

Pancasila Democracy According to Sukarno's Thought and its Potential for Formulation a New Model of Indonesian Democracy

Ganjar Razuni

FISIP Political Science Study Program, Universitas Nasional, Jakarta, Indonesia
ganjar.razuni@civitas.unas.ac.id

Abstract

Until now, the concept of Pancasila democracy has not been formulated properly and comprehensively. Moreover, this formulation is based on the thoughts of the Pancasila explorers, namely; Ir. Sukarno. The absence of a formulation of the democratic concept of Pancasila based on Sukarno's thinking is caused by the process of dehistoricization of Pancasila that has occurred since the New Order. In fact, both in his Speech on June 1 1945 and at the Pancasila Course Session on People's Sovereignty Principles on July 22 1958, Sukarno explained his various thoughts about the principles of democracy in Pancasila. Sukarno's thoughts on Pancasila democracy have potential for the formulation of a new model of Pancasila Democracy, which is different from other models of democracy, especially the liberal democracy model. Therefore, the formulation of a new Pancasila model of democracy based on Sukarno's thinking is an urgent scientific need and is our common concern.

Keywords: Pancasila, Democracy, Sukarno, Liberalism

INTRODUCTION

Democracy is one of the essences or the main essence of Pancasila Thought, according to Sukarno. This is due to the characteristics of democracy which is a construction of a political system, political structure, political nature and at the same time a political civilization that is needed to realize the values of Pancasila itself. One of the characteristics of Pancasila Democracy is: Democracy and Leadership as formulated in the 4th Principle of Pancasila, namely:

"People Led by Hikmad Wisdom in Deliberation/Representation of the People"

Thus, democracy and leadership become the main characteristics of the substances contained in Pancasila and the construction of Pancasila when differentiated from other ideologies, such as Islamism and communism. To understand Bung Karno's ideas of democracy in his Pancasila Thought, we can trace and understand them in two of Bung Karno's speeches; First, the speech on the birth of Pancasila on June 1, 1945 before the First Plenary Session of BPUPK and; Second, the Pancasila Course Speech on the People's Sovereignty Principles session on July 22, 1958.

The historical context of Sukarno's democratic ideas is found in the ideological division between Islamism (the basis of an Islamic state) and nationalism (the basis of a national-state) before the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK. The session which took place on 29 May-1 June 1945 formulated the Basic State Plan which would become the basis for the independent Indonesia that we would establish. Among the 62 BPUPK members, there were two ideologies that developed and colored the thoughts at the trial, namely: Islamism and Nationalism. For groups that propose Islamism, the best basis for a state is Islam, because Islam is a religion that calls for national unity. At the same time, Islam is also a religion whose normative level is higher than other ideologies which are only human thoughts. The proposal for Islamism was put forward by Islamic figures such as Ki Bagus Hadikusumo from Muhammadiyah on May 30 1945 (Kusuma, 2016).

Meanwhile, nationalism was proposed by nationalist groups because nationalism is the basis of a state that represents national diversity and is able to unite this diversity. Nationalism is also the basis of the state which is needed to establish a national state, not a religious state. Figures who are vocal in proposing nationalism are; Mr Soepomo who gave a speech on May 31 1945. In his speech, Mr. Soepomo criticized Hadikusumo, because an Islamic state would give birth to minorities in a country. The Islamic State will also create a majority community closest to the state, marginalizing these minorities. Although the national state is not a religious state, the national state is not anti-religious. On the other hand, according to Soepomo, a national state is a state based on noble values glorified by religion (Kusuma, 2016). Thus, the national state that Soepomo proposed was not a secular state but a religious state, even though it was not a religious state.

Pancasila is a middle way and a way out of the impasse between the two ideologies. In this context, Pancasila is the basis of the state, nation-ideology and democratic state-ideology. This is due to the nature of Pancasila which underlies a democratic national state, which guarantees that every group can fight for their aspirations through democratic state institutions. It's just that since this Republic was founded, the concept and system of Pancasila Democracy has not been properly formulated. The absence of a scientific concept of Pancasila, causes the absence of a scientific concept of Pancasila democracy. One of the methods in formulating the scientific concept of Pancasila and Pancasila Democracy is to root it in the initial thoughts of Pancasila as compiled by the Pancasila explorer, namely: Sukarno. Thus, according to Sukarno, Pancasila Democratic Thought is very necessary for the scientific formulation of the Pancasila Democratic Concept.

Through the scientific formulation of the concept of Pancasila Democracy, the Pancasila democracy model can be developed conceptually. The Pancasila Democratic Model is different from other democratic models, especially democratic models that are built based on the philosophy of liberalism or the philosophy of communism. In this context, the thought of Pancasila Democracy in Sukarno's perspective could be the main material for the formulation of a new model of Pancasila democracy, which has not yet been well and systematically structured, either procedurally (form) or substantially (content). The problem formulation in this paper is:

- a) What were Sukarno's thoughts about Pancasila democracy in his June 1 1945 Speech before the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK?
- b) What were Sukarno's thoughts about Pancasila democracy in his speech at the Pancasila Course Session on the Principles of People's Sovereignty on July 22 1958?
- c) How to formulate a new model of Pancasila democracy based on Sukarno's thoughts on Pancasila democracy?
- d) How can the new model of Pancasila democracy improve the quality of democracy in Indonesia?

RESEARCH METHODS

This paper uses a comparative approach to study the text of Sukarno's speech on June 1, 1945 before the First Plenary Session of BPUPK and Sukarno's speech at the Pancasila Course on July 22, 1958. The comparison is carried out to describe Sukarno's thoughts about democracy in Pancasila, both in the context of his initial ideas on that date. June 1, 1945 and in 1958. In his initial idea on June 1 1945, Sukarno created Pancasila as the basis of the state and national ideology. Meanwhile, on July 22 1958, Sukarno expressed his thoughts on Pancasila democracy in his capacity as President of the Republic of Indonesia.

However, both in 1945 and 1958, Sukarno was still a Pancasila thinker who had continuity in the idea of Pancasila democracy. It is this continuity that this article explores beyond the political context of the two eras. Therefore, the focus of this article is on the formulation of the concept of Pancasila democracy according to Sukarno conceptually, not in the realm of political practice. This is due to the positioning of Pancasila as a state philosophy, so that it is necessary to formulate Pancasila democracy in the philosophical realm, before Pancasila democracy is put into practice in the context of political practice.

The formulation of the concept of Pancasila democracy based on Sukarno's thoughts was carried out in this paper in the context of formulating a new model of Pancasila democracy. For this purpose, this paper uses the concept of models of democracy from David Held(2007). What is meant by a democratic model is a model formed by the concept of democracy based on a certain political philosophy. In this context, Held has formulated several models of democracy, namely direct democracy, representative democracy, liberal democracy, social democracy, republican democracy and deliberative democracy. These various models of democracy were formed based on the political philosophies of liberalism, socialism, republicanism and critical social theory (Held, 2007).

Through Held's models of democracy, this paper formulates a new Pancasila model of democracy. The existence of democratic models that are the same as the democratic principles in Pancasila, is the potential for the formulation of the Pancasila democratic model. In this case there are two main principles of Pancasila democracy which are found in some models of Heldian democracy, namely; deliberation (deliberation) and balance between political equality and socio-economic equality (equilibrium).

The formulation of the new model of Pancasila democracy is philosophical in nature, and has not yet been formulated and put into practice. This means that the existence of democratic practices which are claimed to constitute Pancasila democracy, as occurred during the New Order, is a claim that is different from the concept of democracy, especially based on the

thoughts of the founder of Pancasila, namely Sukarno. Therefore, the formulation of a new model of Pancasila democracy in this paper is expected to fulfill the "conceptual void" that occurs in the Pancasila model of democracy.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Analysis of the Essentials of Pancasila Democracy as a Basis for Building and Institutionalizing the Pancasila Democracy System in accordance with the Essence of the Birth of Pancasila (Raison D'Etire) of Pancasila

This section will analyze the construction of Pancasila as Philosophisch-Grondslag which is the fundamental basis for the formation and institutionalization of the Pancasila Democratic system. Based on reasoning, the author borrows Hel's (2007) conception, that democratic models are formed and institutionalized based on a certain political philosophy. Sometimes there are doubts about formulating the form and structure of Pancasila democracy, not least because this country still lacks or even experiences a conceptual vacuum regarding Pancasila democracy. Our intellectuals still seem reluctant or not very interested in developing knowledge about Pancasila, at least developing the philosophy of Pancasila, both epistemologically, ontologically and axiologically.

This causes a "conceptual vacuum" regarding Pancasila in its implementation in the political, legal, economic and social fields. Our intellectuals are generally more sensitive to developing western concepts or the concept of western democracy. Sometimes there is a feeling of "impatience", so that we end up taking a "short cut" to simply adopt western concepts into Indonesian nature, whose sociological foundations are different, because the structure of this nation's society is based more on collectivity, not individualism. Additionally, there are differences in demographic structure, natural conditions, religiosity, diversity in many ways, differences between groups, ethnicity, race and so on. For this reason, the author tries to analyze Pancasila, as an "intersection" of so many complex differences, and therefore Pancasila democracy, is a concept of democracy with a social character or social democracy and not democracy with a bourgeois character which is based on the philosophy of individualism and philosophy of capitalism.

Pancasila Meeting Point

Beyond the debate between the two ideologies, Sukarno was present to propose a "middle way" and a way out of the deadlock in formulating the basic principles of the state. The solution is Pancasila, namely; five principles which he proposed as the basic state philosophy (Philosophische grondslag) and way of life (Weltanschauung) of the Indonesian people. In a speech on June 1 1945, Sukarno conveyed the idea of the basis of the state as a middle way and a meeting point between the two ideologies. The role of Pancasila as a meeting point is the essence or essence of Pancasila as the basis of the state which is national on the one hand, and divine at the same time.

The basic values of the Pancasila state that Sukarno proposed on June 1 1945, are: Indonesian Nationality, Internationalism (Humanity), Consensus (Democracy) and Social Welfare. In this context, as in Hatta's analysis of the Pancasila Formulation on June 1 1945, Bung Karno placed the political dimension above the moral dimension. The political dimensions that Hatta meant were; The national political values that rank at the top, namely nationality, humanity, democracy and social justice. Meanwhile, the moral dimension that Hatta means is the principle of belief in one and only God (YME), which is in fifth place (Hatta, 1977).

At the Introductory Session of the Pancasila Course on July 22 1958, President Sukarno explained why on June 1 1945, he placed nationality as the First Principle? The answer is, because he explored Pancasila as the objective condition of the Indonesian nation. The objective condition in question is a condition of pluralism which must be united under the banner of

national unity. Only when a people divided by diversity of tribes, ethnicities, religions, languages, social classes and ideologies can be united under the banner of national unity, can the Indonesian people be mobilized to expel the invaders from Indonesian soil. (Sukarno, 1960). This national unity is the substance of national values. Therefore, nationality occupied the First Principle of the Pancasila Formula on June 1, 1945.

In this connection, we can understand that nationality is indeed the "lifeline" for Bung Karno's idea of Pancasila. The term "ridden vein" is used by Hamka to denote the most core value of Pancasila which is the source for other precepts. Hamka places belief in God as the "mainstay" of Pancasila. This means that for Hamka, belief in God is the most important value for Pancasila and is a source for other precepts. Even for Hamka, we only need Godly precepts, because in these precepts, there are not only five precepts, but 1000 precepts. (Hamka, 1951). Hamka's views have an "Islamist assumption", because by relying on divine precepts alone, he agrees with "eka-sila", that is, divine precepts, and ignores Pancasila. This is different from Sukarno, who even though he placed nationality as the "core" of Pancasila, this national value contained other principles.

The content of other principles in the principle of nationality is found in Sukarno's concept of nationality which is internationalist on the one hand, and democratic at the same time. The internationalism that Sukarno meant was the anti-imperialist nature of Indonesian nationalism through the development of international relations without colonialism. This condition of international relations without colonialism is what he calls the condition of a humane world. That is what makes the principles of internationalism the same as humanity. In the official formulation of Pancasila, this principle is redacted as just and civilized humanity. At the same time, nationality is also democratic, meaning that the Indonesian nation-state is a country managed through a democratic system based on deliberation and representation. The democracy to be built is not only political, but also socio-economic. This is what made Sukarno propose social welfare in the Pancasila Formulation on June 1, as the goal of establishing the Indonesian national state.

In this context, Pancasila was born as a middle way and a way out of the ideological deadlock between Islamism and nationalism. The role of Pancasila as a way out occurred because the foundation of the state became a meeting point between the two ideologies that developed at the First Plenary Session of BPUPK. From an Islamism perspective, Pancasila contains the value of the Almighty God which is close to the Islamic doctrine of monotheism. Apart from that, Pancasila also contains democratic values which guarantee that Islamic groups can still fight for their aspirations in parliament, even though not within the framework of an Islamic state. From the nationalism side, Pancasila also contains national values which are the main characteristics of its ideology. For nationalist groups, the principles of the Almighty God do not reflect the doctrine of one religion (Islam), but instead reflect the universal principles of all religions (Ali, 2009).

Pancasila's ability to be "intersectional" by containing the values of Islamism and nationalism is what made it accepted acclamationally by the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK. After Bung Karno made his speech, BPUPK then formed a Small Committee with the task of: reformulating Pancasila as the basis of the state based on and referring to Bung Karno's speech on June 1, 1945 (Committee of Five, 1977). The Small Committee initially numbered eight people, then Sukarno expanded it to nine people, thus becoming the Committee of Nine. The Committee of Nine contained Sukarno (Chairman), Mohammad Hatta, Mr. Muhammad Yamin, Achmad Soebardjo, AA Maramis (nationalist group), as well as Kiai Wahid Hasyim, Haji Agus Salim, Abikoesno Tjokrosoejoso and Kahar Muzakir (Islamic group).

The Committee of Nine held a meeting on June 22 1945 at Bung Karno's residence, Jl. Pegangsaan Timur No. 56, Jakarta and produced a draft Preamble to the Constitution called the Jakarta Charter. In the Jakarta Charter, all the themes of the Pancasila principles proposed by

Sukarno on June 1 were not changed by the Committee of Nine. This means that the theme of the Pancasila principles was accepted by all by the Committee of Nine chaired by Bung Karno. Apart from accepting all the themes of the Pancasila principles, the Committee of Nine also revised the systematics of these principles. Nationality, which was originally the first principle, became the third principle, humanity remained the second principle, democracy, which was originally the third principle, became the fourth principle, social welfare, which was originally the fourth principle, became the fifth principle, and divinity, which was originally the Fifth Principle, became the First Principle. The Committee of Nine then added the phrase "with the obligation to carry out Islamic law for its adherents" to the Godly precepts. The addition of this phrase is a compromise between Islamic and nationalist groups. This means that Islamic groups will not fight for the basis of an Islamic state if in Pancasila there are provisions for the implementation of Islamic law for Muslims.

At the Second Plenary Session of the BPUPK on 10-17 July 1945, Bung Karno as Chairman of the Committee of Nine reported on the Jakarta Charter. He emphasized that the Charter was a compromise between Islamic and nationalist groups. Therefore, he asked the Second Plenary Session of the BPUPK to accept the Charter, because without the Charter which contains the obligation to implement Islamic law for Muslims, Islamic groups will not accept Pancasila. In his report, Sukarno also stated that the five values he proposed on June 1 were all included in the Jakarta Charter, of course with the addition of the obligation to implement Islamic Sharia in the Divine Principles (Setneg, 1992). Sukarno's report that all the values (sila) he proposed were included in the Jakarta Charter proves that there is continuity between the Formulation of Pancasila on June 1 and June 22 1945. It's just that there is a revision in the systematics and the addition of "obligation to implement Islamic law". Sukarno's efforts to defend the Jakarta Charter at the Second BPUPK Session showed that he sided with Islamic values as a consequence of the compromise between Islamism and nationalism. This shows that Sukarno was not anti-Islam and not anti-Islamic law. It's just that since the Second BPUPK Session, there have been objections to the "obligation" to implement Islamic law in the basic formulation of the state. For example, Johannes Latuharhary expressed his objection, because in the basic law, there should be no values that only regulate one particular group. In the basic law, there should only be general values that cover all the values and interests of all citizens (Setneg, 1992). However, the Jakarta Charter continued to pass until the Second Plenary Session of the BPUPK ended on 10-17 July 1945.

Within the framework of objections from non-Muslim circles, before the Indonesian Independence Preparatory Committee (PPKI) Session on August 18 1945, the Eastern Indonesia region threatened to separate itself from Indonesia if the Jakarta Charter was still ratified. Responding to this, Bung Hatta approached Islamic figures, namely KH Wahid Hasyim (NU, Jombang, East Java), Ki Bagus Hadikusumo (Muhamadiyah, Yogyakarta), Mr. Kasman Singodimedjo (Purworejo, Central Java, Masyumi) and Teuku Muhammad Hasan (Aceh). This approach aims to ask Islamic figures to remove the "seven words" of Islamic sharia obligations and replace them with the principles of Almighty God. Based on the awareness to maintain the integrity of the country which was only founded one day after the Proclamation of August 17 1945, these Islamic figures agreed with Hatta's invitation. Hatta played a major role in the lobbying and approach to the agreement to delete the 7 words in the First Sila version of the Jakarta Charter. This was done by Hatta based on input from Assistant Admiral Maeda, namely Nishijima, who was "bridged" by a Japanese officer from Kaigun (AL). Hatta received information and complaints about our brothers and sisters from Catholics and Protestants as well as some from eastern Indonesia such as J. Latuharhary, AA Maramis and others (Hatta; 1979) who objected to the 7 words in the First Precepts Pancasila version of the Jakarta Charter.

Based on the agreement of these Islamic figures, the final Systematics and Formulation of Pancasila with the First Principles were compiled, namely; Belief in the one and only God.

The systematics and final formulation of Pancasila were then reported by Hatta on the orders of the PPKI Chairman, Sukarno, before the First PPKI Plenary Session. The final systematics and formulation were accepted by the PPKI session, including Islamic figures. The systematics and final formulation of Pancasila contained in the Fourth Paragraph of the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution became an integral part of the Constitution which was ratified by the PPKI with its Chairman, Ir. Sukarno on 18 August 1945 before the First Plenary Session of the PPKI, known as the 1945 Constitution.

We can understand the chronology of the birth, formulation and finalization of Pancasila in the following principles. First, the birth of Pancasila occurred on June 1, 1945 through Bung Karno's speech about Pancasila. In this regard, other BPUPK members did not propose Pancasila, including Mr. Yamin and Mr. Soepomo, who during the New Order was asked to propose Pancasila before Sukarno. Based on the archive of minutes of the BPUPK-PPKI session belonging to Abdul Karim (AK) Pringgodigdo, on May 29 1945, Yamin did not propose Pancasila, but only proposed "three basics", namely, representation, deliberation and policy. These three basics actually only represent one principle, namely; democracy (Kusuma, 2017). Meanwhile, Soepomo also did not propose Pancasila, because from the start, he proposed an integralistic understanding (theory) of the state, as a condition for the formulation of the basis of the state (Kusuma, 2016). This means, for Soepomo, before determining the basis of the state, he invited the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK to agree on what state theory he wanted to use. He then proposed the state-integralistic theory. Second, the formulation of Pancasila occurred on June 22 1945 by the Sembian Committee chaired by Sukarno. As explained above, the Committee of Nine did not change the theme of the Pancasila principles, but only revised the systematics and added principles for implementing sharia for Muslims. Third, the finalization of Pancasila at the PPKI session and at that session Sukarno was the Chairman of the PPKI.

Therefore, Sukarno's role in the process of birth and formulation of Pancasila did not stop at the birth phase of 1 June 1945 (BPUPK members), but also in the phases of 22 June and 18 August 1945. In the last two phases, Sukarno played a role in the formulation of the Jakarta Charter and the ratification of the UUD. In the Preamble there is an official Pancasila formulation. Thus, limiting Sukarno's role only to the June 1 speech would belittle his role. Because he also played a very important role in the phases of 22 June 1945 (Chairman of the Committee of Nine) and 18 August 1945 (Chairman of the PPKI). This means that Sukarno was also involved and cared about the Jakarta Charter, and had an important role in ratifying the official Systematics and Formulation of Pancasila.

On the other hand, according to Bung Karno, Pancasila thinking had also gone beyond his ideas on June 1 1945. This means that since Pancasila was officially established, Sukarno no longer used the Pancasila systematics on June 1 1945, where nationality became the First Principle and God as the Fifth Principle. Since post-Independence Republic of Indonesia, Sukarno has always used the official Pancasila systematics where Belief in God is the First Principle and Social Justice is the Fifth Principle. This means that Sukarno's thoughts and explanations about Pancasila no longer use the systematics of June 1 1945, but instead use the official Pancasila Systematics and Formulation. This is reflected in his various explanations at the Pancasila Course in 1958 and in his various speeches about Pancasila during his tenure as President of the Republic of Indonesia.

Therefore, the study of his thoughts on Pancasila democracy uses two study objects. First, Sukarno's speech on June 1 1945. Second, Sukarno's speech at the Pancasila Course Session on the Principles of People's Sovereignty in 1958. The study in this paper will compile the continuity and development of Sukarno's thinking about Pancasila democracy based on these two speeches. After conducting a study of these two speeches, this article will contextualize Sukarno's Pancasila democratic thinking on the quality of our democracy.

Social Democracy

Sukarno's thoughts about Pancasila democracy can be understood in two of his speeches, namely the June 1 1945 speech at the BPUPK session, and the speech at the Pancasila Course Session on the Principles of People's Sovereignty on July 22 1958. In the June 1 speech, Sukarno placed democracy as a system needed to operationalize the ideals of Pancasila. Pancasila ideals. That ideal is a national state that provides a state for all groups. Because the state is national in nature, every group in society must have the opportunity to fight for their aspirations through representation and deliberation mechanisms in order to reach consensus. Consensus is what is meant by democracy in Sukarno's initial explanation. In this regard, Sukarno stated:

"Then what is the third basis? This basis is the basis of consensus, the basis of representation, the basis of deliberation. Indonesia is not a country for one person, not a country for one group, even if it is a rich group. But we established a country of all for all, one for all, all for one. I believe that an absolute requirement for the strength of the Indonesian state is deliberation and representation." (Sukarno, 1947)

From this explanation, we can understand that Sukarno placed democracy as a political system necessary for the upholding of the principles of a national state, namely a state established for all groups. That is what makes him place the principles of democracy under the principles of nationality. In this relationship, the principle of democracy becomes an inward characteristic of the national principle, after which the national principle has an outward characteristic, namely internationalism (humanity). In this connection, we can understand that the national state of Pancasila is a country that is outwardly building a humane world order, as well as inwardly building a democratic state.

In order to emphasize that Indonesia is a country that is one for all groups, Sukarno gave guarantees to Islamic groups, as well as Christian and religious groups and other groups to fight for their aspirations through parliament. Thus, even though Indonesia is not a religious country, religious groups can still fight for their religious aspirations through this democratic system. Sukarno stated:

"For the Islamic side, this is the best place to maintain religion. We, I too, are Muslims. I'm sorry, I'm sorry, my Islam is far from perfect, but if you open my chest and see that I have a heart, you will find nothing but an Islamic heart. And Bung Karno's Islamic heart wanted to defend Islam in consensus, in deliberation. By consensus, we improve everything, including religious safety, namely by means of discussion or deliberation in the People's Representative Body... If, for example, Christians want every letter in Indonesian state regulations to be according to the Bible, they work hard to ensure that so that the majority of the delegates entering the Indonesian representative body are Christians." (Sukarno, 1947).

Sukarno's explanation that democracy was proposed as a means for religious groups to fight for their aspirations was an attempt to overcome the ideological deadlock at the two BPUPK Plenary Sessions. This is due to the existence of Islamic groups who want to make Islam the basis of the state. In this way, Sukarno wanted to emphasize that even though the basis of the state was not Islam, but Pancasila, Muslims, Christians and all religious communities could still fight for their aspirations through parliament. Of course, this struggle must comply with democratic principles, namely through the formation of consensus.

Apart from the principle of channeling political and religious aspirations which became the praxis of the national state, Sukarno also established other principles in his democratic ideas, namely social democracy. Social democracy in question is a democratic system and practice that not only fulfills political rights, but also the socio-economic rights of citizens. This is what

makes the principles of democracy followed by the principles of social welfare (sociale rechvaardigheid). In this matter, Sukarno explained:

"If we are looking for democracy, it should not be Western democracy, but deliberation that gives life, namely politiek-economische democratie, which is capable of bringing social prosperity!... Let us accept this principle of social rechvaardigheid, namely not only political equality, brothers and sisters, but even on the economic field, we must establish equality, meaning the best possible shared welfare. Brothers and sisters, the deliberative body that we will create, should not only be a political deliberative body, but a body that together with society can realize two principles: political rechvaardigheid and sociale rechvaardigheid." (Sukarno, 1947).

Guided democracy

Apart from his speech on June 1 1945, Sukarno also explained his thoughts on Pancasila democracy in the Pancasila Course on the Principles of People's Sovereignty Session, on July 22 1958. This course, which was held at the State Palace, reviewed each principle once a month during 1958 to 1959. As in the course in Another precepts session, this course on the precepts of popular sovereignty, provides a deeper explanation of the brief explanation of these precepts on June 1, 1945. On June 1, 1945, Bung Karno only gave a cursory explanation of the meaning of the precepts of popular sovereignty. This explanation contains several principles. First, that popular sovereignty or democracy is implemented through a deliberative mechanism. This means that democracy in Pancasila does not make the majority vote a representation of truth, but rather consensus through deliberation. This is what is unique about Indonesian democracy, namely deliberation.

Second, the democracy proposed by Bung Karno on June 1 1945 was representative democracy. Through representative politics, all groups in this republic get equal opportunities to fight for their aspirations in parliament. Included in this equality are religious groups such as Muslims, Christians and others. Bung Karno used equality of opportunity in representative democracy as a guarantee, especially to Islamic groups, that they could still fight for their aspirations through parliament. It's just that these aspirations will be tested by a deliberation mechanism. The same applies to all other political, ideological and religious groups.

Third, the democracy proposed by Bung Karno on June 1 1945 was social democracy. What is meant by social democracy is a democratic model that not only fulfills political rights, but also socio-economic rights. This model of social democracy, or borrowing Bung Karno's term, politiek-economische democratie (political-economic democracy) is an alternative model to parliamentary democracy in Europe which only fulfills political rights. In the end, parliamentary democracy actually perpetuates the power of capitalism, because the policies that are produced are not oriented towards fulfilling the socio-economic rights of ordinary people.

In the 1958 Pancasila Course, Bung Karno gave a more in-depth explanation of the concept of Pancasila democracy which he had introduced on June 1 1945. However, in the 1958 course, he gave a more in-depth elaboration of the cultural dimensions of our democracy. What is meant by the cultural dimension is Bung Karno's positioning of democracy as a reflection of the nation's personality which is different from models of democracy in other countries. Bung Karno emphasized the positioning of democracy as a reflection of the nation's personality by understanding democracy not only as a technique or tool, but as a mindset that reflects the nation's personality. Regarding this, Bung Karno stated:

"We think and feel not just technically, but psychologically, nationally psychologically, familiarly. In such a realm of thoughts and feelings, democracy for us is not just a technical tool, but a concept, a belief, in an effort to achieve the form of society that we aspire

to. We believe that it is impossible for family life to be carried out perfectly without implementing the basis of popular sovereignty or democracy or deliberation." (Sukarno, 1960)

The emphasis that democracy is not just a tool, but rather a belief in the ideals of the society that is to be formed, conveys the need to build a democratic system that is uniquely Indonesian. Of course, what is meant by typical Indonesia refers to a social democratic system which is different from parliamentary democracy in Europe. This is what led Bung Karno to build a national style of democracy. He stated, "That is why for us Indonesians, democracy or popular sovereignty has a national style, a style of our personality, a style that does not need to be the same as the style of democracy used by other nations as a technical tool. This means that our democracy is Indonesian democracy; democracy which refers to the personality of the Indonesian nation itself. It does not need to be identical, meaning the same as democracy run by other nations. "In fact, recently I have dared to emphasize that Indonesian democracy is Guided Democracy."(Sukarno, 1960).

At one point, Bung Karno called democracy with a national style and in accordance with the nation's personality with the term "guided democracy". What is meant by guided democracy is not Bung Karno's personal leadership as President. But rather conceptual and programmatic leadership by a holistic development system, which he called National Planned Universal Development (PNSB). Leadership concepts and programs are what guide democracy, so that democratic practice does not fall into the ideological relativity of the parties in parliament. Regarding Bung Karno's criticism of parliamentary democracy, he emphasized this in a statement: "Once in a speech, when I attended the PNI's 30th anniversary celebration in Bandung, I said, 'Perlementaire democratie is the political ideology of capitalism on the rise', from 'Kapitalismus im aufstieg'. Then I draw the conclusion: so, we don't want Capitalismus, but we want it in accordance with the 5th principle of Pancasila, a society of social justice."(Sukarno, 1960).

With this confirmation, we understand that democracy in Pancasila is not parliamentary democracy which only fulfills political rights, but social democracy which also fulfills socio-economic rights. This social democratic model is proof of the completeness of the principle of popular sovereignty in Pancasila which leads to the Principle of Social Justice for All Indonesian People.

Construction and Content of Pancasila Democracy: An Initial Study of Foundations, Content and Form

Sukarno's idea of democracy within the Pancasila framework became the basis for the formulation of the Pancasila model of democracy. In the history of politics in Indonesia, this democratic model has not really been formulated. This is caused by the absence of a standard Pancasila concept that was developed scientifically. One of the scientific parameters in the formulation of the Pancasila concept is the historicity of the Pancasila concept itself, because apart from being a national consensus, Pancasila is also a state philosophy. In the context of state philosophy, Sukarno was the originator of this philosophy.

If we refer to Sukarno's two speeches above, there are several main characteristics of Pancasila democracy which can be used as basic material for formulating the Pancasila model of democracy. First, Pancasila democracy according to Sukarno is a representative democracy that supports the national state, one for all groups. In this context, democracy becomes a possible condition (*conditio sine qua non*) for nation-states or nationalities. Without democracy, the goal of the nation-state as a one-for-all country will not be achieved. Because democracy provides an egalitarian mechanism for channeling the political aspirations of all groups in this

country. In this regard, the first characteristic of Pancasila democracy is political equality. Democracy based on political equality is referred to as political democracy, which fulfills the civil and political rights of citizens.

Second, According to Sukarno, Pancasila democracy is held through a deliberation mechanism to reach consensus. This means that democratic legitimacy is not based on the number of votes, but on the consensus produced through deliberation. In this regard, democracy according to Sukarno does not depart from the principle of majoritarianism, where the owner of the most votes is the winner in democracy. Victory in democracy for Sukarno is a common good that is formed through deliberation.

Third, According to Sukarno, Pancasila democracy is social democracy. Namely democracy which not only fulfills civil and political rights, but also socio-economic rights. In this context, democracy is not a goal, but a means of struggle to create people's welfare. Fourth, according to Sukarno, Pancasila democracy is democracy as a reflection of the nation's personality. The nature of democracy as a reflection of the nation's personality is found in the tradition of deliberation for the sake of consensus which is the second characteristic of Pancasila democracy. This characteristic is also found in Sukarno's concept of Guided Democracy, where leadership is found in national development plans.

The concept of democracy based on several of the characteristics above has the potential for formulating a Pancasila model of democracy that is different from other models of democracy. Referring to David Held, democracy is divided into several models, namely the direct democracy model, the representative democracy model, the liberal democracy model, the social democracy model, the republican democracy model and the deliberative democracy model. These models are a historical continuity of types of democracy that criticize and perfect each other (Held, 2007).

Direct democracy is the first model of democracy that was born in Ancient Greece through the direct involvement of citizens in policy formulation in parliament. This direct involvement in parliament is possible due to the nature of the country as a city state (polis). Within the framework of direct democracy, Ancient Greek society appreciated the distinction between politics (polis) and economy (oikos). Politics is human action for the sake of creating the public good (res publica), while economics is human effort to fulfill private needs (res privata). These two realms must be separated, so that politics is not carried out for personal interests, but for the common good.

The direct democracy model is the ideal model of democracy, because it presents popular sovereignty without representation. Because political representation necessitates distantiation, where the people who are represented have the potential to not be represented by their representatives. It's just that along with the growth of vast nation-states, the ideal of direct democracy is difficult to realize. Finally, modern democracy practices representative democracy, where political parties become organizations that represent the sovereignty of the people.

Within the framework of this model of representative democracy, two political ideologies have developed. First, liberalism. Second, socialism. Liberalism in democracy gave birth to a model of liberal democracy which places individual interests as the main value in people's sovereignty. Liberal democracy is also characterized by the centrality of general elections (elections) as the main procedure in democracy. The liberal democratic model is the basis for the practice of political democracy, where democracy is the goal for fulfilling the civil and political rights of citizens. As the anti-thesis of authoritarianism, liberal democracy relativizes power through periodic elections, so that power always changes every five years. It's just that political democracy then becomes trapped into electoral democracy, where elections become the main measure of democracy (Adian, 2010: 45). In fact, elections and the fulfillment of political rights are the main prerequisites for the realization of the public good which is the goal of politics.

Covering the weaknesses of liberal democracy

A model of social democracy was born which was inspired by socialism. In this regard, democratic socialism is revisionist socialism which does not use revolution as its political mechanism, but uses democracy. Social democracy criticizes liberal democracy, because it glorifies individual interests too much through the fulfillment of political rights alone. Based on the principles of socialism, democracy is not only practiced for the sake of political equality, but also socio-economic equality. In this regard, political equality is not a goal, but a necessary condition for socio-economic equality. Even though it is the anti-thesis of liberalism, social democracy does not annul political democracy, but perfects political democracy. This means that apart from fighting for socio-economic equality, social democracy also upholds political equality (Gould, 1993).

In order to uphold the goals of social democracy, there are two models of democracy that strengthen it, namely republican democracy and deliberative democracy. Republican democracy is a model of democracy based on republicanism. A political philosophy that refers to the political idealism of Ancient Greece, which places the public good (*res publica*) as the essence of politics. In republicanism, politics is realized through active citizenship, where citizens are involved in politics in the public sphere. In this context, the political realm is not only in state institutions but also in the public sphere. What is meant by public space is the space between the state and society, where citizens are directly involved in influencing state policy (Cunningham, 2002).

The expansion of democratic practices in the public sphere gave birth to a model of deliberative democracy. This democratic model expands the realm of democracy, from the parliamentary space to the public space. In this context, deliberative democracy seeks to live up to the ideal of direct democracy through representative democracy. This is due to criticism of the weaknesses of representative democracy which is not optimal in fighting for the aspirations of the people. So, the people can be directly involved in policy formulation in the public sphere to criticize and influence public policies that have been formulated in parliament. In this regard, deliberative democracy has radicalized the meaning of deliberation from its traditional meaning to a progressive meaning in the context of deliberation between the people and the state. This deliberation or deliberation places public reason as the main measure in politics. (Hardiman, 2009)

Within the framework of these models of democracy, Sukarno's thoughts on Pancasila democracy can be used as material for formulating a new model of democracy. This new model is the new model of Pancasila democracy. The Pancasila model of democracy based on Sukarno's thoughts is an alternative to the Pancasila democracy slogan that has developed in Indonesian political history, especially in the New Order era which claimed to have upheld Pancasila democracy. In New Order political practice, Pancasila democracy was not truly based on the concept of democracy and the concept of Pancasila. Because the democratic slogan Pancasila is not based on democratic principles, such as civil and political freedoms in society (Crouch, 1969). On at the same time, the Pancasila democracy slogan in the New Order era was also not based on the concept of Pancasila, because the basic concepts of Pancasila according to the Pancasila Formulators had been abolished. This was marked by the abolition of the commemoration of Pancasila's Birthday since 1970. In fact, the commemoration of Pancasila's Birthday had occurred from June 1, 1964 to 1969. The elimination of the commemoration of Pancasila's Birthday marked the erasure of Sukarno's thoughts about Pancasila, even though his thoughts were the conceptual roots of Pancasila.

Therefore, the Pancasila model of democracy has not actually been formulated conceptually. For this reason, this article will formulate a new model of Pancasila democracy through the following principles:

First, The Pancasila model of democracy departs from two main models of democracy, namely deliberative democracy and social democracy. Deliberative democracy is a development of the method of deliberation for consensus initiated by Sukarno. However, deliberative democracy needs to be developed and strengthened based on the deliberative democracy model, so that deliberation does not only occur in the parliament room among the people's representatives. Limited deliberation in parliament was indeed a political context in the era when Pancasila was formulated, because at that time parliament had not yet been established. When parliament has been established and has weaknesses, deliberation needs to be expanded into the public space to involve the people in the democratic process (Latif, 2011).

The second model is the Pancasila model of democracy is social democracy. According to Sukarno's idea, social democracy is a model of democracy that perfects political democracy based on liberalism. Social democracy, which is a unity between the principles of democracy and social justice in Pancasila, became Sukarno's effort to present the total principles of political equality and socio-economic equality.

Second, The Pancasila democratic model is formed through the unity of the Pancasila principles. Therefore, as Roeslan Abdulgani views, Pancasila democracy is not formal democracy, but material democracy. This means that Pancasila democracy is not "form democracy", but rather "content democracy", namely democracy filled by the Pancasila principles as a unified concept (Abdulgani, 1962). In this context, Pancasila democracy is theo-democracy, namely democracy based on the value of the Almighty God. In Pancasila democracy, divine values are integrated with politics, so that God's sovereignty is presented through the sovereignty of the people.

Third, The Pancasila model of democracy improves the assessment of democracy in Indonesia. Because so far, the assessment of the quality of democracy carried out by the Central Statistics Agency (BPS) through the Indonesian Democracy Index (IDI) only uses three parameters, namely; political rights, democratic institutions and civil liberties. These three parameters actually depart from the political model of liberal democracy. This means that the assessment parameters of the IDI are limited to the fulfillment of civil and political rights. In fact, as mandated by Pancasila, democratic parameters must be strengthened by two other values, namely the involvement of the people in policy formulation through deliberation (deliberation) in the public sphere, as well as the ability of people's representatives and the government to improve the welfare of the people. The values born from the deliberative democracy and social democracy models must be included in this assessment, so that the quality of democracy is not minimalist, but maximalist.

CONCLUSIONS

The basics of the construction and content of Pancasila Democracy actually rest on social democracy which is formed in a unity of basic principles other than Pancasila, so that it is not limited to mere political democracy. Apart from that, Pancasila democracy is also based on deliberative democracy (deliberation) and leadership by wisdom. Meanwhile, since the implementation of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in August 2002, ultra-liberal democracy has developed. The basic character and sociological basis of Indonesian society, which is collectivist in nature, is forced to become individualistic.

Pancasila Democracy, which the New Order claimed was Pancasila Democracy, was actually not yet in the form of Pancasila Democracy. Even if it touches on the principles of Pancasila, it is only on the procedural side. We can still dialogue about this, but substantially it does not touch the basic philosophy of Pancasila as the basis of the state and as the ideology of the nation. Because the essence of Pancasila at that time was "sterilized" from its history, from the essence of the birth of Pancasila (*raison d'etre*), from the founders of Pancasila and from the formulators of Pancasila. What developed during the New Order era was a pure and consistent

conception of Pancasila originating from the philosophy and teachings of "Absolute Core Content" by Prof. Notonegoro, so that what happened was the "sterilization" of Pancasila. With this sterilization, Pancasila lost its ideological spirit, so it became dry. The interpretation and implementation of Pancasila without ideology has unknowingly provided a red carpet for the influx of liberalism, individualism and the rise of ethnicity in various regions in the name of democracy alone.

In thinking about Pancasila democracy, there really is a "conceptual vacuum" which has not been touched by many national thinkers and especially Pancasila thinkers who are increasingly decreasing or increasingly rare, resulting in a "shortcut" by adopting western concepts into the structure, nature, the contour, culture and texture in forming and institutionalizing the Indonesian political system after the 2002 Constitution (1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia), in fact became more Americanized (USA) than the US itself.

REFERENCES

- Abdulgani, Roeslan, 1962, *Resapkan dan Amalkan Pantjasila*. (Jakarta: BP Prapantja Djakarta)
- Budi Hardiman, F. 2009, *Demokrasi Deliberatif, Menimbang 'Negara Hukum' dan 'Ruang Publik' dalam Teori Diskursus Jurgen Habermas*. (Yogyakarta: Kanisius)
- C. Gould, Carol. 1993. *Demokrasi Ditinjau Kembali*. (Yogyakarta: Tiara Wacana)
- Crouch, Harold, 1969. *Perkembangan Politik dan Demokrasi*, (Jakarta: Yayasan Perkhidmatan)
- Cunningham, Frank. 2002. *Theories of Democracy, A Critical Introduction*. (London and New York: Routledge)
- Goode, Luke. 2005. *Jurgen Habermas: Democracy and Public Sphere*. (London: Pluto Press)
- Gahral Adian, Donny. 2010. *Demokrasi Substansial, Risalah Kebangkrutan Liberalisme*. Depok: Koekoesan.
- Harrison, Ross. 1993. *Democracy*. (London and New York: Routledge)
- Hatta, Mohammad, 1979. *Memoir*, (Jakarta: Tintamas Indonesia)
- 1977. *Pengertian Pancasila*, (Jakarta: CV Haji Masagung)
- Held, David. 2007. *Models of Democracy*. Abdul Haris (penerj.) (Jakarta: The Akbar Tandjung Institute).
- Latif, Yudi, 2011. *Negara Paripurna, Historisitas, Rasionalitas dan Aktualitas Pancasila*, (Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama)
- , 2018. *Wawasan Pancasila, Bintang Penuntun untuk Pembudayaan*, (Bandung: Mizan)
- Kusuma, AB. 2016, *Lahirnya UUD 1945*, (Depok: Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum UI)
- , 2017. *Menggugat Arsip Nasional*, (Depok: Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum UI)
- Notosusanto, Nugroho, 1981, *Proses Perumusan Dasar Negara*, (Jakarta: PN Balai Pustaka)
- , 1979, *Naskah Proklamasi yang Otentik dan Rumusan Pancasila yang Otentik*, (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka)
- Notonagoro, 1987. *Pancasila Secara Ilmiah dan Populer*, (Jakarta: Bumi Aksara)
- , 1959, *Pemboekaan Oendang-Oendang Dasar 1945 (Pokok Kaidah Fundamental Negara Indonesia)*, (Djogjakarta: UGM)
- Panitia Lima, 1977. *Uraian Pancasila*, (Jakarta: Penerbit Mutiara)
- Pranarka, AMW, 1985. *Sejarah Pemikiran tentang Pancasila*, (Jakarta: CSIS)
- Pusat, Yapeta, 1995. *Sejarah Lahirnya Pancasila*, (Jakarta: Yapeta Pusat)
- Said Ali, As'ad. 2009. *Negara Pancasila, Jalan Kemaslahatan Bangsa*, (Jakarta: LP3ES)
- Sekretariat Negara, 1991. *Risalah Sidang BPUPKI-PPKI*, (Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara RI)
- Sukarno, 1947. *Lahirnja Pantjasila*, (Jogjakarta: Oesaha Penerbitan Goentoer)
- , 1960. *Pantjasila Dasar Filfasat Negara, Kursus Bung Karno*, (Djakarta: Kementerian Penerangan RI)