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**ABSTRACT**

This article explores the efforts of regional governments in influencing changes in public perceptions, especially in the case of e-voting in the Village Head election (*Pilur*). This study aims to figure out the existence of manipulative discourse by political elites that eliminates direct democratic values.This study employed a qualitative method, where primary data were collected through interviews with the village heads who opposed the e-voting, members of the Sleman *DPRD,* the Heads of Village Community Empowerment, information and technology expert staff, village officials, and the community, as well as through observations. Secondary data were collected through journals, documents, books, and online news. The study was conducted in Purwomartani Village in March – May 2020 in the midst of the COVID-19 pandemic. The results of this study indicate the unpreparedness of the community to use e-voting technology. The public had not yet known that there has been a change from the voting system to touching the computer screen since the socialization of e-voting in the village head election to the public had a short duration. This indicates the loss of democratic values, where public participation, openness, and confidentiality of voters are lost. This happened because the independence of the organizers was lost, due to the involvement of state civil servants as a technical team in the field.
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**INTRODUCTION**

This study is urgent and important to do because of the democratic values that were eliminated in the village head election in Sleman (Lauer & Lauer, 2016). It is suspected that there was an e-voting rejection of the village head election by the village heads in Sleman. The refusal of the village heads who are members of the Manikwoyo community is for the following reasons: *first, the socialization of changes in the election of the village head has not been optimal*. Socialization among the people of Sleman has not been carried out optimally, hence many people do not know about the change from (manual) voting to e-voting. This is based on the fact that the time for the implementation of e-voting in the village head seems 'forced' (Prosser, 2014). The regulation regarding the e-voting in the village head election was set at the end of 2019, then the socialization period started from January to March 2020. Within these 3 months, socialization was carried out unevenly, because the socialization participants were only selected from certain hamlets. Then, the hamlets disseminate information to the community. However, what happened was that the hamlets that had received socialization did not carry out socialization intensively to the community, due to budget constraints. This is different from the implementation of e-voting at the village head in Jembarana, Boyolali, and Bayuasin – socialization in the community was carried out massively for a year. In short, the socialization factor in the community has not been carried out optimally.

 *Second, there is an involvement of state civil servants as a technical team.* The existence of a main technical team consisting of 57 people from various government agencies causes the government in this case the state civil servant (*ASN) to* be independent in the e-voting in the village head election (Kassen, 2020). The main technical team that has the task of being field supervisors and ensuring the e-voting machine is functioning properly is vulnerable to the interests of siding with candidates in the village head election (*Pilihan Lurah,* abbreviated as *Pilur*). It is better if the main technical team is not from the *ASN* because it must be independent and not directly involved in *Pilur* (Avgerou et al., 2019). Ideally, the technical team comes from universities or independent professional parties that have no political interests. Because the main technical team can open the contents of the computer and find out the results of *Pilur*, it is vulnerable to being infiltrated by candidates or the government who have interests with a constituent base at the village level (Essex & Goodman, 2020).

 *Third, the political elite imposes e-voting regulations for the village head election.* People are forced to obey the e-voting in the village head election regulations as if without e-voting machine is considered ineffective and inefficient – not modern and not advanced (Gibson et al., 2016). Just to make Sleman a Smart Regency, democratic values were sacrificed. According to the Head of the Village Community Empowerment Service, Budiharjo, the cost of *Pilur* e-voting is around IDR 14 billion. The financing was used to purchase 1,212 sets of e-voting tools to be used in the village head election. The number of voters for the village head election in Sleman was 444,841 people spread over 1,102 voting places. The village head election was followed by 157 candidates for the village head who would contest. However, according to another source, *Pilur* e-voting costs around IDR 50 billion.

The critical question that should be asked is why has the government came up with the idea of e-voting in the village head election as a smart, fast, and accurate way compared to the manual election?

**REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

A previous study on e-voting in the village head election (*Pilur e-voting*) was conducted by Darmawan & Nurhandjati (2016) in Musi Rawas with a sample of three villages, namely Wonokerto, Pelawe, and BTS Ulu. They mapped that the e-voting in the village head election had been carried out until 2015, including Jembarana (Bali), Boyolali (Central Java),Musi Rawas (South Sumatera), Empat Lawang (South Sumetera), Boalemo (Gorontalo), Bantaeng (South Sulawesi), and Pekalongan (Central Java). It seems that the e-voting in the village head election that has been implemented in several areas went smoothly and efficiently. Darmawan and Nurhandjati's findings show that the motivation of the Musi Rawas Regional Government to adopt e-voting in the village head election is in the context of efficiency, quick recapitulation results, accuracy, and no double voters or wasted voter votes.

This supports Hapsara et al. (2017) who examined the motives of the Boyolali Regency Government in implementing e-voting in the village head election in Boyolali. Hapsara (2019) found that there was an efficient use of the budget for village head elections for being paperless. However, Hapsara found a problem with the adoption of the technology being transformed in rural communities. Villagers were used to voting for the village head using ballot papers, but it was turned into an image that was touched on the monitor by voters. Moreover, there was the problem of accelerating e-voting technology, where the infrastructure in the village was not ready for the implementation of e-voting in the village head election. The criticism of Hapsara's dissertation is about the respondents who were interviewed by members of the General Election Commission, while the village head election is not the general election. Since the aimed to investigate the motives of the Regional Government to adopt the e-voting in the village head election, she was stuck with the word efficiency and accuracy of voter data, without criticizing how the e-voting process in the village head election and the missing democratic values factor.

In line with this, Simangunsong & Rasak (2016) who conducted a study in Bantaeng Regency found that the readiness factor of human resources in operationalization greatly determines the process of the e-voting in the village head election. The incompetence of human resources in operationalizing e-voting causes technical problems in the field. Technical problems can be in the form of equipment failure or the vote-counting system does not work according to the procedure. These technical problems can lead to distrust of the process of organizing the e-voting in the village head election. The weakness of their study is that there is no community element as the owner of the sovereignty interviewed.

Problems with human resources and e-voting equipment in the implementation of the village head election were also found by Fatmawati, Nurlita Fitri (2020) in Pemalang. They explained that there were problems with verification of the error voting tool, making it difficult for the village head election organizers. Likewise, there was the problem of verifying an error in e-KTP fingerprint, thus opening the opportunity for one person to vote at another voting place because the fingerprint had not been verified by the e-voting tool. Therefore, Fatmawati and Saputro suggest that additional tools are needed to verify voter data and optimal socialization to the entire community.

From the various technical issues mentioned above, community resistance emerged against the implementation of e-voting in the village head election in Sleman Regency. Hidayat (2020) suggested that the problem behind the community rejecting the e-voting in the village head election is that there are technical obstacles that thwart the winning of candidates, and damage the cultural values in society that have been accustomed to voting for candidate images manually. Moreover, the socialization factor in the community is not yet optimal, causing them not to be ready to accept changes in the way of voting from manual voting to touching the computer monitor screen.

However, due to the COVID-19 pandemic, where the health protocols are strictly implemented, there is an opportunity for the implementation of e-voting in the village head election. A study by Taniady, et al. (2020) found an opportunity for e-voting in the village head election because the implementation of village head election during the pandemic prohibited mass crowds and enforced strict health protocols. This means that voters can come to voting places with a limited number and duration. The use of e-voting is considered effective because it is fast and effective in the recapitulation process and avoids crowds. According to Taniady, et al. (2020), the election with the e-voting system in Australia and Brazil is effective, because people are technology literate and have optimal socialization. On the other hand, the implementation of the e-voting system in Indonesia is considered ineffective, because the Indonesian people are heterogeneous and not all of them are technologically literate. Furthermore, geographical factors, where people are scattered in rural, urban and remote areas make it difficult for them to access e-voting in the village head election.

A critical evaluation of the practice of implementing e-voting in the village head election was also carried out by Widyana et al. (2014) in Gresik Regency. According to Widyana, the implementation of e-voting village head election is considered wasteful, because it requires a large amount of funding. Moreover, voting at voting places becomes complicated, because voters must use a fingerprint and then only be able to touch the computer screen. Another problem is that the voter data collection factor recorded by the Population and Civil Registration Service (*Disdukcapil*) is less accurate. For example, some residents have died and have not been crossed out, enabling them to be registered as voters. The involvement of *Disdukcapil* in the e-voting in the village head election process is vulnerable to the independence of the organizers.

The implementation of the e-voting in the village head election in Paju’kukang Village, Bantaeng Regency, South Sulawesi was studied by Nara & Sukma Dewi (2017). They found it was effective because the election system was fast and socialization in the community was optimal. However, they also found that the readiness of human resources was an obstacle in the implementation of the e-voting in the village head election. Their study supports the findings of Simangunsong's research. This means that the adaptation of e-voting technology has not been optimally transferred to the technical implementation team in the field. If this is not handled seriously, the public may doubt the results of the e-voting in the village head election, due to technical problems that were not handled quickly.

According to Madise & Martens (2006), the implementation of e-voting was first implemented in Estonian General Elections. The election went smoothly, but the implementation of the e-voting election did not increase public participation. This indicates that the implementation of e-voting in developed countries, where people are technologically literate, is not directly proportional to their interest in coming to polling stations in elections. Furthermore, the implementation of the e-voting election was also debated by members of parliament who questioned the legal basis. The legal basis for e-voting for parliament is very important because the implementation of e-voting without a clear legal basis can be considered 'illegal' in the election results.

A study by Osho et al. (2016) on 306 voters in Nigeria who were millennial generation (aged 18-24 years) found that the education factor was correlated with technology literacy. Educated voters (students) were familiar with the e-voting system in elections because they use their gadgets (internet) every day. However, those who were not familiar with gadgets (internet) experience doubts or worries. According to Osho et al., public confidence in the results of the e-voting election is influenced by factors of public education and demographics. The public education factor correlates with their acceptance of the e-voting system, where the election results are determined by a machine algorithm. While the demographic factors of the people are remote, where they live in remote areas and it is difficult to access information – this makes them doubt the results of the e-voting election.

Supporting Esho’s findings, Waller (2020) conducted a study on 600 youths in Jamaica. Waller's research findings indicate that young people who are familiar with the use of the internet feel comfortable with the e-voting system. They do not doubt the election results with the e-voting system, because they ‘believe’ in the system. Waller's findings indicate that young people who are comfortable with using the internet come to voting places. This means that a sense of comfort and trust in the e-voting system is correlated with increased youth participation in elections. The more youth believe in the e-voting system, the more they are not worried and have no doubts about the election results with the e-voting system. They do not have a problem with the technical implementation of the e-voting system, which could be technical problems in the field, due to demographic conditions and unstable signals.

**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

1. **Governmentality and Power Relations**

Contestation in the village head election (*Pilur*) is a manifestation of the struggle for power in the realm of the village. The Sleman Regional Government has issued Regional Government Regulation Number 18 of 2019 on the use of the e-voting system in the village head election. In this case, the government has set regulations, forcing the community as the owner of the highest sovereignty to obey. However, the process of making Regional Regulation Number 18 of 2019 seems to be loaded with various interests of the political elite and the local government. To investigate the regulation set in the Regional Regulation Number 18 of 2019, the researcher employed Foucault’s theory (Behrent, 2013) regarding governmentality. Governmentality is an arrangement or strategy carried out by the Government in order to prosper the community without them realizing it. Through the process of discourse and policies that are realized through regulations and to benefit the people, governmentality is used as a tactic to grow the image of a government that is in favor of the people. Furthermore, Foucault (2001) explains governmentality as follows:

“The art of government, as becomes apparent in this literature, is essentially concerned with answering the question of how to introduce economy— that is to say, the correct way of managing individuals, goods, and wealth within the family (which a good father is expected to do in relation to his wife, children, and servants) and of making the family fortunes prosper— how to introduce this meticulous attention of the father toward his family into the management of the state.”

Power is the art of governing in the context of the welfare of society, where the adequacy of the basic needs of society is the main goal. In this case, governmentality aims to bring benefits to many people. This support a study by Li (n.d.) which distinguished governmentality from the goal for the benefit of the people and absolute power. In Foucault's perspective, power is spread and is everywhere. Therefore, on a micro-level, power is described as a father who provides for the welfare of his family. On the other hand, absolute power in question is the power of a king which covers the entire territory, wealth, and orders that must be obeyed absolutely by the whole community.

Foucault (2001) considers that power is not negative, violent, and hegemony as perceived by Machiaveli, Hobbes, and Gramsci. Power is not based on economic domination or ideological manipulation as Marx conceived. Nor is power based on charisma as Weber perceived. Besides, according to Foucault, power is not in the form of structures or institutions such as the state, but rather a strategic situation in society - in which there are various relationships, and networks that spread and have a strategic scope. Power is not the domination of the powerful against the powerless, but the power that spreads everywhere (omnipresent). Foucault said that power is not owned by the state, but every society has power. The omnipresent nature of power indicates that power is ‘all-present everywhere’. Power is produced positively in strategic situations by anyone and at any time. In short, power is everywhere - power is not contested, but power ‘liberates’.

In a book entitled *The History of Sexuality* Volume 1, Foucault (1990:94-95) perceives power in five ways, as follows: *First, power is not something that is obtained, achieved, used, or shared* as something that can be grasped or even can be extinct; but power is exercised from various places of a constantly moving relationship. In short, this power is not contested in contests such as the General Election or village head election, but that power is ‘produced’ in a strategic situation that is spread everywhere (omnipresent).

*Second, the power relation is not a hierarchical structural relation* that presupposes that there are those who rule and those who are ruled. Power is not synonymous with relations between state institutions, but with non-structural and non-hierarchical relations.

*Third, power comes from below which indicates that there is no longer a binary opposition distinction* because that power includes both. Power is without an "up and down" pole – there is no separation between the led and the ruled. Power is equal or egalitarian because it spreads everywhere and is omnipresent.

*Fourth, power relations are intentional and non-subjective.* Since power is omnipresent, power is continuous and without a subject. This power spreads and manifests in discourse or knowledge that can be presented by anyone. The spread of discourse is difficult for anyone to contain, because of its omnipresent nature.

*Fifth, where there is power, there is also resistance.* The power that spreads also causes rejection by people in the power environment. In other words, power grows and develops in a community, where the anti resist thesis and power synthesis develop.

1. **The Political Technology of Individual**

In Foucault's perception of power, unlike Marx's or Weber's theory, power is not the same as state institutions or a person's charisma. On the other hand, Foucault defines power in a ‘spiritual’ way - that power spreads and exists within everyone (omnipresent). This means that power is not synonymous with political positions or the influence of people who have a large capital. In Foucault's writings on the politics of individual technology (2001), he describes the following: *“The general framework of what I call the “technologies of the self” is a question that appeared at the end of the eighteenth century*.” Foucault does not distinguish between technical and technology, although etymologically the two words have different meanings. Technical means being or about something, while technology is a scientific method to achieve a goal (Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language, 2008).

However, what Foucault meant by technology is a production of knowledge related to power. Therefore, Foucault often refers to the term "technology of self". At first, Foucault defined technology as a way of producing knowledge for ‘power’ (technology of power). However, along with the development of the era, in 1974, Foucault defined technology as the center of natural power. One of the famous adage is *cogito ergum sum – I think, therefore I exist* (Descartes,1685). It is this conception of *cogito ergo sum* that influences Foucault’s way of thinking about technology – technology is a natural power in line with Descrates’s thoughts on the *cogito ergo sum*. In other words, Foucault emphasizes that mastery over the human mind is a technology that produces power. Foucault believes that power is produced through discourse or knowledge - that knowledge produces omnipresent power (present everywhere) and cannot be prevented by anyone. However, Foucault in other writings also emphasizes that individual technology will bring up the antithesis in society. This means that individual technology as a ‘tool’ to produce knowledge or power will give rise to anti-power.

**RESEARCH METHOD**

 This study is qualitative employing a case study method. The case study was chosen as the study method because it has profound advantages in explaining a topic or phenomenon. Moreover, the case study method also has advantages, because the disclosure or exposure is carried out comprehensively to produce relevant knowledge (theory). To sum up, the research using the case study method seeks to uncover the complexity of the problem to build a framework of thought (knowledge) by using interview data collection techniques, in-depth discussion groups, and observations (Crowther & Lauesen, 2017).

 This research was conducted in Purwomartani Village, Sleman Regency, Yogyakarta Special Region. Purwomartani Village, Sleman Regency, was chosen to be studied for its theoretically and practically. The study was carried out in three months, from March 2020 to May 2020. The data obtained were in the form of primary data and secondary data. The following things were done by the researcher: *The first was conducting interviews.* Interviews were conducted with the organizers of the *Pilur* e-voting at the Purwomartani Village, the head of village community empowerment service as the person in charge of the implementation of e-voting in the village head election, members of the Sleman Regency *DPRD*, expert staff of the technology assessment and implementation Jakarta as the maker of the e-voting application, staff of the Sleman Regency Village Community Empowerment Service, and three village head administrators of the Manikwoyo Community.

*The second was conducting field observations.* The observation was carried out by the researcher by visiting the e-voting device warehouse at the Maguwohardjo Stadium and observing at the Purwomartani voting place. The observation was conducted to get firsthand information on how the process of setting up the e-voting tool and the practice of using the e-voting tool. Meanwhile, the researcher conducted observations at voting places to see and practice directly as voters in the e-voting in the village head election.

*The third was analyzing journals and books.* Secondary data in the form of collecting journals and books were obtained from internet research and library studies. Journals and books were studied with a view to mapping problems and looking for novelty*.*

*The fourth was data triangulation.* Primary data collected by the researcher need to be checked and rechecked. Because this study was conducted during the COVID-19 pandemic, it requires a long duration of time and caution in processing data. The researcher carried out the data triangulation process by checking and rechecking the data through data confirmation in the field.

*The fifth was analyzing primary data.* After the primary data had been validated, the next step was to analyze the data to answer the problem formulation.

*The sixth was analyzing secondary data.* Secondary data analysis from journals was intended to map the problems of the e-voting study. After getting the problem map, the researcher can position himself, especially since this study is different from previous research.

**RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

Since its launching, the Election of Village Heads (Pilur) e-voting plan has responded to the rejection by 86 village heads in Sleman. The village heads, who are members of the Manikwoyo community, delivered a demonstration speech in front of the Regional House of Representatives of the Sleman Regency office. They demanded a review of the E-voting Electoral District Regulation draft that was not yet ready to be implemented in Sleman. They said it was due to the lack of socialization in the community and the unpreparedness of the community to use e-voting tools. Furthermore, Lekta said as follows:

 "It is not a matter of agreeing or disagreeing. The Village Head Association has the right to voice the aspirations of the village heads. The basis for e-voting from the Ministry of Home Affairs and BPPT was that – people who are concerned could not change local regulations. We are not rejecting the e-voting, but it is not sure about the neutrality of field officers." (Interview with Lekta Manuri September 21, 2020)

In the interview with Lekta Manuri, the Chairman of the Manikwoyo Community, it was clear that the village heads demanded the operator's neutrality. The field operators totaling 1200 people were appointed by the Head of the Community and Village Empowerment Service. The field team is in charge of escorting the equipment to the polling station and has a password to open the e-voting equipment. Most of the operators are civil servants (PNS), so the village heads doubt they will be neutral.

**Village Head Ellection E-voting: Innovative, Fast, and Accurate**

By promoting the motto of being innovative, fast, and accurate, the Village Head Election e-voting was simultaneously held in Sleman. The efforts of the Regional Government to realize the use of electronic devices interpret intelligent Village Head Elections. In other words, the election using the conventional (image) voting system is considered old-fashioned because it is not environmentally friendly. However, the Village Head election results can be perceived soon when it ends at 13.00 WIB. Since the e-voting algorithm system is designed to recap the results quickly and accurately, there is no need for a long time-consuming recapitulation of results. The speed of the recapitulation of the results of the Village Head election has become a critique of being a time-consuming and long-winded practice. The long-winded counting of candidate votes can lead to horizontal conflicts and the emergence of Covid-19 clusters. The solution to a community gathering in the Village Head Election is e-voting because the results are accurate and avoid the emergence of new COVID-19 clusters. The accuracy of the Village Head election result recapitulation is also reliable. It eliminates the possibility of hijacking or diverting votes to particular candidates.

To realize the innovative, fast, and accurate Village Head Election, the Regional Government issues regulations, for one of the authorities of the local government is to make regulations to regulate and prosper the community. Based on the authority attached to the government, the Sleman Regency Government makes a Regulation concerning the Election of Village Head conducted electronically. The Regional Government has issued Sleman Regency Regulation No. 18 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2015 concerning Procedures for Election and Dismissal of Village Heads. In Regional Regulation Number 18 of 2019, it is regulated regarding the use of electronic devices in the Election of Village Heads, article 5 A, as follows:

"The simultaneous holding of the Village Head Election as referred to in Article 3 letter a is carried out using an electronic Village Head Election."

The change in the implementation of the Village Head Election from conventional (manual) voting to e-voting marks a novelty. Of course, these changes require funds and socialization in the community. The funds needed for purchasing computer equipment and renting e-voting applications are approximately IDR 50 billion. To realize the village head election e-voting, the Sleman Regency Government cooperates with the Assessment and Application of Technology Agency (BPPT). Why did the Sleman Regional Government replace the Village Heads Election with e-voting?

To answer this question, Sri Purnomo, as the Regent, said as follows: “*Pilkades* "Pilkades (Village Heads Election) using e-voting can be carried out in a more straightforward and guaranteed way, and everyone can do it. We have conducted a study that in Sleman, the implementation of e-voting can be carried out" Purnomo's statement indicates the readiness of the Sleman Regional Government apparatus to carry out the e-voting Village Head Election. In addition, Purnomo has also anticipated several obstacles that will arise. Furthermore, Purnomo said: "The *Pilkades* (Village Heads Election) using e-voting will be followed by 35 villages / sub-districts in Sleman Regency, which will be carried out simultaneously in 1 day. We have anticipated the possibility of problems in the implementation. Hopefully, the implementation of the e-voting can go well,"

In addition to its simplicity and accuracy – the recapitulation results are practical and efficient as a discourse circulated to the mass media. The use of e-voting is more effective than the use of paper. In this case, e-voting is better and more effective because it is paperless and has no lost votes. The system detects all votes cast by voters and evidence of a voter's receipt. It is indicated by the statement of Commission A of the Regional House of Representatives of Sleman Regency members as follows:

"In e-voting, no votes are lost. It is simpler. After the Village Head election is over, we can immediately get the results," said Budi Sanyata, S.Pd. (Commission A DPRD Sleman Regency)

Sanyata's statement indicated that the members of the Council approved the change from conventional voting to the use of e-voting because no votes were wasted (*golput*). All voters' votes are recorded on a computer, and there is evidence of voter receipts who have cast their ballots. In addition, voter lists that do not have identity cards will be detected. The data of voters who have changed their domicile and died will be detected on the computer. Using e-voting is more effective than conventional voting because the final result is not immediately known in conventional voting. The recapitulation of the Village Head Election results took a long time to calculate manually, and there were invalid ballots.

However, the change in the Village Head election system was not matched by a good socialization process in the community. The impact of lack of socialization in the community causes people not to know about these changes. It is a problem that the Village heads who are members of the Manikwoyo community are worried about. Because socialization is not optimal for the community, the elderly in the villages may not come to the polls. Lack of socialization in the community can reduce community participation. The low level of community participation is detrimental to the Village Head candidates who will contest. Therefore, they rejected e-voting, which could threaten public support due to decreased participation.

Efforts to ward off the Village Heads' refusal were emphasized by the Regional Regulation Number 18 of 2019. Regulations made by local governments have the power to compel the Village Heads and the community to obey them. The rejection of the government's policy resulted in not being able to run again.

"Financially, the Village Head election is a burden on the regional budget. E-voting for the Village Head Election was forced; why wasn't it done in the Regional Head Election (?). The majority of Sleman people are agrarian and not yet technologically literate. Polling Station officials easily direct them to choose specific candidates. The long-established relationship will be lost with the e-voting," said Tomon Haryo Wirosobo

The Village Heads have suspicions about implementing the e-voting because it was forced to be implemented. The critical question that Tomon asked was why e-voting was not applied in the Regional Head Election?. According to Tomon, the implementation of e-voting for the Village Head Election has political content because the incumbent regent wants his family to continue. One way to realize this desire is engineered through e-voting, which can change the constituent support map.

Tomon explained that efforts to build relationships with communities in the hamlets would change with e-voting. In the conventional voting system, voters know the Village Head candidate and are given transportation money. However, in the e-voting – the elderly are likely not to come to the polls because they are technology savvy and there is no one to direct them. If they come to the polling station, they may be directed by officers to choose a particular candidate. Behind the struggle to reject the e-voting, it is implied that there is a Village Heads' motive determined by referring to Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, one of which is the determination of the Governor and Deputy Governor. The argument presented by Tomon is that there is a linear relationship between the Governor and the village heads. If the Governor is appointed, then the village heads should ideally also be appointed because they consider themselves loyal courtiers to the Governor (Sultan).

However, the Village Head Election refers to Article 31 of Law Number 6 of 2014, stating that the Village Head Election is held simultaneously. The Village Head (Lurah) is directly elected by the community in general, free, confidential, honest, and fair. It means the Election is carried out concerning the election mechanism different from the Election of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta determined.

"The motto of the Village Head Election e-voting is innovative, fast, and accurate. We do not have to wait long for the results by using e-voting. The e-voting security tool is guaranteed because the system is offline. It is environmentally friendly because it does not use paper, and it is a form of accountability. There are separate duties between Voting Organizing Group (KPPS) officers and the Technical Team. Therefore, the Technical Team does not interfere in the technical matters of the Village Head election," said Budiharjo, the Head of the Village Community Empowerment Service.

In other words, the implementation of the Village Head Election is carried out in a transparent and accountable manner because it is held professionally. It can be seen from the Election results, which can be directly known by the community right after the Election ends. It does not need to wait long to find out the Election results. In addition, there is proof that the voters have given their choice – to anticipate a lawsuit. Budiharjo dismissed the suspicion of the Technical Team and KPPS officers that they had different main tasks. Technical Team officers are not allowed to divulge voter data. Likewise, KPPS officers are not allowed to direct voters to choose specific candidates. In summary, the implementation of the e-voting for the Village Head Election is carried out professionally, transparently, and independently.

"E-voting calculations are faster than the recapitulation of conventional voting. In addition, computers and e-voting are more efficient because they can be used in the next Village Head Election. The e-voting security system is guaranteed to be safe because it is done offline and cannot be hijacked. The e-voting village head election application has been used by 22 regencies and 11 provinces spread over 1500 villages. There were no problems with the e-voting trial in the villages. However, the concern was the behavior of urban people – who questioned the change from conventional voting to touching the monitor screen. E-voting is very simple. The voters only need to touch the screen twice: (1) the candidates' image and (2) the Yes mark. It is done," said Aziz, a BPPT (Agency for the Assessment and Application of Technology) expert

**Unraveling the E-voting Village Head Election Reason**

At first, e-voting was rejected by the village heads because it could make them lose democratic values, ​and it is the lack of optimal socialization among residents in the villages. The Village Heads are worried that if the socialization of the Village Heads Election from conventional voting to e-voting is not optimal, it will impact the lack of community participation (Cserny & Nemeslaki, 2018). On the other hand, the local government assumes that the Village Heads Election using the e-voting system is effective and efficient. From the two different arguments, the authors try to analyze by finding the reasons behind the two arguments. By analyzing Foucault's conception of omnipresent power, where each individual 'has power.' However, the government often uses its power to influence people to obey them. Explain the reasoning behind the two arguments, is described as follows:



Figure 1 above explains the elite's manipulative reasoning in e-voting: first, the elite stipulates Regional Regulation No. 18/2019. The political elite manipulated the need for efficient, fast, and accurate e-voting for the Village Head Election. The election of the Village Heads using the ballot system is considered inaccurate because manual calculations are prone to errors. In addition, conventional voting has a long process of recapitulating the results. Therefore it has the potential to cause conflict. In short, e-voting is needed to answer the community's needs.

Second is the refusal of the Village Heads. The Village Heads rejected changing the voting method from conventional voting to e-voting because they were deemed to have removed democratic values. The village heads of the Manikwoyo community are worried that the election changes will seem 'forced' and lack socialization in the community. The lack of socialization the e-voting can lead to a decrease in community participation. In addition, most elderly are not familiar with technology. The village heads held a demonstration to the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) of Sleman Regency to reject the e-voting. However, the Sleman Regional People's Representative Council only accepts aspirations but does not change the substance of the e-voting. Likewise, the Sleman Regency Government does not listen to the aspirations of the village heads. Even though the village heads reject it, the Sleman local government is still adamant about implementing e-voting.

*The third is media manipulation.* Political elites manipulate the media to influence people's understanding and perspective that e-voting is effective and efficient (Öner, 2007). The elites manipulated social media, printed media, and electronic media with the issue that e-voting was effective because the public would immediately know the results of the e-voting. In addition, e-voting minimizes lost votes because all voters are registered and can be monitored via computer (By & Burchell, 2009). The use of e-voting is considered environmentally friendly because it does not use a lot of paper and does not require enormous costs. In other words, e-voting is more effective and efficient than conventional voting.

*Fourth is innovative, fast, and accurate.* The Elite used innovative words to influence people. Therefore, they would put their faith in e-voting (Kusumasari et al., 2018). The word innovative indicates that e-voting is better than the conventional voting system. In addition, the e-voting system is faster in terms of results recapitulation because each voter's vote is directly recorded by the computer so that the election is finished and the committee can display the accumulation of the results on the computer screen. The word accurate is used to convince the public that the e-voting election is better. The voters can trust the accurate e-voting election results compared to the conventional voting, which is prone to data manipulation. The word 'accurate' is to lead people's minds that people can trust the e-voting election results.

*Fifth is pseudo-legitimacy.* E-voting election logic that denies the role of the community in recapitulating results, non-transparency, and involvement of civil servants can impact pseudo-legitimacy (Knight et al., 2012). The people were forced to accept the e-voting election, even though the village heads had refused. It means that the essence of democracy has been replaced with technology. E-voting has replaced the position of people's aspirations with an algorithmic machine (Warkentin et al., 2012). It becomes the subject, while the public becomes the object of submission. The implication of forcing e-voting is that the results of e-voting piling produce pseudo-legitimacy because an e-voting machine replaces the position of citizens. Legitimacy is essential in government because the winning village head is trusted to govern. With the legitimacy of the community, the government can plan government programs. With the legitimacy of the community, the community will support the elected head village. On the other hand, the results of e-voting can produce false legitimacy. It will make the community will reject the elected village head.

**The Loss of Democratic Values**

The conventional village head election, either conventionally or by e-voting, requires trust and independence from the organizers. If the organizers are not credible and are not trusted by the community, then the village head election is not legitimizedi(Burnell, 2018). Along with the times when technology and information have changed human behavior, the village head election also uses an e-voting system. The power from the administrative bureaucracy shifted to the technology, where the application of e-voting became the parameter to elect the Village Head. It is stated in the Sleman Regency Regional Regulation Number 18 of 2019 concerning the Second Amendment to Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2015 concerning Procedures for the Election and Dismissal of Regional Heads, which are carried out electronically. In the section considering points a and b, the main argument is that the Village Head Election uses an e-voting system to realize good village governance and lead to effective, efficient, and community welfare services. Is the election of the village head without the E-voting system makes services to the community are not effective and efficient (?).

Figure 2 below describes the loss of confidentiality and independence in the e-voting Village Head Election: first is the conflict of interest. The process of making Regional Regulation No18/2019 is prone to conflicts of interest because the political elite has an interest in ruling. Regional Regulation No.18/2019 is the basis for implementing e-voting Village Head Elections. Meanwhile, the political elite is interested in controlling the village heads as the basis for mobilizing supporters in the General Election/Local Leaders Election. *Second is the refusal of the village heads.* At first, the village heads rejected the e-voting Election due to local government intervention and the non-transparency of the process. In addition, the time for socializing with the changes in the community is relatively short. Therefore many people do not know about these changes. The village heads are worried that the problem of change without optimal socialization will impact decreasing community participation. The implementation of Regional Regulation No. 18/2019 seems coercive; therefore, the village heads must accept the e-voting election and cannot criticize it. If the village heads do not accept the election using the e-voting system, they are welcome to resign or not run for the election. The process of making this elitist Regional Regulation No.18/2019 further strengthens the existence of a particular political agenda.



*The third is the involvement of civil servants (ASN).* The conventional village head election (Pilkades) embodies democracy in the village (*kalurahan*). In the perspective of governance science, the village head election is a process of community negotiation with candidates to form an independent *kalurahan* (village) governance. It means that the election reflects the people's party, where the people give a mandate (sovereignty) to the candidates to carry out the prospering and educating order. The village head election using a conventional voting system going on so far has not caused any significant excess.

However, the involvement of the Main Technical Team involving 60 civil servants and 1200 field teams in the e-voting village head election can 'injure' democratic values. They were formed and determined by the Head of the Community and Village Empowerment Service as the executor of the village head election. The Main Technical Team is assigned to provide counseling to field operators. In summary, the primary technical and field teams are people recruited by the government, not from an independent Institution. It is reinforced by the statement of the Head of the Community and Village Empowerment Service:

"On the election day, only the field technical team at the respective polling stations had the e-voting password. This password is for opening the e-voting system used," said Budiharjo .

Budiharjo's statement confirmed Manuri's assumption that the Main Technical Team and the Field Team could find out each voter's data on the computer because they have a password and can open the e-voting device. In other words, the secrecy and independence of the village head election organizers were doubted by the village heads. Theoretically, according to Foucault, power is everywhere – everyone owns that power. In the e-voting village head election, power is interpreted as 'owned' by the government, which is manifested by mastering passwords and data in the e-voting device. The involvement of the Main Technical Team and the Field Technical Team seems to assist people who are not yet technologically literate.

However, they are 'the apparatus of the ruling regime' that are prone to be instrumented by the political elite for temporary purposes. It is different from the conventional village head election, where polling station officers are not allowed to open ballot boxes without the recommendation from the witnesses. It means that the officer at the polling station does not have the authority to open the ballot box without witnesses. The involvement of ASN as a team of experts and controlling polling stations, especially access to e-voting tools, makes ASN's involvement clear. Only a team of experts and mentors can open voter data, and they know about the voters' choices. It is prone to abuse authority in changing the voters' data. With the involvement of ASN in the e-voting village head Election, the democratic values (confidentiality, independence, and integrity) are lost. Confidentiality in the village head election is an absolute requirement that must exist. If it is violated due to local government intervention, the results of the village head election are not legitimized by the community. The ASN's involvement in the election as the executor in the field contradicts the principle of independence, where the organizers must not side with anyone. An independent organizer will generate public confidence in the outcome of the village head election. Independent organizers are those who have integrity. In short, democratic values ​​tend to be lost due to the imposition of the e-voting system that intervenes with the village government. Intervention against the village government will lead to a weak village/ *kalurahan* governance.

Unlike the conventional election by using ballot that has no primary technical team, all voters' data and the counting process are carried out by officers under the supervision of witnesses and the community. In the context of the e-voting village head election, the government intervenes and stifles people's rights by controlling passwords and voter data. Foucault argues that taking control of the field by the technical team means taking the people's power because the voter's vote represents the people's voice. In this case, the government has eliminated the people's sovereign rights. The people's sovereignty realized through the election of the village head disappeared and was replaced by a set of procedural village elections. The democratic essence of secrecy is lost and replaced by machine algorithms. It is in line with Manuri's argument that doubts the principle of confidentiality, as follows:

"The e-voting village head election eliminates the confidentiality. The voters' confidentiality will be disclosed and known by the operator. The operator is doubtful because they are people coming from the Regional Government. The operator will know the voter's secret and can monitor it from the ballot receipt. The principle of secrecy in democracy is lost."

Manuri's statement was reasonable because the local government intervened by forming a technical and field team who have a 'password' to open voters' data. "The democratization party will disappear because the public does not witness the counting process," Manuri said. It is prone to cheating on the results of the village head election, where the technical team officers become the political elite's apparatus to 'change' or eliminate voters' data. Political elites have interests in the electoral district, where the *kalurahan* (village) is a strategic area to rally the masses. Therefore the political elites hold a political interest in supporting the candidate for the Village Head because they are investing for the long term (general elections and regional head elections).

 As a result of the lack of confidentiality in the e-voting election, the committee becomes a subsidiary. A committee that is not independent (subsidiary) poses a danger to the election process, as it can damage democracy. Furthermore, Manuri emphasized that there were not enough witnesses to the process of recapitulating the results of the e-voting.

"During the recapitulation, the committee did not open the ballot boxes. The recapitulation is based on the results of the electronic recapitulation. Aggrieved candidates cannot dispute the results of the electronic recapitulation. Disclaimers are allowed in the district court by opening the ballot box," he said.

Since the public did not witness the election results, it could raise suspicions. The community can doubt the election results because the organizers are not independent. In other words, the legitimacy of the results of the village head election is doubtful and can result in disunity in society. Community groups that support the losing candidate will undermine the authority of the elected village head. On the other hand, the village head supporting group will maintain a strategic position and control natural resources beneficial to many people. The disunity of society can occur in the absence of secrecy and independence of the organizers of the Village Head Election (Tarasov & Tewari, 2017).

**CONCLUSION**

Initially, the e-voting village head election with innovative, fast, and accurate jargon aimed to support the Sleman Smart Regency Regional Government program. However, in practice, the implementation of e-voting elections impacts eliminating democratic values. The refusal by the village heads was met with repression through Regional Regulation no. 18/2019. Through printed and electronic media, discourse engineering is carried out to answer the less than optimal socialization in society. Implementing the e-voting village head election eliminates the people's sovereign government.

The loss of democratic values ​​means seizing the sovereignty of the people, which is replaced by technology. People's sovereignty, the primary source of democracy, is replaced by an e-voting machine. The e-voting machine existence has replaced public participation and the absence of transparency in the recapitulation of the village head election results. The implication of the loss of democratic values ​​in the e-voting village head election raises false legitimacy.
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