



Indigenous Democracy in the Policy-making Process

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim^a, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor^a, Neneng Yani Yuningsih^{a*}

^aUniversitas Padjadjaran, Jl. Bukit Dago Utara No. 25 Bandung, 40135, Jawa Barat, Indonesia

Information Article

History Article

Submission : 10-September-2022

Revision : 01-December-2022

Published : 13-July-2023

DOI Article:

<https://doi.org/10.24905/jip.8.1.2023.50-63>

ABSTRACT

The policy process cannot be separated from democracy because in the policy process there is an aggregation of interests and accommodation of interests, where the existing needs of the community will be tied in one package, namely public opinion. The original village democracy was characterized by deliberation in decision-making and involved gotong royong in all implementations related to joint achievement efforts. Meanwhile, traditional rural democracy has undergone a change towards a decline where the implementation of democracy in independent villages (Village Development Index) has no substance. This paper tries to analyze the Policy Process in the Perspective of Original Village Democracy which changes according to and depends on political culture variables and socio-economic variables. This study uses a qualitative method with purposive sampling in determining the informants and interview techniques, observation and documentation. The rest of the data sources are obtained through literature study of concepts and theories about the policy process and democracy that occurs in the village contained in books and several articles that have been published. The data used by the author are primary data and secondary data.

Acknowledgment

Keywords: Policy Process, Indigenous Democracy, Social Change,

© 2023 Published by Governmental Studies. Selection and/or peer-review under responsibility of JIP.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: tiyanrahamanul.hakim@gmail.com.

1. Introduction

The enactment of Law No. 6/2014 on Villages provides new insights into village governance policies. In addition, the Village Law also provides recognition and respect for villages that have various diversities, both before the existence of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia and after its formation. Diversity such as customs, traditions, and culture are given guarantees and clarity of status and legal certainty in the constitutional system. The spirit of change and renewal of the village paradigm has an impact on changes in the relationship between the state and the village. Moreover, the Village Law encourages village independence in terms of sustainable development and empowerment of the village community. The objectives of Law No. 6/2014 are explained as follows Recognize and respect the existing villages with their diversity before and after the formation of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia; Provide clarity on the status and legal certainty of the Village in the constitutional system of the Republic; Indonesia in order to realize justice for all Indonesian people; Preserve and promote the customs, traditions, and culture of the Village community; Encouraging initiatives, movements, and participation of the Village community for the development of Village potential and Assets for common welfare; Establish a Village Government that is professional, efficient and effective, open and accountable; Improving public services for Village residents in order to accelerate the realization of general welfare; Improve the socio-cultural resilience of the Village community in order to realize a Village community that is able to maintain social unity as part of national resilience; Advancing the economy of the Village community and overcoming national development gaps; and Strengthening village communities as the subject of development.

Although the objectives of the Village Law have not yet had a significant impact on village development, the reality is that villages are always used as objects of development, meaning that there is no involvement of villagers in development efforts. As a result, the higher the level of dependence of villages on the state and the unevenness in terms of village development, the more unnoticed regional areas are. In both the reformation and early reformation eras, policies made related to villages did not really touch the interests of the community, even decisions made by the central government have not been seen in accordance with the wishes and needs of rural communities. Meanwhile, village autonomy essentially mandates the village as the subject of development. The village is the subject or main actor in village development in terms of planning, financing and implementing the development. This is representative of the spirit of Village Development, which is the basis for Law No. 6/2014 on Villages. Where villages are required to be able to independently develop themselves based on the interests of their communities, so that villages are able to be sovereign in the economic, political, social, cultural and technological advances. The concept that can illustrate the existence of village autonomy is the policy process that occurs in the village. There is interaction between the community and the government/authority in policy making, either directly facilitated by the local government or through groups that accommodate the interests and needs of the village community.

In the political view, the policy process is characterized by the collection of interests and the formulation of public interests, so that the policy process cannot be separated from democracy because in the policy process there are demands such as various kinds of community needs, education, health, agriculture, services, and others that need to be organized by policy makers. It should be emphasized that in a democratic system, every person, organization and interest group

has the same opportunity to convey their demands, it is only how the policy maker meets the satisfaction of these various demands. Therefore, the policy process is interpreted as a process of dialogue or conveying the interests of the various parties involved so as to influence the results of the dialogue which will determine the content of the policy. A form of democracy is the participation of the people in reaching decisions by taking into account mutual consent, which reflects a reciprocal relationship between various stakeholders and everyone has the same opportunity to express their opinions. This kind of process existed before colonial times, characterized by communal land ownership. As Mohammad Hatta has said, the democratic system is still strong in the village on the basis of communal land ownership. In communal land ownership, everyone must comply with agreed norms or rules so that if he behaves and acts regarding economic activities (communal land), it must prioritize mutual consent and act according to applicable rules. This is not the case in post-reform villages where dialogic processes often only take place at the level of the village elite who are the decision makers without involving the small communities such as poor farmers and farm laborers who are most affected by the policies.

Thus, on the one hand, this is a form of decline of the original democracy that was once embraced by the villages due to the socio-economic transition in the villages, on the other hand it is influenced by the socio-economic transition in the local community and this is considered the basis of social development. This is evident in Pangalengan Village, Pangalengan Sub-district, Bandung Regency, which is categorized as an independent village (according to the 2021 Village Development Index Ranking). That the dialogic process is only centered on the village government and RW heads and some community leaders. The social condition of the village community has changed where the RW head is the representative of the village community. The RW head has the authority to decide everything that affects people's lives. In addition, the actions of the village government encourage the RW heads to be more dominant in village development. The village deliberation is always attended by the RW heads as the channel of aspiration and the bridge between the village government and the community.

The role of village elites in Pangalengan Village is key to influencing village government policies. It seems that most people play a passive role in village development. The community is more focused on their work or the economy of their family because most of them are farmers, traders and farm laborers. This busyness is one of the reasons for the lack of community contribution to village governance, so that the Pangalengan community relies more on the role of village elites to coordinate all interests. Based on the reality in Pangalengan Village, the policy process is no longer the same as it was when traditional democracy was effectively implemented in closed communities that were still relatively united. Traditional democracy is symbolized by deliberation in reaching collective decisions and mutual cooperation governed by customs, so the highest authority is the village meeting

The public space referred to above is influenced by environmental variables, so the policy process depends on the situation of values and people's lives. As in (Taufiqurokhman, 2014) that policy making is inseparable from environmental influences, and then transformed into a political system. The three elements involved in a policy include policy actors, the policy environment and public policy. In the case of Pangalengan Village, there are two environmental variables, namely Political Culture Variables and Socio-Economic Variables.

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, Neneng Yani Yuningsih

The change in social order in Pangalengan has an impact on the decision-making process. Village meetings are merely mandatory activities that are regulated by the supra-village government without paying attention to the substance. As a result, the village government only carries out procedural formalities so as not to violate the rules. The role of the village elite is increasingly dominant in making decisions concerning the village community. The dominant role of the village elite may be perceived differently depending on which strata people belong to, whether it is a person who has a great position or influence so that his or her opinion is highly valued in the community. Other things such as population density, where people with different backgrounds result in pluralism and the attitudes and behaviors of people who respond to economic and political activities can change the rural situation. It is too complex to generalize because social change changes depending on the region.

In this discussion, democracy is mostly analyzed in terms of the aspects and ways of reaching decisions in society and other matters that affect democracy where socio-economic changes resulting from democratization affect the shift in the nature of democracy that the village once had before it was contaminated by programs entrusted by the government above the village which caused the village to be unable to escape the influence of national development strategic plans. This paper tries to analyze the policy process in the perspective of Original Village Democracy, which changes according to and depends on the socio-economic environment in which democracy is implemented. The object of research is Pangalengan Village, Pangalengan Sub-district, Bandung Regency as one of the comparisons where the original village democracy has been transformed due to state intervention and the role of village elites. This cannot be discussed without an understanding of the social changes that have developed in the villages

2. Method

The method used is qualitative research method. This research departs from the study of concepts and theories about the policy process and democracy that occur in the village by comparing those categorized as independent villages. Determination of informants using *purposive sampling* techniques by assigning informants including Village Secretaries, BPD Chairmen, RW Leaders, Community Leaders, and the General Public.

The techniques used in this study were interviews, conservation and documentation. In this case, the author does not merely collect and write the results of several books, scientific journals, and internet sources that have been analyzed, but interviews directly with informants, and directly observes the behavior, activities of individuals in Pangalengan Village, Pangalengan District, Bandung Regency. The data obtained includes information and facts about Pangalengan Village and about the policy process in the perspective of village original democracy. In this study, the data used by the author are primary data and secondary data conducted through literature studies. The author obtains data that is in accordance with the problem under study and in accordance with the research objectives, so that the data collected can be analyzed in depth.

To obtain scientific truth, data collection techniques and data analysis are carried out that are expected to represent the reality of research. To avoid subjectivity and avoid research process errors, one way is to test the validity of the data. Testing data credibility by checking data obtained through various books, scientific journals, the internet, then described and categorized which ones are the same, which ones are different or which are specific until finally the data that has been analyzed can be concluded.

3. Findings and Discussion

Political Culture Variables: Patterns of Rural Democracy as Policy Processes

According to the customs that are still held tightly by the villagers, if the leadership of the village head is not satisfactory, then the community will replace him. The community has some sort of authority to dismiss and elect its village head, including holding large deliberations on problems and village development. However, after the village is inserted by the state interest in the implementation of village administration, the implementation function regarding village deliberations or rather village meetings is always initiated by village officials or government above the village (supradesa) who instruct decisions regarding village development. In fact, a democratic policy process will be carried out in a village meeting initiated by the community.

As can be seen in Pangalengan Village that village deliberations are only carried out during the village development planning stage, for example in making RKPDes (Village Government Work Plan), and APBDes (Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget). Other deliberations are carried out when there are instructions from the supravillage government such as the procedure for determining BLT (Cash Direct Assistance) Beneficiary Families. This is of course solely to fulfill administrative obligations.

So that the implementation of the village meeting in Pangalengan Village still has not touched the substance. The reason for the non-optimal village meeting is because, the Pangalengan Village Government only looks at the procedural side, namely the village's obligation to implement supravillage government rules. Most village meetings are initiated by the village government with guidance from the supravillage government, and the discussion of the meeting is always related to planning the physical development of the village and socializing village programs.

Even though the concept of public space is seen in a village meeting where the policy process as a demand in traditional village communities, how a policy is built on the basis of community interests and of course a policy is fully supported by the community. In a democratic village meeting, all communities have the same opportunity to express their opinions whether they are represented or in person.

The forms of public space in village policy making are divided into formal and informal. The formal public space is a forum between BPD (Village Consultative Board), Village Government, and village community elements organized by BPD to agree on strategic matters, village development planning, BUMDes and others, regulated in PDDT amendment No. 16 of 2019 concerning village deliberation. While informal public spaces can be carried out between village officials, BPD members and the community can be done anywhere, more flexible without referring to the amendment.

In Pangalengan Village itself, we can still find the availability of public spaces that provide communication space with the community informally. Like the interaction between farm workers and land owners (land farmers), usually land owners are included in the elite who are not powerful in the sense of community leaders who are always invited to attend meetings in the village. The complaints (interests and needs) of farm workers are always poured out to the landowners who then the things discussed earlier will be conveyed in the village meeting.

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, Neneng Yani Yuningsih

Village meetings can also be interpreted as social spaces generated by communicative actions where village meetings become the place where democratic policy processes occur. This happens if the village community wants a village meeting to discuss the interests and needs of the village community in village development. In contrast to village meetings initiated by the village government which has recently acted as an implementer of programs derived from the government above the village (supra-village). So the resulting essence does not represent the interests of society contained in public opinion earlier.

In addition, the wisdom of the Village Head has a great influence in determining the results of deliberations, meaning that the *community mindset* still considers the Village Head as the highest authority who determines village development, although problems related to the proposals of each region certainly often cause a little conflict of interest between community leaders or the Head of the Community Pillars which is ultimately resolved by the Village Head. The conflict of interest in question is that the Head of RW is given the responsibility as a carrier of the aspirations of residents in his area and as a determinant of the success of the proposals charged to him to be proposed in village meetings, so that the egos of community leaders in each region are very high to fight for these proposals

Given the era after independence, those who have the right to attend village meetings and express their aspirations are adult men. However, in traditional villages, those who have the right to participate in village meetings are those with high social status, in other words, only people who have land can attend and people who do not own land cannot attend village meetings. People who do not own land are usually asked for their opinions informally.

In Pangalengan Village, the implementation of village meetings or village deliberations was attended by the Head of RW as a representative of the community, TP Cadres. Village PKK and community leaders who have a major influence on village development. The Pangalengan Village Government must refer to PDPTT Amendment No. 16 of 2019 considering that the regulation is a guideline in the implementation of village meetings.

As stated by Hofsteede where the frequency of village meetings varies from once for 5 years to once a month or more. The frequency is adjusted to the projects of rural communities. But given the fact that the projects were actually initiated by the upper levels of the village, the consequences at this time apparently tend to be less than they used to be around 1960. On the other hand, decisions may be reached by the Village Council or the sub-district in consultation with the Village Deliberation Body. Bamudes now consisted not only of important people with knowledge of customs, but also of formal and informal leaders.

The implementation of the Village Meeting has undergone a shift in meaning. Adaya state rules related to village deliberations actually become a binder for villages to follow the procedures for implementing deliberations, so that the village government only follows from the procedural side. Padahal is the highest power in the village meeting as stated above that the village meeting as a space to gather all interests by deliberation and consensus. According to him, the village meeting is the highest body that holds power in the village, using a system of government unique throughout the history of the legal philosophy of countries around the world and its system of deliberation and consensus. Deliberation means to consider together to reach a point of agreement and of course neither side wins nor loses, nor victory by arguing, but to achieve victory together. (Kartohadikoesoemo S., 1984, p. 123)

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, Neneng Yani Yuningsih

Although the government emphasizes that every activity must go through village deliberations and based on the principle of consensus deliberation, PDTT Amendment No. 16 of 2019 concerning Village Deliberation does not provide an understanding regarding the highest decision making in village meetings or village deliberations, meaning that the emphasis on consensus deliberation has not been optimally implemented. That lack of clarity maintains the *community's mindset* that village law is handed over to the Village Head and village officials, so that the community only acts as a proposer and giver of consideration.

However, there is a difference between the implementation of village meetings and deliberations within Rukun Masyarakat (RW) initiated by the community. RW deliberation in the decision-making process and its achievement is based on the principles of deliberation, as mandated in the fourth precept of Pancasila, namely deliberation to reach consensus on a familial basis. Solving problems through RW meetings does not use *voting* methods or who is dominant will be the decision maker. As in Sukamenak Village RW 18 Pangalengan Village, regular meetings are held once a month and discuss village development or physical development programs, as well as discuss social assistance from the central government such as PKH (Family Hope Program), BPNT (Non-Cash Food Assistance), and other social assistance that is unexpected in distribution.

Pangalengan Village as a whole has a fairly high self-help, including Kp. Cibeureum RW 20, Kp. Sukamenak RW 18, Kp. Tanimukti RW 17, and Kp. Tirtamukti RW 06. These areas are some areas that are the locus of research and have different characters and conditions even though each region is close to each other and there is no significant distance separating the areas. The social condition of the community has a very large influence on the level of self-help. The livelihood of the population and the role of the leader (RW Chairman) are two other pieces of evidence that can answer how much it affects the implementation of community self-help.

This should be a concern, self-help is one of the important values in people's lives. noble values that have been inherent in Indonesian society that exist for generations and become the personality of the Indonesian nation. Self-help can be understood as a culture of mutual assistance, namely cooperation to achieve common goals by consensus and mutual deliberation driven by awareness, sincerity, willingness, and trust and enthusiasm that grows in each individual community.

Self-help can be said to be a form of social capital. Self-help describes joint efforts to help achieve common goals for the benefit of mutual benefit. As happened in Kp. Tanimukti RW 17 Pangalengan Village, there are regular community fees. The contribution system carried out by the Tanimukti community symbolizes a relationship of trust. Umpi activities or other names for dues are long-established programs intended to support community activities that are not coordinated by the Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget. This activity has become a tradition both in the RW 17 Kp. Tanimukti area or other areas in Pangalengan Village.

What has been explained above is an original and ideal democracy whose existence may still appear to be the implementation of RW-level deliberations. But considering the political influence that arises from both internal and external and especially state regulations that are not in accordance with the conditions of society, so the original democratic pattern that grows in society is doubtful. In fact, village democracy only exists in communities that still hold ancestral rules (ancestors), for example, the policy process on communal land management is still something that is maintained and as a source of life for the community. In this society, the achievement of consensus is taboo because economic activities still depend on each other.

Table 1 Aspiration Delivery Process in Pangalengan Village

	Village Government	Village Consultative Body (BPD)	Village Community Institutions	Public Figures
Village Elite	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Village head as implementer of development, community development (community participation), community empowerment 2. Village equipment, helping the village chief's performance 3. Head of territory (Head of hamlet, Rukun Tentangga, Rukun Warga) 	<p>BPD members, the function of accommodating and channeling aspirations.</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Head of RW and RT 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Landlord 2. Rich Farmer 3. Political Party figures
Collaborative Planning	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Aspiration Delivery in Village Meeting 2. Village Development Planning Deliberation 3. Audience at the house of the cadet pack (the community deliberately came to convey their needs 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-formal hearings can be held at stalls, in people's homes, etc. 2. Residents' meeting with BPD members during the funeral process of the deceased <p>Then followed up in BPD deliberations</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Non-formal hearings can be held at stalls, in people's homes, etc. Then followed up in internal meetings of the organization 2. Mobilization of time collected in one place to conduct construction 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The interaction between landowners and rich farmers with their workers in the rice fields 2. Time mobilization gathered in one place.

Source: research processing, 2021

According to the table above, the process of conveying the aspirations of rural communities tends to be informal. Because indeed changes in the democratic process at the meeting only a handful of influential people were invited to the village meeting and the discussion of the village meeting was only about physical development planning, and its implementation was also such as socialization of development programs that would be implemented in the future, so that informal greeting carried out by the village community was through delivery to land owners / rich farmers or in other words community leaders. At this time the above situation is no longer found in the implementation of village meetings. Meanwhile, the outside influence of the village changed as well. Traditional democracy is implemented effectively in closed communities that are still relatively united, one of which is the indigenous Baduy community in Banten Province

Indonesian-style democratic values can be found in traditional villages that still uphold values passed down from generation to generation. In land ownership, the "Baduy Dalam" community has a rule that they cannot sell their land or fields, because their land is customary land or the ownership is communal. In the management of this customary land, ownership can change to other community members (other Baduy Dalam), in the sense that the previous landowner managed land elsewhere and the former land can be replaced by other Baduy communities. It is evident that communal land ownership binds them together in a land of life that depends on each other. There grew the original village democratic system where deliberation became a space for expressing opinions that accommodated all the aspirations of the community.

Mutual attachment to each other is maintained by the value of equality that is still firmly held in everyday life. Even though the traditional head of the baduy who in fact is the leader of the indigenous people lives a simple and undifferentiated life, as well as the customary rules that must be obeyed by everyone including traditional leaders who if they violate the rules will still be subject to severe punishment because this traditional head (puun) is a special person who has more knowledge than other communities, It is natural to be a good example for the community.

Socio-Economic Variables: Consensus Achievement in Village Policy Process

Socially, the life of the village community can be said to be still homogeneous and the pattern of interaction is horizontal with the family system. All people who interact are considered family members and the things that play a big role in their interactions and social relationships are social motives. Social interaction is always sought so that social unity is not disturbed, conflicts or social conflicts are avoided as much as possible. Similarly, the process of achieving decisions is defined as solving problems faced by the community. The achievement of decisions that occur in village meetings should be a community concern. In rural areas where people own large amounts of private land, the role of landowners largely determines the policies that will be made by village officials in a village meeting. There is a reciprocal relationship between landowners and farmers who do not own land where these two people/groups need each other, usually landowners who are considered village elites and are an extension of the tongue of poor farmers, then these elites will ask their opinions on something needed at the meeting. Formal deliberations occur between formal and informal leaders who play an important role in delivering the results of village meetings.

That in all aspects of rural democracy, the initiation, endorsement, implementation and participation of the people began to diminish. In achieving meeting decisions that should have the

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, Neneng Yani Yuningsih

most important function, now it has been replaced by consultation between the lurah (the call of the Village Head in Javanese society in ancient times) and the Village Consultative Body (Bamudes) consisting of formal and informal leaders appointed by the lurah where the lurah here plays an increasingly important role.

As in Pangalengan Village, the decision achievement process is dominated by the Village Head. The role of the Village Head has a major influence in determining the results of deliberations, and this is reinforced by the *mindset* of the community who still considers the Village Head as the highest authority who determines village development. Because most people seem passive towards village development. The people of Pangalengan village think more about and prioritize the family economy because most of their livelihoods are traders, farmers, and agricultural laborers. Of course, the busyness of economic activity is one of the causes of low supervision and contribution of ideas to village development, so that the people of Pangalengan rely more on village elites to coordinate every interest. The flow of communication between the Pangalengan Village Government and the village community is maintained by the Head of RW. In this case, the Head of the RW will accommodate all proposals or complaints from the community through regular meetings with the Head of the RT. This is one of the available public spaces that provides communication space to discuss community problems and make decisions related to village development priorities. Regular RW meetings are interpreted as actions or community responses to government policies that affect their interests. Then the aspirations of the community will be conveyed at the village meeting. As stated by (Mariana, Dede. 2015) that this kind of aspiration channeling model is a characteristic of representative democracy.

While the decision-making process still involves the wider community either in terms of monitoring or providing opinions and wishes even though it is informally only represented to village elites, it will not have much effect on the decline of native democracy. With a note that the village elite really attaches more importance to the public. When the village elite is oriented towards its interests, there will be a distortion of aspirations because the results of decisions are not based on an objective priority scale, but the village elite determines what things will be fought for. The moral obligation of elites is a critical factor for continuing democracy in the countryside. But its adherence to norms can only be expected in a situation where in society there is a living mechanism to limit the power of the elite. Collective land management was once an important democratic foundation. In a society where wealth and resources are communally regulated and social relations are also important wealth, it is wise to maintain social harmony and good relations with one's friends rather than creating tension and squabbles open through competition.

Such a thing has not been seen in the Village Administration. The history of state regulations that intervene in social life is one of the factors that influence social change in society. As one example, the promotion of the Village Cash Intensive Program (PKTD) has an impact on eroding the culture of mutual cooperation in the village. Such as the implementation of paid service work, resulting in volunteerism and community togetherness, it reduces where community orientation prioritizes material. The need for work also makes people dependent on PKTD who can provide temporary work, so that this factor supports the effectiveness of the program and the negative impact of the tradition of mutual assistance is decreasing.

Similarly, arrangements related to the management of carik land or village cash land. As a result, village cash land management has shifted completely from the power of the village community over land rights. The authority of the village head can fully manage the village treasury

land without the consent of the village community though. Village authority is strengthened by the recognition of the supravillage government which gives freedom to the village government to manage and not interfere, so that the village head can fully regulate the results of the village treasury land. I don't know when the transfer of power over land rights became the authority of the Village Head and almost all villages have occurred fenomena like this, including in Pangalengan Village as well. Permendagri No. 1 of 2016 (Article 4) actually strengthens the position of the Village Head over village asset management, where the Village Head is given the authority to determine village asset management policies, determine policies for the use, utilization or transfer of assets, and establish asset security policies. At least these three things can be used as opportunities for the Village Head's arbitrariness towards the management of PADes. In fact, according to Kartohadikoesoemo that according to the original law, the right to land is entirely in the hands of the villagers, not only over agricultural land, but also over land that has not been cultivated (planted), but also includes scrub land and ravines. The kings did not take power over the land. If he needed land, then he asked the village for the necessary land (postponed).

If the political system is not strong enough, democracy is not so developed. If a person does not like a decision, he does not need to stay in society, as long as wealth and resources are also available elsewhere. The role of the leader is also not so important because administrative or political functions are also not developed. If such a society requires stronger leadership for either internal political, administrative, or economic purposes, or efforts to deal with external threats, consensus is essential.

Thus arose the form of society in which democracy was necessary for harmony. After the community, a society arises where the economic situation is close to the lives of community members, each villager has relatively equal bargaining power. This kind of community leadership will be stronger than the society above. But this leadership is overseen by other residents of the community. In this case sanctions will be held by the follower party. Agreement is formed between followers, while the task of the leaders is only to mediate. They cannot lead society to a decision that only meets the interests of these leaders. In addition, the process of achieving a consensus requires a leader who is able to embrace every element in society. A need for leaders to have the ability to communicate with the community in order to accommodate the aspirations of the community, even though it is very difficult to satisfy all members of society. But this communication is able to minimize disappointment if community satisfaction is not achieved.

The existence of norms passed down from generation to generation by ancestors with rules that require all activities to be in accordance with deeply held norms is a characteristic of traditional society. An attitude that worships past successes, for example, and is less future-oriented. This traditional attitude to life has repercussions in the mindset of the village community. It is this traditional pattern that measures who deserves to be their leader. According to (Ulum, 2004) the process of selecting Baduy traditional leaders is very interesting to explore. An indigenous leader always has privileges both from the knowledge he has and the sharing of the results of economic activities obtained. The process of selecting traditional heads is divided into two ways, first through deliberations held by traditional elders through customary deliberations where this process occurs after the descent of wangsit through the previous traditional head to carry out the replacement of the old Puun. After Puun had a long dialogue with other puuns regarding his responsibility and sincerity to put down the position of traditional chief, the results

of the wangsit were brought to the musawarah of the puuns. When there is a result of the puun's deliberations that indicate the replacement of the puun, a customary musayawarah will be held and prepare for the selection of puun. Second, there are prospective leaders who are prepared in advance (2-3 years) by traditional village heads and deputy traditional leaders. So Puun candidates are not just one person can be more.

That the election made by the traditional baduy customs places the leader as the father to his villagers. Even in traditional villages, only a handful of people can give advice on prospective leaders, but the election process is carried out deliberately. Of course, this process will make leaders who are in accordance with what their community members want and become protectors for their communities. If we compare it with the village (not customary) that lurah (former name) is a villager whose nature and role and duty of life, skills, ethics in character exceed other residents. It can be determined by the nature of his personality can be seen honesty, a sense of solidarity, mastery of knowledge and material knowledge and his role in all areas of life of the village community.

As a formal leader, the lurah is faced with the obligation to realize programs instructed from above, in accordance with the authority he clearly has. However, in a traditional society, a lurah is still required to behave as a father based on a wise nature like a leader found in the Baduy indigenous community. So it can be said that in rural communities where the village head / lurah has a fatherly attitude with a wise and reliable nature by the community and protecting the community will potentially maintain the original form of democracy that can still survive in rural communities today.

In contrast to modern society where political factors trump social factors in the election of village leaders. In this society, it is not seen based on the ethics, skills, and personality of a leader, but the practice of money politics that makes a person a leader. It is already Umrah in the election of leaders directly (through elections). The impact of the policies made is also a political product, meaning that a Village Head certainly has a political promise (vision and mission) when he runs and this is stated in the RPJMDes. Within 6 years of his office, the Village Head must complete his vision and mission and of course it is a guideline in village development. Community participation is only as a beneficiary.

4. Conclusion

There is a link between the policy process and rural democracy. Democracy contained in the lives of rural communities after the reform is different where the policy environment greatly affects the substance and procedures of village deliberations as a space for village democracy, including:

Viable Political Culture:

- The intervention of the supravillage government through regulations related to village deliberations has an impact on the nature of the original village democracy. The spirit of village deliberation as the highest decision in the village is procedurally transformed only.
- The changing patterns of village native democracy affect the policy process, where tendencies in rural democracy are influenced by political circumstances after the Village Head Election. The first is caused by the dominance of the authority of the Village Head in determining village development, reducing the process of dialogue with the community.

Socioeconomic Variables:

- The role of village elites is very influential in achieving decisions in a Village Meeting. The economic factors of the community are behind the passive participation of the community, so it leaves the decision to the village elites.
- National programs that enter the village have an impact on social change in the community, such as the Village Cash Intensive program eroding the culture of village gotongroyong
- The management of village carik (crooked land) goes from a collective decision of the community to the authority of the Village Head as a whole.

References

- Adiwilaga, Rendy. 2021. *Sistem Pemerintahan Desa di Indonesia*. Bandung: Penerbit Manggu Makmur Tanjung Lestari.
- Amanulloh, Naeni. 2015. *Demokratisasi Desa*. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia.
- Bahrul Ulum. 2014. *Nilai-Nilai Demokrasi Dalam Pengangkatan Puun/Raja Pada Masyarakat Hukum Adat Baduy*. Universitas Brawijaya Malang
- Cresswell, Jhon W. 2013. *Research Design*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Dede Mariana. 2015. *Partispasi masyarakat dalam proses kebijakan*. Jatinangor: Cosmogov, vol. 1 No. 2
- Dekki Umamur Ra'is. 2017. *Kebijakan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Dalam Perspektif Asas Rekognisi dan Subsidiaritas Undang-Undang Desa Nomor 6 Tahun 2014*. Malang: Universitas Tribhuwana Tunggadewi
- Eko, Sutoro. 2014. *Desa Membangun Indonesia*. Yogyakarta: *Australian Community Development and Civil Society*.
- Heri Wahyudianto. 2020. *Model Desa di Masa Depan dan Kebijakan Pembinaannya*. Jakarta: Jurnal Kemendagri
- Hikmah Handayani. Pengaruh Demokrasi Dalam Kehidupan Bangsa Indonesia. Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Ekonomi Perbankan.
- Huda, N. 2017. *Penataan Demokrasi Dan Pemilu Di Indonesia Pasca-Reformasi*. Jakarta: PT Fajar Interpratama Mandiri.
- Jamaludin, Adon Nasrulloh. 2015. *Sosiologi Pedesaan*. Bandung: Pustaka Setia.
- Kartohadikoesumo, Sutardjo. 1984. *Desa*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka

Tiyan Rahamanul Hakim, Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, Neneng Yani Yuningsih

Kurniawan, Boni. 2015. *Desa Mandiri, Desa Membangun*. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, Dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia.

Maleong, Lexy J. 1996. *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.

M. Syahbudin Latief. 2003. *Kendala dan Prosepek Demokrasi di Desa Pada Era Otonomi Daerah*

M. Prijono, Yumiko & Tjiptoherijanto, Prijono. 2012. *Demokrasi di Pedesaan Jawa*. Jakarta: Kosa Kata Kita.

Raynold Mubarak. 2018. *Sinergitas Pemerintah Desa Dan Perusahaan Dalam Penerapan Corporate Social Responsibility (Csr) Pt. Xiv Nusantara (Persero) Di Desa Wanua Waru Kec. Libureng Kab. Bone*. Universitas Islam Negeri Alaudin.

Sarjana Sigit Wahyudi. 2009. *Demokrasi di Tingkat Lokal*. Semarang: Universitas Diponegoro

Syafiie, Inu Kencana. 2011. *Manajemen Pemerintahan*. Bandung: Pustaka Rena Cipta

Taufiqurokhan. 2014. *Kebijakan Publik Pendelegasian Tanggungjawab Negara Kepada Presiden Selaku Penyelenggara Negara*. Jakarta: Universitas Moestopo Beragama (Pers)

V.Wiratna Sujarweni. 2014. *Metodeologi Penelitian*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Baru Perss, 2014.

Author Profile

Tiyan Rahmanul Hakim, born in Bandung, February 12, 1995, Master Student of Government Science FISIP Universitas Padjadjaran.

Nandang Alamsyah Deliarnoor, lecture at Department Government Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran. Research focus on government, and public policy.

Neneng Yani Yuningsih, lecture at Department Government Studies, Universitas Padjadjaran. Research focus on Local Politics and Public Policy.