis on Gender Mainstreaming Policy in Indonesian International Peacekeeping Forces. *Jurnal Politik, 10*(1), 82–116. https://doi.org/10.7454/jp.v10i1.1180

Rodman, E. (2024). On Political Theory and Large Language Models. *Political Theory, 52*(4), 548–580. https://doi.org/10.1177/00905917231200826

Rohmah, E. I. (2023). Dinamika Overlapping Kewenangan DPR dan Presiden dalam Pembentukan Kebijakan Negara. *Dekrit, 13*(1), 48–68. https://doi.org/10.56943/dekrit.v13n1.137

Rossa, S., Sari, A. P. A., Lianasari, A., Imammusadin, M., & Ambarwati, R. T. (2024). Partisipasi Politik Sedulur Sikep Blora dalam Pemilihan Umum Inklusif melalui Ajaran Kerukunan. *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik, 15*(1), 79–94. https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.15.1.2024.79-94

Rosyidin, M. (2020). *Teori Hubungan Internasional: Dari Perspektif Klasik Sampai Non-Barat*. PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.

Sabari, J., Wibawa, & Sari, M. W. (2016). *Efektivitas Pemanfaatan Media Pembelajaran Interaktif pada Materi Sejarah Benua Australia Berbasis Multimedia*.

Sabon, M. B. (2019). *Ilmu Negara: Bahan Pendidikan untuk Perguruan Tinggi*. Penerbit Unika Atma Jaya Jakarta.

Sapin, B. M., Bruck, H. W., & Snyder, R. C. (Eds.). (2012). *Foreign Policy Decision Making: An Approach to the Study of International Politics*. Literary Licensing, LLC.

Sawmar, A. A., & Mohammed, M. O. (2021). Enhancing Zakat Compliance Through Good Governance: A Conceptual Framework. *ISRA International Journal of Islamic Finance, 13*(1), 136–154. https://doi.org/10.1108/IJIF-10-2018-0116

Sinaga, C. M. (2014). *Dinamika Hubungan Australia-Indonesia dalam Bidang Politik (2010–2015)* [Undergraduate Thesis]. Universitas Hasanuddin.

Singleton, G., Aitkin, D., Jinks, B., & Warhurst, J. (2013). *Australian Political Institutions*. Pearson Australia Pty Ltd.

Slater, D. (2018). Party Cartelization, Indonesian-Style: Presidential Power-Sharing and the Contingency of Democratic Opposition. *Journal of East Asian Studies, 18*(1), 23–46. https://doi.org/10.1017/jea.2017.26

Smith, A. (2021). *Prime Ministers and Parliamentary Democracies: A Comparative Analysis of Australia.* Sydney University Press.

Suastika, I. N. (2020). Fenomena Susilo Bambang Yudonyono dan Implikasinya terhadap Pendidikan Politik Masyarakat Indonesia Pasca Pemilu 2004. *Media Komunikasi FPIPS, 19*(2), 104–110. https://doi.org/10.23887/mkfis.v19i2.27317

Sudirman, F. A., & Saidin. (2022). Pemerintahan Berbasis Elektronik (E-Government) dan Pembangunan Berkelanjutan: Reviu Literatur Sistematis. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 21*(1), 44–58. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v21i1.269

Syamsuddin, A. (2018). Legislasi dan Pengawasan: Hubungan DPR dengan Presiden di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Tata Negara, 15*(2), 89–101.

Tang, M. C. (2014). *Kisah-Kisah Kebijaksanaan China Klasik: Inspirasi bagi Para Pemimpin* (V. Sutanto, Trans.). Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Thahir, B. (2023). Memahami Kebijakan Rencana Tata Ruang Wilayah di Provinsi Banten. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Widya Praja, 49*(1), 102–115. https://doi.org/10.33701/jipwp.v49i1.3133

Thoha, M. (2014). *Perilaku Organisasi: Konsep Dasar dan Aplikasinya.* Rajawali Pers.

Triananta, Moch. N., & Purnomo, E. P. (2023). Pengembangan Kebijakan Satu Data dalam Pelayanan Publik di Kabupaten Sleman. *Nakhoda: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan, 22*(2), 195–206. https://doi.org/10.35967/njip.v22i2.600

Utami, D. M., Ikhsan, M., Dartanto, T., & Mallarangeng, R. (2024). Political Behaviour of the Indonesian Middle Class: Lower Turnouts in More Modernised Areas. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik, 27*(3), 314–329. https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.89360

Ward, A. J. (2013). *Parliamentary Government in Australia.* Australian Scholarly Publishing.

Ward, I. (2018). The Australian Federal System of Government: Structure and Function. *Australian Journal of Governance, 29*(4), 44–59.

Wibowo, A. P., Wardhana, E. W., & Nurgiansah, T. H. (2022). Pemilihan Umum di Indonesia dalam Perspektif Pancasila. *Jurnal Kewarganegaraan, 6*(2), 3217–3225. https://doi.org/10.31316/jk.v6i2.3295

Wiratmadinata. (2018). Memahami Kembali Rumpun Ilmu Hukum Tata Negara. *Jurnal Hukum Samudra Keadilan, 13*(1), 44–66. https://doi.org/10.33059/jhsk.v13i1.731