

**Pancasila Democracy versus Direct Democracy: A Review of the Concept of Civil Society**

Yakob Noho Nani

Department of Public Administration, State University of Gorontalo, Indonesia

**Abstract.** The emergence of the phenomenon of identity politics, money politics, primordialism and political pragmatism, which emerged as a consequence of the direct democratic system turned out to be different from its basic goal as an effort to increase the role and participation of the public in the era of political reform. The purpose of this study is to identify the basic norms of Pancasila democracy as the nation's personality to ensure the consistency of democratic values on a fundamental basis. To fulfill this, a comparison has been made between the norms of Pancasila democracy and the norms of direct democracy rooted in liberal democracy through a literature study with a qualitative approach.

Empirical facts show that; 1) the development of democracy demands a change in the underlying values; 2) there are linguistic causative factors and moderating factors that determine the quality of democracy; 3) countries have different philosophical norms from one another and lack an in-depth philosophical understanding; 4) there is an inconsistency of values caused by a lack of a basic understanding of the substance of democracy in a comprehensive manner, where democracy is merely an attempt to respond solely. This problem must be corrected so that it does not cause widespread and hereditary impacts in the administration of the state and government.

**Keywords:** Pancasila Democracy, Direct Democracy, Civil Society

**Introduction**

Democracy is a concept that must be understood from two fundamental paradigms. First, democracy is implemented as a reflection of the application of universal basic values such as humanity, justice and freedom as well as local wisdom. Both democracies are a reflection of the application of rational-empirical values that are applied as a response to injustice, discrimination and excessive domination of power.

In this context, directly implemented under the ideological foundations of liberalism and Pancasila democracy have different paradigms both philosophically and empirically rationally based on different empirical norms and values. There are no definite criteria about ideal democracy whether it leads to the application of philosophical values or tends to empirical values for sure, but there are moderating factors that also determine the quality of democracy, namely the extent to which the role of community involvement as a form of implementing civil society in a democratic system

Liberal democracy is rationally based on the concept of "individual freedom", which is believed to be born as a natural factor that is owned by each individual as a human right. The application of these natural values requires a competitive climate that can guarantee the actualization of individual freedom to participate directly in the democratic system. The hallmark of the application of liberal democracy is that it is carried out based on the constitution so that the state can guarantee the implementation of individual human rights in a competitive and supportive democracy.

Meanwhile, Pancasila democracy is based on cultural roots and philosophical values that are universal and empirical values that are rational. The form of Pancasila democracy is based on philosophical norms, religious and divine norms, and the values of the nation's personality. Meanwhile, direct democracy is empirically born as the antithesis of the application of religious norms that dominate and regulate individual freedom in excess. Liberal democracy tends to give birth to individualism behavior because it is driven by individual freedom and capitalism

as a change in the ideological aspect of the state. In contrast to Pancasila democracy, which is based on the principles of kinship and the values of *gotong royong* as a characteristic and personality, the national ideology is based on the motto *Bhineka Tunggal Ika*.

Pancasila democracy is run in a populist system led by wisdom as a fundamental philosophical reflection. Recognition of individual freedom is a manifestation of the manifestation of the independence of each nation which is a divine grace that must be used based on social functions. Therefore, the principle of democracy is always carried out in the principle of mutual cooperation and the principle of kinship in one brotherhood as one nation, one discussion and one flag in the noble personality of the Indonesian nation.

Pancasila democracy demands the role of the state to rationalize the interests of individuals, groups and the interests of the state, so that all of them can function socially. Individual ownership rights are recognized for the control of the factors of production but the control must be able to function socially to realize social justice. The difference between the two models of democracy can be described in a parable such as "water flowing in natural law, namely from top to bottom" are universal norms. While axiologically, water can be used for energy needs for various human needs. Thus Pancasila democracy and direct democracy are two different things both ontology, epistemology and axiology, where Pancasila democracy is not only based on rational-empirical aspects alone.

### **Historical Roots of "Civil Society"**

The concept of civil society is often found in various literatures which are generally categorized into two ideological interventions, namely from the ideology of liberalism and the ideology of socialism. Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679) in his book on Leviathan (Stark, 2003) understands civil or political society as a normative idea about the freedom and equality of citizens as a political unit. But classically, he held the view that it was not society that created the state, but through a "social contract", the presence of the community was united under state power. Hobbes gave rise to the theory of "social contract" or community agreement which states that the source of government power is community agreement (Darmawan, 1999).

Furthermore, the concept of civil society can also be traced from the concept of civil government, which was introduced by John Locke (1632-1704) in his book "Civilian Government" in 1690 (Azzuhri, 2009; Sofwan, 2017). The book has a mission to revive the role of society in facing the absolute power of kings and the privileges of nobles. In the mission of establishing a civilian government, Locke built the idea of "people's authority" to realize freedom from power and wealth. According to him, all can be realized through a parliamentary democracy that functions as a representative of the people and a substitute for the king's authority (Darmawan, 1999).

Meanwhile, Rousseau (1712-1778) through his book "The Social Contract" (1762 AD), talked about the authority of the people, and the political agreements that must be implemented between the individual people and the rulers (Colette, 2015). In this case, he shares the same goal with Locke, which is to invite individual people to participate in determining their own future, and to destroy monopolies carried out by the ruling elite for their own interests (Morris, 1999).

John Locke and J.J Rosseau expressed their thoughts on society and politics (State of Nature from John Locke and Social Contract and Rousseau) (Beenstock, 2016). In their view, both are a political society as a symptom of paternal authority or the natural state of a community group (Raharjo, 1999). Therefore, Raharjo stated that these two experts did not categorize the difference between civil society and the state. Because the state, more specifically, the government, is a part and a form of civil society in the context of one unity as a state. In fact, both of them assume that civil society is a civil government of natural

society or natural conditions (Raharjo, 1999).

In 1767 Adam Ferguson (1723-1816) published his classic "An Essay on the History of Civil Society" (1767). Then this work was developed by Hegel, Marx and Tocqueville (Azzuhri 2009; Darmawan 1999; Culla, 1999). The distinction between civil society and the state arises from the views of Hegel (1770-1831) (Sudiono, 2020), a German thinker who has attracted much attention, including Marx (Rahman, 2013). Hegel views that civil society is a sphere of life for people who have left the family unit and entered a competitive economic life (Raharjo, 1999). This is an arena, where certain or special needs and various individual interests compete, which has the potential to cause divisions, so that civil society contains a great potential for conflict within it (Macid, 1987).

It distinguishes civil society from political society (Raharjo, 1999), which is seen as a political society is the state. By Hegel, civil society is confronted with the state. Presumably, it is from Hegel's theory that the "dichotomy between state and society" is known (state and society). The above understanding of civil society is reversed by Hegel from the views of Locke and Rousseau. Civil society is their association between individuals who form what he calls "*Bürgerliche Gesellschaft*" or bourgeois society (Raharjo, 1999). For him, civil society is not the only one formed in a social contract. In other words, civil society is only one part of the overall political order. Another part of the political order is the state.

Hegel and his followers distinguish civil society from the state, the first is a form of association that is spontaneous and based on habits in society (customary values), but does not depend on law. While the second is legal and political institutions that protect society as a whole. Hegel recognized that civil society can be formed based on informal and formal values that direct and protect society.

In understanding the structure of Indonesian society, there are interesting things that can be drawn from Hegel's view and relevant to conditions in Indonesia, namely his view of civil society which was born naturally based on social values. Where Hegel idealizes the state that the state is part of the superstructure, which reflects the division of society into classes and the domination of the political structure by the dominant class. bourgeoisie (Azzuhri, 2009).. Because Indonesia is a pluralistic country that has a variety of different cultures and social norms, this group of people can be placed as part of the state structure.

Therefore, Soepomo, a legal expert and a member of the Investigative Agency for Preparatory Work for Independence (BPUPKI), stated that we in Indonesia tend to follow Hegel's ideal-state concept, combined with Muller's integralistic concepts and Spinoza's monism. He added that we view the state as the growth of the ideal values embodied in Pancasila. On the other hand, we also tend to be suspicious of civil society. Therefore, the leaders in power always tend to integrate civil society into the state, such as "*Manunggaling Kawulo lan Gusti*".

The term civil society in Indonesia first emerged from Australian scholars, at a conference held with the theme "State and Civil society in Contemporary Indonesia", 25-27 November 1988. The conference then gave birth to a book entitled State and Civil society in Indonesia (Prasetyo & Munhanif, 2002: 78-79). Since then, the term civil society has developed in Indonesia.

### Democracy Theory

The development of the concept of democracy cannot be separated from the discussion of the state, government system, civil society, and social culture. Democracy marks every change in human civilization in its interaction or relationship with the administration of the state. Democracy is a state system in the administration of power and government. The application of democratic values is an idealistic bet between universal (philosophical) human values and pragmatic community values in the application of power.

The application of democracy in Ancient Greece was a model of democracy that was run directly by citizens who had met the requirements in determining quality leadership. The quality of leadership is largely determined by the representation of society and is far from philosophical and religious values and norms. This model of democracy was criticized by Plato in his time. Plato is actually an aristocracy but Although Plato supports the idea of individual freedom, he prefers a political system in which the power to govern the polis is handed over to an elite group who has the best moral qualities, knowledge, and physical strength, known as "*the philosopher Kings*" (Syam, 2007).

Similar to Aristotle, democracy is not something ideal but only the most viable form (Azhari, 2010). His personal preference for monarchy is clearly seen in his book Politics. He gave little support to the proposition that democracy was the form of government that best suited human nature for his time and he agreed with Plato on the negative nature of democracy. According to him, the definition of freedom as a free person to live according to his own will, and for the sake of his own will is not correct. However, as he wrote in politics: "People, individually, have a great chance to be controlled by anger, or controlled by other feelings so that, as such, they make misleading judgments or decisions.

Democracy requires a comprehensive discussion not only to conduct direct elections but democracy is a complete system to ensure the application of ideology and the achievement of state goals. As understood by Lincoln, democracy is a form of government in which the supreme political authority and sovereignty are in the hands of the people who have the right to govern. Therefore, a democratic government is a government that gets the approval of the people or a government that already has a mandate to govern from the people in a people's government system or what Lincoln called "government by people" represented in the form of representative institutions on behalf of the people's interests (Sahdan, 2004).

From the point of view of the historical development of democracy, the Middle Ages produced an important document, namely the Magna Charta (Great Charter 1215). Magna Charta is a contract or agreement between several nobles and kings. Where the king is also bound by constitutional law (Zimmerman, 2015). Although this charter was born in a feudal atmosphere and did not apply to the common people, the Magna Charta is considered a milestone in the development of democratic ideas.

During the Enlightenment period, democracy developed rapidly and was implemented by European countries rooted in changes in the concept of democracy, including 1) natural individual freedom (Thomas Hobbes, Hegel) (Graham, 2014; Honneth, 2010); 2) social contract theory (Hobbes And John Locke) (Zimmerman, 2015); 3) civil society theory (Hobbes, Adam Ferguson) (Ferguson, 1980); 4) economic capitalism (economic and political system) (Holcombe, 2015); 5) monopoly group by joint group (Marx, 2010); and 5) separation of powers (John Locke, Montesque) (Gencer, 2010).

The thinkers of this era include Niccolo Machiavelli (1469-1527), Thomas Hobbes (1588-1679), James Harrington (1611-77) John Locke (1632-1704) and Montesquieu (1689-1755), David Hume (1711-76) (Adams & Dyson, 2003). This era was marked by the emergence of Republican thought by Machiavelli (Kramnick, 2019) and early liberalism or independent state of nature Thomas Hobbes and Locke (Sákéj & Henderson 2000; Grant, 2010) and the concept of a sovereign state separate from ecclesiastical power (Hobbes) (Sákéj & Henderson, 2000). Furthermore, the initial idea of a system of separation of powers (Montesquieu) (Krause, 1985) was introduced as an alternative to the absolutist model.

In the modern era, the development of democracy was marked by early thought in the democratic system which was the fruit of the enlightenment phase and the Industrial revolution which broke the domination of the Church as the legitimacy of the absolute monarchy system and ushered in two major revolutions that paved the way for the formation of a modern democratic system, namely the American Revolution (1776) (Schwarzmatel, 1998) and the

French Revolution (1789) (Kubesh, 2007). The American Revolution gave birth to a system of liberal democracy and federalism, while the French Revolution ended absolute monarchy and laid the groundwork for the protection of human rights.

The development of modern democracy is marked by the development of conceptual thinking about the state, class conflicts, nationalism, ideology and the relationship between the state and society and so on. In addition, the emergence of ideological disputes, especially between capitalism and communism. The most influential modern democratic thinkers include JJ Rousseau (1712-1778), John S Mill (1806-1873), Alexis de Tocqueville (1805-1859), Karl Marx (1818-1883), Friedrich Engels (1820-1895), Max Weber (1864-1920), and J. Schumpeter (1883-1946) (Hollander, 2016).

Rousseau made a conception of a "social contract" between the people and the ruler by which the legitimacy of the second party would be granted, and could be revoked at any time if he was deemed to have committed fraud (Abduh, n.d.). The idea and practice of civil disobedience (civil disobedience) as a legitimate resistance to the authorities was strongly influenced by Rousseau's thinking. In addition, John S Mill developed a conception of "liberty" (Macid, 1987) which became the main foundation of liberal democracy and a "modern representative" democratic system (Parliamentary system) in which he emphasized the importance of protecting individual rights from state/government intervention (Macid, 1987). The idea of a small and limited government is at the core of Mill's thinking which later developed in America and Western Europe.

De Toqcueville noted that the tendency of the state to intervene in social and individual life thus requires a counter force, namely "independent civil society" (de Tocqueville, 2001; Sofwan, 2017). Marx and Engels were the pioneers of radical thinkers and socialist-communist movements that wanted the "loss of the state" and the emergence of "democracy by the proletariat" or by the dictatorship of the proletariat. The state is regarded as the "executive committee of the bourgeoisie" and a tool created to exercise control over the proletariat. (Sidney, 1933). As long as the state is still an instrument of the bourgeois class, its existence must be removed (withering away from the state) and replaced by a model of direct government under a dictatorship of the proletariat. Marx and Engels considered the system of representative democracy proposed by the liberals as a means of maintaining the power of the bourgeoisie and therefore not as a genuine political vehicle capable of articulating the interests of the proletariat (Springborg, 1984). But how is it possible to do democracy without a state. This problem is a dead end when applying Marx's views.

Therefore, Max Weber are two thinkers who reject the idea of direct democracy in the style of Marx and emphasize the representative democracy system in Germany. The rational or at least functional element in Weber's political analysis, and especially his typological approach to leadership (Eliaeson, 1998). Joseph Alois Schumpeter is considered one of the greatest economists of the first half of the twentieth century. He redefines representative democracy which has been seen as a competition for leaders that democracy is an individual will, a common will or the common good. Democracy is basically a method that has no intrinsic value and its sole function is to choose a leader. To give birth to democracy, his leadership does not make sense because the leader always imposes his will and cannot be controlled by the voters, therefore competitive elections are a must (Eliaeson, 1998).

Thus, democracy is a competition of elite groups in society, in accordance with the process of change in modern society which is increasingly disaggregated according to functions and roles. With the development of bureaucracy, science and technology, and the modern division of labor system, it is no longer possible to create a system of government that is truly capable of directly accommodating the interests of the people. Effective democracy is through representation and carried out by those who have the ability, therefore in essence modern democracy is a competition of the elites (Rapar, 1996) especially governance (governance).

Thinkers like Robert Dahl, for example, say that democratic theory aims to understand how citizens exercise control over their leaders. For the control function, an independent organization on a large scale democracy is needed (Eliaeson, 1998). Thus the focus of democratic thought and theory is increasingly focused on the problems of general election processes or the competition of political parties, interest groups, and certain individuals who have the influence of power.

Indonesia is in the process of transforming from an authoritarian system to a democracy as aspired by its founders in the constitution. Inevitably, a comprehensive understanding of the concept of democracy is needed to implement democracy based on the norms of Pancasila. The right step for this nation is to apply the values of the nation's personality both in the order of the life system of the state, nation and society.

### **Development of Democracy in Indonesia**

Indonesia since the beginning of its independence has implemented the concept of democracy. The application of democracy did not experience rejection from all figures of the struggle for independence and the Indonesian people who had very diverse backgrounds. Even Muslims who come from a thick santri tradition do not display a strong rejection. Whereas in other places, Islam and democracy often cannot be reconciled (Makriif, 2009).

Democracy has actually long been coveted by figures such as Mohamad Hatta, Soekarno and Syahrir who received education in Europe studying the values of democracy in an independent country and very different from the implementation in Indonesia. They get more fair treatment in Europe than in their own country (Hatta, 2011). Although Indonesia's democracy at first did not reflect a clear form of democracy because it was constantly changing in its implementation.

Initially applied democracy tended to be similar to liberal democracy, namely implementing a parliamentary system in 1950 with the Constitution. The Constitution is considered inadequate for the implementation of Parliamentary democracy. The implication of implementing democracy is that it causes the ups and downs of the cabinet because no cabinet can last for two years. During parliamentary democracy the first elections were held in 1955, which are remembered as the most democratic elections.

The parliamentary democratic system did not get positive support from the military and they urged the president to end it immediately. 17 October 1952 Cannons were directed at the palace but the government was still able to deal with the situation (Adams, 2007). Finally, parliamentary democracy ended juridically with the issuance of a Presidential Decree on 5 July 1959, along with the re-enactment of the 1945 Constitution (Kurniawan, 2016). The decree began with the giving of the President's mandate to the Constituent Assembly on April 22, 1959. In his mandate, Soekar conveyed the main points of guided democracy, namely: 1) Guided democracy is not a dictator; 2) guided democracy is compatible with the personality and basic life of the Indonesian people; 3) Guided democracy means democracy in all matters of state and society, including politics, social and economics; 4) the essence of leadership in a guided democracy is deliberation led by wisdom; 5) In guided democracy, the opposition is required to produce healthy and constructive opinions.

In fact, guided democracy is also not in line with Pancasila values because it tends to lead to a concentration of power. And finally the practice of guided democracy often deviates from the values of Pancasila, the 1945 Constitution, and the nation's culture. Politics by combining nationalism, religion and communism in Nasakom Political understanding, this democracy eventually deviated from the basic norms of Pancasila and ended with the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) rebellion in 1965.

Furthermore, in the New Order regime, Indonesia's political direction was emphasized to re-implement the principles of Pancasila democracy, which was marked by the dissolution of

the PKI and declared a banned party. The government's mission is carried out to realize national stability and ensure the unity and integrity of the nation.

The transformation of democracy in this era of liberal-style democracy and guided democracy has not yet found its true form because the formulation of Pancasila democracy which is based on the fourth principle of Pancasila, namely democracy led by wisdom in wisdom is also still universal and requires substantive interpretation so that its implementation tends to depend on the regime. government. The government dominates the structure of the state and thinks it understands the affairs of politics and democracy best.

Finally, politics was implemented with a limited democracy system, with the simplification of political parties with three parties namely Golkar, PDI, PPP, where Golkar was the government party and was supported by the dual function of ABRI as an institution supporting the government's political power. Individualistic democracy and liberalization gradually influence this limited democracy model which is characterized by the application of economic liberalization.

Several irregularities also occurred, including: 1) Unfair and unfair election administration; 2) lack of guarantee of freedom of expression; 3) banning a number of media criticizing the government; 4) criminalization of individuals and groups who disagree with the government; 5) rampant practices of collusion, corruption, and nepotism; 6) restraint on campus discussions; 7) the party system is not autonomous; 8) kidnapping and enforced disappearance of a number of activists.

In the reform era, the Pancasila democratic system was reaffirmed by carrying out reform agendas in the political, economic, social and bureaucratic and government systems as well as increasing the role of civil society, holding direct elections.

To actualize the role of civil society and public services and participation, the political system was changed to a direct democratic system and required amendments to the 1945 Constitution. The administration of the bureaucracy also underwent a fundamental change with the addition of state institutions, the application of a decentralized system, an increase in the professionalism of the TNI/Polri which was marked by the abolition of ABRI Dual Functions.

Salamah (2010) mentions several deviations from the basic norms of Pancasila, among others: 1) The results of the amendments have eliminated the basic foundations of the state, such as the text of the 1945 proclamation, the preamble of the 1945 constitution, Pancasila, and the body of the 1945 constitution, becoming only based on the 1945 constitution. This has implications for the government system, which has an impact on further distancing the laws and regulations produced by the DPR from the state foundation that was aspired to in the proclamation of 17 August 1945, Unity in Unity which became the Pancer Pancasila, and the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution; 2) The loss of the role of the DPA Institution consisting of Sultans/Kings, traditional leaders and stakeholders in the archipelago, so that the policies, regulations, and laws produced by the DPR do not reflect full representation; 3) involving regional representatives (DPD) who do not have representative rights as law-forming institutions (Salamah, 2010)

Meanwhile, empirically, the implementation of direct democracy during the reformation era can lead to several negative implications, including: 1) Direct democracy tends to apply a rational approach to how large the number of votes is generated from minorities so that they are considered to be outside the system of government groups (opposition), the community will have consequences in the provision of assistance and there was even a transfer of bureaucratic officials because they were not in line with government politics (Harjanto, 2011); 2) the growth of perimordame in a democratic system; 3) increasing identity politics (Habibi, 2018; Nasrudin, 2019); 4) political pragmatism (Aminuddin & Ramadlan, 2015), because it is the constituent base that should be the main concern of democracy (Hasan, 2011; Tahir et al., 2020); 5) create social divisions (Fitrianingsih, 2019; Kusumawardani, 2004; Rozi, 2016); 6)

justify all means to achieve goals with money politics (Fitriah, 2017); 7) the emergence of political dynasties (Susanti, 2018), 8) the quality of democracy based on popularity (Hilmy, 2020) is far from basic norms (Canovan, 1999).

## Discussion

### The Roots of Pancasila Democracy

The root of Pancasila democracy is a democracy that was born from the personal values of democracy long before independence. Social life in Indonesia is structured in social strata as adopted in the royal system which is influenced by the application of religious beliefs and norms. One of the kingdoms that had the most extensive territory was the Majapahit kingdom (1293-1527).

According to Hendarji, Majapahit was familiar with the system of democracy, law and autonomy in the government system and implemented a hierarchical system in the government structure. Public relations with the royal government are largely determined by social stratification and the monarchy of the royal government. Society is divided into four groups or colors (strata) namely the Brahmin caste (religious leaders), the knight caste (king) and civil society, namely the Vaisya (sword) caste and the Sudra (slave) caste (Subardini, 2011).

In the modern democratic paradigm, this relationship can be categorized into two groups. First, the Brahmin and Kshatriya castes are groups of royal society (political society) and the Vaisya (traders) and Sudra (slave) castes are civil society groups. This condition is similar to Hegel's view of the existence of the state as a political community group and the existence of civil society as a civil society group (Raharjo, 1999).

People at this time are always accustomed to living in harmony and peaceful coexistence as described by Empu Tantular in the 14th century during the Majapahit era, describing this peaceful life in his book, known as Sutasoma, describing the existence of a single diversity in terms of social life. which is described in depth in stanza 5 pupuh 139. This stanza in full is as follows: "*Rwāneka dhātu winuwus Buddha Wiswa, Bhinnêki rakwa lightapan hit parwanosen, Mangkang Jinatwa kalawan iwatatwa Tunggal, Bhinnêka Tunggal ika tan hana dharma mangrwa*" (Pursika, 2009).

The deep philosophical wisdom contained in this book illustrates that people's lives are one unit in the clump of harmony, togetherness and live side by side peacefully in one principle of kinship and mutual cooperation. These basic values were later adopted by the founders of the nation as the basis for the source of ideology and Pancasila as the basis of the state which was set as the source of all sources of norms in the administration of the state, democracy and government. As in the fourth precept, it is stated that democracy is led by wisdom in representative deliberation.

### Pancasila Democracy versus Direct Democracy

Democracy must be understood comprehensively from two fundamental paradigms, namely democracy is a reflection of the universal application of philosophical values and also democracy is a reflection of the empirical application of rationality values.

A wrong understanding of the concept of democracy can even have negative implications in its application, for example the application of the principles of kinship and mutual cooperation in the Pancasila democratic system can have implications for the implementation of the bureaucracy which is always based on the principle of primordialism, giving birth to subjective behavior based on family closeness (nepotism) which can also lead to lazy behavior. in cooperation.

Likewise, in understanding the basic values of liberal democracy, if it is understood partially, it will have a negative impact on the concept of democracy itself. For example,



democracy will tend to be individualistic and lead to excessive secularism, the emergence of jockeying groups as stated by Marx and so on.

Pancasila democracy and direct democracy have philosophical roots and historical values and conceptual differences in implementing the civil security system in a fundamental way. Philosophically, these differences can be distinguished from the aspects of ontology, epistemology and axiology in the philosophical perspective and empirical rationale in the application of the concept of civil society.

### Ontology

**Direct democracy**, democracy as a reflection of liberal democracy was born as a response to the domination of power, the application of church norms. Born as a response to the monarchical system of government that failed to provide freedom and services to the community. The roots of the theory are based on "individual freedom" which is born naturally both politically, economically and socio-culturally. Democracy was born as a response to the application of religious values that legitimize the monarchical system in government and is always dominated by the church. Leads to religious values that always regulate patterns and individual freedoms in the state (Verhulst, Jos & Nijeboer, 2015). The implications of the theory affect the implementation of the state administration system, the division of government power and the representation system (Crum & Fossum, 2009; Neblo et al., 2018; Shackleton, 2017).

**Pancasila democracy**, democracy that was born as a response to colonial behavior and the domination of the power of the Indonesian state government which always ignores the basic norms of Pancasila which causes various deviations from the application of universal values such as: human values and justice and human rights. Democracy is born of norms that are universal in nature originating from religious norms and people's beliefs fundamentally as a bond between individuals and their beliefs as in the first principle of Pancasila.

Freedom is understood as the fulfillment of the basic "interests" of humanity universally and in stages from the interests of the state, the interests of the nation, basic group and individual interests. It is carried out within the boundaries of the agreement between nationality and nationalism as a consensus that binds every citizen in the paradigm of prioritizing the public interest above personal or group interests. As in Law Number 51 of 2009. Pancasila democracy recognizes; 1) equality of individual rights and obligations before the law and government without discrimination based on human values and justice which is born as individual human rights as stipulated in Law Number 39 of 1999 concerning Human Rights; 2) recognizing individual ownership and fulfilling individual interests but having social functions as reflected in Law Number 5 of 1960.

### Epistemology

**Liberal democracy**: 1) The application of individual basic rights constitutionally, as human rights inherent in each individual naturally (Fitrianingsih, 2019; Kusumasari & Arifianto, 2020); 2) recognizing individual freedom of association as a basic constitutional right (Brownlee, 2015; Shackleton, 2017); 3) fostering supportive competition in a democratic system in a fair and honest system of openness and democracy; 4) implementing the political rights of every citizen in making their choice, either through direct democracy or representative democracy (Alexy, 2005).

**Pancasila democracy**: 1) Recognizing the basic rights of individuals constitutionally as human rights but in their application they must be able to function socially as a form of kinship and mutual cooperation; 2) recognizing cultural diversity, social values as pillars of nationality and moderating the people's democratic system or democratic nationalism based on the motto Bhineka Tunggal Ika; 3) Applying competitive values rationally because individual freedom is

limited by social freedom as the basis for the growth of cultural values and diversity that bind society normatively in the social system. This includes acknowledging the existence of a royal court system that applies in society where individuals are royal citizens who practice values based on local wisdom; 4) Ensuring the implementation of individual political rights in a representative system as part of a "popular" system led by truth (wisdom wisdom), Wise leadership can only be born from wise individual behavior or which is based on universal basic values and rationality values.

### **Axiology**

**Direct democracy:** 1) creates a political mechanism that reflects competitive competition as a means to actualize individual freedom (Binswanger & Prüfer, 2012; Devlinm, 1983) in the political system and government as well as in the social and economic life of society in a liberal (free) manner; 2) implement a constitutionally based system with a representative system (Alexy, 2005) or a direct democratic system (Matusaka, 2005; Rostow, 1952) as long as it does not reduce the implementation of individual human rights; 3) guaranteeing the implementation of democracy in a sporting and fair competition (Binswanger & Prüfer, 2012; Flyvbjerg, 2003; Marris, 2001) in the constitution that must be respected together in a sporting manner as a reflection of individual freedom in exercising their basic rights which tends to create an image with integrity and morality. in winning a healthy competition. Only leaders with integrity can be accepted as leaders.

**Pancasila democracy:** 1) creates a political mechanism that reflects the values of kinship and mutual cooperation based on the motto "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" as stated in the preamble of the 1945 Constitution; 2) Implement a constitutional system in exercising the basic rights of citizenship based on the basic norms of the state as a consensus that binds every citizen in respecting the independence of each individual universally as stipulated in Article 27 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution; 3) Guarantee the implementation of democracy in a fair, honest, authoritative manner with freedom of expression, association and assembly in a responsible manner based on the constitution by guaranteeing the honor of individuals or groups of people equally without discrimination and brotherhood as part of nationalism and nationalism as reflected in Article 29 Paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution

**Liberal democracy or direct democracy** tends to: 1) create social classes materially because the freedom of individualism will give birth to the capitalist group as a group of happy people; 2) encourage the application of rationality values in actualizing individual interests and the interests of the state rationally (Devlinm, 1983; Kikinezhdi, 2011); 3) realizing ideal conditions for the growth of democracy that reflects individual freedom in a competitive and supportive manner in the administration of the state and government. Because individuals have equal rights in law and government

**Pancasila democracy** tends to: 1) encourage the creation of a diversity of values, culture, customs as pillars of nationality in realizing a harmonious life under the values of kinship, mutual cooperation and diversity in diversity in achieving common goals; 2) increasing the role of the state in rationalizing the fulfillment of interests in terms of individual basic values and basic social (national) norms that lead to social functions or the universal application of state basic norms. The state conducts behavior control based on universal Pancasila norms without distinguishing one another or without discrimination; 3) realizing ideal conditions based on basic norms fundamentally through the application of functional universal values and the application of structural rationality values in implementing a balanced democratic system as an ecosystem for the state, nation and society.

## Civil Society

**Liberal democracy:** 1) realizing the role of "civil society" in a fair, competitive and supportive manner in the implementation of democracy based on the protection of human rights and the fulfillment of the basic public interest as a state goal (Beetham, 2004); 2) strengthening people's sovereignty (Beetham, 2004); 3) Tend to give birth to a monopoly of power by gambling groups as a power sentiment (Sidney, 1933); 4) Give birth to political groups that support the government and groups of opposition to orders (Castells, 2019) as a consequence of the system of supervision of the government. This condition, if not managed properly, will lead to a political crisis.

**Pancasila democracy:** 1) realizing the role of civil society as a moderator or pillar of the implementation of Pancasila democracy substantially which reflects the operation of a direct representation system (not direct democracy) based on musyarah values and policies that are universal and rational; 2) implementing the people's sovereignty system as a source of state power in the government mechanism from the people by the people and for the people as the motto of popular democracy that is subject to social norms (customary law) and constitutional norms; 3) it tends to create a monopoly if the government is not run with a civic society which is not based on the norms of the nation's personality. 4) the government system is not controlled through a political mechanism between government support groups and the opposition, but the social control mechanism or civil society control can be effective if it is carried out with a dual mechanism in which civil society carries out its moderating function on democracy both informally and formally.

Civil society in the perspective of Pancasila is better known as populist, which is mentioned in the fourth precept that democracy is led by wisdom in deliberation of representatives. Thus civil society implies that people's leadership can be formal and informal. Formal leadership is born from the legalization of the constitution while formal leadership is leadership that is born naturally in the midst of society on the basis of certain values held by the community. Civil society is not only represented by Community Organizations, or NGOs but is also a religious, customary, cultural and other leadership structure that can represent it directly in democracy. This strengthening of society can moderate the increase in the role of the community in the direct and representative system of representation for the quality of Pancasila democracy.

## Conclusion

Democracy conceptually must be understood in two approaches, namely democracy as a reflection of the application of philosophical norms in the administration of the state and empirical democracy as a reflection of the application of rational values in the structure and political system both in the distribution of power, the application of a direct election system and so forth. Changes in democratic values can be caused by direct factors such as human values, justice, wisdom, universal norms and empirical factors as moderating factors such as civil society, domination of power, electoral system and so on. as a reflection of the application of rational-empirical values of democracy.

Pancasila democracy and direct democracy differ in philosophy, historical value and civil society paradigm as factors that shape the capacity of the political system of the state government system. Bhineka Tunggal Ika is the basic principle in the implementation of the Pancasila democratic system while direct democracy is based on natural individual freedom.

## Implication

1. The application of the basic norms of Pancasila requires fundamental political reforms at the system, institutional and bureaucratic levels of the government.

2. Pancasila democracy demands a change in the paradigm of state power which distinguishes between substantive state power and rational government authority. where state power implements democratic norms universally and bureaucratic authority carries out rational values in increasing the quality and effectiveness of democracy. This base will be discussed in the continuation of the next article.

### References

- Abduh, M. (n.d.). Islam dan Demokrasi. *Aqlania*, 10(1), 63. <https://doi.org/10.32678/aqlania.v10i01.2109>
- Adams, I., & Dyson, R. (2003). *Fifty Major Political Thinkers*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203413487>
- Adams, C. (2007). *Bung Karno Penyambung Lidah Rakyat*. Yayasan Bung Karno.
- Alexy, R. (2005). Balancing, constitutional review, and representation. *International Journal of Constitutional Law*, 3(4), 572–581. <https://doi.org/10.1093/icon/moi040>
- Aminuddin, M. F., & Ramadlan, M. F. S. (2015). Match-All Party: Pragmatisme Politik dan Munculnya Spesies Baru Partai Politik di Indonesia Pasca Pemilu 2009. *Jurnal Politik*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.7454/jp.v1i1.9>
- Azhari, A. F. (2010). *Demokrasi & Autokrasi*. Pandiva Buku. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=ekrCDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA50&dq=konsep+tentan+demokrasi+perwakilan+oleh+JOHN+STUART+MILL+\(1806-1873\)1&ots=fA2vi3kP\\_M&sig=72qeEbPy79qkUD6BqDMnkEEZT2c&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=ekrCDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PA50&dq=konsep+tentan+demokrasi+perwakilan+oleh+JOHN+STUART+MILL+(1806-1873)1&ots=fA2vi3kP_M&sig=72qeEbPy79qkUD6BqDMnkEEZT2c&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Azzuhri, M. (2009). Pendidikan Berkualitas ( Upaya Menuju Perwujudan Civil Society ). *Jurnal Forum Tarbiyah*, 7(2), 143–156. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/69319-ID-pendidikan-berkualitas-upaya-menuju-perw.pdf>
- Beenstock, Z. (2016). *The Politics Of Romanticism*. Edinburgh University Press.
- Beetham, D. (2004). Freedom as the foundation. *Journal of Democracy*, 15(4), 61–75. <https://doi.org/10.1353/jod.2004.0057>
- Binswanger, J., & Prüfer, J. (2012). Democracy, populism, and (un)bounded rationality. *European Journal of Political Economy*, 28(3), 358–372. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejpoleco.2012.02.002>
- Brownlee, K. (2015). Freedom of association: It's not what you think. *Oxford Journal of Legal Studies*, 35(2), 267–282. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ojls/gqu018>
- Canovan, M. (1999). Trust the people! populism and the two faces of democracy. *Political Studies*, 47(1), 2–16. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9248.00184>
- Castells, M. (2019). *Rupture-The Crisis Of The Liberal Democracy*. CPI Group (UK) Ltd. Croydon. <https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=2HtDwAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PT4&dq=Give+birth+to+political+groups+that+support+the+government+and+groups+of+opposition+to+orders+as+a+consequence+of+the+system+of+supervision+of+the+government+models+of+liberal+dem>
- Colette, M. (2015). *Freedom and Dignity in The Social Contract. 1*.
- Crum, B., & Fossum, J. E. (2009). The Multilevel Parliamentary Field: A framework for theorizing representative democracy in the EU. *European Political Science Review*, 1(2), 249–271. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1755773909000186>
- Darmawan, J. M. & lalu. (1999). *Wacana Civil Society ( Masyarakat Madani ) DI Indonesia*.
- de Tocqueville, A. (2001). Democracy in America, Volumes One and Two. *The Journal of Blacks in Higher Education*, 31, 134. <http://seas3.elte.hu/coursematerial/LojkoMiklos/Alexis-de-Tocqueville-Democracy-in-America.pdf>

- Devlinm, Lord. (1983). Law, Democracy And Morality. *New York University Law Review*, 183, 471–489.
- Eliaeson, S. (1998). Max Weber and Plebiscitary Democracy. *Max Weber, Democracy and Modernization*, 47–60. [https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26836-8\\_4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-349-26836-8_4)
- Ferguson, A. (1980). *An Essay on the History of Civil Society*.
- Fitriah. (2017). Fenomena Politik Uang Dalam Pilkada. *POLITIKA: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 3(1 apr), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.3.1.2012.5-14>
- Fitrianingsih, F. (2019). Kebebasan Berpendapat yang Dibatasi Oleh Pasal 310 KUHP Prespektif Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang HAM dan Abu Mansur A'la Al Maududi. *Al-Balad: Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1(3). <http://urj.uin-malang.ac.id/index.php/albalad/article/view/526>
- Flyvbjerg, B. (2003). *Rationality and Power*. 318–329.
- Gencer, B. (2010). *Bedri Gencer-Sovereignty and the Separation of Powers in John Locke*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10848771003783611>
- Graham, G. (2014). *Francis Hutcheson and Adam Ferguson on Sociability*.
- Habibi, M. (2018). *Analisis Politik Identitas di Indonesia*. March. <https://doi.org/10.31227/osf.io/pey72>
- Harjanto, N. (2011). Politik Kekerabatan dan Institusionalisasi Partai Politik di Indonesia. *Analisis CSIS*, 40(2), 138–159.
- Hasan, K. (2011). *Propaganda Politik Di Indonesia*. 2010–2012.
- Hatta, M. (2011). *Berjuang dan dibuang untuk negeriku sebuah otobiografi*. Kompas Media. [http://opac.dpr.go.id/catalog/index.php?p=show\\_detail&id=28261%0Ahttp://opac.dpr.go.id/catalog/lib/phpthumb/phpThumb.php?src=../images/docs/hjvhusbv.jpg.jpg](http://opac.dpr.go.id/catalog/index.php?p=show_detail&id=28261%0Ahttp://opac.dpr.go.id/catalog/lib/phpthumb/phpThumb.php?src=../images/docs/hjvhusbv.jpg.jpg)
- Majapahit sudah mengenal sistem demokrasi, hukum serta otonomi.
- Hilmy, M. I. (2020). Fenomena Gerakan Populisme Dalam Kemunduran Demokrasi. *Jurnal Civic Hukum*, 5(2), 145–156. <https://doi.org/10.22219/jch.v5i2.13080>
- Holcombe, R. G. (2015). *Political Capitalism*. 41–66.
- Hollander, S. (2016). *The Politics Of Referendum Use In European Democracies*. Saskia Lizette Hollander.
- Honneth, A. (2010). *The Pathologies Of Individual Freedom, Hegel's Theory Social*. Princeton University Press. <https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=P00gEAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP7&dq=Individual+freedom+theory+by&ots=qRU>
- Kikinezhd. (2011). *The Dilemma Of Personal Self-Actualization Of Students From Western Region Of UkraineL Gender Perspective*. 342–347.
- Kramnick, I. (2019). *Republican Revisionism Revisited. In Republicanism and Bourgeois Radicalism*. Cornell University Press. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.7591/9781501745980-007>
- Krause, S. (1985). *The Spirit of Separate Powers in Montesquieu*.
- Kubesh, K. et al. (2007). *The French Revolution*. Coloma, MI 49038. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=W57bqQUfuv0C&oi=fnd&pg=PA8&dq=The+French+Revolution\(1789\)+ended+the+Absolute+Monarchy&ots=zSBvOz2-6M&sig=kwI3R8PLxYGwXeWzbRNzYlyLazw&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q=The+French+Revolution\(1789\)+ended+the+Absolute+Monarchy](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=W57bqQUfuv0C&oi=fnd&pg=PA8&dq=The+French+Revolution(1789)+ended+the+Absolute+Monarchy&ots=zSBvOz2-6M&sig=kwI3R8PLxYGwXeWzbRNzYlyLazw&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q=The+French+Revolution(1789)+ended+the+Absolute+Monarchy)
- Kurniawan, D. (2016). Demokrasi Indonesia dalam Lintasan Sejarah Yang Nyata dan Yang Seharusnya. *MOZAIK: Jurnal Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 8(1), 94–111. <https://doi.org/10.21831/moz.v8i1.10770>
- Kusumasari, D., & Arifianto, S. (2020). Makna Teks Ujaran Kebencian Pada Media Sosial. *Jurnal Komunikasi*, 12(1), 1. <https://doi.org/10.24912/jk.v12i1.4045>
- Kusumawardani, A. (2004). *Nasionalisme*. 2, 61–72.

- Macid, H. . (1987). *John Stuart Mill: 1806-1873. History of Political Philosophy*.
- Makriif, A. S. (2009). *Islam dalam bingkai keindonesiaan dan kemanusiaan : sebuah refleksi sejarah*. Maarif Institute Indeks.
- Marris, P. (2001). On Rationality and Democracy. *International Planning Studies*, 6(3), 279–284. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13563470120069698>
- Marx, K. (2010). *Karl Marx Frederick Engels, Collected Works* (Vol. 7).
- Matusaka, J. G. (2005). Direct democracy works. *Journal of Economic Perspectives*, 19(2), 185–206. <https://doi.org/10.1257/0895330054048713>
- Morris, C. W. (1999). *The Social Contract Theoritis*. Rowman & Littlefield Publishing, INC. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=ParWAQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Rousseau+\(1712-1778\)+through+his+book+%22The+Social+Contract%22&ots=UgGroO-QQg&sig=ZggVOI7nQVVKH2-pqMuYa7s1d\\_k&redir\\_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=ParWAQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PP1&dq=Rousseau+(1712-1778)+through+his+book+%22The+Social+Contract%22&ots=UgGroO-QQg&sig=ZggVOI7nQVVKH2-pqMuYa7s1d_k&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false)
- Nasrudin, J. (2019). *Politik Identitas Dan Representasi Politik. 1*, 105–112.
- Neblo, M. A., Esterling, K. M., & Lazer, D. (2018). *Politics with the people : building a directly representative democracy*. 166.
- Pursika, I. N. (2009). Kajian Analitik Terhadap Semboyan ”Bhinneka Tunggal Ika”. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, 42(1), 15–20.
- Raharjo, M. D. (1999). *Demokrasi, Agama dan Masyarakat Madani*. 25–33.
- Rahman, M. T. (2013). *FILSAFAT SOSIAL DAN POLITIK TRANSFORMATIF (Kajian Perbandingan antara Pemikiran Marx dan Shariati)*.
- Rapar, J. H. (1996). *Filsafat Politik Plato*. PT Raja Grafindo Persada. <https://onsearch.id/Record/IOS3326.KATEN-03090000001406>
- Rostow, E. V. (1952). The Demicratic character of Judicial Review. *Harvard Law Review*, 116(5), 1212–1228. <https://doi.org/10.2307/1342725>
- Rozi, S. (2016). *Nasionalisme Demokratisasi dan Sentimen Primordialisme di Indonesia*.
- Sahdan, G. (2004). *Jalan Transisi Demokrasi Pasca Soeharto*. Podok Edukasi.
- Sákéj, J., & Henderson, Y. (2000). *The Context of the State of Nature*.
- Salamah, U. (2010). Penta Politika Indonesia. *SATWIK: Kajian Ilmu Budaya Dan Perubahan Sosial*, 1(1), 37–48.
- Schwarzmatel, J. (1998). *The Age Of Idiology Political Idiologis From The American Revolution Of Postmodern Time*. New York University Press. [https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=Vfg8DAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=American+Revolution+\(1776\)+and+French+Revolution+\(1789\).+The+American+Revolution+gave+birth+to+a+system+of+liberal+democracy+and+federalism+\(James+Madison\)&ots=ITs5HUhz1r&sig=lm2](https://books.google.co.id/books?hl=id&lr=&id=Vfg8DAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR11&dq=American+Revolution+(1776)+and+French+Revolution+(1789).+The+American+Revolution+gave+birth+to+a+system+of+liberal+democracy+and+federalism+(James+Madison)&ots=ITs5HUhz1r&sig=lm2)
- Shackleton, M. (2017). Transforming representative democracy in the EU? The role of the European Parliament. *Journal of European Integration*, 39(2), 191–205. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07036337.2016.1277713>
- Sidney, H. (1933). *Towards The Understanding Of Karl Marx A Revolution Interpretation* (Terbitan P). London Victor Gollancz LTD.
- Sofwan, E. (2017). Penguatan Civil Society Berdasarkan Hak Asasi Manusia Di Negara Hukum Pasca Amandemen Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 1945 1. *Dinamika Masalah Hukum Dan Keadilan*, 4, 287–315.
- Springborg, P. (1984). Karl Marx on Democracy, Participation, Voting, and Equality. *Political Theory*, 12(4), 537–556. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0090591784012004005>
- Stark, R. (2003). *One True God Consequences of Monotheism, terj. M. Sadat Ismail*. Nizam Press.
- Subardini, N. N. (2011). Stratifikasi Masyarakat Bali Dalam Tarian Bumi Dan Kenanga Karya Oka Rusmini. *Atavisme*, 14(2), 214–227.

<https://doi.org/10.24257/atavisme.v14i2.70.214-227>

Sudiono, L. (2020). *State And Civil Society: G.W.F Hegel Conception On The State's Constitution*. 32, 122–134.

Syam, F. (2007). *Pemikiran politik Barat: Sejarah, Filsafat, Ideologi, dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Dunia Ke-3*. Bumi Aksara.

Tahir, R., Kusmanto, H., & Amin, M. (2020). Propaganda Politik Hoaks dalam Pemilihan Presiden Tahun 2019. *Perspektif*, 9(2), 236–251.  
<https://doi.org/10.31289/perspektif.v9i2.3458>

Verhulst, Jos and Nijeboer, A. (2015). Direct democracy. In *Direct democracy*.  
<https://doi.org/10.4337/9781849806039.00019>

Yee, L. M., Ming, H. W., & Yang, Y. (n.d.). *Rousseau and The Social Contract*.

Zimmerman, A. (2015). "Originalism" in *Magna Carta*. 197–207.