

COMPARISON OF CONCEPTS AND PRACTICES OF CITIZENSHIP BETWEEN LIBERAL DEMOCRACY AND PANCASILA DEMOCRACY

Abdul Basit

Panca Marga University
Jl. Raya Dringu, Krajan, Pabean, Kec. Mayangan, Kota Probolinggo,
East Java, Indonesia 67216
abdulbasit@upm.ac.id

Abstract

This research focuses on how the existence of the world's great ideologies is between liberal ideology and Pancasila ideology. These two ideologies are studied and analyzed in depth, especially concerning conceptions and practices that lead to the existence of a democratic system in a country such as the United States and Indonesia. This study uses a qualitative approach with library research methods. The data collection technique uses documentation, while the data analysis used is content analysis. The results of this study indicate that the existence of the two world's great conceptions such as liberal democracy and Pancasila democracy remains the subject of a very long scientific discourse into the 21st century as it is today. The practice of liberal democracy and Pancasila plays its role according to the culture of each country. If liberal democracy focuses on the process of freedom and equality as happened in the United States and almost all European countries. In contrast to liberal democracy, Pancasila democracy is of serious concern to the people of Indonesia in which religion, culture, and the state constitution are integrated into one unit so that the political system of the nation and state of Indonesia runs as it should following the values of Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia.

Keywords: Comparison and good practices; Civic; Democracy; Pancasila.

A. Pendahuluan

The term citizenship has been evaluated to contain the proliferation of meanings starting from ancient Greece until today. Aristotle explained that citizenship is defined as politeness as someone who governs and is governed and is inseparable from political governance. In modern politics experienced by the Athenian community, citizenship participation has expectations in building the goals and aspirations of the state. The activity of each citizen as an instrument and inspiration in democracy aims for inclusive political life. However, this ancient concept is seen as a serious threat to rulers. It is for political reasons that, on the one hand, the concept of ancient Greek citizenship is eroded, and on the other

hand, the strengthening of the ancient Roman empire.

Contrary to Aristotle's concept, ancient Roman society believed that political rights were obtained when they were in the council and threatened the existence of freedom and protection of citizens' rights. Unlike ancient Greece and Rome, the pre-colonial condition in Sulawesi, Indonesia, has different citizenship terminologies (Henley & Candwell, 2019). The difference in citizenship terminology can be seen from the following table.

Table 1. Differences in terminology of pre-colonial European and Indonesian citizenship

Citizenship terminology/ Comparison	Ancient Greek	Ancient Roman	Pre-colonial Indonesia (Sulawesi)
Integralistic Political Community	Huge class gap between the aristocrats and non-aristocrats	There is a common ideological goal communally believed by the people and represented by their government	Only sparsely existed in several ethnic groups
Law and Justice Enforcement	Public Legal System	Judge-centered enforcement	Customary law
The conception of citizenship	Citizens are privileged to get involved in politics directly	Representative based politics	Based on a communal verdict
Political system	Contractual culture influences the formation of constitution and bureaucratization	Citizens have equal rights indiscriminately	Has a strong social stratification

Source: Henley & Candwell (2019)

In line with Henley & Caldwell's views, Klinken (2018) explains the dominance of local government in Indonesia in developing community economic resources. The role of the central government is very small, as they believe that the prerogative rights of village autonomy directly provide opportunities to manage various potential resources. This new decentralization movement is expected to be a driving force in providing full freedom to the community, which affects the fabric of life. The presentation of citizenship terminology is also supported by Indonesian democracy index data, which was still in the moderate

category in 2018 with a score of 72.39%, an increase of 0.28 points compared to 2017, which only reached 72.11%. Several changes are influenced by various factors such as a decrease in civil liberties, a decrease in political rights, and an increase in democratic institutions (Vera, 2019).

The definition of citizenship is an open element that combines different perspectives and crosses space and time. The formation of citizenship rooted in character and personality development results in new forms of expression of truth and concern for oneself and others (White & Hunt, 2000). The idea or concept of citizenship includes equality, individuality, autonomy, freedom, rights, obligations, ownership, public good, debate in open forums, representation, inclusion and exclusion, people's sovereignty, and commitment to various types of communities or governments.

The idea of citizenship is a central point in the modern struggle for democratic citizenship, which is also an important concept in analyzing international conflicts that impact natural resource scarcity and the world economy (Turner, 1997). The Marshall citizenship model remains the main reference, which emphasizes civil freedom and civil rights as essential elements of citizenship (Budimansyah et al., 2022). The need for a vision of citizenship in the world as the root of national identity is eroded by global economic changes that tend to divide civil society (Turner, 2009). In addition, ongoing tensions make opportunities for life, rights, and provision to face challenges with the rapid population growth and declining economy (Turner, 2010). The increasing number of economic unemployment causes changes in the social-economic finalization caused by the finalization of capitalism. Therefore, defending citizens becomes very important (Turner, 2011). Issues of citizenship in multicultural societies (nation-state) that are divided into ethnocultural, citizenship, and religious

aspects collaborate in realizing the necessary social solidarity of society (Turner, 2012).

Various issues of citizenship will continue to occur if the state cannot provide a clear conception in its governance practices. One popular citizenship conception that is still relevant and applied by Western and US countries is the conception of liberal democratic citizenship. The concept of liberal citizenship is defined as the concept of the freedom of thought, worship, and expression, which is the best way to achieve truth and improve social life (Mill in Schunk, 2002). The core concept of liberal democratic citizenship is about the primacy of individual roles and freedoms. The individual is in the most important position. Schuck (2002) stated that the individual is a form of all social aggression, including the state. The liberalism movement focuses on maximizing the fulfillment of individual rights.

Basically every nation-state (nation-state) wants to always be present in educating its people to become smart and good citizens, one of which is by providing an understanding of the conception of democratic citizens (Budimansyah, 2010). If you look at the concept of democratic citizenship that is currently applied in Indonesia, it is based on Pancasila. Pancasila has its own views, ideas and ideals about the concept of ideal citizenship. However, the concept of Pancasila citizenship is not the antithesis of other citizenship concepts including the concept of liberal citizenship. Precisely Pancasila, either directly or indirectly, intentionally or unintentionally tries to bring together elements of other approaches to citizenship so carefully. These elements are then formulated as the concept of an ideal citizen in Indonesia (Latif, 2015).

The basic difference between the conception of liberal democratic citizenship and Pancasila democratic

citizenship is in the aspect of religiosity or religion and culture. If the conception of liberal democratic citizenship constitutionally ignores the role of religion in the life activities of democratic citizens while the conception of Pancasila citizenship must originate from the noble values of the Indonesian nation. Religious values cannot be separated in the practice of citizen democracy including political rights, social rights and civil rights. The value of religiosity or religion is the core of all life activities of Indonesian citizens who are independent, united, sovereign, just and prosperous.

B. Research Method

This study used a qualitative approach and library research methods (Library Research). Library research itself is a bibliographic research with a scientific system and uses data collection techniques with various bibliographical materials related to research objectives (James, 2014). To conduct library research, a researcher must follow several steps contained in library research. The steps in library research are 1) determining the research topic, 2) collecting information or data related to the research object, 3) conducting research focusing, 4) searching for documents (reading materials) and classifying the documents that have been obtained, 5) the researcher makes a research note, 6) conducting a document review, 7) reclassifying documents and finally compiling or writing a report (Zed, 2004). Data collection techniques in this study used documentation (journal articles, national and international proceedings, books or e-books, dissertations, theses, online and print media, magazines and so on). The data analysis technique in this study used content analysis, which attempted to describe the results of the analysis conducted by the researcher. The data analysis used in this study is content data analysis or content study, which is a research method that utilizes several procedures to draw conclusions from valid

data from several documents (journals, seminar proceedings, books, internet, online news and so on).). The data analyzed in this study are related to the conception and best practice of liberal democracy in America and Europe with Pancasila democracy in Indonesia.

C. Results and Discussion

1. Citizenship According To Liberal Democracy and Pancasila

The liberal democratic conception of citizenship maximizes individual rights by reducing state involvement to a minimum, especially in individual affairs. This concept of liberalism is a critique of and resistance to discriminatory feudalism by defining individual politics and economic opportunities by membership of certain groups. Based on this experience, liberal democratic citizenship emphasizes the equality and independence of its citizens as its basic commitment (Kymlicka, 1995). Furthermore, Locke (1960) views the individual as a gift that is represented by reason and characterized as the voice of God. who can discern and act on divine orders as a gift of natural law.

From birth, all people have a gift that is the basis for all their decisions to leave the natural environment and enter into the civil and political community. Natural laws and reason to understand them tend individuals to consider not only their own interests but also the interests of others. Thus it is necessary to value social cooperation and self-control. Freedom under government, for Locke, is not only the absence of outside restraints but also living according to one's wishes. These are fixed rules to be followed, common to everyone, and established by the legislative power established within them (Locke, 1960).

For Locke and the liberal theorists who followed him, private property was an essential condition for individual freedom as its ultimate goal. Locke's property theory, which has received much attention from politicians, relates to three elements

that are essential to liberal democratic citizenship. First, the idea that individuals create private property and profit by investing it through recruiting labour. Second, the protection of public and private property is the most important function of law and government. Third, lawful use of property naturally results in inequality without injustice. Furthermore, Mill (1951) said that the unlimited freedom of individual thought, inquiry, worship, and expression is the surest path to truth and social improvement. Individual freedom of action can be limited to more than freedom of thought. Mill proposed that by making rules to preserve the domain, self-promotion of a very wide range of individual liberties while also minimizing the scope for government intervention.

The basic principles of the concept of liberal democratic citizenship focus on a) the primacy of individual freedom understood primarily as freedom from state interference in private interests and property, broad protection of freedom of inquiry, opinion, and worship; b) excessive state power over individuals; c) restrictions on state power over areas of activity that can influence other people; and d) strong, though disputable presumptions in favor of privacy, markets, and other forms of private desire (Mill, 1951; Locke 1960). However, many revolutionaries exposed liberal ideas and ideas openly. Issues of race, the civil rights movement (individual rights and social rights), and changes in the socio-economic impact of society exclusively must be fair and equal so as to minimize the occurrence of prolonged conflicts in the United States (Turner, 2011).

In terms of universalism that occurred in modern countries, especially in the 19th century, social rights and other formal rights were formed through settlement movements that originated and had faith (religion), subjective interpretation, and respect for certain people which then formed social patterns

and large-scale policy reforms. large (Villadsen & Turner, 2015). In addition, through the European Social Forum in Florence, Italy, it was indicated that citizens carried out large-scale demonstrations with the aim of forming a new, pluralist democracy. Because of this, freedom movements were born in various countries, including the United States. They expect a new citizenship paradigm in which citizens' rights to freedom and participation determine a new order of life and must not be taken away by the authorities (Conway, 2004).

Meanwhile, the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship provides space for individuals or families, ethnic communities, religions and groups to develop their own particular understanding. Latif (2015) explained that the private area of the community and the public can be categorically distinguished, but in the reality of life these things cannot always be separated. The concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship is different from liberalism or other views which can arbitrarily intervene in private and community areas in citizenship. The concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship views private moral sources, community, religion, local wisdom and others as mutualistic, not segregation of one race to another. Individual or private values are an integral part of the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship itself.

Pancasila's conception of democratic citizenship does not intend to intervene in the development of private and community morals but can wisely prevent the development of private and community morals which can endanger public life (Latif, 2015). The contents of the human rights articles are spelled out in detail from article 28A to article 28J of the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. These articles mean that the private sphere is the core value of Pancasila. In contrast to other conceptions of citizenship, the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship tries to integrate the three

major world concepts, namely liberal, republican or other concepts into a formula known as the Pancasila precepts. At the same time, the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship also prevents the danger of privatizing the concept of good life as practiced in a liberal society. But on the other hand, it must be realized that this conception is only relevant if it is interpreted openly, for example with respect to universal human values such as the concept of human rights. Therefore, the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship is always interesting if it is studied and examined in depth through scientific discourses in the public sphere. Thus, the conception of Pancasila democratic citizenship takes part in the process of forming collective consciousness for a nation state like Indonesia (Otto, 2015).

2. Citizenship Practice in Liberal Democracy

As a result of these cultural and religious differences, a debate arises between religion and citizenship to fight in providing solutions to social solidarity (Turner, 2012). Meanwhile the New Deal social program can alleviate poverty, unemployment assistance, job training and social insurance are also considered to strengthen the negative treatment of minorities and women's rights. Discriminatory treatment of minorities and women's rights became smaller when power was held by Ronald Reagan in the United States and Margaret Thatcher in England. Reducing threats to social rights has a positive impact on minorities and women's rights so that upper-class groups, both those based on birth and ethnic and political dominance, urge new regulations regarding multicultural citizenship that the government must pass in the form of laws.

Liberal democratic citizenship is inseparable from the rights of citizens in political, economic and social aspects. The existence of social, economic and cultural communities, associations or groups is

necessary in order to avoid conflicts resulting from racial, ethnic and religious disparities. Liberal democratic citizenship is needed to provide an understanding that good citizens do not come from political activity but from respect for equality that appears in society as a shared participatory ideal. In realizing these ideals, a national education system is needed which must accommodate the diversity of its citizens so that it is hoped that the goals and ideals of the country can be maintained (Rothblatt, 1993). However, today after the promulgation of the declaration of world human rights, the state system in the world has changed significantly. Conquest or expansion became a highly reprehensible thing in the world. Individual freedom from being colonized is highly respected. This has a major impact on the pattern of citizenship of a person in a country. Liberal democratic citizenship is understood that citizens are no longer based on ethnicity, race, and even religion but on equality and justice. A person will become a citizen if he is legally declared a citizen of a country as a citizen. Citizenship can also be obtained by applying to the country concerned, regardless of ethnicity, race or religion (Aziz, 2016). Civil citizenship, such as in England and ethnic citizenship in Germany, signifies a constructive and complex change of citizenship despite the gulf between citizenship based on *jus sanguinis* and citizenship based on *ius soli*. In Germany there is a difference between native citizens and immigrants who are associated with migration and terrorism even though they are included as *ius soli* citizenship. It is different in England, where different nationalities between native citizens and immigrants are indirectly and openly racialized (Diez & Squire, 2008). If you look at a broader level, local and national identities even work hand in hand in strengthening the role of citizenship so that a new culture is formed that is in accordance with their wishes, as happened in Manchester and

Chicago (Diggett, 2021). But the fact is that local identity has a large and continuous influence on the social rights and political rights of citizens (Fahrmeir & Jones, 2008). In fact, the stronger the social and political ties formed by the community or society, the greater and more effective the commonwealth in England is (Sacks, 2007). In contrast to the views above, the liberal democratic citizenship that developed in Germany made collective identity and equality occurred between Muslim immigrants and native Germans by emphasizing tolerance and non-discrimination (Joppke, 2008).

3. Citizenship Practice in Pancasila Democracy

The conception of Pancasila democratic citizenship in Indonesia can be reflected in the contemporary citizenship of Balinese citizens where political, social and religious practices are interrelated between the government and society. Balinese society or community jointly increases participation in order to supervise the government so that it does not act arbitrarily. If restraint or violations are found from the local or village government, they will petition and seek protection from other nearby village governments (Creese, 2019). If you look at the concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship which is pluralist and multicultural, apart from being carried out by religion and cultural values it is also played by the values of Pancasila itself. The concept of Pancasila democratic citizenship is the locus of contextualization of the universal concept of human rights so that it becomes part of the life of the people in Indonesia as a whole. Pancasila's conception of democratic citizenship also prevents the danger of privatization of the concept of good life (liberal democracy) or other concepts of democratic citizenship. This concept does not require a religious state in Indonesia that has diverse cultures, ethnicities and beliefs (Makin, 2017)

If examined universally, the practice of Pancasila democratic citizenship can only be accepted as the ideological basis and way of life for a pluralist and multicultural Indonesian society. Equality of rights, obligations and responsibilities of citizens in accordance with human values as contained in the second precept of Pancasila. In the political field, every citizen has the same rights and is guaranteed in law (the fourth precept of the Pancasila). There are similarities between Pancasila democratic citizenship and modern liberalist citizenship in the United States which lies in the plurality and heterogeneity of society based on race, ethnicity, religion and others.

The practice of Indonesian democracy is actually inspired by Pancasila as a philosophical system in which the precepts in Pancasila are hierarchical and pyramidal in shape which places the precepts of Belief in One and Only God as the first precept which occupies the broadest level because it is the basic basis of the other four precepts (Lasiyo et al, 2019). The first precept also hierarchically underlies and animates the other precepts (Notonagoro, 1975). Pancasila as a philosophical system is also an organic unit that is interrelated, interconnected and mutually qualifying (Kaelan, 2013). This is a logical consequence in the conception and practice of Pancasila democratic citizenship in which there is a causal relationship between the state and the foundation of the Pancasila precepts and is comprehensive (Bakry, 2010).

However, in practice Pancasila democratic citizenship has a very complex pluralism and is divided into two perspectives namely horizontal and vertical. The horizontal perspective is seen from differences in religion, ethnicity, regional language, geography and culture while the vertical perspective looks at differences in levels of education, economy, social and culture. The plurality phenomenon, on the one hand, has a

positive impact by enriching rich cultural treasures, on the other hand, it has a negative impact by causing conflict between community groups which causes instability in security, political, social, cultural and economic aspects (Suryana & Rusdiana, 2015). Kymlicka (2002) adds that the practice of liberal citizenship is often faced by minority groups who are vulnerable to becoming victims of discrimination even though they only want their identity to be recognized. In contrast to Kymlicka, Triadafilopoulos (1997) said that minority groups must have affinity with those who are different so that their original culture is protected.

The state guarantees legal and ethical autonomy to citizens as juridical individuals where each person can define himself as an ethical person and build social interactions with others as happened in Indonesia (Otto, 2015). Human freedom is expressed through autonomous decisions and based on conscience that cannot be intervened by outside agencies (cf. Franz, 1999). Freedom can regulate itself from within the moral substance of each individual and the homogeneity of a society. The danger of totalitarianism begins to peek when the state, for example through positive law, wants to regulate the conscience and personal preferences of citizens. Here the state has the ambition to regulate everything, including the way of thinking and morality of its citizens, which should be impossible to implement. The state's ambition creates conflict and endangers general peace because it denies the existence of plurality of culture, religion, behavior and freedom of thought in a modern democracy (Otto, 2015). Pancasila as an ideology of a multicultural Indonesian society must be able to ward off tendencies of liberalism or other notions that try to re-question the distinction between state and society, between juridical and ethical persons and want to revive a state of truth (religious regime, ideology, way of life).

Pancasila democratic citizenship emphasizes the rights, obligations and responsibilities of citizens in their social roles and status. Juridically with regard to the status of Indonesian citizenship, it turns out that it really respects and protects human rights. In articles 4 to 6 of Law Number 12 of 2006 concerning Citizenship, Indonesia has accommodated the rights of citizens to obtain citizenship status with limited dual citizenship. This is also reinforced in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia article 28D paragraph 4 which reads that everyone has the right to citizenship status. This means that the legal politics of Indonesian citizenship through this constitutional and statutory basis has made significant progress in the protection of human rights and the gender of citizens both within the country and outside (diaspora) such as Indonesian workers in Malaysia (Killias, 2014).



Picture 1. Indonesian Expatriates at Malaysia

Given the importance of the public role of religion, the practice of Pancasila democratic citizenship makes corrections to the thesis of the privatization of religion by liberals, and advocates a paradigm of differentiation in the relationship between religion and the state. This is because when religion is cornered from the public sphere to the private sphere, what emerges is an expression of personal spirituality that is disconnected from public life. In contrast, western secular politics despise religious values and ignore the moral significance of God. The result of this situation of mutual neglect is spirituality without social responsibility and politics without soul. For this reason, both

religious and secular based fundamentalism must be avoided. The rise of corruption in the midst of the rapid development of religions in Indonesia is visible evidence that religion is still lived as a private devotional rite and has not yet become a moral force in the public space (Otto, 2015).

Belief in God within the framework of Pancasila democratic practice expresses the commitment of the Indonesian nation to organize political-public life on the basis of universal moral values of religions and noble character. The moral crisis facing modern society and the phenomenon of the rise of religions in a secular society make the divine paradigm within the framework of Pancasila democratic citizenship practices important and increasingly relevant. Since the 1990s, in Western society, the secular paradigm that marginalized religion into the private sphere began to falter and religious themes returned to enliven public discourse. Habermas, for example, considers himself "religios un usikalisch" (religiously gifted) to re-realize the important role of religion in the public sphere and develop the concept of a post-secular society. Pancasila does not want a state religion in Indonesia. But that doesn't mean that Pancasila's democratic citizenship agrees with the views of liberals who see religion as a purely private matter. Pancasila requires that religious values be translated into public morality. Here the concept of divinity in Pancasila plays a role like civil religion which deals with public morality and does not interfere with personal morality and beliefs (Otto, 2015).

By making Pancasila the basis of ideology does not mean that the Indonesian state ignores the principle of state neutrality. An ideologically neutral state is more than a bureaucratic institution. The neutrality principle of the modern state has at least three meanings. First, the neutrality of the result or consequence. That means the application of liberal principles has the same

consequences for all communities within a country. Second, goal neutrality. The liberal state can never prioritize certain concepts of the good life over other views or ideologies. This is exactly what happens when a state is founded on the basis of a certain religious ideology. Third, neutrality legitimacy or justification (Otto, 2015).

The basis of the legitimacy of the principles of justice must not be based on certain communal ethical values but rests on universal and impartial moral concepts. The neutrality principle of liberalism is an achievement of human civilization and has succeeded in overcoming the conflict between religion and ideology that plagued European society. This concept can be applied in multicultural Indonesia so that differences and diversity do not become a source of conflict but a nation's wealth. Countries that adhere to the principle of neutrality can still play a role politically so that discourses around ideology, views on life and the concept of a good life are objects of thematization in the public sphere (cf. Forst, 1993).

In the entire process of public discourse around the view of life, Pancasila can act as a normative substance that provides guidance so that shared life values such as tolerance, freedom, equality, solidarity, obedience to law and abstinence from violence are maintained and upheld. Thus Pancasila can become the basis for recognition in a multicultural society so that each individual, group, outlook on life and religion can manifest themselves authentically without endangering others. This is also reinforced by Ubaedillah's question (2018) that although Islam in particular is not a state ideology, Indonesia's initial success as a democratic country cannot be separated from the share of the Muslim majority.

4. Citizenship Concept in Pancasila Democratic System Today

The practice of Indonesian democratic citizenship has remained an important phenomenon in Indonesian politics over the last two decades.

Democracy has become an important source of self-identification in Indonesia's ontological struggle driven by colonial stigma and existential anxieties. Similar to sovereignty and unity, the idea of democracy has been used repeatedly for many purposes including the development of the modern Indonesian state and the strengthening of self-awareness. Recently thanks to global politics and security, Indonesia's democratic identity has been acknowledged and showcased by the west. This democratic identity has fostered a sense of pride in achieving modernity which has long sought the social agency and ontological security of the state (Nguitragool, 2020).

Liberal ideas have actually emerged and have influenced Indonesia's legal, economic and political structures and have developed rapidly in various media, professions, academics and civil society organizations and reached their peak in unique and interesting circumstances after the post-Soeharto period (Bourchier & Yusuf, 2022). The demand for democracy echoes throughout the regions in the country (Uhlin, 1993). Various scientific discourses and consolidation on democracy took place during this transitional period. This was done in order to increase the sense of nationalism of the Indonesian nation (Eddyono, 2020). Meanwhile, repeated attempts to establish a political vehicle for overtly liberal democracy have found little traction in an Indonesian political environment dominated by nationalist and Islamist parties. The poor New Order regime had an impact on Pancasila democracy which was seen as delusional and Pancasila democracy itself cannot be contested in national political life (Iskandar, 2016).

In this context of increasing democracy, the role of the people represented by non-governmental organizations (NGOs) can contribute to the thinking and practice of Indonesian democracy by upholding participatory and open values (Eldridge, 1996). In addition,

the role and existence of the ulama through the NU, Muhammadiyah and MUI organizations are very important in order to defend Islamic values while maintaining and upholding the democratic values of Pancasila from what becomes a distortion of Islamic values themselves (McGregor, 2002). Thus, the various roles played by the community through various NGOs and various religious organizations have contributed to developing the Indonesian state, especially during the identity crisis era after the fall of President Suharto.

Apart from being the largest Muslim country in the world, it cannot be denied that Indonesia is also the third largest democracy in the world (Hefner, 2019). Often Indonesia's political democracy is structured. This means that the subject matter of Indonesian politics revolves around the Islamic religion and the Indonesian people (Duile & Bens, 2017). Various pesantren movements and Islamic thought have also influenced young Indonesian intellectuals (Barton, 1997). However, it is factually undeniable that the Pancasila democratic process began when President Suharto stepped down in 1998 when the student demonstration movement became the main reference (Ubaedillah, 2018). Therefore, the democratic process during this transition period must be strengthened by harmonious relations between the community and the government so as to minimize the vertical conflicts that occur in Indonesia.

Today's Indonesian democracy, hit by various main problems in the Covid 19 case, has caused President Jokowi to be seen as giving way to the decline of Indonesian democracy through statutory regulations. The democratic system fades when citizens are limited in speaking and expressing criticism of the government. However, it is strange that the government has opened a wide space for the military and intelligence in public life in the name of pluralism. In Pancasila democracy there needs to be good governance and management between the central

government and local governments so that community members appreciate the performance of the leadership (Kuncoro et al, 2009).

However, the occurrence of discriminatory steps against some Islamic communities which are considered sectarian and intolerant by the government has further emphasized the weakening of the pillars of democracy in this republic. The president's reformist credentials have also been undermined by Jokowi's own decision to support the candidacy of his son and daughter-in-law in mayoral elections in two major cities, bringing accusations of dynasty and elitism (Fealy, 2020). Even Indonesia's democracy is currently being exacerbated and exacerbated by the issue of the three periods (Setijadi, 2021). Therefore, the government should reduce its egocentricity in order to prioritize the interests of the nation and state above individual interests, interests and groups.

D. Conclusion

The concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship makes individual and public spaces protected and developed by the Indonesian state. Moreover, the cultural traditions or wisdom that shape society's life are also protected and developed by the state, as stipulated in the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. Therefore, individuals, families, ethnic and religious communities can develop their particular ideologies under the auspices of Pancasila ideology. The concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship regards private, communal, and public spaces as categorically distinguishable in the reality of life and cannot be separated. The concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship has five fundamental values that must be practiced by all Indonesian citizens. These values include religiosity, humanity, nationalism, mutual cooperation, democracy, and social justice integrated into the national education system. Individual or private values

become an inseparable part of the concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship.

It cannot be denied that Indonesia is a multicultural and pluralistic society. In a multicultural society, communal values need to be transformed into public ethics to be accepted by everyone. The concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship is nothing but this public ethics that has overcome communal barriers. As the foundation of the state, Pancasila also provides normative guidelines whether certain communal values are acceptable as common norms in the public sphere or not. In continuous dialogue with national and global values, the concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship shows its dynamism as a national identity. An identity that is always open to reinterpretation.

Speaking of significant and sustainable influence, Pancasila not only becomes an ideology and the foundation of the nation-state but also a democratic system so that every highly diverse Indonesian citizen can carry out their activities properly. Therefore, the concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship must always be thematized in public discourse or political debate. Thus, the concept of Pancasila democracy citizenship continues to be part of the process of forming the collective consciousness of the Indonesian nation in the present and future.

Pancasila democracy that existed in Indonesia after the fall of President Soeharto underwent a transition period. This is based on the widespread and widening lack of public trust in the government. Various elements that have been represented by community and religious organizations such as NGOs, Nahdlatul Ulama, Muhammadiyah and MUI have contributed to protecting the internal peace of Indonesian society. However, nowadays the level of democracy in Indonesia has also decreased. The public's dissatisfaction with the government's performance is the reason why the public even criticized

President Jokowi when freedom of speech and constructive criticism were threatened. This was exacerbated by the entry of sons and daughters-in-law to become mayors in two big cities and the issue of the three periods that echoed in various media so that it is only natural for the public to judge that Indonesian democratic politics has turned into dynastic politics, oligarchy and elitism.

REFERENCES

- Aziz, A. (2016). Dhimmi dan konsep kewarganegaraan: perspektif klasik dan modern. *Jurnal Studi Islam*, 11(2).
- Bakry, N. M. (2010). *Pendidikan Pancasila*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar
- Barton, G. (1997). Indonesia's Nurcholish Madjid and Abdurrahman Wahid as intellectual Ulama: The meeting of Islamic traditionalism and modernism in neo-modernist thought, *Islam and Christian-Muslim Relations*, 8(3), 323-350.
- Bdk. Franz, M. S. (1999). *Etika Politik. Prinsip-prinsip Moral Dasar Kenegaraan Modern*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Bdk. Forst, R. (1993). *Kommunitarismus und Liberalismus - Stationen einer Debatte*, dalam: Axel Honneth (ed.): *Kommunitarismus. Eine Debatte über die moralischen Grundlagen moderner Gesellschaften*. Frankfurt/Main/ New York: Campus Verlag, 1993, 181-219.
- Budimansyah, D. (2010). Tantangan global terhadap pembinaan wawasan kebangsaan dan cinta tanah air di sekolah, *Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 11(1).
- Budimansyah, D., Arpanudin, I., Kusnadi, Arif, D.B., Mulyono, B., Alrahman, R., Tarsidi, D.Z., Wantoro, T., Sukmayadi, T. Iswandi, D dan Rawanoko, E.S.

- (2022). *Studi kewarganegaraan: konsep, teori, dan kerangka psiko-pedagogik*. Bandung: CV. Jendela Hasanah.
- Bourchier, D. & Jusuf, W. (2022). Liberalism in Indonesia: between authoritarian statism and islamism. *Asian Studies Review*, 1(2).
- Conway, J. (2004). Citizenship in a time of empire: the world social forum as a new public space, *Citizenship Studies*, 8(4), 367-381, doi: 10.1080/1362102052000316972.
- Creese, H. (2019). Acts of citizenship? rulers and ruled in traditional Bali, *Citizenship Studies*, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2019.1603269.
- Diez, T. & Squire, V. (2008). Traditions of citizenship and the securitisation of migration in Germany and Britain, *Citizenship Studies*, 12(6), 565-581.
- Diggett, P. (2021) After the shock city: urban culture and the making of modern citizenship, *Cultural and Social History*, 18(4), 601-603
- Duile, T. & Bens, J. (2017). Indonesia and the “conflictual consensus”: a discursive perspective on Indonesian democracy, *Critical Asian Studies*, doi: 10.1080/14672715.2017.1295358.
- Eddyono, S. (2020). Competing nationalisms in post-new order Indonesia, *Nationalism and Ethnic Politics*, 26(4), 421-439, doi: 10.1080/13537113.2020.1843775.
- Eldridge, P. (1996). Development, democracy and non-government organizations in Indonesia, *Asian Journal of Political Science*, 4(1), 17-35, doi: 10.1080/02185379608434070.
- Falk, R. (2000). The decline of citizenship in an era of globalization, *Citizenship Studies*, 4(1), 5-17.
- Fahrmeir, A. & Jones, H. S. (2008). Space and belonging in modern Europe: citizenship(s) in localities, regions, and states. *European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire*, 15(3), 243-253.
- Fealy, G. (2020). Jokowi in the covid-19 era: repressive pluralism, dynasticism and the overbearing state, *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 56(3), 301-323, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2020.1846482.
- Gordon, A. & Stack, T. (2007). Citizenship beyond the state: thinking with early modern citizenship in the contemporary world, *Citizenship Studies*, 11(2), 117-133.
- Harris, P. (2002). The origins of modern citizenship in China, *Asia Pacific Viewpoint*, 43(2), 181-203.
- Hefner, R.W. (2019): Whatever happened to civil Islam? Islam and democratisation in Indonesia, 20 Years On, *Asian Studies Review*, doi: 10.1080/10357823.2019.1625865.
- Henley, D. & Caldwell, I. (2019). Precolonial citizenship in South Sulawesi, *Citizenship Studies*, 23(3), 240-255, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2019.1603271.
- Herzog, T. (2021). Early modern citizenship in europe and the americas: a twenty years’ conversation, *Ler História*, 78
- Hettne, B. (2000). The fate of citizenship in post-westphalia, *Citizenship Studies*, 4(1), 35-46.
- Hindess, B. (2002). Neo-liberal citizenship. *Citizenship Studies*, 6(2), 127-143.
- Iskandar, P. (2016). The Pancasila delusion, *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, doi: 10.1080/00472336.2016.1195430.
- Kaelan. (2013). *Negara Kebangsaan Pancasila: Kultural, Historis, Filosofis, Yuridis dan*

- Aktualisasinya*. Yogyakarta: Paradigma.
- McGregor, K. E. (2002). Commemoration of 1 October, "Hari Kesaktian Pancasila": a post mortem analysis?, *Asian Studies Review*, 26(1), 39-72, doi: 10.1080/10357820208713330
- James, D. (2014). Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan. *Antropologi Indonesia*, 52, 82-92. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7454/a.i.v0i52.3318>
- Joppke, C. (2008). Immigration and the identity of citizenship: the paradox of universalism, *Citizenship Studies*, 12(6), 533-546, doi: 10.1080/13621020802450445.
- Killias, O. (2014). Intimate encounters: the ambiguities of belonging in the transnational migration of Indonesian domestic workers to Malaysia, *Citizenship Studies*, 18(8), 885-899, DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2014.964550.
- Klinken, G., V. (2018). Citizenship and local practices of rule in Indonesia, *Citizenship Studies*, 22(2), 112-128, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2018.1445489.
- Kuncoro, M., Widodo, T. & Ross H. McLeod, R. H. (2009). Survey of recent developments, *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 45(2), 151-176.
- Kymlicka, W. (1995). *Multicultural citizenship*. Oxford: Oxford University Press
- Kymlicka, W. (2002). *Kewargaan multikultural: Teori Liberal Mengenai Hak-hak Minoritas*. Jakarta: Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia.
- Latif, Y. (2015). *Revolusi Pancasila*. Mizan: Jakarta.
- Lasiyo, Soeprapto, S., Wikandaru, R. (2019). *Pancasila*. Tangerang: Universitas Terbuka.
- Locke, J. (1960) *Two treatises of government, ed., peter laslett*. New York: New American Library, revised ed.
- Makin, A. (2017). Not a religious state, *Indonesia and the Malay World*, doi: 10.1080/13639811.2017.1380279.
- Mill, J. S. (1951). *Utilitarianism, liberty, and representative government*. New York: E.P. Dutton & Co.
- Nash, K. (2001). Feminism and contemporary liberal citizenship: the undecidability of 'women', *Citizenship Studies*, 5(3), 255-268, doi: 10.1080/13621020120085234
- Nguitragool, P. (2020). Indonesia's sense of self, the West, and democracy: an ontological (in)security perspective, *Contemporary Politics*, doi: 10.1080/13569775.2020.1795372.
- Nyegaard, N. (2017). Heteronormative foundations of modern citizenship in early-twentieth-century Denmark. *NORA (Nordic Journal of Feminist and Gender Research)*, 25(1), 4-18.
- Otto, G. M. (2015). Pancasila dalam pusaran diskursus liberalisme versus komunitarisme. *Jurnal Studi Islam dan Humaniora*, 13(2).
- Rothblatt, S. (1993). Modern citizenship and mass higher educational systems in the United States. *Paedagogica Historica: International Journal of the History of Education*, 29(3), 719-733.
- Sacks, D. H. (2007). Freedom to, freedom from, freedom of: urban life and political participation in early modern England. *Citizenship Studies*, 11(2), 135-150.
- Setijadi, C. (2021). The pandemic as political opportunity: Jokowi's Indonesia in the time of Covid-19,

- Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 57(21).
- Schuck, P. H. (2002). Liberal citizenship. *Handbook of Citizenship Studies*, 131-144.
- Suryana, Y. & Rusdiana, H. A. (2015). *Pendidikan multikultural: suatu upaya penguatan jati diri bangsa konsep, prinsip dan implementasi*. Bandung: CV. Pustaka Setia.
- Thompson, M. R. (2000). Whatever happened to democratic revolutions? *Democratization*, 7(4), 1-20, doi: 10.1080/13510340008403682.
- Triadafilopoulos, T. (1997). Culture vs citizenship? A review and critique of will Kymlicka's multicultural citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 1(2), 267-277, doi: 10.1080/13621029708420658.
- Turner, B., S. (1997). Citizenship studies: A general theory, *Citizenship Studies*, 1(1), 5(18), doi: 10.1080/13621029708420644.
- Turner, B., S. (2009). T.H. Marshall, social rights and English national identity, *Citizenship Studies*, 13(1), 65-73, doi: 10.1080/13621020802586750
- Turner, B., S. (2010). Ralf Dahrendorf on citizenship and life chances, *Citizenship Studies*, 14(2), 237-244.
- Turner, B., S. (2011). Judith N. Shklar and American citizenship, *Citizenship Studies*, 15(6-7), 933-943, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2011.600110.
- Turner, B., S. (2012). Managing religions, citizenship and the liberal paradox, *Citizenship Studies*, 16(8), 1059-1072, DOI: 10.1080/13621025.2012.735029.
- Ubaedillah, A. (2018). Civic education for muslim students in the era of democracy: lessons learned from Indonesia, *The Review of Faith & International Affairs*, 16(2), 50-61, doi: 10.1080/15570274.2018.1469837.
- Uhlin, A. (1993). Transnational democratic diffusion and Indonesian democracy discourses, *Third World Quarterly*, 14(3), 517-544, doi: 10.1080/01436599308420340
- Undang-Undang Nomor 12 Tahun 2006 tentang Kewarganegaraan Indonesia.
- Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945.
- Vera. (2019). *Indeks Demokrasi Indonesia 2018 Meningkat Jadi 72,39*. <https://www.kominfo.go.id/content/detail/20322/indeks-demokrasi-indonesia-2018-meningkat-jadi7239/0/berita> diakses tanggal 27 Desember 2022
- Villadsen, K. & Turner, B., S. (2015). Tracing the roots of social citizenship: Jane Addams' thought between formal rights and moral obligation, *Citizenship Studies*, doi: 10.1080/13621025.2015.1107028.
- White, M. & Hunt, A. (2000). Citizenship: care of the self, character and personality, *Citizenship Studies*, 4(2), 93-116.
- Zed, M. (2004). Metode penelitian kepustakaan. Yayasan Obor Indonesia.