

# The Development of Indonesian Pancasila Democracy

**Saan Mustopa**

*Faculty of social and political science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia,  
Saanmustopa.sm@gmail.com*

**Muradi**

*Faculty of social and political science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia*

**Obsatar Sinaga**

*Faculty of social and political science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia*

**R. Widya Setiabudi Sumadinata**

*Faculty of social and political science, Padjadjaran University, Bandung, Indonesia*

## Abstract

This research looks at how Indonesia's democratic system, founded on the Pancasila doctrine, has progressed over time. The foundation of Indonesia's democratic system is a set of procedural principles that are diametrically opposed to the core principles of democracy. The Founding Fathers were firm in their belief that the kind of democracy known as "consensus democracy," which is also known as "deliberative democracy," would prove to be the most successful over the course of time. A majoritarian democracy, which has a propensity to discriminate against the forces of minorities, would make it more difficult to identify a common goal and establish national unity in a society that is formed of a varied set of individuals. Even though it is just one kind of democracy, the Pancasila Democracy nonetheless adheres to the fundamental tenets of democracy and incorporates them into its structure. Some of the aspects that go into making up these components include things like an equitable allocation of power, the ability to voice one's thoughts in public without fear of repercussions, equality before the law, and equal status as citizens who are endowed with rights.

**Keywords:** *Pancasila, Democracy, Indonesia, Development.*

## Introduction

From the very beginning of political thought, the question of who should rule? It is a question that often causes debate. Since the twentieth century, however, the question has tended to receive a single, universally accepted response; the people should rule. According to Heywood (2015) perhaps no other political idea has gained the approval of the majority as democracy enjoys anymore today. Regardless of whether they are liberal, socialist,

communist, or even authoritarian and fascist groups they are vying for a democratic mandate. The desire to inherit democratic values can occur because democracy offers a concept that is difficult for humans to reject, namely freedom. This idea peaked after the French revolution which gave birth to the values of egalite, liberte and fratarnite which then spread to all parts of the world. Interest in democracy has been proven by research conducted by Huntington (1995), that democracy inspired 80 countries in the world to

change their political system to democracy. The majority of political system transformations occur in countries with a background of monarchy, authoritarianism and fascism.

Indonesia is one of the countries in the world that agrees that democracy is the best system to use. This is not without reason, according to Yudi Latif (2011) as a multicultural country, Indonesia will survive more firmly if it stands on a foundation of government management that is able to guarantee a balance between fulfilling the principles of freedom, equality and brotherhood. What is demanded is not only the fulfillment of the rights of individuals and groups of people, but also the obligation to develop social solidarity in the context of the benefit and happiness of the nation's life as a whole. This reason also underlies the majority of Indonesia's founding fathers when determining the political system that will be used by the country in the future. However, what must be underlined is that the democracy used is democracy that is not only adapted from western values, but also democracy adapted from the noble values of Indonesian culture. In short, the desired democracy is democracy that presupposes the ideals of popular sovereignty in a spirit of kinship that provides space for multiculturalism that must resonate strongly in the heart of the Indonesian nation as a reflection of the bitter experience of colonial oppression and the tradition of mutual cooperation in Indonesian society.

The ideas of democracy and Pancasila have indeed become a new formula in Indonesia for managing the lives of rulers and citizens by taking a balanced proportion. But in its development, Pancasila democracy, especially Pancasila as an ideology co-opted by the domination of power which leads to Pancasila, has become a kind of symptom that has resulted

in the breaking of the friendly relations between citizens and rulers. This can be seen in the Soeharto regime which sacrificed Pancasila as an effort to maintain the status quo. Through the issuance of rules regarding the "Single Principle" Pancasila becomes a holy idea that should not be polluted with its sanctity. The climax, according to Samekto (2020), was that during the reform event, there was an attempt to obscure the role of Pancasila as the basis of the state and outlook on life. This is due to fears that Pancasila will again be used by future authorities as a tool to legitimize unilateral interests. Democracy also experiences the same thing, the difference is that there are no demands to replace democracy with another system. The problem with democracy in Indonesia is how the oligarchs and the rulers have an affair which then causes democracy in Indonesia to only be a mere ceremonial event. The democratic malfunction was then corrected after the authoritarian regime of Suharto by amending the 1945 Constitution. The focus of improvement is directed to the trias politica authority by providing a balanced portion between these institutions. After democracy recovered, continued Samekto (2020), two major thoughts emerged, namely the logic of capitalism and the free market and then radical thoughts in religious life. As a result, the idea of Pancasila Democracy disappeared from the circulation of thought in Indonesia.

From the explanation above, the history of democracy and Pancasila in Indonesia has experienced its ups and downs. As an instrument, it depends for its livelihood from people who believe in the values contained therein. The problem with Pancasila democracy does not only revolve around the conceptual area but also in the area of its application, especially in the realm of power. Therefore this problem has attracted a lot of attention from various groups, one of which is Surya Paloh. As

a statesman he said that at this time Indonesia needed to restore Pancasila as a fundamental manifestation both in society and as a state. The concept of democracy inherited by Indonesia today is a good system that can bring citizens and rulers together to create a prosperous society. However, a sharp correction of these two notions is necessary. Democracy that is too reliant on western values is something that must be avoided, because Indonesia has fundamental values that should be cultivated with democracy so that democracy and Pancasila can give birth to a complete idea which then gives birth to a new idea, namely "Pancasila Democracy". From this, this article will explain how the idea of Pancasila Democracy in Indonesia is by analyzing the development of Democracy and Pancasila in Indonesia from time to time. Analysis of the development of Pancasila Democracy is important to do as an effort to find symptoms of the disappearance of the concept of Pancasila Democracy, especially in terms of its application in Indonesia.

### **Research Method**

This article uses a descriptive research method with a qualitative approach used because it emphasizes logical construction and interpretive exploration based on documentation and literature materials that are relevant to the topic and problem of this research. (Muhadjir, 1990). A qualitative approach generally places the researcher on a phenomenological view in which the researcher tries to understand the meaning of events and their relation to people in certain situations. Therefore the use of a qualitative approach in this study is more to synchronize, compare and find common ground between empirical reality and theory. According to Afrizal (2017) the qualitative research method is defined as a social science research method

that collects and analyzes data in the form of words (oral or written) and human actions and researchers do not try to calculate or quantify the qualitative data that has been obtained and thus does not analyze numbers, the data analyzed in qualitative research are words and human actions.

The data collection technique used in this article is using secondary data, namely library research. Then for the data analysis technique, the data was analyzed using four stages, namely first, the stage of sorting the data related to the resistance to Pancasila Democracy. Second, the classification stage (categorizing) by making comparisons between one data and another. Third, the comparison stage, namely by making comparisons between one data and another. And the fourth stage of synthesis (synthesizing) by interpreting the data and relating it to the theoretical framework so that the phenomenon of the ups and downs of Pancasila Democracy in Indonesia can be understood.

### **Theoretical Framework**

#### **Democracy Model**

The first expert to systematically classify democratic models was Macpherson, a well-known political scientist from Canada. In his critically acclaimed book *The Life and Times of Liberal Democracy*, Macpherson distinguishes four models of liberal democracy: Protective, Developmental, Equilibrium, and Participatory. Protective democracy is characterized by the desire to make democracy a tool to get rid of state oppression. Developmental democracy is characterized by the will to make democracy "a tool of self-development". Equilibrium democracy is characterized by the will to provide wider space for the elite to participate in the democratic process. Finally, participatory democracy is characterized by the will to provide more

opportunities to the people, rather than only to the elite

By dividing the development of liberal democracy into models, Macpherson presents a new argument for the history of liberal democracy. He stated that liberal democracy in theory and practice only emerged in the early 19th century. This view contradicts the common assumption that liberal democracy originated in the 18th century or even earlier, when political philosophers such as Rousseau (18th century) and Locke (17th century) wrote their works. His argument is that it was only in the 19th century that political theorists "found reason to believe that 'one person, one vote' would do no harm to property, or to the survival of a class-divided society". Prior to the 19th century, liberals believed that freedom would threaten capitalist interests. The first thinkers to change this mindset, according to Macpherson, were Bentham and Mill. So, the new liberal democracy begins with Bentham and Mill

According to Macpherson (in Assyaouanie, 2011) defines a model as "a theoretical construction to describe and explain real relationships, behind the things that appear, between or within the phenomena being studied". He recognized that models in the social sciences differ from models in the natural sciences, in that they are more consistent and sustainable. This is mainly due to the nature of the social sciences, whose phenomena are highly dependent on variables that are constantly changing, namely, humans and society. In the natural sciences, things are different. One can talk about the scientific model in a paradigmatic way, such as the Ptolemaic, Copernican, Newtonian, or Einsteinian paradigms.

The uniqueness of the model in the social sciences, must be seen as a pattern that

distinguishes itself from other models in a certain period of time. Therefore, to become a model, there are two requirements that must be met. First, it must seek to explain not only the fundamental reality of existing or past relationships between willed and historically influenced beings, but also the probability or probability of future changes in those relationships. Second, he must explain as well as evaluate. Explain means something that can explain the political system or society and how the system functions; judging means that the model can justify how good a political system is and why. With these two requirements, Macpherson does not consider the model to be merely a standard of reference based solely on political experience, but also on the wishful thinking of political theorists and politicians about an ideal political system.

The framework of Macpherson's models of democracy was fully adopted by Held, a British-born political scientist, whose book *Models of Democracy* (2012) has become a classic. He added five other models of democracy: Classical, Marxist, Elite, Pluralist, and Legal. Held did not limit democracy in the liberal sense as Macpherson understood it, but also considered other models that had worked. Therefore, he also includes Marxism as a variant of the democratic model. The Marxist model of democracy was born as a direct response to Western liberal democracy. In fact, his model is shaped as a rejection of the foundations of liberal democracy, namely, capitalism. The Marxist model of democracy holds that "democratic government is essentially impossible to succeed in a capitalist society; democratic life arrangements cannot be realized under the constraints imposed by capitalist production relations" (Assyaouanie, 2011).

The democratic model is based on what is meant by "model". Held (2012) defines a model as a theoretical construction designed to reveal and explain the main elements of a democratic form and the structures or relations that underlie them. According to the MPR Study Agency together with the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, (2018) any theoretical construction that can explain the main elements of democratic forms and relational structures can be considered a democratic model. What must be considered in creating any model whether in the past, present or future are the patterns, recommendations, key assumptions about the nature of society in which democracy is embedded or may be embedded, its fundamental concepts of capability human politics, and how they justify their views and choices. Therefore, to find out how Pancasila democracy is formed, researchers use Held's typology of democracy as a framework for understanding how the Pancasila democracy model works.

### **Pancasila Democracy**

Referring to what Machperson said regarding the democratic model, Pancasila Democracy is something that is legitimate as a model of democracy whose application is specific to Indonesia. We all know that Democracy in the West was built on individualism which then developed into capitalism. Such democracy is called liberal democracy. Liberal democracy in the West gave birth to conflicts between the capitalist class and the working class in the context of industrialization. The conflict then spread outside the Western world to give birth to colonialism in Asia, Africa and Latin America. 62 The opponent of liberal democracy is socio-democracy which is based on collectivism (socialism). This movement emerged since 1830 marked by the emergence of the offer of the concept of working class

resistance from a German Jew, Marx (1818-1883).

Pancasila democracy is democracy based on the principles of kinship and mutual cooperation aimed at the welfare of the people, which contains elements of religious awareness, truth, love and noble character, Indonesian personality and sustainability. In Pancasila democracy, the state organizing system is carried out by the people themselves or with the consent of the people. Individual freedom in Pancasila democracy is not absolute, but must be aligned with social responsibility (Latif, 2013). Pancasila democracy is also interpreted as democracy that is lived by the nation and state of Indonesia which is imbued and integrated by the noble values of Pancasila. In adhering to the principles of Pancasila democracy, the state organizing system is carried out by the people themselves or with the consent of the people, in which the nobility of humans as God's creatures in the political, economic, socio-cultural and defense and security fields is recognized, obeyed and guaranteed on the basis of Pancasila statehood. Government based on constitutional democracy is not absolutism (unlimited power). The constitution here is interpreted in a broad sense, as a living constitution, both the written ones which are called the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, as well as the unwritten basic laws (conventions), such as the basic rules that arise and are maintained in the practice of administering the state even though Unwritten.

The concept of Pancasila democracy is extracted from the values of indigenous Indonesian people with values attached to them, such as democratic village, collectivism meetings, consensus agreement, mutual help and other terms related to it. The aim is to provide a sociological empirical basis for the

concept of democracy that is in accordance with the nature of life of indigenous Indonesian people, not something foreign that comes from the West and is imposed on the reality of the life of the Indonesian people. The indigenous people referred to here are the forms of community life that have taken place on the islands of the archipelago for centuries and which are composed of the smallest and different units of life such as villages in Java, nagari in West Sumatra, pekon in Lampung or subak in Bali (Yunus, 2016). These indigenous people have a set of mental and moral values that are homogeneous, structural and collective, all of which have their own cultural system and take place democratically, namely direct democracy as existed in the city-states of ancient Greece 25 centuries ago.

The process of metamorphosis of democratic values extracted from Indonesian cultural wisdom has undergone several periods in its implementation process as a necessity. Culture is the spirit and identity of the nation in the life of the state, where the level of national dignity is very much determined by the level of the nation's culture itself. The identity of the Indonesian nation is largely determined by the results of the process of actualizing the nation's cultural values within the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. Pancasila as a culture and ideology which is becoming a system he hopes will be able to support the demands of democracy which are progressively progressive in a cultural-educational manner, with reference to their own cultural mindset. An ideological system that is able to grow openly carries out an increase in people's political and economic awareness and participation which is getting higher from time to time, without the effects of cultural alienation, and even strengthens the form of Indonesia's national awakening whose stages are getting more

mature and mature. This implies the need for cultural politics based on Pancasila.

Alfian (1990) said that Pancasila in democratic life lies, among other things, in the qualities contained within it. Apart from that, its relevance lies in its comparative position with other ideas so that the Indonesian people believe, live and understand why Pancasila is an ideology that is used as the basis and at the same time the goal in building life in society, nation and state.

Pancasila democracy underwent changes that were heavily influenced by the regime. For example, the movement that occurred during the Old Order era, making Pancasila the basis of the state, which in its development experienced a weakening in implementing the values contained in the ideology of Pancasila. The new format of the Indonesian political system found its shape when Pancasila Democracy was established as the basis for implementing democracy. Pancasila democracy for the MPR New Order government was naturalized into regulation No.II/MPR/1983 concerning GBHN, Pancasila democracy was affirmed and Pancasila was the only principle that colored the political system in Indonesia. The formulation of this principle is stated in Law Number 8 of 1988 concerning Ormas and Orpol. However, the canalization of political power in the necessity to accept Pancasila as the only principle does not reflect the idea of pluralism which requires diversity of isms in the implementation of democracy. The collapse of the New Order government in 1998 also became a kind of dissolution of Pancasila democracy as a single principle. Until now the notion of Pancasila democracy only refers to the values contained in Pancasila.

Pancasila democracy is essentially a norm that regulates the implementation of people's

sovereignty and the administration of state government, in political, economic, socio-cultural and defense and security life, for every citizen of the Republic of Indonesia, organizations of socio-political forces, community organizations and other social institutions and institutions - State institutions both at the center and in the regions. Pancasila democracy has principles that apply, such as: 1) Freedom or equality (freedom/equality). Freedom/equality is the basis of democracy. Freedom is considered as a means of achieving progress and providing maximum results from people's efforts without restrictions from the authorities. With the principle of equality, all people are considered equal, without discrimination and get access and opportunities together to develop themselves according to their potential. The freedom contained in Pancasila democracy does not mean free fight liberalism that grows in the West, but freedom that does not interfere with the rights and liberties of others. 2) Sovereignty of the People (people's sovereignty). With the concept of people's sovereignty, the nature of the policies made is the will of the people and for the interests of the people. Such a mechanism will achieve two things; that is, the possibility of abuse of power is minimal, and the interest of the people in governmental tasks is more secure. Another manifestation of the concept of sovereignty is the existence of supervision by the people.

By considering the advantages and disadvantages of these various approaches, an understanding of democracy should not use only one approach but should pay deep attention to the interaction of the four approaches above. According to de Tocqueville (in Latif, 2013) emphasized that democracy is a multidimensional subject, which includes political, moral, sociological, economic, anthropological, and psychological aspects.

according to Latif (2013) it is possible and even only for the Indonesian people to adapt forms and models of democracy that are in accordance with the culture and style of Indonesian society itself. Thus, what is called "Pancasila Democracy" is empirically and theoretically valid. The founding fathers of the Indonesian nation fully lived up to the bad effects of political repression and economic exploitation caused by colonialism and capitalism, therefore they highly idealized harmony between political democracy and democracy. economy, which in Sukarno's terms was called "socio-democracy".

They also realize that Indonesia's socio-cultural and socio-economic diversity requires a spirit of kinship in overcoming the various existing inequalities. It is with this spirit of family-unity that they strive for independence and form a national state, and it is also with this spirit that democracy is directed to achieve an independent, united, sovereign, just and prosperous society. The type of democracy that is imagined to be able to overcome the dictations of capitalist-capitalistic forces and in accordance with national pluralism is deliberative democracy. In a deliberative democracy that is led by wisdom, the legitimacy of democracy is not determined by how much support there is for a decision, but how broad and how deep deliberative (deliberative) processes are involved.

Democracy must depart from specific socio-political, socio-economic, socio-cultural and socio-psychological conditions and strive to overcome these conditional challenges. Because it does not operate in a vacuum, the adoption of democracy also requires adjustments to socio-historical, moral-cultural (habitus) realities, and societal ideals. Thus, even though there are similarities in principle, democracy does not have a single face, but

presents itself in various ways, because it must be adapted to the context of space and time so that it can take root in various types of society. In Indonesia, the principles of democracy have been compiled in accordance with the values that grow in society, although it must be said that it is only limited to procedural democracy, in the decision-making process it prioritizes voting rather than deliberation for consensus, which is actually the original principle of Indonesian democracy. This democratic practice should then be served based on a mental state that is rooted in the noble values of the nation.

## **Discussion**

### **History of Pancasila Democracy in Indonesia**

In Indonesia, democracy is actually not new. Bung Hatta, once even said that the embodiment of democracy can be seen in the dynamics of village community life in Indonesia. This means that democracy also has strong roots in the social structure of society in Indonesia. The democracy we know today is democracy that originated in Western countries. Democracy rooted in a liberal spirit, which upholds freedom and recognition of individual rights. In this context, decision making is based on the will of the majority, regardless of differences in social and economic status. The journey of democracy in Western countries has been going on for almost 3 (three) centuries. Starting from resistance to arbitrary monarchical power, democracy was born with the spirit of breaking down traditional-patrimonial power relations and trying to create equality in the relationship between people and rulers (Nani, 2022).

Democracy has actually long been coveted by Indonesia's founding fathers such as Mohamad Hatta, Soekarno and Syahrir who were

educated in Europe by studying democratic values in that country. Although Indonesian democracy initially did not reflect a clear form of democracy because it continued to change in its implementation. At first the democracy that was applied tended to be similar to liberal democracy, namely implementing a parliamentary system in 1950 with a constitution even though the Constitution at that time was considered inadequate for the implementation of Parliamentary democracy. The implication of implementing democracy is to cause cabinets to fall and rise because no cabinet can last for two years (Irawan, 2006). During parliamentary democracy, the first elections were held in 1955, which are remembered as the most democratic elections.

Actually, until now, who sparked Pancasila Democracy today is still unclear. This is because the popularity of Pancasila Democracy surfaced as a reaction to Soekarno's guided democracy (Sudrajat, 2016). The concept that approaches Pancasila Democracy is Deliberative Democracy introduced by Mohammad Hatta, namely democracy based on the rejection of the domination of certain individuals or groups in decision making. The fundamental values that serve as the foundation are traditions and culture in Indonesia. Some of the founding fathers of other nations, like Tjokro, idealized democracy hand in hand with society as the basis for the struggle for Islam and the basis for the life of the nation. Soekarno with the concept of Socio-nationalism which talks about democracy which fights for social justice which does not only care about civil and political rights but also economic rights (Latif, 2011).

A new wave of democratization hit Indonesia towards the close of the 1990s. This transition is a bit late, because Southern Europe (Spain and Portugal), Latin America (Bolivia, Chile,



Argentina, Brazil, Mexico, etc.) and Asian countries (Philippines, South Korea, Taiwan) have experienced democratization in the 1970s and 1980s. Why did the transition to democracy in Indonesia only occur in 1998? The answer lies in Suharto's strong position of power. In the 1970s, Suharto built the material base of his power through his main supporting machines (army, bureaucracy, Golkar and technocrats). Suharto could freely use his sources of support, strengthening the legitimacy of his power. The series of democratic journeys can be seen in the following table:

Period of the Republic of Indonesia I	1945-1949	Constitutional Democracy or also called parliamentary democracy because it highlights the party system and the role of parliament
Period of the Republic of Indonesia II	1959-1965	Guided Democracy which is defined as a form of deviation from constitutional democracy and some fundamental values in democracy
Period of the Republic of Indonesia III	1965-1998	Pancasila democracy, which is a democracy based on procedural values that are far from the values of the substance of democracy
Period of the Republic of Indonesia IV	1999-to-present	Democracy formed on the basis of democratic correction in the Soeharto regime

Sources are processed from Miriam Budiarjo (2013)

In the same decade, the positions of civil society and the urban middle class that grew under the developmentalism program did not contribute anything to the growth of democracy. Civil society is co-opted into various organizations that are deliberately created to limit the movement of society. This co-optation gave birth to control and centralization of supervision of citizens who have the possibility of becoming dissidents. On the other hand, the urban middle class really enjoys economic growth which is centralized in urban areas and glorifies political stability to maintain order for economic growth. The combination of the two provides loose space for Suharto to do so. There was not the slightest space in society that escaped Suharto's scrutiny, thus closing the opportunity for the emergence of a democratic movement. The heroic story of Pancasila, which must be assimilated by all lines related to the state, must be admitted to have been born from the Soeharto regime. However, instead of using Pancasila Democracy, what actually happened was actually anti-democratic. It is still recorded in our memories how at that time Indonesia was under a militaristic, authoritarian and centralistic leadership. This can be seen how Suharto abolished the role of the people in the definition of a state.

So the traces of Pancasila are actually only found in the Suharto regime. The formal basis for the regime period was Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and MPRS decrees. The implementation of Pancasila Democracy in this regime contains symptoms that give rise to abuse of power from the authorities. President Soeharto was transformed into a dominating ruler in the Indonesian political system, not only because of his position as President but because of his dominant influence in the Indonesian political ecosystem (Suwarta, 2018). This then causes executive power to

over power which results in social tensions in society. So Pancasila Democracy is actually only a means of political legitimacy for the New Order regime to produce unilateral interests.

### **Reformulating Pancasila Democracy**

Efforts made in implementing Pancasila Democracy are still deadlocked. This is because indeed Pancasila democracy does not contain operational practical instructions for managing living together or managing the state (Bolo, 2019). Pancasila democracy is a basic principle, a philosophy that forms the basis of democratic life in social and political spaces. At this point, Pancasila democracy is an intellectual discourse or open discourse that needs to be translated into the realm of practice.

Democracy in Indonesia still maintains its fundamental values, namely freedom, equality and brotherhood. However, as an open discourse it has stagnated in the realm of praxis so that its application in the life of the state becomes alienated. Thus, several social scientists in Indonesia are trying to reformulate how to interpret Pancasila democracy in both conceptual and practical areas. As a discourse, another name for Pancasila democracy is found in the manuscripts written by the founders of the nation, namely social democracy and deliberative democracy. Social democracy is a democracy that was raised by the founding fathers of the nation because the portrait of understanding that emerged at that time was heavily mixed with socialist notions.

Social democracy is an ideology as well as a concept of democracy. As an ideology, social democracy has the ideals of a political system that provides a balance between fulfilling civil and political rights and fulfilling socio-economic rights by giving the state an

important role in providing welfare services, such as health and education (Latif, 2011). It has been explained at the beginning of the discussion, that most of the nation's founders were intellectual figures who had a passion for the teachings of socialism. They basically accept the understanding of socialism as a discourse, meaning that it is very possible that the understanding of socialism can be acculturated or assimilated with Indonesian and Islamic understanding. Tjokroaminoto is one of the nation's founders who tries to combine the concepts of Islam, nationality and socialism as an understanding in formulating intellectual projects for Indonesia in the future. Within Tjokro contained three ideological tendencies, firstly Islamic-Modernist (1911-1915) Nationalist or nationalist (1916) and then Socialist (1924) (Rahardjo, 2021). Apart from Tjokro, there was also Sjahrir who had the same ideas about socialism. Sjahrir was a major figure in the Indonesian Socialist Party who revolutionized the understanding of socialism with religious and human understanding (Setiawan, 2020). He did not want socialism that was the same as Russia's. Sjahrir believed that if the state took over the role of the people's economy and abolished private property rights as was practiced in the Soviet Union, such a thing would only lead the state as the highest institution to become a totalitarian institution. Therefore, the postulate of democracy that Sjahrir wants is that the people have a special place as the most sovereign party.

The closest to the concept of Pancasila Democracy is Mohammad Hatta through his idea of Deliberative Democracy. Even though the desire for democracy in Indonesia remains with social democracy, in the Indonesian context the clearer formulation of Pancasila Democracy or deliberative democracy is clearer than Mohammad Hatta (Latif, 2011). According to him, democracy in the nature of

Pancasila is democracy based on theocentric values that glorify human values, respect for differences based on social justice for all Indonesian people. So the figures that underlie the presence of the idea of Pancasila Democracy have a fundamental foundation of social understanding by cooperating with human and religious values in the life of the nation.

After the ideas that emerged from the founders of the nation regarding the concept of Pancasila Democracy, there was a kind of dissatisfaction from intellectual figures in Indonesia. The reason is that until now the doubts about the idea of Pancasila Democracy do not only range in the practical area but also in the conceptual area. This then has implications for the implementation of Pancasila democracy which is considered to be very vague. The intellectual project on Pancasila Democracy was again traced by Yudi Latif by explaining how the idea of Pancasila Democracy, especially in the conceptual area. According to him, another name for Pancasila Democracy is deliberative democracy which is contained in the 4th precept. He began the discussion by explaining the foundations of democracy which have the values of equality, freedom and brotherhood which are transformed into a spirit of liberation from colonialism. Taking into account the mutual cooperation tradition of the Indonesian people, the multicultural nature of the Indonesian nation, and the experience of colonialism engendered by colonialism as an extension of capitalism and individualism, the founding fathers of the nation proposed democracy that is in line with the mindset and personality of the Indonesian nation itself, namely a deliberative democracy that provides vehicle for the realization of the spirit of kinship and social justice under the guidance of wisdom (Latif, 2011). Under the spirit of kinship, a people-sovereign state is the ideal of

democracy and deliberation. Democracy gains its authenticity in strengthening people's Sovereignty, when political freedom is intertwined with economic equality, which revives the spirit of brotherhood within the framework of deliberations and consensus. In the principle of deliberation, decisions are not dictated by the majority or minority forces of the political elite and businessmen, but are led by wisdom that glorifies the powers of deliberative rationality and the wisdom of citizens through the egalite principle.

### **Pancasila Democracy Today**

Far from the fire, that's a suitable sentence to visualize the picture of Indonesian democracy today. This sentence must be said when looking at the condition of democracy today by looking at the data presented by The Economic Intelligence Unit (EIU) that today's Indonesian democracy score is recorded with a score of 6.3. This figure is the lowest figure obtained by Indonesia during the last 14 years (Dw.Com, 2022). This reason is quite rational when Indonesia is faced with an assessment of the decline of democracy today. According to Bolo (2019) there are 2 challenges to Indonesian democracy, namely money politics and identity politics. In reality, the reform era did not in itself give rise to the establishment of a deliberative democracy capable of utilizing public space as an effort to strengthen common will. On the other hand, primordial ties continue to progress into neo-primordialism to the point where democracy is clogged by collective egoism which rests on the spirit of unity.

First, money politics is a chronic disease that affects democracy in Indonesia. Money politics does not operate with a single pattern, it is always intertwined with various factors that make the work process run massively. What

needs to be known is that the form of money politics is not only in the form of buying votes but also in the form of goods (patronage) or pork barrels or also providing services such as free health, social services and so on (Mahsun, 2020). This problem is increasingly surfaced when today's political conditions are relevant to economic growth in Indonesia. If we look at the data on the increase in the Indonesian economy today, it has experienced a significant increase, namely at 7 percent. However, the problem is the unequal level of economic distribution and equity. Reporting from Oxfam, Indonesia is included in the category of the 6th most unequal country in the world with an overview of the accumulated wealth of the four richest people equal to the wealth of 100 million of the poorest people in Indonesia (Oxfam.Org, 2022). This then has implications for the flourishing of money politics in Indonesia.

Second, identity politics is a symptom of democracy in Indonesia. In practical terms, identity politics is a method of struggle by minority groups to demand their rights as human beings. This means that identity politics is an attempt by minority groups to gain recognition from the majority group. However, today identity politics has turned into identity politicization which is often used by the majority group to achieve their interests (Paskarina, 2017). Through the politicization of identity, tensions between religious and cultural groups in Indonesia have increased due to weak supervision of today's democratic spaces which has implications for dichotomous society.

One of the figures who has a sharp analysis of identity politics in Indonesia is Surya Paloh. Surya Paloh is the general chairman of the Nasdem party who has a manifestation of thought through the idea of Restoration of Indonesia. Surya Paloh understands that

identity issues are becoming a polemic in Indonesia. This is caused by a crisis of confidence in government policies that are felt to be unable to solve the problems of the wider community, causing the emergence of political interests to maintain the government's credibility in the eyes of the public. According to Surya Paloh, the conflict between identity politics in Indonesia is also influenced by the general election climate which tends to involve religious issues that must be separated from state issues. Leading to cases of religious blasphemy, making minority religious groups feel discriminated against by the majority religion (Interview with Surya Paloh, 4 September 2022). This polemic then continued to the very substantive problem of not mixing religion into political matters. The holding of elections often becomes an arena for power struggles that justifies any means, so that even religion becomes a victim.

This election process became the main point of the development of the split between the spirit of nationalism and religion in Indonesia. The government's failure to organize a just and wise government coupled with its greed to maintain power has made identity politics the most powerful vehicle to gain people's votes. The herding and formation of public opinion through the mass media regarding the spirit of diversity and nationalism has divided the life of the nation. Even though it cannot be denied, that the majority religion in Indonesia has long practiced the principles of nationalism in the administration of the government system in Indonesia, such as the approval of Pancasila as the foundation of the state to religious tolerance by recognizing the existence of minority religions.

Issues regarding identity politics must be seen by who, what and how the underlying interests are. The interests of elite groups who use

identity politics to raise the issue of primordialism by trapping a person's or group's fanaticism in religious matters has created such great divisions and become a threat to state nationalism. The conflict over identity politics was then exacerbated by various reports in the mass media which accused each other of the truth and wrongs of both parties. The increase in the number of reports, even in a matter of minutes, causes issues regarding identity politics to get out of control and raises new problems regarding the spread of news whose truth is uncertain and even mostly contains lies (hoaxes).

So Pancasila Democracy in Surya Paloh's thinking is actually an effort to create a society that conforms to the fundamental values in Pancasila. Surya does not want democracy overshadowed by majority rule. As we know that democracy requires a majority of votes to be the winner. To prevent this, Surya said in an interview he conducted on Metro TV: "I want people from the island of Sumatra to become president, from the islands of Sulawesi, Kalimantan, Papua and all children of the nation have the right to become president. This opportunity can only be opened when our political ecosystem is healthy (Youtube, 2022)".

With the perspective that majority rule will discriminate against minority groups, the founding fathers idealized a consensus democracy (deliberative democracy/Pancasila) as an effective democratic choice. Indonesia is a country that includes a plural society with a strong tendency towards a multi-party system. Under such conditions, the model of majoritarian democracy is difficult to understand and will even cause many problems in the nation-building process. In this regard, Surya reminded that it is difficult for a plural society to find a common will, a fact that makes

nation-building in such a society an impossible project. In fact, a sense of belonging to a common political entity is a precondition for democracy. National unity must precede other phases of democratization, indicated by the existence of a large number of citizens who have no qualms about joining the national political community. Majoritarian democracy which tends to discriminate against minority forces will make it increasingly difficult to find common will and national unity from a plural society.

Surya Paloh also does not want democracy to be controlled only by a group of elites. In fact, many studies have resulted in the discovery that democracy is very possible to be hijacked by certain elites. Surya also does not want democracy to be just a set of procedures by which decisions are made and policies are produced. He also does not want democracy to only be used as a competition for certain circles.

The democracy that Surya Paloh wants is democracy that does not eliminate the essence of equality and justice for its citizens. Fulfillment of democratic values originating from the west is actually not accepted at face value. Democracy should be acculturated with local cultures that function as an integration process. The idea of "deliberative democracy" based on the principles of Pancasila is a conscious effort from Surya Paloh which he studied from the founders of the nation as an effort to make democracy work and take root in the Indonesian context.

One of the frameworks offered by Surya Paloh actually has a resemblance to Mohammad Hatta. In a deliberative democracy, a majority vote is accepted as a minimum prerequisite for democracy, which still has to be optimized through broad participation and approval from

all forces in an inclusive manner. This broad participation and agreement is achieved through persuasion, compromise, and consensus in quality by requiring a collective mentality guided by wisdom, so that any power will feel owned, loyal, and responsible for all political decisions. On that basis, voting must be placed as a last resort, and even then it must uphold the spirit of mutual respect. The difference is that Surya Paloh has high confidence that by suppressing the communicative function between the people and the authorities, the optimal realization of deliberative democracy in Indonesia will occur. Aside from that, Surya also suggested that deliberative democracy should not only rely on family values. Indonesian democracy must recognize superstructure institutions as rule-making mechanisms and as symbols of people's sovereignty. They are elected representatives of various political identities and preferences across Indonesia.

Attitudes towards Pancasila Democracy have finally reaped various understandings that seek to realize Pancasila as the main element in democracy. as a model, Pancasila Democracy is intended as a marker for ethical relations between citizens. The warmth of being a nation must be carried out in a culture of pluralistic views on the lives of citizens. This means that the activation of conversations in deliberative public spaces must be increased because it is indeed the state's duty to activate citizens' ethical conversations.

## Conclusion

As a model of democracy, Pancasila Democracy still contains the main elements of democracy embedded in it, including the distribution of power, freedom to carry out conversations in public spaces, equality before the law, and equality as citizens who have

rights. The development of Pancasila democracy can actually be traced from the various thoughts of the founders of the nation regarding social democracy. Social democracy is an ideology as well as a concept of democracy. As an idea, social democracy has the ideals of a political system that provides a balance between fulfilling civil and political rights and fulfilling socio-economic rights by giving an important role to the state in providing welfare services. Names such as Tjokro, Sjahri, Mohammad Hatta are figures who are the foundation of the concept of democracy which has social values that are in line with Pancasila. The historical development of democracy only became an official product during the Soeharto regime. Pancasila democracy in the Suharto regime was not Pancasila democracy in accordance with the concept of the founders, instead it became a tool of political legitimacy to fulfill the interests of the authorities. Currently, Pancasila democracy is an intellectual discourse or open discourse that needs to be translated into the realm of practice. So one of the figures trying to translate the concept is Surya Paloh. Surya Paloh believes that Pancasila Democracy is Democracy based on the 4th Precept, namely on deliberation-representation and Wisdom-wisdom. In addition, the concept of Pancasila democracy Surya Paloh has a fulcrum by emphasizing the communicative function between the people and the authorities, so that the optimal realization of deliberative democracy in Indonesia will occur. Aside from that, Surya also suggested that deliberative democracy should not only rely on family values. Indonesian democracy must recognize superstructure institutions as rule-making mechanisms and as symbols of people's sovereignty. They are elected representatives of various political identities and preferences across Indonesia.

## Reference

- Afrizal. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif* (4th ed.). PT. RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Alfian. (1990). *Pancasila Sebagai Ideologi Dalam Kehidupan Politik*. Perum Percetakan Negara.
- Assyaukanie, L. (2011). *Ideologi Islam dan Utopia*. In Freedom Institute (Vol. 1).
- Bolo, A. D. (2019). Demokrasi di Indonesia: Pancasila sebagai Kontekstualisasi Demokrasi. *Melintas*, 34(2), 145–167. <https://doi.org/10.26593/mel.v34i2.3389.145-167>
- Budiarjo, M. (2013). *Dasar-Dasar Ilmu Politik* (8th ed.). PT.Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Padjadjaran Dan Badan Pengkajian MPR. (2018). *Penegasan Demokrasi Pancasila* (T. Andana, S. Aminah, Setiawan, O. Trangganis, & P. Devis (eds.)). MPR Republik Indonesia.
- Held, D. (2012). *Model Of Democracy* (Third). Polity Press.
- Heywood, A. (2015). *Pengantar Teori Politik* (I). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Huntington, S. P. (1995). *Gelombang demokratisasi ketiga* (A. Marjohan & A. S. Abadi (eds.)). Pustaka Utama Grafiti.
- Irawan, B. B. (2006). Perkembangan Demokrasi di Indonesia. *Perspektif*, 5(3), 54–64. <http://jurnal.untagsmg.ac.id/index.php/hdm/article/viewFile/312/364>
- Latif, Y. (2011). *Negara Paripurna :Historitas, Rasionalitas dan Aktualitas Pancasila*. Pustaka Gramedia.
- Latif, Y. (2013). *Negara paripurna*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Mahsun, M. (2020). Demokrasi Patronase dan Praktik Politik Uang: Pengalaman Pemilu Legislatif 2014 di Kota Palembang, Sumatera Selatan. *JPW (Jurnal Politik Walisongo)*, 2(1), 13–26. <https://doi.org/10.21580/jpw.2020.2.1.1996>
- Muhadjir, N. (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif* (pertama). Rake Sarasin.
- Nani, Y. N. (2022). Demokrasi Pancasila versus Demokrasi Langsung: Tinjauan Konsep Masyarakat Sipil. 2(2), 1–15.
- Paskarina, C. (2017). Politisasi Identitas dalam Kompetisi Pemilu di Indonesia Pasca 2014. *Jurnal Bawaslu*, 3(2), 169–183.
- Rahardjo, M. D. (2021). *Sosialimse Dari Utopia ke Indonesia* (M. Saifullah (ed.); I). CV. Kontradiksi Indonesia Grup.
- Samekto, F. A. (2020). *Kebangsaan Pasca Reformasi dalam Pusaran Kapitalisme dan Radikalisme*. *Kedeputian Pengkajian Dan Materi BPIP*, 1–11.
- Setiawan, H. (2020). *Sutan Sjahrir, Sosialisme, Dan Perjuangan Kemerdekaan Indonesia Tahun 1927-1962*. *Avatara*, 9(1), 1–9.
- Sudrajat, A. (2016). Demokrasi Pancasila Dalam Perspektif Sejarah. *MOZAIK: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 8(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.21831/moz.v8i1.10763>
- Suwirta, A. (2018). *Pers dan Kritik Sosial pada Masa Orde Baru: Studi Kasus Pers Mingguan Mahasiswa Indonesia di Bandung, 1966-1974*. *Mimbar Pendidikan*, 3(2), 113–136. <https://doi.org/10.17509/mimbardik.v3i2.13949>