

ORIENTATION OF PANCASILA IDEOLOGY ACCULTURATION (A Preliminary Study of the Relationship between Political-Regime Character and Acculturation Orientation of Pancasila Ideology)

Ganjar Razuni
Universitas Nasional
Jl. Sawo Manila No.61, RW.7, Pejaten Bar., Ps. Minggu, Kota Jakarta Selatan, Daerah Khusus
Ibukota Jakarta 12520, Indonesia

Correspondence email: ganjar.razuni@civitas.unas.ac.id

Submitted: 2 March 2023., Reviewed: 31 May 2023, Published: 28 June 2023

ABSTRACT

This paper examines the orientation of the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in each period of the era of the Indonesian political system, namely, the age of Western-style Liberal / Parliamentary Democracy November 3 1945-July 5, 1959, the first volume of liberal democracy in Indonesia; the Soekarno Guided Democracy era July 5 1959-March 12 1967, the Soeharto New Order era March 12 1967-May 21 1998. This era was followed by the post-1998 Reformation era, which consisted of: the era of Liberalization or Ultra-Liberal Democracy Volume Two and; the period of the rediscovery of Pancasila ideology in Indonesian social, national and state life 2018-present (Rediscovery of Pancasila Ideology) amid the era of Ultra-Liberal Democracy / Liberal Democracy Volume Two. This study aims to construct the orientation of Pancasila ideology acculturation and its implementation in each period of the political system from an ideological perspective and regime character as a background to formulate the right Pancasila ideology acculturation according to the needs of the times without being uprooted from the philosophic roots, ideological roots, historical roots and intellectual roots of Pancasila ideology while innovating Pancasila ideology acculturation to fight the weakening of the nation from within itself.

Keywords: orientation; acculturation; Pancasila ideology

ABSTRAK

Tulisan ini mengkaji orientasi pembudayaan ideologi Pancasila dalam setiap periode era sistem politik Indonesia, yaitu; era Demokrasi Liberal/Parlementer ala Barat 3 November 1945-5 Juli 1959, era demokrasi liberal jilid pertama di Indonesia; era Demokrasi Terpimpin Soekarno 5 Juli 1959-12 Maret 1967; era Orde Baru Soeharto 12 Maret 1967-21 Mei 1998. Era ini dilanjutkan dengan era Reformasi pasca 1998 yang terdiri dari: era Liberalisasi atau Demokrasi Ultra-Liberal Jilid Dua dan; era penemuan kembali ideologi Pancasila dalam kehidupan bermasyarakat, berbangsa, dan bernegara Indonesia 2018-sekarang (Rediscovery of Pancasila Ideology) di tengah-tengah era Demokrasi Ultra-Liberal/Demokrasi Liberal Jilid Dua. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkonstruksi orientasi pembudayaan ideologi Pancasila dan implementasinya pada setiap era sistem politik dari perspektif ideologi dan karakter rezim sebagai latar belakang untuk merumuskan pembudayaan ideologi Pancasila yang tepat sesuai dengan kebutuhan zaman, tanpa tercerabut dari akar filosofis, akar ideologis, akar historis, dan akar intelektual ideologi Pancasila sekaligus melakukan inovasi pembudayaan ideologi Pancasila untuk melawan pelemahan bangsa dari dalam dirinya sendiri.

Kata kunci: orientasi; pembudayaan; ideologi Pancasila

BACKGROUND

In general, a nation almost always faces the problem of national integration. Vertically, the problem of national

integration usually rests on the issue of center-regional relations. While the problem of national integration at the horizontal level usually arises from issues of conflict and

competition between ethnic groups, religions, races, inter-groups, primordial ties, inter-regional relations and others. (Mehden; 1983; Crouch; 1984).

Integrity is defined as "acting in conformity with appropriate moral and legal ideals and standards" in the current study and is significant in developing the Political Integrity Index. (Huberts, 2018). Government integrity is a behavioral expectation of public organizations to do their business in a socially acceptable manner nationally. Corruption, a socially undesirable condition, and a violation of moral standards and ideals for political and administrative activity result from the absence of such expected action (Chizema & Pogrebna, 2019). The pre-modern community will be included in the more extensive network through many aspects of life. In the political realm, small community groupings will be elevated to the modern political entity known as the country. The response against imperialism, nationalism, and local community unification spirit will emerge in nations that have just gained independence. (Mulyoto, 2018).

The new post-decolonization nations and states in Asia and Africa did not grow and develop progressively and were prone to failure. This pattern of unbalanced trade continued into the period of colonialism and remains today. Despite this, local states still controlled the supply side of the slave trading system. (Settles, n.d.). The deep awareness of environmental change contained in survival, in being present, has rarely been recognized by the mechanisms imposed by colonialism to create wealth for settler-colonial civilization and its imperial

(and, subsequently, state and national) administrations. (Howitt, 2020).

In this context, the new nations and states need a direction for the nation's journey to grow and develop with a national ideology. In this way, ideology has a role as a motivating factor. (Dzenis & Nobre Faria, 2022). Nation-states that are strong and become nation-states "players" in the global map of the world are; the only nation-states that have, adhere and are consistent with the ideology of the nation they adhere to, such as Britain, Germany, the United States, Russia, China, Japan, South Korea, North Korea, Cuba, Vietnam and so on.

It has been demonstrated that government ideology influences law-and-order policy. Previous econometric analyses overlooked efforts in parliament when assessing how government/party ideology affects individual policies (Potrafke, 2020). Ideology might reach compromises to safeguard its base (Genovese & Hermida-Rivera, 2022). On the other hand, ideology might endeavor to legitimize reform even in the face of apparent conflicts (Shepherd, 2021). Thus, examining a country's ideology is strategic to studying its system of government.

Historically, The Indonesian nation, sociologically-politically, philosophisch-grondslag, and constitutionally has a national and state ideology. The construction, substance, systematics, and formulation are contained in the 4th paragraph of the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution (UUD 1945). This manuscript is a product of the founding fathers who were members of the Independence Investigation Board (BPUPK) at the First

Plenary Session of the BPUPK on May 29-June 1, 1945 and the Second Plenary Session of the BPUPK on July 10-17, 1945 (AB. Koesuma; 2004; and 2017). Then the discussion and ratification continued until it was finalized by the Indonesian Independence Preparation Committee (PPKI) in the First Plenary Session of PPKI on August 18, 1945 (AB. Koesuma; 2004; and 2017). The formulation and systematics of Pancasila are also contained in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, which is the First to Fourth amendments to the 1945 Constitution in 1999-2001 by the MPR as a result of the 1999 elections.

Pancasila may also be described as a framework for the Indonesian legal system (Dewantara et al., 2019). Since the window of liberal democracy allowed so many of the country's political elite to lay down their beliefs, the 1950s were the most exciting time for researching Indonesian political philosophy in the early years of independence. (Fogg, 2020). Regrettably, recent social events show that Pancasila's political worth is dwindling and being undermined by other Indonesian politicians. In contrast, today's political discourse is intended to mislead people (Latupeirissa et al., 2019). This shows that the dynamics of implementing the Pancasila ideology in Indonesia were turbulent. Thus, researchers want to discuss the paradigm shift within the scope of civilizing the Pancasila Ideology in Indonesia.

The formation of the ideology of the Indonesian nation went through a long process, both sociologically, historically, philosophisch, and politically, in the

struggle of ideas and thoughts of the founding fathers. The construction, substance, systematics and formulation of Pancasila experienced dynamics and dialectics in the stages of development in the period 1945-1949, the era of Western-style Parliamentary Liberal Democracy 1950-1959, the era of Soekarno's Guided Democracy 1959-1967, the era of Soeharto's New Order 1967-1998, and the 1998 Post-Reformation Period or the Second Period of Liberal Democracy 1998-present. (Jadidah, 2020). In the terminology of political system studies, the phases of the political system that have been in effect can be divided into the following: First, the political system based on the 1945 Constitution (August 18, 1945 - November 14, 1945); Second, the western-style liberal / parliamentary democracy system (November 14, 1945 - July 5, 1959) based on the 1945 Constitution which was violated through the parliamentary system (November 14, 1945 - December 27, 1949); RIS Constitution (December 27, 1949 - August 17, 1950); Third, the parliamentary / western-style democracy system based on the Provisional Constitution 1950 - July 5, 1959; Fourth, Soekarno's Guided Democracy system from July 5, 1959 - March 12, 1967 based on the Presidential Decree of July 5, 1959 re-enacting the 1945 Constitution; Fifth, the New Order Pancasila Democracy system based on the 1945 Constitution from March 12, 1967 - May 21, 1998; Sixth, Post-reform 1998 which is the second phase of the liberal democratic political system starting from the Transition Period during the Presidency of B.J. Habibie May 21, 1998-October 20,

1999. (Siradjuddin & Kholil, 2021) Moreover, the Presidency further strengthened what the author calls the ultra-liberal democratic political system to date.

The question is, what is the acculturation of the nation's ideology? Acculturation of the nation's ideology in political science terminology can be called political socialization or civic education for citizens. This is done to shape the state's character, identity, and nature and form a national spirit in a national unity of a nation-state. Based on the concept of Ramlan Surbakti (1992) related to political socialization, which is a process of forming political attitudes and orientations of community members. In the research on elite political socialization, there are hopes of improved political self-competence, faith in political structures, and happiness with democracy as citizens get more engaged with politics. (Erlingsson & Wittberg, 2021).. Political socialization may be a formative practice with long-term effects on public perceptions of crime and antisocial behavior (Gray et al., 2019). People can gain attitudes and orientations toward political life through this political socialization process.

In this case, Easton sees two reasons (Easton, 1984); first, every political orientation has antecedent factors, and second political socialization is an essential factor of the political system, at least in two ways, namely political socialization has implications for political behavior in general and political roles in particular. Political socialization has implications for the change and stability of the political system.

Civilization has a higher and more profound meaning than correctional. In the singular, civilization is a concept or norm that establishes barriers to acceptance and rejection. It is a notion with intrinsic "normative quality" (Hobson, 2008). Acculturation can be interpreted as being nurtured, internalized in cultural constructs, and preserved values to be maintained and implemented as appropriate. Regarding growing Pancasila principles, temporal digital control comprises creativity, independence, democracy, national spirit, peace-loving, high social care and homeland love, honesty, tolerance, discipline, and hard work. (Hidayah et al., n.d.).

Based on Organsky's (1985) theory of stages of political growth, most old countries have gone through linear phases such as integration as nationhood and statehood, industrialization, equal distribution of justice, and mass maturity. The ordinary people in these countries faced severe oppression from traditional feudal regimes. On the other hand, industrialization gave rise to bourgeois factions, who were both the perpetrators and the beneficiaries of industrialization. It was this bourgeois alliance with the ordinary people that led to the great revolutions in Western Europe, such as the French Revolution of 1789, which laid the foundations for the development of individualism and liberalism in the modern political system. These ideas continued to flourish in the US rather than in Eastern Europe. Eastern Europe was slower and became strong traditional agrarian states, taking the socialist-leninist-stalist path, while Western

Europe took the long and linear liberal political and economic path.

Thus the liberal-capitalistic countries have taken on such a minimal role of the state in the acculturation of ideology, where the national consciousness has already been formed in the form of the old states. The state formation and growth process in liberal-capitalistic countries has lasted more than 200 years, so it has gradually passed through the phases of political development as theorized by Organsky (1983). They are what Crouch (1984) calls the old states. Furthermore, in Asia and Africa, Crouch (1984) and Mehden (1985) referred to them as new states born from the de-colonization process in the late 19th or 20th century. On the other hand, socialist countries, such as countries in Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, Poland, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, East Germany, and later in Asia, namely; China and Vietnam, and in Central America, Cuba, which took the socialist path in acculturating ideology by placing such a significant and massive role of the state.

With the background of the problem and the formulation of the problem above, the questions of this writing are: First, why in each political system is there a change in the orientation and direction of the acculturation of the ideology of the Indonesian nation? Second, how is the construction of the orientation and direction of the acculturation of the ideology of the Indonesian nation in the era of the political system so that it can be formulated how to acculturate the ideology of Pancasila according to the needs of the times, without being uprooted from its philosophic roots.

METHOD

The research method in this writing is to use a qualitative research method with a descriptive-analytical approach. Data collection is done by literature study in the form of scientific journals and books. In addition, archival materials of the Pancasila ideology development institution and education and training materials on the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology during the political system in Indonesia, as described above, were also used.

Data validity was examined to ensure the accuracy of the data presented in the writing. In this instance, both data triangulation and expert triangulation were employed. In order to analyze the existing data and information, the analysis is bolstered by the historical method by analyzing historical movements within the current political system, as described above.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Orientation of Pancasila Ideology Acculturation in the era of Liberal Democracy / Western-style Parliamentary Democracy / Liberal Democracy Volume One dated November 3, 1945 - July 5, 1959 and Soekarno's Guided Democracy era July 5, 1959 - March 12, 1967.

Formally, the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology was only present in this country during the Guided Democracy era with the establishment by the state of the Revolutionary Soul Development Committee (PPDR) in 1960, which was later upgraded to the Revolutionary Soul Development Institute (LPDR) in 1966.

PPDR/LPDR is an institution for Pancasila ideology development based on Manipol (Political Manifesto) and USDEK (1945 Constitution, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy, Guided Economy and Indonesian Personality) for the formation of the Revolutionary Spirit of the Indonesian nation. Before that time, the acculturation of Pancasila was done non-formally through various speeches of President Soekarno. Liberal democracy (1950-1959) was a time of challenge to Pancasila. Amid the sharp polarization of the ideology of political parties as a consequence of the Western-style liberal-parliamentary democratic system at that time and the system of many political parties amid a national society whose level of integration is far from the level of cohesiveness, Pancasila is also threatened by other ideologies, especially Islamism and also communism. Whereas, in the formation of Indonesia's national ideology and principles, the Pancasila, in 1945, Sukarno campaigned for social fairness, personal liberty, and national independence. (Fakih, 2020).

One symptom in this regard was the polarization between Islamic groups and President Soekarno, triggered by Bung Karno's speech in Amungtai, South Kalimantan, on January 27, 1953. (Picard, 2011). The speech emphasized that Indonesia was a national state based on Pancasila, not an Islamic state. According to Islamic groups, Bung Karno's speech was divisive between Islamic and national groups that would contest the 1955 elections. According to this group, Pancasila was not accepted as the final state foundation because the issue of the new state

foundation would be formulated and determined by the Constituent Assembly as a result of the 1955 elections (Melik, 2022).

Amid these various upheavals, President Soekarno strengthened Pancasila in several stages. First, the release of the speech on June 1, 1945 (Kusuma & Elson, 2011). Bung Karno before the BPUPKI session, as depicted in the 1947 book *Bornja Pantjasila*. This publication was intended to emphasize the birth of Pancasila, which was born through Bung Karno's speech before the First Plenary Session of BPUPK (Soekarno, 1947). Second, the implementation of the Pancasila Course from May 1958 to February 1959 at the State Palace. Through the course, Bung Karno gave an in-depth description of Pancasila. For example, the description of the Precepts of Belief in One God (Madinier, 2022) allowed interfaith people to accept this value as part of Pancasila (Soekarno, 1960). At the end of the sentence, Bung Karno emphasized, "My heart will celebrate if you agree that Indonesia's independence is based on the One True God." (Soekarno, 1947).

Third, the commemoration of Pancasila's birthday was first held on June 5, 1958, and then officially held on June 1, 1964, to 1969, with President Soeharto giving a state speech in each of the three years (Ari, 2021). In 1964, the commemoration of Pancasila's birthday was triggered by a statement made by the leader of the Indonesian Communist Party, D.N. Aidit, in May 1964 (Razuni et al., 2021). Aidit said that for the PKI, Pancasila was no longer needed as national unity within the Nasakom framework. Hearing this

statement, President Soekarno was angry and set the commemoration of the anniversary of Pancasila on June 1, 1964, with the theme "Pantjasila Sepanjang Masa." (Harsono, 1985). This shows that Bung Karno was not a PKI and even opposed the PKI.

Fourth, the establishment of a Pancasila acculturation institution, namely the Committee for the Nurturing of the Revolutionary Spirit (PPDR), based on Presidential Decree No. 10/1960 on PPDR. In 1966, PPDR was upgraded to the Institute for the Nurturing of the Revolutionary Spirit (LPDR) based on Presidential Decree No. 80/1966 on LPDR. Both PPDR and LPDR are institutions for acculturating the Pancasila ideology in the context of forming the revolutionary spirit of the Indonesian nation (Arif, 2018).

The concept of Pancasila, according to Bung Karno, is Pancasila as a national ideology. (Chia, 2022) which unites the diversity of the nation for the achievement of Indonesian Socialism, which is also a reflection of the objective condition of the nation, namely the diversity of the nation that requires national unity. The power of Pancasila that unites the nation's diversity is a "golden bridge" for realizing social justice for all Indonesian people, or Indonesian Socialism.

The orientation of the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in the era of Guided Democracy was the formation of a revolutionary spirit to complete the Indonesian Revolution, both in the framework of the national revolution and the anti-neocolonialism and neo-imperialism (NEKOLIM) revolution.

(Immanuel & Napitupulu, 2021). In order to achieve this goal, the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology was carried out through the Manipol-USDEK indoctrination process with the material of the Seven Basic Materials of Indoctrination (BP Prapatja; 1965). Bung Karno's Pancasila birth speech on June 1, 1945, the 1959 Political Manifesto (Manipol) Speech, the 1960 USDEK Speech, the To Build the World A New Speech at the United Nations General Assembly on September 30, 1960, and various MPRS Decrees on Manipol-USDEK and Universal Planned National Development (PNSB) became material in the Tubapi book (Oedijo & Rasjad, 1962). Socialization through indoctrination was necessary at that time because the dimension that was strengthened from Pancasila was an ideological dimension that required cognitive understanding and internalization.

The essential thing in the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in the era of Soekarno's Guided Democracy was the formalization of the establishment of Pancasila as the final and permanent basis of the state through the Presidential Decree of July 5, 1959. (Rahawarin, 2021). This is because, during Liberal Democracy, Pancasila was not accepted as the final state foundation due to the authority given to the Constituent Assembly to draft the final constitution (UUDS 1950). Unfortunately, this Council was formed through an electoral process that became a field for contesting political parties with their respective ideologies. The Presidential Decree of July 5, 1959, stopped the ideological polarization that nullified

Pancasila by reestablishing the 1945 Constitution, which was imbued with Pancasila.

Orientation of Acculturation of Pancasila Ideology during Soeharto's New Order era March 12 1967-May 21, 1998/ Guided Democracy in Politics Volume Two

The acculturation of Pancasila ideology in the New Order era began when President Soeharto initiated the Guidelines for the Cultivation and Practice of Pancasila (P-4) in 1978. This P-4 applies as a guideline for citizen behavior based on Pancasila values and is the only interpretation considered valid according to the public and history (Krissantoso, 1976).

In 1975, President Soeharto formed the Lima Committee to compile an official interpretation of Pancasila, chaired by Mohammad Hatta, with members Achmad Soebardjo, AA Maramis, AG Pringgodigdo and Sunario. The Committee of Five worked and produced a book of recommendations, Description of Pancasila (1977). However, the book was rejected by President Soeharto because it contained the testimony of the Committee of Five that Pancasila was born on June 1, 1945, through Soekarno's Speech (Bourchier, 2007b). President Soeharto's rejection of the recommendation reflected the de-Soekarnoization process of Pancasila that had been carried out since the early 1970s, in addition to the termination of the commemoration of Pancasila Harlah every June 1. (Arizona, 2019). The discontinuation of the commemoration of the anniversary of Pancasila was based on

manipulating the history of the birth of Pancasila by placing Mr. Mohamad Yamin as a figure who proposed Pancasila beside Bung Karno.

Historian Prof. Nugroho Notosusanto carried out the sovereignty efforts of these two figures based on the 1945 Constitution Preparation Manuscript book. The book contains the text of Mr. Mohamad Yamin's speech, which proposes Five Precepts similar to Pancasila: Nationality, Humanity, Belief, Democracy and People's Welfare (Yamin, 1959). The theme of the precepts is precisely the same as the Pancasila proposed by Soekarno on June 1, 1945, only the position of the religious value is different. Based on this text, Nugroho states that Mohamad Yamin had proposed the Five Precepts of Pancasila before Bung Karno's speech on June 1, 1945, before the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK, although he did not call it Pancasila (Notosusanto, 1981).

Meanwhile, Mr. Soepomo was positioned as proposing the Five Precepts: Unity, Kinship, Inner and Outer Balance, Deliberation and People's Justice. The person who proposed Mr. Soepomo as the proposer of Pancasila was A.G. Pringgodigdo, former Vice President of BPUPK, who had previously been a member of Committee Five (Pringgodigdo, 1991). Based on the Minutes of his speech at the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK, Soepomo only proposed the five values with numbering. New Order-era writers took the five values at random to show that Soepomo also proposed five values similar to Pancasila. Soepomo spoke conceptually about integralist state theory as an

alternative to the individualist and communist state theory (Simanjuntak, 1994).

The Lima Committee criticized the New Order's historical construction. The Lima Committee stated that Yamin's text in the Constitution Preparation Manuscript was a draft of the Preamble of the Constitution that he wrote to benefit the Committee of Nine meeting on June 22, 1945. The original minutes in the authentic minutes of the BPUPK and PPKI sessions have been lost, so they are replaced by the text of the draft Preamble of the Constitution, which contains the Five Precepts similar to Pancasila. (Pertiwi, 2020). According to Bung Hatta, the draft Preamble of the Constitution by Mohamad Yamin was rejected by the Committee of Nine because it was too long. The Committee of Nine then rewrote a shorter formulation of the Preamble, known as the Jakarta Charter (Five, 1977; Arif, 2021).

Although the founding fathers rejected the historical construction, the New Order government continued this manipulative construction in the context of stopping the commemoration of Pancasila's Birth Day since 1970. The commemoration was then replaced with the commemoration of Pancasila Miracle Day based on Presidential Decree No. 153/1967 concerning Pancasila Miracle Day every October 1. Through this Pancasila Miracle Day, the New Order raised a common enemy of Pancasila, namely communism. (Eddyono, 2023). The placement of communism as an enemy of Pancasila was attached to Soekarno's Guided Democracy regime with the New Order naming Bung

Karno's Old Order. Based on this, the New Order created a claim that during the Old Order, there had been a desecration of the purity of Pancasila by communism. The pure Pancasila is the Pancasila, as written in the fourth paragraph of the Preamble of the Constitution, not the Pancasila proposed by Bung Karno and the Committee of Nine.

The New Order limited Pancasila only as an Indonesian legal norm which caused Pancasila to experience intellectual dryness. The New Order deliberately avoided ideological dynamics, as it would create political instability that was not conducive to economic development, as the central thesis of the New Order. (Salam, 2021). Based on this legalistic concept of Pancasila, Soeharto emphasized the simplification of Pancasila through the elaboration of practical daily values. This simplification concept gave birth to P-4 with 45 points of interpretation of each precept for the sake of practice in daily life (Center, 1994).

The orientation of Pancasila acculturation in the New Order era was to strengthen Pancasila as a guideline for the behavior of state apparatus and citizens. This aims to discipline the apparatus and citizens to align with state policies based on Pancasila values. This orientation was achieved by the New Order through systematic, structural, and massive indoctrination methods through the P-4 upgrading in all lines of state and society. (Santoso & Sari, 2019). In order to carry out the P-4 upgrading, the Education Development Agency for the Implementation of the Guidelines for the Creation and Practice of Pancasila (BP-7)

was formed in districts/cities throughout Indonesia. (Karyono, 2020).

At the same time, the New Order also built "ideological monolithism" by making Pancasila the Single Principle, both for political parties and community organizations (CSOs). The Pancasila single principle policy for political parties was preceded by a political party fusion policy in 1973 (Moertopo; 1976), which united the diversity of political ideologies into three major parties, namely the United Development Party (PPP), Golongan Karya (Golkar), and the Indonesian Democratic Party (PDI). In order to adapt to this policy, mass organizations, especially religious mass organizations, tried to integrate themselves into Pancasila permanently. For example, Nahdlatul Ulama (NU) accepted the single principle of Pancasila through the 27th NU Congress in Situbondo, East Java, in 1984, and Muhammadiyah through its 41st Congress in Surakarta in 1985 also accepted the single principle of Pancasila (Harun & Mulkhan, 1986).

Based on this, the community participates in acculturating the Pancasila ideology through participation in the P-4 upgrading and organization within the framework of accepting the single principle of Pancasila. (Santoso & Murod, 2021). Under these conditions, the New Order can succeed in "socializing Pancasila" and "Pancasilaizing society." However, there was a fatal flaw in the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in the New Order era, namely, accompanied by the removal of the historical roots and intellectual substance of Pancasila as the philosophical-groundlag of the nation. This was later corrected by the

spirit of Reformation, especially the New Order state's interest in disciplining the community through P-4, which history will later judge whether it was right or a national mistake. Similarly, the institution organizing the acculturation and education of the Pancasila ideology in the New Order era, namely the Education Development Agency for the Implementation of the Guidelines for the Creation and Practice of Pancasila (BP-7), was dissolved in 1998 as a consequence of the revocation and revocation of MPR Decree No: II/MPR/1978 concerning Guidelines for the Creation and Practice of Pancasila (P-4).

Orientation of Acculturation of Pancasila Ideology in the Post Reformation Era 1998: Era of De-Ideologization and Sinking of Pancasila Pancasila 1998-2018/ Era of Ultra-Liberal Democracy/ Liberal Democracy Volume Two and 2018 -now era of Rediscovery of Pancasila in the era of Liberal Democracy Volume Two

The acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in the 1998 post-reform era began with the revocation of P-4 and the dissolution of BP-7. Since the 1998 Reformation, the word Pancasila has never been heard in the vocabulary of state administrators from the center to the regions. Only at the state government level did the terminology and meaning of Pancasila appear in the official document of National Development Planning in Book I, Chapter I, Subchapter A of the RPJMN 2015-2019, which emphasizes an Ideological Path of National Development. It was only in 2012 that the MPR RI started

a similar program, although not specifically Pancasila, namely the Socialization of the Four Pillars of Nationality and Statehood initiated by the Chairman of the MPR RI Taufik Kiemas. The four pillars are Pancasila as the basis of the state, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia as the constitution, the Republic of Indonesia as the form of state, and Unity in Diversity as the motto of national unity.

Later, the Four Pillars theme was challenged, and the Constitutional Court annulled the diction. However, the MPR took the initiative to revise the theme to "The Four Pillars of the MPR RI," which refers to the MPR RI's "Socialization of the Four Pillars" program. In this regard, the MPR argues that linguistically, pillar does not only mean pillar but also the basis, thus placing Pancasila as one of the pillars (Basarah, 2017). Within the framework of the MPR agenda, an agreement has been formed by all factions in the MPR RI on the historical principles of the birth and formulation of Pancasila, which states that the formulation of Pancasila on June 1, 1945, by Bung Karno, the formulation of the Jakarta Charter version of Pancasila on June 22, 1945, by the Committee of Nine, and the final formulation of Pancasila in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution by PPKI (PPKI Chairman Bung Karno), is a unitary process of forming Pancasila. This means that all political and ideological forces in parliament have agreed on the Three Formulations of Pancasila and the historical process as a unitary process of forming Pancasila, which is not dichotomous but complementary (*Materials for Socialization of the Four Pillars of the MPR RI* 2021).

This MPR RI agreement was adopted in substance by the 2015-2019 RPJMN and President Joko Widodo's Decree No. 24 of 2016 concerning the Birth of Pancasila, which established June 1 as Pancasila Day. Since then until now, June 1 has been commemorated again as the birthday of Pancasila after it disappeared in 1970. Since the issuance of Presidential Decree No. 24 of 2016, the process of acculturating the ideology of Pancasila in the post-1998 Reformation era began again. After the issuance of the Presidential Decree, Presidential Regulation No. 54 of 2017 was also issued regarding the Working Unit for Pancasila Ideology Development (UKP-PIP). This Presidential Working Unit is tasked with assisting the President in fostering the ideology of Pancasila in three areas: assessment and preparation of materials, socialization, advocacy, and control. The head of UKP-PIP is Yudi Latif, PhD. One of his monumental works is *Negara Paripurna, Historicity, Rationality and Actuality of Pancasila* (2011) which describes the history of Pancasila, the socio-political theories used to interpret each precept, and the actualization of Pancasila in the present era.²¹ In 2018, UKP-PIP was upgraded to the Pancasila Ideology Development Agency (BPIP) based on Presidential Regulation No. 7/2018 on BPIP. The difference between BPIP and Bung Karno's LPDR is BPIP's effort to contextualize Pancasila in the millennial era with the challenges of the digital world. BPIP (Prasetya et al., 2022) strengthens the dimension of the Precept of Indonesian Unity amid the threat of national disintegration based on the inspiration of

Bung Karno's nationalistic thinking. The material used by BPIP is the Basic Material for Pancasila Ideology Development (MDPIP), with an emphasis on the use of digital technology.

At the same time, BPIP also wrote the Teaching Book for Pancasila Ideology Development Education from Early Childhood to Higher Education. The writing of the textbook was accompanied by the commitment of President Joko Widodo's government to revive Pancasila education through Government Regulation No. 4/2022 on National Education Standards. This regulation revives Pancasila education as compulsory from primary and secondary to higher education.

Comparison of Acculturation Orientation of Pancasila Ideology

Based on the description above, the orientation of Pancasila ideology acculturation in the First Volume Liberal Democracy era, the Guided Democracy era, the Soeharto New Order/Second Volume Guided Democracy era in Politics, and Post-Reformation 1998, which consists of the 1998-2014 era as the era of de-ideologization of Pancasila in Ultra-Liberal Democracy or Second Volume Liberal Democracy and the era of Rediscovery of Pancasila in the Ultra-Liberal Democracy or Second Volume Liberal Democracy era can be compared through the following:

Table 1. Typology and Organization of Pancasila Acculturation with Each Era of Political System In Indonesia

Typology of Acculturation	The Era of Liberal Democracy / Western-style Parliamentary / First Volume Liberal Democracy November 3, 1945 July 5, 1959	Soekarno Guided Democracy Era / Guided Democracy (Poleksos) July 5, 1959 March 12, 1967	New Order Era Soeharto/ Guided Democracy in Politics March 12, 1967 - May 21, 1998	Post-Reformation 1998 The Era of Ultra-Liberal Democracy / Liberal Democracy Volume Two (Poleksos)	
				1998 - 2014	2014 - 2018 to Present
The concept of Pancasila	Bung Karno's 1953 and 1956 Pancasila courses	Bung Karno's Thoughts on the Realization of Indonesian Socialism	Simplification of Pancasila into a Code of Ethics	De-ideologization of Pancasila; The vocabulary of Pancasila is replaced with Openness, Democratization, Liberalization, Decentralization, Regional Autonomy, Privatization, Good Governance;	Revitalizing Bung Karno's Thoughts in the digital era
Orientation	None	Formation of the Indonesian Revolutionary Spirit as the Soul of the Nation; Character and Nation Building;	Discipline to integrate with development	Dis-orientation of Pancasila Implementation	National unity in the midst of challenge towards national pluralism
Material	Concerning the history and philosophy of Pancasila	Manipol-USDEK in Tubapi	P-4 Materials in Upgrading-4 by BP-7	None;	Pancasila Development Material by BPIP

				Pancasila education is replaced by PPKN where in the Citizenship dimension, western democratic values such as individualism, etc., enter, historical roots, intellectual roots, and philosophic roots are lost / absent;	Philosophical Ideological Foundations
Socialization	None	Indoctrination of Manipol-USDEK by the Revolutionary Spirit Building Committee/Institute	P-4 indoctrination by BP-7	It does not exist. The state is absent, and the community has no role, even developing a "sisnism" against Pancasila.	Socialization, training, and strengthening of Pancasila Ideology Development as a nurse of national pluralism by BPIP; It was preceded by the Sosilaisation Program of the 4 Pillars of the MPR, namely; Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and Unity in Diversity;
Country Interests	Still weak due to the strong individualism of political parties in the era of liberal democracy	The success of national and international revolutions	Social stabilization for political stability	Diminishing the role of the state/government, resulting in a weak state;	Strengthening Pancasila as a Nurse of national pluralism
Community Role	Not prominent because it is still focused on the role of independence followed by the liberal democratic realm full of individualism.	Indoctrination Participation	Indoctrinated Participation	Civil society strengthens even more than the state	Cross-sectoral participation

Source: the author, 2023

The table shows that the orientation of Pancasila acculturation in the three eras differs. In the Soekarno era, at least two eras were divided, namely; First, the era of Western-style Parliamentary Liberal

Democracy (November 3, 1945-July 5, 1959), the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology was released without any particular program from the state and society, except for the Pancasila Course

delivered by Bung Karno in the early 1950s. Meanwhile, the acculturation of Pancasila in the era of Soekarno's Guided Democracy, July 5, 1959-March 23, 1967, was oriented towards strengthening national unity amid pluralism and ideological competition that was still so sharp. The ideologies of nationalism, Islamism, and communism developed until they were contained in the map of political parties. The peak of the clash of ideologies occurred in the Constituent Assembly (1956-1959), where Islamism was used as an alternative to the state foundation Pancasila. The figure involved in formulating the Jakarta Charter, Kahar Muzakir, again proposed Islam as the basis of the state, not Pancasila.

Similarly, Nahdlatul Ulama member of BPUPKI, KH Masykur, also re-proposed Islam as an alternative to Pancasila (Ismail, 1999). After the Decree of July 5, 1959, the new Pancasila became the basis of the state and became the beginning of the seriousness of Bung Karno's government to carry out the Pancasila ideology acculturation program. From the orientation of upholding national unity amidst the clash of political ideologies, Bung Karno launched the success of the Indonesian Revolution, both national and international revolutions, towards establishing Indonesian Socialism.

Meanwhile, the New Order made economic development the primary goal (goal attainment) of the life of the nation and state, orienting the acculturation of Pancasila for the sake of socio-political stability. This orientation led President Soeharto to initiate the urgency of simplifying Pancasila into "grains" of

practice in daily codes of conduct. By the New Order, Pancasila was simplified, no longer as a large umbrella that unites major political ideologies (nationalism, Islamism, and communism) like in the era of Guided Democracy; Pancasila was also cleansed of the intellectual content of the Diggers and Formulators of Pancasila. Avoiding the intellectual and ideological dimensions of Pancasila, the New Order took another path, namely, the placement of Pancasila as a moral value that must be lived and practiced by organizers and citizens. The goal of all this was the integration of society into the state. Within this framework is the premise of Mr. Soepomo's "integralist state," where the New Order wanted to equate the state with society and society as the state (Bourchier, 2007a).

The beginning of Reformasi was marked by the absence of the Pancasila ideology acculturation program due to the revocation of P-4 and the dissolution of BP-7. There was a phobia towards Pancasila due to the acculturation of the New Order-era Pancasila ideology, contrary to democratic values. The acculturation of Pancasila has only been revived post-Reformation since Presidential Decree No. 24 of 2016 was issued concerning the Birth of Pancasila and the establishment of UKP-PIP and later BPIP. The Presidential Decree is an effort to restore the historical roots of Pancasila that the New Order uprooted through de-Soekarnoization, de-individuation of Pancasila and de-ideologization of Pancasila. Through this Presidential Decree, President Joko Widodo's administration straightens out the history of the birth of Pancasila and brings back Bung Karno as

the digger of Pancasila. Soekarno's Pancasila thinking also re-colored the Pancasila acculturation program by BPIP.

However, unlike the orientation of the Guided Democracy era (1959-1967), which aimed to realize Indonesian Socialism, the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology by BPIP is aimed at maintaining national unity amid the threat of national disintegration and the strengthening of primordialism politics. The strengthening of religious intolerance, religious radicalism, and terrorism in the name of Islam, to the use of identity politics, hoaxes, and hate speech on social media, is a challenge that technically did not exist in the previous era. Likewise, the emergence of the danger of the radical middle, characterized by ultra-pragmatism, pragmatic, transactional orientation, hedonism, cosmopolitanism, and others, leads to a corrupt mentality and

systematic corruption (Razuni, 2021). In this regard, the acculturation of the Pancasila ideology after the 1998 Reformation was carried out cross-sectorally, targeting various achievement targets, from socialization, training, material preparation, and livelihood of Pancasila education to the alignment of laws and regulations based on Pancasila.

Stage of Development of Thought on Pancasila

Based on Organsky's conceptual approach (1984) described above, there are stages in the development of Pancasila thinking towards the orientation of Pancasila ideology acculturation. The stages of the development of thinking about Pancasila in the author's view can be seen in the table below:

Table2. Stages Of Development Of Pancasila Ideological Thought Struggle

No.	YEAR OF DEVELOPMENT	STAGE OF DEVELOPMENT
1.	1945 - 1949	CREATION STAGE
2.	1949 - 1965	DEBATE STAGE
3.	1966 - 1998	POLITICAL-ENGINEERING PHASE & INDIVIDUALIZATION OF PANCASILA from Philosophisch-Grondslag to mere Individual Code of Conduct
4.	1998 - 2014	THE STAGE OF DE-IDEOLOGIZATION IN THE REALM OF ULTRA-LIBERAL DEMOCRACY / LIBERAL DEMOCRACY VOLUME TWO
5.	2014 - 2018 to HERE	REDISCOVERY PHASE for RE-CONSOLIDATION OF PANCASILA IDEOLOGICAL DEVELOPMENT IN THE MIDDLE OF ULTRA-LIBERAL DEMOCRACY CURSE

Source: the author, 2023

Based on this table and Organsky's concept of the Stages of Political Development (1984). The more liberal the character of the political system in Indonesia, the more directionless the

orientation of ideological acculturation. Conversely, the more it leads to the Soekarno or Soeharto version of the Guided Democracy system, the stronger the direction of the orientation of the Pancasila

ideology acculturation. On the other hand, the character of the political system is influenced by the configuration of the character of the ruling regime, the attitude of the national bourgeoisie, and the independence of the regime in foreign investment, which can facilitate the foreign offensive without a single bullet. As for the regime's character affects the character of the existing political system to acculturate Pancasila.

CONCLUSION

The acculturation of the Pancasila ideology in the Soekarno era (Western-style parliamentary liberal democracy and Soekarno's Guided Democracy era, Soeharto's New Order era and Post-Reformation 1998 had different orientations. It is just that the acculturation of the post-Reformation Pancasila ideology in 2018 became a milestone for straightening out the history of Pancasila and basing Pancasila on the thoughts of the nation's founders.

The de-historicization process of Pancasila by the New Order has left a legalistic understanding of Pancasila, as it is separated from the philosophical and intellectual dimensions conceived by its framers. This can be corrected by involving other founding fathers, apart from Bung Karno, as part of the historical roots of the Pancasila. The involvement of the founding fathers who formulated Pancasila is needed intellectually and politically. Intellectually, the founding fathers have thoughts about Pancasila that can complement Bung Karno's thoughts—for example, those of Hatta and Islamic religious figures. While

politically, the involvement of other founding fathers is needed so that Pancasila becomes the common property of all elements of the nation. In this regard, the acculturation of Pancasila ideology is to strengthen the nation's ideology amid the challenges of ultra-liberal politics that have developed post-Reformasi. Under these conditions, elections can potentially create national disintegration due to using primordial politics. Democracy (fourth precept) can harm national unity (third precept). The acculturation of Pancasila by BPPI has not significantly impacted the culture and nature of the post-Reformation political system and culture. This is due to the birth of BPPI, which occurred after ultra-liberal politics lasted for a long time. However, the acculturation of Pancasila ideology by BPPI, which is directed towards maintaining diversity amidst the challenges of primordial politics, is still needed to strengthen the national ethos in the face of ultra-liberal politics.

Moreover, further studies are needed to compare the process of Pancasila acculturation in the Old Order, New Order and post-Reformation eras. This is needed to find out the strengths and weaknesses in each era for current and future improvements;

It was straightening the history of the birth of Pancasila as a follow-up to Presidential Decree No. 24/2016 on the Birth of Pancasila. This is because the writing of the history of Pancasila in Pancasila and Civic Education (PPKn) textbooks still uses the New Order version. Even though this version is not based on authentic historical sources and a-historical;

Vol.9, No.1, 2023
Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v9i1.46960
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

Involving all elements of the nation in the process of acculturating Pancasila, especially religious groups, in order to ward off intolerance, radicalism, and terrorism in the name of religion;

Strengthening the socialization of Pancasila in the digital world to target young people who are not camouflaged by only presenting Pancasila symbols without strengthening adequate Pancasila knowledge material;

It was, moreover, reviving Pancasila education at all levels of education by strengthening the scientific dimension of Pancasila. This effort must be accompanied by a massive revival of Pancasila Education and Training, as had happened in the era of Soekarno's Guided Democracy and Soeharto's New Order with an orientation according to the needs of the times.

REFERENCES

- Ari, S. (2021, October 2). Power without Depth. *Kompas*.
- Arif, S. (2018). Patterns of Development and Pancasila Education: A Comparison of Old Order, New Order and Post-Reformation. *Prisma Journal*, 37, 15.
- Arif, S. (2021). Is it True that Muhammad Yamin and Soepomo Proposed Pancasila? *Silapedia Magazine*, 97–99.
- Arizona, Y. (2019). The Return of Pancasila: Political and Legal Rhetoric Against Transnational Islamist Imposition. *Constitutional Review*, 5(1), 164–193. <https://doi.org/10.31078/consrev516>
- Basarah, A. (2017). *Bung Karno, Islam and Pancasila*. Konstitusi Press.
- Bourchier, D. (2007a). *Pancasila Versi Orde Baru dan Asal Muasal Negara Organik (Integralistik)* (1st ed.). Pusat Studi Pancasila UGM-Aditya Media.
- Bourchier, D. (2007b). *The New Order Version of Pancasila and the Origins of the Organized (Integralistic) State*. Center for Pancasila Studies UGM-Aditya Media Yogyakarta.
- Center, B.-7. (1994). *P-4 Training Materials*.
- Chia, P. S. (2022). Pancasila and Covenantal Pluralism in Indonesia: A Historical Approach. *Transformation*, 39(2), 91–98. <https://doi.org/10.1177/02653788211069971>
- Chizema, A., & Pogrebna, G. (2019). The impact of government integrity and culture on corporate leadership practices: Evidence from the field and the laboratory. *Leadership Quarterly*, 30(5). <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.LEAQUA.2019.07.001>
- Dewantara, J. A., Suhendar, I. F., Rosyid, R., & Atmaja, T. S. (2019). Pancasila as Ideology and Characteristics Civic Education in Indonesia. *International Journal for Educational and Vocational Studies*, 1(5), 400–405. <https://doi.org/10.29103/ijevs.v1i5.1617>
- Dzenis, S., & Nobre Faria, F. (2022). Combining ideology with narrow self-interest in positive political theory. *Journal of Political Ideologies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13569317.2022.2135254>
- Easton, D. (1984). *Kerangka Kerja Analisa Sistem Politik (terj)* (Sahat Simamora (Ed.); 1st ed.). Penerbit Bina Aksara.
- Eddyono, S. (2023). The shift in the regime of silence: Selective erasure of the 1965 massacre in post-New Order Indonesia's official narrative. *Memory Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/17506980231155565/FORMAT/EPUB>
- Erlingsson, G., & Wittberg, E. (2021). Does Becoming a Politician Increase

Vol.9, No.1, 2023
 Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v9i1.46960
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

- Internal Political Efficacy and Satisfaction with Democracy? Evidence from a Longitudinal Panel of Councillors in Sweden. *Representation*, 57(4), 475–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00344893.2020.1835698>
- Fakih, F. (2020). Authoritarian Modernization in Indonesia's Early Independence Period. In *The Foundation of the New Order State (1950-1965)*. Brill.
- Five, C. of. (1977). *Description of Pancasila*. Mutiara Publisher.
- Fogg, K. W. (2020). Indonesian Socialism of the 1950s: from ideology to rhetoric. *Third World Quarterly*, 42(3), 465–482. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01436597.2020.1794805>
- Genovese, F., & Hermida-Rivera, H. (2022). Government ideology and bailout conditionality in the European financial crisis. *International Interactions*, 48(5), 897–935. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03050629.2022.2090936>
- Gray, E., Grasso, M., Farrall, S., Jennings, W., & Hay, C. (2019). Political Socialization, Worry about Crime and Antisocial Behaviour: An Analysis of Age, Period and Cohort Effects. *British Journal of Criminology*, 59(2), 435–460. <https://doi.org/10.1093/bjc/azy024>
- Harsono, G. (1985). *Political Horizons of the Sukarno Era*. Inti Idayu Press.
- Harun, H. S., & Mulkhan, A. M. (1986). *The Background of Muslims Accepting Pancasila as the Single Principle (An Informative Study of NU-Muhammadiyah Views)*. Aquarius Publisher.
- Hidayah, Y., Simatupang, E., Belladonna, A. P., Colombo, J., No, Y., Malang, K., & Istimewa, D. (n.d.). *Pembudayaan Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Dalam Konsep Etika. 1*.
- Hobson, C. (2008). "Democracy as civilisation." *Global Society*, 22(1), 75–95. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13600820701740746>
- Howitt, R. (2020). Decolonizing People, Place and Country: Nurturing Resilience across Time and Space. *Sustainability*, 12, 1–16. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su12155882>
- Huberts, L. W. J. C. (2018). Integrity: What it is and Why it is Important. *Public Integrity*, 9922. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10999922.2018.1477404>
- Immanuel, C., & Napitupulu, T. (2021). Scrutinizing the Political and Economic Dynamics of China's Distribution of Vaccines in Securitized Health. *Global South Review*, 2, 189–207.
- Ismail, F. (1999). *Ideological Hegemony and State Authority, Discourse on the Creative Tensions of Islam and Pancasila*. Tiara Wacana.
- Jadidah, F. (2020). Perubahan Konstitusi Dalam Transisi Orde Baru Menuju Reformasi Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Mandala Education*, 6(1), 149–161. <https://doi.org/10.58258/jime.v6i1.1120>
- Karyono, H. (2020). *Strengthening the Implementation of Pancasila Values in Life of Nation and State Private Living in Indonesia's Legal System*. 140(Ic leh), 369–373. <https://doi.org/10.2991/aebmr.k.200513.074>
- Krissantoso (Ed.). (1976). *President Soeharto's Views on Pancasila*. CSIS.
- Kusuma, A., & Elson, R. (2011). A note on the sources for the 1945 constitutional debates in Indonesia. *167(3)*, 196–209.
- Latupeirissa, D. S., Ketut, I., Laksana, D., Artawa, K., Ayu, G., & Sosiowati, G. (2019). *On Political Language Ideology: Critical View of Indonesian President Speech*. <https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1004.23>
- Madinier, R. (2022). Pancasila in Indonesia a "religious laicity" under attack?

Vol.9, No.1, 2023
Doi: 10.24198/cosmogov.v9i1.46960
<http://jurnal.unpad.ac.id/cosmogov/index>

- Asia and the Secular*, 71–91.
<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110733068-005i>
- Materials for Socialization of the Four Pillars of the MPR RI*. (2021).
- Melik, S. (2022). *Demokrasi Pancasila dan Perjuangan Ideologi* (1st ed.). Undertree.
- Mulyoto, -. (2018). National Integration and Its Process in Indonesia. *Historia: Jurnal Pendidik Dan Peneliti Sejarah*, 12(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v12i1.12113>
- Notosusanto, N. (1981). *The Process of Formulating the State Basis*. PN Balai Pustaka.
- Oedijo, S. S., & Rasjad, M. (Eds.). (1962). *Doctrine of the Indonesian Revolution, Manipol Indoctrination Materials*. CV Narsih.
- Pertiwi, M. K. (2020). Historical Development over Religious Liberty in the Indonesian Constitution. *Sociological Jurisprudence Journal*, 3(1), 65–74. <https://doi.org/10.22225/scj.3.1.1525.65-74>
- Picard, M. (2011). *Balinese religion in search of recognition: From “Agama Hindu Bali” to “Agama Hindu” (1945-1965)*. 167(4), 482–510.
- Potrafke, N. (2020). Dragnet-Controls and Government Ideology. *Defense and Peace Economics*, 31(5), 485–501. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10242694.2019.1568147>
- Prasetya, R., Maarif, S., Mahroza, J., & Simbolon, L. (2022). The Strategy of the Pancasila Ideology Development Agency (BPIP) in Facing Ideological Threats. *Res Militaris*, 12(6).
- Pringgodigdo, A. (1991). *The Struggle of the Indonesian Nation to Uphold Pancasila during the Japanese Occupation* (D. Darmodihardjo (Ed.)). Usaha Nasional.
- Rahawarin, Z. A. (2021). Viewing Pancasila in the Eyes of Nationalists in Indonesian New Order Era. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 12(4), 64–92.
- Razuni, G., Bainus, A., Kantaprawira, R., & Haris, S. (2021). The Ideologizing of The Golkar’s “Work and Concrete Service” Characteristics. *Croatian International Relations Review*, 27(88), 133–149.
- Salam, R. (2021). Implementation of Pancasila Values in the New Order Era and Post-Reformation. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute Journal*, 4(2), 3177–3185. <https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v4i2.2050>
- Santoso, G., & Murod, M. (2021). Pancasila Education Curriculum Perspective ; 21st Century Strengths , Weaknesses , Opportunities and Threats. *World Journal of Entrepreneurship Project and Digital Management*, 2(1), 46–52.
- Santoso, G., & Sari, P. (2019). The Development Model of Curriculum Content of Civics Education (1975-2013) in Indonesia 21st Century. *Educational Initiatives Research Colloquium*, 131–141.
- Settles, J. D. (n.d.). *The Impact of Colonialism on African Economic Development*.
- Shepherd, E. (2021). Ideology and Institutional Change: The Case of the English National Planning Policy Framework. *Planning Theory and Practice*, 22(4), 519–536. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2021.1942528>
- Siradjuddin, A., & Kholil, M. (2021). Proses Perubahan Mendasar Konstitusi Indonesia Pra Dan Pasca Amandemen. *Siyasah Jurnal Hukum Tatanegara*, 1(1), 45–60.
- Soekarno. (1947). *Lahirnja Pantjasila*. Oesaha Penerbitan Goentoer.
- Soekarno. (1960). *Pantjasila Dasar Filfasat Negara, Kursus Bung Karno tanggal 26 Mei, 5 Juni, 16 Juni, 22 Juli dan 3 September 1958 di Istana Negara serta Kuliah Umum Bung Karno pada Seminar Pancasila*

*tanggal 21 Februari 1959 di
Yogyakarta dan Pidato Lahirnya
Pancasila I J.*

Yamin, M. (Ed.). (1959). *Preparatory
Manuscript of the 1945
Constitution*. Siguntang Djakarta.