

# PANCASILA DURING THE OLD ORDER, NEW ORDER, AND POST- REFORMATION ERA



Jurnal Analisa Sosiologi

**Grace Purwo Nugroho\*, Roby Cahyadi  
Kurniawan**

Faculty of Social and  
Political Sciences.  
University of Lampung,  
Indonesia

**\*Correspondence email:**  
gracepnugroho8@gmail  
.com

Received: 16 May 2025  
Revised: 9 June 2025  
Accepted: 10 July 2025

**Edition:**  
July 2025, 14 (3): 437-466

## Abstract

The current Pancasila has been left unclear and with a vague concept. Historically, the formation of the state foundation in 1945 was marked by a debate on Pancasila that centred on ideological values and social representations of the Indonesian people. A need in the scientific realm and government practice to find out how Pancasila is debated ideologically and whether Pancasila can indeed be practised. The writing of this journal employs a qualitative descriptive method, incorporating a literature review to collect data from previous research, public sources, and credible, legitimate information. The results of the data and information that have been checked for validity are then analysed comprehensively and critically. The findings indicate that the concept of Pancasila encompasses a range of values and ideologies, including those from religion/theology, humanism, nationalism, liberalism, and socialism, all of which are intertwined within the concept of Pancasila. In the practice of the old order state, Pancasila could not be operationalised because the newly established state, the New Order, interpreted it manipulatively for the interests of power and during the reform order, Pancasila experienced degradation. However, the Pancasila study institution, namely BPPI, re-emerged, which became an academic arena for the concept of Pancasila and an opportunity for the operationalisation of Pancasila in the context of government and state.

**Keywords:** Pancasila, Concept, Old Order, New Order, Reform Order

## INTRODUCTION

Indonesia is conceptualised as an Archipelagic State and has been recognised in the International Convention, United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS) on December 10th, 1982. This concept is related to international legal recognition of the geographical form of the country formed by the thousand islands, which are conceived as a complete unit in one territorial and legal area (Shalihah, 2015).

As a former Dutch colony with all the implications, an archipelagic state carries its sociological implications, such as a). The consequences of socially diverse identity and interactions influence the interactions between the islands. b.) Transitioning to a modern nation with global influence in social structure and economy presents unique challenges across the islands, both coastal and inland. c). Social interaction and mobility influence population migration, collaboration, and conflicts between communities on the island. This condition continues to be dynamic sociology as a consequence of the rural society, which then affects the system and cultural politics.

The situation raises various issues, including language variations, dialect, social norms, beliefs, religions and also negative stereotypical prejudices that often create a tense situation. On the other hand, being an archipelagic state also offers advantages, including diversity of natural resources, tourism, and rich traditions or cultures. (Kolinan, 2024).

The diversity made the Dutch East Indies government, as a colonial ruler since 1907, aware of the need of adaption to strengthen the government by assimilating Western culture and local culture through education, grouping respected cultural customs, especially local government model, translating the policy into some languages including Malay, Sundanese and Javanese as an effective way to build communication and also to develop local language, (Jedamski & Cita, 2009)

The social reality demonstrates the advantages of an archipelagic nation, as every corner of the region offers access. The east, west, north, and south coastlines are open to anyone, at least in the past, when the nation did not exist. This open situation allowed for the introduction of ideologies, traditions, religions, clothing, languages, and other social systems. Moreover, almost no one has been able to dominate the archipelago known as Indonesia except through political power. Traditional societies, characterised by interconnectedness, foster harmony between rationality and the natural world, as seen in their mythology. This complexity raises the question of how a nation will be shaped, both in terms of its model and the values that will serve as the foundation for all its citizens.

The context of modern Indonesia in the 20th century occurred when educated people began to emerge due to the impact of ethical politics or Dutch colonial politics of gratitude until the emergence of educated Indonesians, accompanied by the rise of new nations, after World War I, as an example of the initial emergence of Budi Utomo as the beginning of a modern organization in the archipelago, until the youth gathered on October 28, 1928, which was known as Youth Pledge Day, (Akbar, 2022). Until World War II, Indonesian intellectuals struggled with the model of the nation-state that was considered ideal. After the Dutch lost to Japan, Japan began to weaken in defending the annexed areas due to defeats in various Pacific wars. In early 1945, around March, Japan initiated the formation of the Investigating Agency for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence (*BPUPKI*), (Kompas, 2022). The formation of this agency is documented in many historical records as an effort to garner sympathy from the colonial people at that time; however, in a relatively short time, it became a focal point of discourse in Indonesia's struggle for independence from the colonisers. Each group in BPUPKI was represented by the social, political, and religious communities that existed at that time, which were generally divided into religious groups (Islam), National Groups (nationalists and non-Islamists), and socialist groups. The first two groups were the largest, while the socialist group was considered minor due to its minimal number of supporters. However, what was clear was that each group tried to fight for ideas regarding the concept of a state based on the views of their respective group.

One of the main points in the debate in the BPUPKI sessions was regarding the basis of the state that could accommodate all elements in the state that would be formed, a phenomenal opinion was conveyed by Ir. Soekarno at the session on June 1, 1945 by offering the basic concept of the state, namely, (BPIP, 2023): 1). Indonesian nationality, which states all groups of society. 2). Internationalism/humanity, namely, participating in the brotherhood and unity of nations. 3). Consensus/Democracy, based on representative agreement. 4) Social welfare, justice in the economic sector. 5). Cultured divinity, regarding the principle of piety to God Almighty.

In the follow-up discussion, other concepts of Pancasila were also introduced, including the Jakarta Charter, which added the obligation to implement Islamic law for its adherents. However, a compromise was made which was emphasized in the preamble to the 1945 Constitution, which was agreed upon, stating that Pancasila with the order of the concept of the principles, namely: 1. Belief in the one supreme God, 2. A Just and

civilized humanity, 3. Unity of Indonesia, 4. Democracy is guided by the wisdom of deliberation among representatives 5. Social justice for all Indonesian people; this order remains in effect to this day.

Pancasila has always been considered as a guideline in the concept of state, but in the three eras, namely the Old Order 1945-1966, the New Order 1966-1998 and the Reformation Order 1998 - now, there is no standard interpretation of the meaning of Pancasila, each time order or specific government regime has the freedom to interpret Pancasila to legitimise its power.

In practical and contemporary terms, there has been a decline in the quality of the meaning of Pancasila. A preeminent political event occurred during the 2017 Jakarta gubernatorial election when one of the gubernatorial candidates, Basuki Tjahaya Purnama, also known as Ahok, inadvertently "slipped" by alluding to a term in the Muslim holy book, which then had national repercussions and contributed to social segregation. This incident also gave rise to a new wave of more sectarian Islamic political movements with a large current of Islamic populism that is very influential to this day. (Masykuri & Ramadlan, 2021). Another significant phenomenon is the diversity of the Indonesian nation, in terms of ethnicity, skin colour, and belief systems, which makes it vulnerable to racism and discrimination. Incidents of bullying in schools and universities demonstrate that Indonesians' diversity, while not only an asset but also a source of social unrest, challenges whether Pancasila can contribute to reducing the symptoms of social pathology. (Rohman, 2024).

In previous research, various aspects of Pancasila themes have been studied, including how to enhance the relevance of Pancasila in the 21st century, which faces challenges in issues of radical identity, vertical divisions due to economic disparities, and the phenomena of oligarchy and corruption, (Magnis-suseno, Tinggi, & Driyarkara, 2022). Concerning welfare, whether Pancasila values contribute to the formulation of policies and their implementation in the social welfare sector, as well as the challenges they pose, (Tamba, Hartanto, 3, & Putri, 2024). The concept of Pancasila and nationalism in the context of local cultural development and the development of globalisation, which requires more intense relations in the international world, (Arianto, 2023). The Pancasila economic system and values whether able to reduce the impact of the free market and can be a guide to creating a fair system of values, culture and policies in the economic sector, (Arif Budimanta, 2024). Pancasila is also faced with liberal democracy, and the

opportunity to adapt the concept of liberal democracy to the current values of Pancasila, (Otto Gusti Madung, 2014).

In other scientific research, it is also stated that Pancasila is a theoretical conception of Bung Karno's political teachings, which cohesively reviews the concept of nationalism with the international world, adopting a more progressive national approach that aligns with the idea of Marhaenism, (Pribadi, 2022). Pancasila also encompasses various values of Divinity and Humanity, which are expected to serve as the basis of integrity that can be practiced to prevent acts of corruption, especially among state officials, (Sacipto & Kepulauan, 2022). In the context of political economy, Pancasila also provides an opportunity for social transformation to establish stronger national institutions to address economic and political independence. Pancasila has the potential to create a more just socio-economic structure for society, (Samudro, 2020). Concerning the relationship between religion and state, Pancasila serves as a guideline for state policies related to religious beliefs. Pancasila can serve as a guide to prevent discrimination in policies based on religion in society, ensuring that every policy related to religion and the state reaches all citizens, (Patittingi, Irwansyah, Hasrul, Arisaputra, & Yunus, 2021). Pancasila serves as a guide for the rule of law and democracy, encouraging respect for human rights as a means of practicing divine and humanitarian principles. Human rights guaranteed by the rule of law are a condition for a healthy democracy, (Aswandi1 & Kholis Roisah2, 2019).

A review of the studies conducted found that Pancasila is often discussed in normative studies, which assess state and government policies using the current concept of Pancasila. Studies within a political framework also often use Pancasila as political jargon without further examining how Pancasila can be put into practice. A historical and critical re-examination of the Pancasila idea across three regimes is lacking. This paper aims to rediscover a more critical Pancasila framework from various ontological perspectives, introducing new ideas to the research on Pancasila.

Various interpretations and concepts regarding Pancasila from different perspectives suggest that Pancasila has emerged as a collective identity and ideological spirit of the Indonesian nation. However, during its development, the concept and practice of statehood have undergone fluctuations.

The purpose of this research will specifically focus on examining how the concept and practice of Pancasila have experienced changes in meaning or redefinition, even contradicting the initial concept when Pancasila was formed, so that the impact that we

can feel is the unclear position of Pancasila in the political and social system of Indonesian society, thus it is inevitable that many communities due to lack of understanding then seek their ideological path. The challenging situation is to address the primary issue: What are the elements that comprise the concept of Pancasila? How is Pancasila treated in the era of the old order, new order, and reform order?

## METHODS

Journal writing employs a literature review method to collect credible data and information, as well as conduct reviews of previous research, public data, and credible information related to the relevant research theme. These references will be provided to provide an overview that demonstrates the legitimacy of this research, (Adlini, Dinda, Yulinda, Chotimah, & Merliyana, 2022).

The literature review method was employed to identify the latest developments in research, utilising a narrative review that qualitatively summarises and challenges discussions of previous research findings. Literature selection utilized Google Scholar and Scopus-based journal information within a timeframe relevant to the research's urgency. This study also conducted an analysis and categorisation, reviewing historical records and documents, assessing the authenticity and validity of information sources, and then conducting theoretical analyses and comparisons.

The writing scheme of this research uses an interpretation of Pancasila which is contextualised in the periodisation of the regime, namely the Old Order regime (1945-1966), the New Order (1966-1998) and the Reformation Order (1998-present), with each explaining who the dominant actors were who were the driving force of the regime at that time, not only using political history but also using a historical-critical sociological approach.

The research subjects are ideas that emerge in the form of official documents, library materials such as books, scientific journals, official reports, widespread reports, and other information that supports the research. The primary method in this research will employ a qualitative research model in social and political science, which is used to interpret political phenomena and social constructions (Unggul Sagena, MPP, MA et al., 2016). Previous scientific ideas relevant to this paper will be drawn from various sources, including those on the impact of Pancasila on society. The method used will be a review of journals and reference books to determine the direction of the phenomenon posed by

this paper and hopefully provide a clearer understanding of the theories and concepts that inform the conclusions of this paper.

The research also employs a critical paradigm, specifically by reviewing the main theoretical ideas regarding the position of Pancasila in modern democracy. If Pancasila remains politically relevant, it is essential to revitalize its meaning in contemporary democracy.

The critical research paradigm is employed to examine the injustice and dominance of hegemonic power structures that are hidden behind the implementation of Pancasila in government. This paradigm also critically challenges social change to restore the meaning of Pancasila to a level that is relevant for the future of the Indonesian nation.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

The aspect of the emergence of the Pancasila idea cannot be separated from the historical, philosophical, sociological and geopolitical conditions of the world at that time, namely after World War I in 1914-1918, the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate in Turkey in 1924 with all its implications for Islamic countries in the Middle East followed by World War II in 1939-1945. Following World War I, the emergence of new countries in Eastern Europe, such as Poland, Yugoslavia, Hungary, and Czechoslovakia, was accompanied by the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate, which led to the creation of new countries, including Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, Iran, Jordan, and Syria, (Hasibuan, Kusdiana, Hernawan, & Al, 2023), (Kompas, 2020). After World War II, which was filled with wars against fascist countries such as Nazi Germany, Japan, and Italy, which then gave rise to new world political blocs, namely the Socialist bloc and the Western Bloc, it was in this condition that Indonesia was born. The primary trigger or cause was Japan's defeat in World War II in the Asia-Pacific region. The global world situation was marked by the emergence of world blocs after World War II, giving rise to a Cold War between the communist group under the Soviet Union and the neoliberal countries led by the United States and its allies.

The world conflict that was the background to the birth of Indonesia directly and indirectly became the basis for how the Indonesian state would be established, while also taking into account the conditions of Indonesian society at that time, so that the debate regarding the basic design of the state and the Indonesian constitution became a fundamental topic of discussion.

The difficulties of the Indonesian nation, which is so diverse in terms of ethnicity,

religion, and origin, make it a country that is particularly vulnerable to the division of power. One example of the failure of a plural state is the disintegration of the former Yugoslavian country, a region in Southeast Europe. The disintegration of the country of Yugoslavia into 7 (seven) countries, namely Slovenia, Croatia, Bosnia-Herzegovina, North Macedonia, Montenegro, Serbia, Kosovo, which was caused by, among others, the end of the Cold War marked by the fall of the Berlin wall in 1989 and the emergence of new former communist countries. The charismatic leader Josep Broz Tito who was a friend of Bung Karno died, and Yugoslavia then experienced a civil war due to various problems including economic, socio-political problems, differences in religious adherents and languages that vary in each region, the rise of nationalism in the regions of the country and a prolonged economic crisis which then ended the existence of the country of Yugoslavia on April 27, 1992, (Szczesio, 2021).

Yugoslavia's plurality is almost identical to that of the Indonesian nation, and perhaps even more complex, because Indonesia is an archipelago inhabited by hundreds of ethnicities, languages, religions, and historical roots that differ from region to region. This situation highlights the need to revitalize the Pancasila concept by revisiting its roots of thought and practice throughout the nation's history through a more comprehensive discussion of the concept.

### **1. The Concept of Pancasila.**

Pancasila, with its various concepts, is a representation of the ideas of the nation's founders, modern thought, and the political conditions of the world at that time, so that giving meaning to the existence of the principles must be done based on the context at the time Pancasila was formed and when Pancasila was put into practice.

As the foundation of the state, Pancasila serves as the philosophical basis for the nation's existence, establishing its primary goals as the spirit of the state. The virtues of Pancasila serve as a source of inspiration for state administrators in formulating policies, laws, and the nation's overall orientation. Therefore, the explanations of the Pancasila principles must be accepted, along with the rationale behind each principle within the context of the Indonesian state.

The First Principle (the first), Belief in the One and Only God. In Bung Karno's initial idea, the first principle of Pancasila stated that religion is a social force that lives in society, and the existence of religious concepts is prioritized to achieve the goal of community prosperity. Indonesia itself has a diverse range of beliefs and religions,



including Hinduism, Buddhism, Islam, and Christianity, which are the main elements considered to unite the Indonesian people's souls. Bung Karno saw that religion also has unique characteristics because religion is more dominated by dynamic personal spiritual experiences, but the power of religion in Indonesia is a star that guides (*Leitstar*) the progress of the nation and completes the political goals of the nation and state, the concept of the first principle was conveyed by Bung Karno in his introductory speech to the Pancasila course on June 16, 1958, (BPIP, 2023).

Bung Karno's initial thoughts suggested that the existence of people who adhere to religion should be directed towards national progress, that religious diversity requires equality, and that the absence of the dominance of a particular religion is essential. The emergence of the Jakarta Charter, which stated the obligation to implement Islamic law for its adherents, was completed with a compromise that Indonesia is sufficiently based on the One Almighty God. The context, if we trace the society or the Muslim community at that time, was still devastated by the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate in 1924, so that the spirit of restoring the glory of Pan-Islamism grew. This concept of divinity was one of the fundamental principles of the state, reflecting the social conditions of society at that time. Before the emergence of religious traditions, the people of the archipelago were closely tied to the concept of belief in nature and supernatural beings, known as animism and dynamism.

The concept of divinity in Pancasila is not intended as a state ideal with a religious basis, but rather to accommodate religion in state life, especially in the context where religious interpretations may struggle to formulate a religious state model based on their teachings. The debate on the position of religion in the state, especially Islam, has long been going on. Natsir and his friends had a design for an Islamic-based state, which then experienced internal contraction. During the New Order era, Nurcholis Madjid also offered a formulation of the position of religion and state with a more balanced position, (Syarifah & Fauzan, 2022).

The initial concept of Pancasila affirmed that all citizens have the right to live according to their religion, but that all religious ethics and spirits are to be used entirely for the benefit of the state and nation. To this day, the relationship between religion and state experiences ups and downs, influencing each other and continually finding balance.

Principle II (two) Just and Civilized Humanity, as stated by Bung Karno in the Pancasila course in 1958, posits that the concept of humanity is based on living creatures that possess reason and is the result of evolution that has occurred over hundreds of

thousands of years. The condition of the Indonesian nation was formed from ethnic groups that grew and influenced each other, namely the various Indonesian ethnic groups with diverse regions, including those influenced by India and China, which, in addition to interacting, also influenced each other. Humanity, as outlined in the second principle, is also the goal of religions, ensuring that the relationship between humanity and the state's objectives is aligned. Pancasila emphasizes respect for humanity, regardless of its origins; thus, Pancasila is also conceptualized as a means to build solidarity among Indonesian ethnic groups, (BPIP, 2023, bks. 220–240).

The principle of humanity in the view of humanist philosophy is to place humans above everything in this universe, so that human dignity and will must be a priority in life, (Hadi, 2012). The concept of humanism philosophically requires equality and respect for human dignity. This concept emerged when Western civilisation entered the Renaissance Enlightenment era. In the philosophy of humanism, it states that human freedom to think and act is an absolute and inviolable right. Humanism is directed to humanise humans naturally. It rejects a form that degrades human dignity, and thus humanism rejects the enslavement of humans and encourages them to live better from day to day. Humanism is also the basis for the foundation that human rights (HAM) are fundamental rights that the constitution must guarantee. The figures who are thinkers of humanism include Carl Rogers, Abraham Maslow (Absor, Armiyati, Putri Pangestika, Zahara Maulida, & Febri Riliani, 2020).

The concept of humanism has also been rejected, particularly by religious teachings that define humanism in their terms, or by hard-line humanist groups that assert that no other entity is more valuable than humans, thus rejecting the concept of divinity. However, humanism has recently developed into a more moderate concept that does not conflict with religious beliefs.

Principle III (three) is the Unity of Indonesia. The initial concept by Bung Karno was known as the concept of nationhood or nationalism, which, according to him in his speech at the United States Congress in 1952, was the "social core" of the nationalist movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America, aimed at encouraging the achievement of justice and prosperity. In his speech on the Pancasila course in 1952, the primary basis of the principle of nationality was the unity of language. With a shared language, it would be easier to foster a sense of national identity. The unity of the Indonesian language became one of the prides of the Indonesian nation.

Nationalism, or nationality, is the will to live together that binds individuals in a

national entity united by local geopolitics, specifically the relationship between geographical location and the feelings and solidarity of political life in a particular region, which becomes a unified entity. In the concept of nationality conceptualised by Bung Karno, it is stated that the nation, bound by Indonesian nationality, is needed to build justice and prosperity for its citizens; thus, nationalism or nationality is a temporary means to accelerate this process, (BPIP, 2023, bks. 150–171).

Nationalism, in its outdated concept, is characterised by unconditional love for the homeland, symbolised by heroism and patriotism, and fighting for the nation by all means. However, the idea changed after independence; the concept of nationalism in the current context must be a more concrete identity in the framework of a modern state with a clean, democratic government and protection of human rights, (Kusumawardani & Psikologi, 2004).

The context of Bung Karno's nationalism is that all efforts in maintaining the nation and state must be oriented towards the citizens of the nation. After the end of the European dark ages that ended the power of the church over the state, many new countries were formed which were expressions of nationality, including Romania, Germany and after the collapse of the Ottoman Caliphate in 1924, new nationalist countries were also formed in the Arab region, including Iraq, Saudi Arabia, the United Arab Emirates, and after World War II the Republic of Indonesia, including newly established countries besides India and China. The nationalism expressed by Bung Karno was the nationalism of the Indonesian context at the beginning of independence, which must be reinterpreted in light of the times' development.

Principle IV (four): Democracy is led by the understanding among honourable representatives from the parliament. Bung Karno's initial concept of people's sovereignty or democracy is a tool to achieve goals within the state. However, other tools have also been used, such as Hitler's fascist dictatorship, the Soviet Union's proletarian dictatorship model, and the socialist model. Bung Karno envisioned the democracy adopted by Indonesia to be one with a national character and a distinctive Indonesian personality, rather than a democracy like those practised by other nations, which incorporated technical and liberal elements. Bung Karno sought a guided democracy that prioritised national progress, rather than a secular and liberal democracy as practised in the Western world, which was dominated by capitalist-neocolonial countries. Bung Karno himself in his 1958 Pancasila course speech positioned Indonesian democracy based on the concept of the Marhaenism democratic idea, which is also a Marxist idea that was organised,

adapted and implemented in Indonesia, *"is het in Indonesia toegepaste marxisme"*, (BPIP, 2023, bks. 113–121).

The democracy that Bung Karno envisioned at that time must be implemented to achieve the progress and prosperity of the people. Thus, the democracy implemented by capitalist countries is not suitable for the Indonesian nation because it does not fulfil the mandate of alleviating the people's suffering. Guided democracy will be the design to achieve democracy in the Indonesian style. Bung Karno, as an initial step, began to experiment with guided democracy on July 5, 1959, with a Presidential decree inviting 3 (three) elements, namely nationalists, religion and communists (Nasakom), as the prominent supporters of the Indonesian revolution, (Nurrahmi, Jurrahman, & Kaswati, 2021).

Bung Karno, in his initial concept, referred to social justice as being achieved through guided democracy, because when Indonesia became independent, the world was entering a phase of industry and the development of capitalism, making the Indonesian people vulnerable to social injustice within society. Therefore, it is essential to raise awareness among the people about the importance of responding to industrialisation in a way that benefits them through the concept of guided democracy. The concept of achieving social justice in question can be realised if the state consciously adopts the idea of socialism, namely mobilising all the people's strength to unite and control capitalism, thereby managing themselves to achieve social justice. (BPIP, 2023, bks. 150–172).

Bung Karno also stated that to achieve social justice, Indonesia needs to implement Indonesian-style socialism or socialism based on Pancasila; thus, the need for guided democracy is a consequence of achieving social justice. The Indonesian-style socialism referred to by Bung Karno is a form of socialism where each person can develop the production sector according to their abilities, and others will work on other parts to meet domestic and international needs. Bung Karno considers this concept of Indonesian socialism to be the path to prosperity for Indonesia.

In the current concept, Bung Karno's concept of social justice is more closely aligned with the idea of a welfare state. This concept requires the establishment of a state formed by the people to accelerate the achievement of prosperity and social justice. In practice, the idea of the fifth principle must also be operationalised in the administration of government, with work programs that are evenly distributed to all Indonesian citizens, (Sarifuiddin & Joesoef, 2023).

From the description of the concept of Pancasila above, it can be concluded that the

values that form Pancasila, which later became the driving force behind the formation of Indonesia, are the values of Islam, Nationalism, and socialism/communism. Socialism firmly rejects colonialism because socialism/communism requires a classless social structure in the production sector to achieve social justice, and the primary opponent of the condition of injustice is colonialism. The idea of socialism emerged and was brought since before independence, namely by a Dutch East Indies citizen named Henk Snievlet by forming ISDV or called the Dutch East Indies socialist party, then by the native citizen Tan Malaka and during the independence period it then became the Indonesian communist party participating in the 1955 election and obtained 4 (four) of the most significant votes, (Wikandaru & Cahyo, 2016).

The concept of Islam also became a substantial value that formed the idea of Pancasila because before independence this idea already existed, when the Dutch East Indies implemented ethical policies allowing natives to attend school and form modern organizations, then emerged from Islamic religious political groups namely the Islamic Union in 1905, Muhammadiyah in 1912 and Nahdatul Ulama in 1926 which initially were a community gathering congregation then became a socio-political force of the Muslim community, (Ayu, 2020), (Weli Tridayatna AS, Fathiyah Shabrina Mudafri, 2024), (TRD, Zetra, & Asrinaldi, 2022), (Hutapea<sup>1</sup>, Sitohang<sup>2</sup>, & Siti Mawar Naibaho<sup>3</sup>, 2024).

Conceptually, Pancasila, as the values that shape Indonesia, is derived from the ideas of socialism/communism, Islam, humanism, nationalism, and liberalism, which are combined into a set of principles adapted to the conditions of Indonesian society. In the practice of the state after the proclamation, Pancasila can be observed in three (3) phases: the Old Order, the New Order, and the Reformation Order, which we will discuss in the following section.

The critical analysis of the Pancasila concept above shows that the discovery of the Pancasila idea is not an original source of the Indonesian nation but rather ideas that live in the international world and have become a world agreement to this day, namely the role of religion, human rights, nationalism, democracy and social justice.

In comparison, the 1949 Indian Constitution clearly outlines the fundamental concepts of the state: a sovereign, socialist, secular, democratic republic, freedom, justice, equality, and brotherhood of nations. The preamble to the Indian Constitution encompasses nearly all the ideas and ideologies prevalent in the world at that time and continues to do so to this day, (constituteproject, 2012).

## 2. Pancasila in Old Order

The formulation of the Pancasila concept in an institutional manner was facilitated by the Japanese government, which at that time was the ruler/colonizer, by forming the Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Independence of Indonesia (BPUPKI) which was represented by representatives of the socio-political forces that were growing at that time, until the proclamation was read on August 17, 1945, (ANRI, 2010).

At the beginning of independence, following the proclamation of Pancasila and the adoption of the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945), Pancasila became a conceptually final principle. However, due to post-war and post-colonial conditions, the newly independent Republic of Indonesia faced numerous difficulties in consolidating its state organisations. The state was formally established, but technically it was not yet operating effectively.

In the initial stage of implementing people's sovereignty, the government issued Decree Number X (ten) October 16, 1945, the main content of which was to carry out the state's legislative duties and assign the Indonesian National Committee to act as the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) and the People's Representative Council (DPR) and appoint a department for that purpose from among the National Committee before a definitive representative was formed. The Indonesian National Committee's task was to determine the General Outlines of State Policy (GBHN) and, together with the president, to establish laws, all of which were carried out before the formation of a people's representative by the 1945 Constitution, (Maklumat, 1945).

The government was unstable at times after the proclamation, particularly during wartime. However, due to the significance of this country as a representation of the social structure that forms the Indonesian state, a Government Decree was issued on November 3, 1945, through the Vice President, No. X of 1945 which allowed the people to establish political parties, so that formal political parties began to emerge, namely the Indonesian Muslim Consultative Council Party (Masyumi), the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI), the Indonesian Christian Party (Parkindo), the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI), the Catholic Party of the Republic of Indonesia (PKRI), (Arifin & Pasundan, 2024).

In practice, the government of the Republic of Indonesia in the early period of 1945-1955 was very ineffective because the Dutch colonialists were still interested in controlling it again by carrying out military aggression in 1947, the emergence of a rebellion in Madiun by the PKI because they rejected the Renville agreement with the Dutch government which only recognized Central Java, Jogja and Sumatra as Indonesian territory and encouraged the formation of the Republic of Indonesia Serikat, this

agreement gave rise to rejection which led to another attack by the Dutch military aggression against Jogjakarta, and the arrest of Soekarno-Hatta in 1948. This second military aggression event then gave rise to diplomatic politics and negotiations took place at the Round Table Conference (RTC) which agreed to the formation of the Republic of Indonesia Serikat (RIS) which changed the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945) to the RIS Constitution which was very different from the initial spirit of independence of the government model because the RIS state used a parliamentary model.

Ten years after independence as a commitment to becoming a democratic country according to the initial idea of Pancasila, the 1955 election was held with a political configuration with a dominant vote acquisition including the Indonesian National Party (PNI) 22.3%, the Masyumi Party (20.9%) (Islam), the NU Party (Islam) (18.4%) the Indonesian Communist Party (16.4%) and the Indonesian Islamic Union Party (2.89%). This political configuration represented the political power of the Indonesian people prior to independence. The 1955 election seemed only to confirm the structure of political power that lived in Indonesian society. The election results then prompted Bung Karno to initiate the concept of a nationalist, religious, and communist alliance (Nasakom), which culminated on July 5, 1959, and returned Indonesia to the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945), and the beginning of guided democracy, guided by the Nasakom ideological idea, until 1965. (Wiratama, Budianto, & Sumarwoto, 2022).

The meaning of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945) in the period known as the old order (1945-1965) received less attention than it did at the beginning of its formation and formulation. However, instead, there was a debate between religious groups, nationalists and communists, which became more and more intense, not to mention the Dutch interference after the proclamation with various types of agreements that were detrimental to the Indonesian nation (the pretext of retaking control). So that President Soekarno took a sole role with the model of guided democracy ala Soekarno, by implementing centralism of power on his individual, without paying attention to the constitutional order (UUD 1945), because in the 20 years of independence there was only 1 (one) election, namely in 1955, and the guided democracy in question was not a collective idea of the people's representatives, but calling himself the great leader of the revolution. This is the root of Sukarno's ambiguity, because he initiated the idea of a national revolution to fight the tyranny of liberalism and global capitalism. However, not all groups supported the idea of the revolution. Both religious and nationalist circles, as well as military and Islamic groups, considered Sukarno too lenient, fearing it would give

wind to the communist group. Indeed, the victim was the PKI as a party that had the idea of revolution. Moreover, what is more unfortunate is that at that time the end of the 50s and early 60s was the history of the cold war began after the Korean war ceasefire (divided South and North Korea, like East Germany - West Germany), the Western Bloc (imperialist countries) led by America and the Eastern Bloc led by the Soviet Union (communism). All the powers of the two blocs fought indirectly in countries considered strategic, utilising any issue, religion, nationalism, and economic interests. Indonesia was deemed an important area to be controlled.

There was no relevant interpretation that could be implemented by the old order government towards Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945). Some understood this because, as a newly established country, the consolidation of government could not be fully implemented. Pancasila, as the basic philosophy of national life, was likely utilised in critical conditions. Soekarno, as the originator of the Pancasila foundation, also began to evolve ideas with various new elements, campaigning again for nationalism, religion, and communism (nasakom) as the basis for living together, and the achievement of national independence through the revolution that was echoed. In the history of revolution, revolution is an idea that is captured by the people and transformed into continuous movements, led by a leader who completes it with the legitimacy of the people.

The Old Order in the history of the founding of the Republic of Indonesia was not fully effective in managing the country, Pancasila itself was still just a political jargon because the government's attitude changed due to the unstable political situation as a post-colonial country caught in a political bloc battle between the liberal western bloc and the socialist/communist eastern bloc.

### **3. Pancasila in New Order**

The event marking the fall of the old order was the September 30, 1965, movement, which was accused of being a movement led by the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). Bung Karno, who was known to be close to the group, became the political target of the anti-Soekarno faction. The political and economic crisis in 1965-1967 resulted in the PKI being dissolved as a legitimate political party, and then Bung Karno was dismissed as president for life, and then appointed General Soeharto as acting president, thus starting the new order phase until 32 (thirty-two) years later.

The emergence of the new order is considered the victory of the cold war and



Indonesia as its arena of war, the cold war was a global political and military competition after World War II between the liberal western bloc led by the United States and its allies and the Soviet Union which led the eastern bloc group with a social/communist ideology. The fall of Bung Karno and the end of the old order were suspected to be the result of the impact of the Cold War conflict, which was marked by the dissolution of the PKI as a banned party in 1965, (Britannica, 2025).

The New Order phase in Indonesia was marked by the rise of President Soeharto, who emerged from the military. During this period, the basic position of the state and constitution remained rooted in Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945), serving as the basis for governance, with the interpretation of the New Order leaning towards pro-economic liberalism and prioritizing natural resources. It could be said that the New Order was a victory for the Western bloc; communism in Indonesia was dissolved and localized/eradicated. Religious groups also received extraordinary pressure because we know that before facing the West, religious groups opposed the secularization of religion, and communists opposed economic exploitation; both of them opposed the dominant Western bloc. Even when the capitalist bloc or Western bloc did not exist, religious and communist groups often conflicted.

However, what is interesting is that during the New Order era, Pancasila became an incredibly massive jargon, all state affairs had to require documents containing information about having gone through a Pancasila appreciation course, better known as the P4 program or Guidelines for Appreciating and Practicing Pancasila, which was formed by a decree of People's Consultative Assembly (MPR) in 1978, which then redefined the principles of Pancasila as a guide to ethical life among fellow citizens/residents, not as a comprehensive spirit in taking state policies, attitudes towards relations between countries, democracy and social justice in the economic sector. The first principle emphasizes how to behave as a follower of any religion. This redefinition differs significantly from when Pancasila was first proposed as the state philosophy. Pancasila during the New Order era was like a guide to citizen morality. Therefore, it is appropriate that, in the practice of the New Order state, there was no concern for social justice, human rights, or democracy. Anything that did not align with the will of the authorities was considered contrary to Pancasila and, therefore, could face legal action or military force. Control over the attitudes and actions of residents was strictly monitored by the military apparatus from the central government down to the village level, commonly referred to as village guidance non-commissioned officers (Babinsa) from the

local military command. The military established systematic cooperation by supporting the ruling party, the Functional Groups, which made it the sole victorious party. This approach was similar to how the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) hierarchically placed its organizational organs alongside the Red Army at every level of the state hierarchy.

Islamic and nationalist groups during the New Order era were emasculated in such a way that, within the scope of Islamic political parties, the NU Party, the Indonesian Muslim Party (Parmusi), the Indonesian Islamic Union Party (PSII), and the Islamic Tarbiyah Party were combined under pressure to become the United Development Party (PPP). Among the nationalists, a fusion of the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI) was formed, which was a merger of the Indonesian Nationalist Party (PNI), the Indonesian Christian Party (Parkindo), the Catholic Party, the People's Consultative Assembly Party (Murba), and the Indonesian Freedom Fighters Association Party (IPKI). Both groups received a hard political blow, from the beginning the nationalist party received quite good support so far, it was destroyed, likewise the Islamic party which had fanatical loyalist supporters had existed in the 1977 election, then slowly decreased, especially the PDI which experienced the most political alienation, because the working group forcibly took over its claim as a nationalist party as the government party, (Dwi & Gayung, 2012).

The New Order was able to hold elections in 1971, 1977, 1982, 1987, 1992, and 1997 before finally falling in 1998, despite redefining Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution, following the resignation of President Soeharto. Formally, democracy was implemented through elections, but the regime's control over election participants meant that the quality of democracy could not be relied upon to accurately represent the will of the people. Democracy, a product of the European Enlightenment and considered the best way to achieve the will of the people, can be manipulated by the systematic control of a regime; perhaps this could also be called the paradox of liberal democracy.

Pancasila was given a new interpretation by defining the Pancasila principles through the issuance of the Pancasila points based on MPR Decree No. II of 1978, which contains the Guidelines for Understanding and Practicing Pancasila (P4) or (Eka Prasetya Pancakarsa), which became a way of life and nation and state, which was conceptualized more like a culture, (MPR, 1978).

During the New Order era, everything had to be stable under the will of the government and the military, a task that many considered extraordinary: controlling and eliminating the remaining communists who were still active, silencing nationalist groups, and simultaneously controlling religious groups (Islam) so that they would not disrupt the

government's agenda. This enormous task, if not supported by foreign/external powers, would undoubtedly be challenging. Foreigners saw the atmosphere becoming increasingly enthusiastic, in addition to investing heavily in Indonesia, foreign countries also formed an extensive coalition of lenders, which later became an unresolved debt burden to this day. In the process of controlling stability, no action was allowed without the regime's permission, even the so-called SARA (ethnicity, religion, race, and inter-group) issue would be an effective blow if it were disturbed. During the New Order era, the absence of ethnic, religious, and racial conflict was more due to pressure from military power, not because of awareness within the group. In the short term, this was effective, of course, with a not insignificant cost in terms of military support that entered parliament and political mobilization for Golkar, as the leading supporter of the New Order's political power; the rest was merely complementary.

A critical analysis of the interpretation and practice during the New Order era shows that the regime at that time manipulated Pancasila as a condition of submission to the ruling. The interpretation of Pancasila was made shallow and became an administrative requirement, where every level of education and government was required to participate in the Pancasila Appreciation and Practice Training Program (P4), which was implemented through courses in every government agency. The New Order government held a single interpretation of the meaning of Pancasila, meaning that any interpretation outside of this was considered a form of rebellion or subversion of state power. More precisely, Pancasila at that time was used as a repressive tool and a tool to legitimize the New Order political dictatorship.

Sociologically, the Old Order and New Order phases are matched with the concept of legitimacy of authority as formulated by Max Weber which is very relevant, namely by dividing the ideal type of legitimacy of authority, namely the traditional type which is based on customary ties and traditions, charismatic authority where authority is obtained from the personal charisma of the leader and has personal power which is considered to carry a special mission and finally is rational-legal which constructs legitimacy based on systematic, formal legal rules and is obeyed by the political system that is built, (Wæraas, 2018). In the context of the old order led by Soekarno, the authority built represents a charismatic concept, where legitimacy stems from personal appeal and the romanticism of the colonial struggle. Such authority is usually fragile because it is not supported by strong institutional power. In the new order era, led by Soeharto, based on Weber's legitimacy theory, the new order utilizes legitimacy through rational-legal authority by

strengthening power through the use of legal power and state institutions, which are, in practice, manipulated to support the authoritarianism of the new order.

Pancasila was utilized during the New Order era to establish hegemony by occupying educational space through the Pancasila training model, also known as P4, which spanned from elementary to higher education. Even for bureaucrats, Pancasila courses were conducted as a means of promoting the hegemony of the Pancasila idea, as interpreted by the New Order, to create a hegemonic value belief for the regime at that time. This situation is relevant to Gramsci's theory, which posits that education is not a neutral space, as it can be utilized as a tool for reproducing the hegemony or ideology of the dominant class to maintain its power, (Hafidz, 2006).

#### **4. Pancasila in Reform Order**

The transition from the New Order to the Reform Order was marked by an economic crisis which then spread to become a political crisis and had an impact on a social crisis which gave rise to conflict and protests, where the situation reached its peak with the resignation of President Soeharto who had been in power for thirty-two years, marked by Soeharto's resignation on May 21, 1998, and the end of the New Order's power to become the Reform Order in Indonesia.

This period can be described as a dramatic transition. The fall of Sukarno in 1965 can be compared to the process of Suharto's fall during the 1998 reforms. Neither was favored nor considered valuable to foreign interests, in this case, the United States and its allies. Sukarno was overthrown because he opposed capitalism, and there were no economic negotiations with the Western bloc. At the same time, the fragile government was easily provoked to overthrow him. An economic crisis hit Suharto, and the public's trust had been lost; the military that was his guard was no longer able to contain the will of the people, which ultimately led to Suharto's resignation as president.

The reform government was led for approximately a year from 1998 to 1999 by President BJ. Habibie, who was previously vice president and also former chairman of Golkar in the New Order era, the phenomenal policy in the Habibie era was to open the referendum tap in the Province of East Timor, which later became the new country of the Democratic Republic of Timor Leste supported by Australia, which is worth remembering that America also supported the annexation of Timor Leste by Indonesia in 1974, because at that time the largest faction of Timor Leste's power was Fretilin which was a socialist party, which was feared to disturb the Southeast Asian region. Now that

the Cold War is over, Indonesia was even pressured to release it through a referendum method. The following policy aimed to set up another election in 1999 by opening up the registration of new political parties as widely as possible. This wide-open political space then revealed the fragmentation of previously silent political groups. Islamic political parties which were reincarnations of political parties in the old order emerged again, there were approximately 16 (sixteen) Islamic-based parties out of 48 (four months) parties that participated in the 1999 election, to name a few that still exist until the 2024 election are the National Awakening Party whose formation was fully supported by NU circles and the National Mandate Party whose formation was fully supported by Muhammadiyah, there is also the Justice Party which was formed by a modern Islamic network which is said to have one idea with the Egyptian Muslim Brotherhood renewal movement which moved through campus networks, the rest of the other Islamic parties only tried to revive the romanticism of previous Islamic parties such as the Indonesian Islamic Union Party, Masyumi, NU Party etc. which did not get support for votes and seats in the 1999 election, (Supriyanto, 2022).

Pancasila during the New Order era was a frightening, sacred, and powerful concept. In the name of Pancasila, it could suppress anything that did not conform to the prevailing power at that time, as well as its interpretation of Pancasila during the New Order era and the perceptions experienced by people who lived through that era. The first thing abolished at the beginning of the reform was the Pancasila courses for mass organizations and every level of education, from junior high school to university. These courses had previously been the main requirements during student orientation for university students. Pancasila education and courses during the New Order era did contain indoctrination, and Pancasila was conveyed through the concept of Pancasila points, which served as guidelines for individual behavior. This approach differed from Pancasila as debated by Soekarno in the BPUPK session before the proclamation, which comprehensively outlined how Indonesia could continue to exist.

Due to the trauma of the New Order's Pancasila education, during the reformation era, Pancasila subjects/training in schools or introductory courses were abolished for several years. Even when Gus Dur or Megawati became President, they were still unable to move. They considered Pancasila, according to the New Order's definition, to be unnecessary, and the agencies responsible for managing Pancasila were disbanded. School education for Pancasila was replaced with civics education for elementary, middle, and high school students. Moreover, discussions regarding the concept of

Pancasila, as delivered by Soekarno and used as the basis of the state, were not revisited because there was still suspicion that this early version of Pancasila was also a collection of other isms. Until SBY ordered Pancasila education to be reintroduced, but combined with civics education, and the teaching department for this major was also adjusted. In practice, there is still a reluctance to teach, especially regarding the ethics of life, which are usually covered in religious and moral education lessons. Pancasila is a national perspective on life, the philosophical basis of which must be understood, not as a daily ethical principle, but rather as a philosophical concept. This is why, after approximately 15 years of reform, Pancasila, which is considered the foundation, has never been elaborated upon, (Kompas, 2011).

The impact of the current situation is starting to be felt, there is a disturbance related to inter-religious relations, unity and justice, it is felt that there is a loss of guidance for the meaning of nationality, perhaps so far it is still struggling with how democracy is followed and implemented, but the parties who are contestants of democracy, namely political parties, can themselves determine the ideology and political line of their group, even though there are conditions in the formation of political parties. However, in practice, all ideologies are free to spread in the political market. Some of the particular ideologies also do not agree with electoral democracy; perhaps they have other ways to seize political power.

Even now, more than 25 years after the reforms, Pancasila remains merely a display of the nation's foundations, as its primary source of law often contradicts its regulations. Even the amendments to the 1945 Constitution are often accused of contradicting the principles of Pancasila. As a national philosophy, Pancasila still falls far short of becoming a value that shapes the nation's perspective and spirit.

Pancasila, since its inception as a concept at the beginning of the proclamation, has become a social reality constructed by the elite, which was then institutionalized by the state through various means, including educational institutions. The function of education is to internalize the values that are considered ideal by the people. This concept in the Berger & Luckman approach is through the process of creating meaning by the elite with various bases that appear objective as the basis for thinking and acting in the context of the state, so that these ideas and meanings can be accepted by the people and feel they have an obligation to obey even though many of them cannot explain or critically understand the concept of the principles in Pancasila, what is interesting is that Pancasila is constructed socially and historically this causes Pancasila to always be open to new

interpretations depending on the particular political context and who is dominant in producing the meaning of Pancasila, (Demartoto, 2013).

A critical analysis of the concept of Pancasila during the reform era reveals that the reform phase from 1998 to the present has not provided a more operational interpretation of Pancasila, remaining limited to state jargon. In the last decade, efforts to revive the concept of Pancasila began with the establishment of June 1 as the birth of Pancasila, as outlined in Presidential Decree No. 24 of 2016. The establishment was linked to Bung Karno's speech regarding the basis of the state at the BPUPKI session on June 1, 1945. Another significant development in the post-reform period was the establishment of the Pancasila Ideology Study Agency (BPIP), an agency formed from the president's work unit that was later upgraded in status. This agency became a new arena for further developing the Pancasila discourse academically, conducting socialization, and conducting studies on Pancasila. The performance of this agency has not had a significant political impact because its role is limited to that of a research institute under the president, and it does not make political decisions. However, in terms of discourse, studies on Pancasila have begun to develop by involving the role of Legislative Assembly or People's Consultative Assembly members in the socialization of the 4 (four) pillars, namely: Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945), *Bhineka Tunggal Ika*, and the concept of the unitary state of the Republic of Indonesia (NKRI).

Since the establishment of Pancasila Day and the strengthening of the BPIP institution's role, the current government regime has been seen as internalizing Pancasila by intensifying Pancasila education at the elementary, secondary, and tertiary levels, with the main agenda of strengthening Pancasila education. The reinterpretation of Pancasila has also been carried out through the creation of a special Pancasila journal that accepts all ideas and interpretations of Pancasila from a particular perspective, further demonstrating that the socio-historically constructed Pancasila provides a space for interpretation. In addition, BPIP also conducts social media campaigns, publishes Pancasila books, offers courses, and holds ceremonies necessary for building Pancasila hegemony and social construction, (BPIP, 2025).

Madung's thoughts on nationalism in Pancasila democracy suggest that nationalism and democracy must be integral to political progress, as Pancasila democracy serves as a meeting point for cooperative and deliberative politics, while also blending the plurality of the Indonesian nation with a more emancipatory nationalism and rejecting atomistic liberalism, (Otto Gusti Madung, 2014). Furthermore, Frans Magnis developed a concept

that Pancasila, which contains religious freedom, human rights, democracy, and social justice, will remain relevant to the current situation. Pancasila as a source of ethics can serve as the basis for considering state policies in the political, social, and economic fields, while also efforts to reduce the abuse of power in the name of Pancasila. (Magnis-suseno et al., 2022).

The reform era from 1998 to the present has been an era of open government and the promotion of democratization in the political sphere. This condition continuously challenges the discussion of the Pancasila concept and its internalization into political policy. New problems posed by Pancasila have changed as the world has become more open and connected, resulting in challenges such as religious radicalism, oligarchy, corruption, social inequality, and technological threats. In this era of constant uncertainty, does Pancasila possess the capacity to adapt and imbue new meaning to state and government management? This requires further, more in-depth study.

From the above description, several initial reflections can be drawn, namely that Pancasila has become a space for power struggles between state ideology and the people. After the reformation, radical Islamic movements, suppressed by the authorities during the New Order, became more expressive through bombings and other radical acts. In the political arena, during the reformation period, religious and regional populist movements emerged, particularly in Aceh and Papua. This situation is known as a national crisis, characterized by the collapse of national solidarity due to sectarianism, a consequence of a pluralistic state. Reexamining and contextualizing Pancasila in the contemporary era can be a tool for social engineering that benefits the nation and state.

The theoretical implication of the above study is that interpretations of Pancasila are heavily influenced by dominant power structures, thus confirming that understanding ideology can be used as a tool of state hegemony. Therefore, in the study of Pancasila, a critical approach will help re-examine the history and interpretations of Pancasila, challenging any single narrative about it.

The practical implication of the above study's findings is to begin examining the current model of Pancasila education and revitalizing it into a more transformative and critical model, rather than merely a concept that becomes a doctrine. Because Pancasila is vulnerable to manipulative interpretations by those in power, a relevant philosophical interpretation is needed, or, according to Magnis Suseno, to re-position Pancasila philosophically and contextually according to the needs of the times.



## CONCLUSION

From the description above regarding how the concept of Pancasila was initiated from pre-independence to experience in the context of the state in 3 (three) periods, namely the Old Order, New Order, and Reform Order, the following conclusions can be drawn:

- Pancasila, as a syncretic product, is a synthesis of global ideologies, namely Islam, socialism/communism, humanism, nationalism, and liberalism, which demonstrates the plurality of ideologies within Pancasila. This situation caused Pancasila, when it became the foundation of the Indonesian state, to be very flexible, but at the same time vulnerable to manipulative interpretations by the ruling regime. In practical terms, at the operational level, it is also open to multiple interpretations and unable to reduce the social and political tensions that arise in state governance.
- Pancasila has a wealth of ideological discourse so that when this idea is reopened to the public space which currently tends to be open, then academically it will have the potential to contribute to thinking about how ideology in a country is practiced and goes beyond the limits of the regime's power, so that critically this discourse will increasingly find its relevance for social and state life.
- This research is preliminary due to limitations in methodology and a lack of contemporary analysis. The perspectives discussed are still limited to elite narratives and lack an analysis of Pancasila's operational strategies. These shortcomings could be the focus of future research.
- There are further recommendations for research and policy studies, namely revitalizing the philosophical interpretation of Pancasila to make it more up-to-date, international comparisons with studies of other countries that are also ideologically plural, and efforts to develop Pancasila education with a critical approach, with a more transformative Pancasila education model.

## REFERENCES

- Absor, F. N., Armiyati, L., Putri Pangestika, V., Zahara Maulida, C., & Febri Riliani, T. (2020). Tumbuh dan berkembangnya humanisme pada masa renaissans abad ke 14 sampai 17. *Pendidikan Sejarah*, 4(1), 214–221. Retrieved from <https://journal.lppmunindra.ac.id/index.php/alursejarah/article/view/7088>

- Adlini, M. N., Dinda, A. H., Yulinda, S., Chotimah, O., & Merliyana, S. J. (2022). Metode Penelitian Kualitatif Studi Pustaka. *Edumaspul: Jurnal Pendidikan*, 6(1), 974–980. <https://doi.org/10.33487/edumaspul.v6i1.3394>
- Akbar, M. R. (2022). Bumi Manusia dan Anak Semua Bangsa: Dari Politik Etis Hingga Lahirnya Konsepsi Nasionalisme di Tanah Hindia, (April).
- ANRI. (2010). *Arsip Sidang BPUPKI*.
- Arianto, A. (2023). Konsep Nasionalisme Michael Sastrapratedja : Sebuah Tinjauan Filsafat Pancasila dalam Rangka Pengembangan Karakter Bangsa. *Jurnal Filsafat Indonesia*.
- Arif Budimanta. (2024). Struktur Ekonomi Pancasila (Pancasilanomics). *Jurnal Keindonesiaan*. <https://doi.org/10.2307/41260772>
- Arifin, F., & Pasundan, U. (2024). Pertanggungjawaban Wakil Presiden dalam Sistem Presidensial di Indonesia, (September). <https://doi.org/10.38035/jihhp>
- Aswandi1, B., & Kholis Roisah2. (2019). NEGARA HUKUM DAN DEMOKRASI PANCASILA DALAM KAITANNYA DENGAN HAK, 1.
- Ayu, N. D. (2020). Roda Perjalanan Karir Sarekat Islam Dari Komunitas Hingga Organisasi Anti Kolonialis. *Jurnal Kajian Islam Kontemporer (JURKAM)*, 1(1), 31–36. Retrieved from <https://ejurnal.seminar-id.com/index.php/jurkam/article/view/252>
- BPIP. (2023). “API PANCASILA ” Melalui Pidato-pidato Bung Karno.
- BPIP. (2025). Program Kerja BPIP. Retrieved from <https://bpip.go.id/>
- Britannica. (2025). Perang dingin. Retrieved from <https://www.britannica.com/event/Cold-War/Toward-a-new-world-order>
- constituteproject. (2012). Konstitusi India 1949 (direvisi 2012). Retrieved from [https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/India\\_2012](https://www.constituteproject.org/constitution/India_2012)
- Demartoto, A. (2013). TEORI KONSTRUKSI SOSIAL DARI PETER L. BERGER DAN THOMAS LUCKMAN. Retrieved from <https://argyo.staff.uns.ac.id/2013/04/10/teori-konstruksi-sosial-dari-peter-l-berger-dan-thomas-luckman/>

- Dwi, H. W., & Gayung, K. (2012). Propaganda Orde Baru 1966-1980. *Verleden*, 1(1), 1–109.
- Hadi, S. (2012). Konsep Humanisme Yunani Kuno Dan Perkembangannya. *Jurnal Filsafat*.
- Hafidz. (2006). Hegemoni Negara Terhadap Dunia Pendidikan: Telaah Atas Teori Kritis Antonio Gramsci. *Al- 'Adalah*.
- Hasibuan, S. B., Kusdiana, A., Hernawan, W., & Al, M. B. (2023). Keruntuhan Kerajaan Turki Ustmani Serta Implikasinya Terhadap Islam (1566-1924). *GJMI: Gudang Jurnal Disiplin Ilmu*, 1(September), 228–233.
- Hutapea<sup>1</sup>, D., Sitohang<sup>2</sup>, D., & Siti Mawar Naibaho<sup>3</sup>. (2024). ORGANISASI KEAGAMAAN PADA MASA PERGERAKAN NASIONAL: NAHDLATUL ULAMA (NU) 1926-1945. *Pengembangan Pendidikan*, 8(1), 120–130.
- Jedamski, D. A. . C.-L. H., & Cita. (2009). Kebijakan Kolonial Di Hindia Belanda. *Leiden University*.
- Kolianan, J. (2024). PERSPEKTIF SOSIOLOGI TENTANG KEPULAUAN, (August).
- Kompas. (2011). Pendidikan Pancasila Dihapus Artikel ini telah tayang di Kompas.com dengan judul “Pendidikan Pancasila Dihapus”, Klik untuk baca: <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2011/05/06/03075643/pendidikanpancasila-dihapus?page=all>. Kompascom+ baca berita tanpa iklan. Retrieved from <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2011/05/06/03075643/pendidikanpancasila-dihapus?page=all>
- Kompas. (2020). Dampak Perang Dunia I di Berbagai Bidang Artikel ini telah tayang di Kompas.com dengan judul “Dampak Perang Dunia I di Berbagai Bidang”, Klik untuk baca: <https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2020/10/26/123457769/dampak-perang-dunia-i-di-berbagai-bidang>. Komp. Retrieved from <https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2020/10/26/123457769/dampak-perang-dunia-i-di-berbagai-bidang>
- Kompas. (2022). Sejarah BPUPKI: Tujuan, Tugas, Anggota, dan Hasil Sidangnya Artikel ini telah tayang di Kompas.com dengan judul “Sejarah BPUPKI: Tujuan, Tugas, Anggota, dan Hasil Sidangnya”, Klik untuk baca:

- <https://www.kompas.com/stori/read/2022/07/06/110000479/sejarah->. Retrieved from <https://www.kompas.com/stori/read/2022/07/06/110000479/sejarah-bpupki-tujuan-tugas-anggota-dan-hasil-sidangnya>
- Kusumawardani, A., & Psikologi, B. (2004). NASIONALISME. *Buletin Psikologi UGM*, 2.
- Magnis-suseno, F., Tinggi, S., & Driyarkara, F. (2022). DI ABAD KE-21 : PANCASILA APA MASIH DIPERLUKAN ?, 3(2), 1–12.
- Maklumat. (1945). Maklumat Wakil Presiden No. X.
- Masykuri, R., & Ramadlan, M. F. S. (2021). Analisis Manifestasi Segragasi Politik Pelabelan dan Polarisasi di antara Kelompok Islam Sepanjang 2014-2019. *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 12(1), 68–87. <https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.12.1.2021.68-87>
- MPR. (1978). KETETAPAN MAJELIS PERMUSYAWARATAN RAKYAT REPUBLIK INDONESIA NOMOR II/MPR/1978 TAHUN 1978 TENTANG PEDOMAN PENGHAYATAN DAN PENGAMALAN PANCASILA (EKAPRASETIA PANCAKARSA).
- Nurrahmi, Jurrahman, & Kaswati, A. (2021). Pemikiran Soekarno Tentang Nasakom dan Implementasinya di Era Demokrasi Terpimpin. *RINONTJE: Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Penelitian Sejarah*, 2(2), 63–71. Retrieved from <https://jurnal.ipw.ac.id/index.php/rinontje/article/view/118/120>
- Otto Gusti Madung. (2014). PANCASILA , DEMOKRASI LIBERAL. *Jurnal Ledalero*.
- Patittingi, F., Irwansyah, I., Hasrul, M., Arisaputra, M. I., & Yunus, A. (2021). RELASI NEGARA DAN AGAMA DALAM PERATURAN DAERAH BERNUANSA SYARIAH : PERSPEKTIF PANCASILA, 01(01), 17–33.
- Pribadi, A. (2022). POLITIK SOSIO-NASIONALISME SUKARNO DAN KEBANGSAAN PROGRESIF. *Jurnal Pancasila*, 3(2), 65–79.
- Rohman, A. (2024). Implementasi nilai pancasila : Menghadapi problematika rasisme dan diskriminasi, 2(7), 147–156.
- Sacipto, R., & Kepulauan, U. R. (2022). PEMBENTUKAN KARAKTER ANTI KORUPSI, 3(1), 39–50.

- Samudro, B. R. (2020). PANCASILA SEBAGAI INSTITUSI PENGGERAK TRANSFORMASI STRUKTUR SOSIAL BANGSA : *Jurnal Pancasila*, 1–13.
- Sarifuddin, A. J., & Joesoef, I. E. (2023). Implementasi Keadilan Sosial dalam Mewujudkan Negara Kesejahteraan ( Welfare State ) Indonesia. *National Conference on Law Studies (NCOLS)*., 5(1), 21–30. Retrieved from <https://www.bing.com/ck/a?!&&p=b2875e26ac0ce247JmltdHM9MTcyNTkyNjQwMCZpZ3VpZD0wZmlyYzkyNS01M2Y2LTZjOTItMWI5OC1kZDM5NTJmNzZkZjUmaW5zaWQ9NTE5Mg&ptn=3&ver=2&hsh=3&fclid=0fb2c915-53f6-6c92-1b98-dd3952f76df5&psq=Implementasi+Keadilan+Sosial+dalam+Mewujudkan+Ne>
- Shalihah, F. (2015). *Eksistensi Konsep Negara Kepulauan ( The Archipelagic State ) Dalam United Nation Convention On The Law Of The Sea (UNCLOS) 1982 Terhadap Kedaulatan Wilayah Perairan Perbatasan Indonesia*.
- Supriyanto. (2022). GERAKAN MAHASISWA DALAM UPAYA KEJATUHAN PEMERINTAH SOEHARTO 1998. *Jurnal Impresi Indonesia*, 1(2).
- Syarifah, I., & Fauzan, A. (2022). Relasi Negara dan Agama dalam Pemikiran Politik Islam di Indonesia. *Manabia: Journal of Consitutional Law*, 2(1), 87–100. Retrieved from <https://e-journal.uingusdur.ac.id/al-manabia/article/view/725>
- Szczesio, S. L. (2021). International aspects of the disintegration of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, 19, 9–31.
- Tamba, 1Wahyu Pratama, Hartanto, 2Mochamad Felani Budi, 3, & Putri, P. Y. (2024). Pancasila Sebagai Dasar Kebijakan Kesejahteraan Sosial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Keind*, 4(2).
- TRD, T., Zetra, A., & Asrinaldi, A. (2022). Upaya Depolitisasi Birokrasi oleh Birokrasi Pemerintah Kota Padang Melalui Pemilu Gubernur Sumatera Barat 2020. *Indonesian Journal of Religion and Society*, 4(1), 58–68. <https://doi.org/10.36256/ijrs.v4i1.272>
- Unggul Sagena, MPP, MA, M. T., Herman Lawelai, S.I.P., M. I. ., Dr. Herman Dema, S.Pd., S.I.P., M. S., Sundari S.A.P., M. A. ., Hardianti, S.A.P., M. A. ., & Irawati, S Sos., M. . (2016). *METODE PENELITIAN SUB RUMPUN ILMU POLITIK (Teori*

& Referensi berbasis Studi Kasus).

- Wæraas, A. (2018). On weber: Legitimacy and legitimation in public relations. *Public Relations and Social Theory: Key Figures, Concepts and Developments*, (March), 19–38. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315271231>
- Weli Tridayatna AS, Fathiyah Shabrina Mudafri, I. S. K. (2024). Sejarah dan peran muhammadiyah di dalam pendidikan. *Proceeding International Seminar On Islamic Studies*, 5(1), 1323–1329.
- Wikandaru, R., & Cahyo, B. (2016). Landasan Ontologis Sosialisme. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 26(1), 112. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.12627>
- Wiratama, N. S., Budianto, A., & Sumarwoto, M. I. Z. I. (2022). Pancasila Dan Nasakom Dalam Mempersatukan Bangsa Indonesia. *JEJAK : Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah & Sejarah*, 2(2), 66–76. <https://doi.org/10.22437/jejak.v2i2.22428>