

Sustainability and Dynamics of Democracy in Indonesia from an Islamic Perspective

Muthoifin^{1,*}, Sudarno Shobron²

^{1,2}Department of Islamic Studies, Faculty of Islamic Studies, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, Indonesia

*Corresponding author. Email: mut122@ums.ac.id

ABSTRACT

The democratic political system has become the choice in many countries among the existing political systems, because this system is considered to be near the ideal, including by the Islamic States. This study aims to find answers to the formulation of the problem, namely how the dynamics of the democracy implementation in Indonesia since the old order to the order of reform for 75 years (1945-2020) because of the implementation of democracy in Indonesia contains many problems. The methods used in this research were qualitative, literature study, and a historical, phenomenological, sociological, and normative approach. The findings of this study were that each regime modified democracy in accordance with the wishes of the authorities. There was liberal democracy, guided democracy, Pancasila democracy, and liberal democracy return. The Pancasila democracy was apparently not a complete democracy, but a quasi-democracy, an unusual democracy, a half-hearted democracy, or procedural democracy. The reform era, which initially hoped that the nation's condition was getting better, turned out not to be expected. Because the people involved directly in the general election were not completely ready with their rational choices full of consideration. Returning to representative democracy is the right choice. This research is about democracy in the view of Islam and Pancasila, which recommends: returning to representative democracy is the right choice according to the wishes of Pancasila.

Keywords: sustainability, dynamics, democracy, pPancasila, Islamic perspective

1. INTRODUCTION

The democratic political system has become the choice in many countries among the existing political systems, because this system is considered to be near the ideal, including by the Islamic States. It is marked by the first, the rise of Islam, along with democracy. The magnitude of the people's demands in participating in engaging in political processes cannot be dammed. There are several cases of democratization in Islamic countries, including Iran and Algeria. Iranian involvement overthrew Pahlavi's power in 1979 consisted of clerics, business people, and politicians. This event shocked the Western world because the Islamic ideology could awaken Muslims to their rights as a nation, and it was the greatest danger to Western interests throughout the Islamic world. [1]

Likewise, the Front Islamique du Salut (FIS) in Algeria won the election against the government party with the motto of the movement "al-Jazair is our homeland, Arabic is our language, and Islam is our religion. The movement doctrine motivated the people of Al-Jazair to make changes. Also, the cases of direct popular involvement in political processes carried out by the Front National for Liberation/FNL. Not long ago in Lebanon, Hezbollah won the election but did not receive recognition from the West, especially America and Israel, and Hezbollah could not become the ruler, even though democratic processes have been followed. [2]

Second, the rise of Islam rejecting democracy as done by the HT is because, according to them, the democratic system is contrary to Islam's ideology (mabda'). In addition, democracy is believed to have fostered a great ideology of the world, namely capitalism, and socialism. Democracy as a political system has been carried out in Indonesia with full dynamics, proof of the implementation of honest and fair elections, free of secrets, and the freedom of the press. Regime change will lead to changes in the political system and policy that will be implemented because it is inevitable that there is a desire to do something that will bring the people towards a better system and reform policy. Thirteen years after Indonesia's reforms succeeded, Middle Eastern countries struggled to carry out reforms in Tunisia, Egypt, Libya, Bahrain, Jordan, Yemen, and Iran. Indonesia's reforms were considered successful, so the President of the United States, Barack Obama, called for the attention of Middle Eastern countries to emulate Indonesia's reform model. However, it must be remembered that Indonesia's reforms did not come suddenly but have gone through a long process in the form of criticism of government policies and systems that are implemented, which are not following the development of a society that continues to progress.[3]

Reforms occurred in Indonesia due to the swift currents of democratization in other parts of the world. It was the third waveform of democracy around 1990 when the Soviet Union split into twelve independent countries, followed by several

countries that wanted to change the monarchical system of authoritarianism into a democratic state. Eight years after the third wave of democracy, reform took place in Indonesia. Indonesian reform is a historical necessity because so far, democracy has been shackled and held by a ruler, President Suharto.[4]

The development of democratization in Indonesia is no different from other countries, which are always accompanied by the development of capitalism. There is an argument that democracy can foster a belief in the significant development and prosperity of capitalism. This argument may seem controversial because capitalism is an economic system in non-communist countries, a country that is very famous for its democratic system. Meanwhile, the communist countries adhere to socialism, where economic resources are not private property as capitalism, but all belong to and within the authority of the State. Consequently, the State must distribute these economic resources to citizens. In contrast, in a non-communist state, all citizens have the right to accumulate personal wealth and control economic resources. Adam Smith, in 1776, wrote the book "An Inquiry into the Nature and Causes of Wealth of Nations", stating that economic policy on mercantilism (an economic system that is concerned with export-import balance) is a policy that provides benefits because, in it, there is market competition. In capitalism, all products will compete fairly in the market to get a response from the public. It is a real trade battle without any protection from any party. Anyone has the freedom to throw their products to the market, and it only exists in a country that adopts a democratic system. The conclusion of the American Economic Association's (AEA) symposium is that first, democracy and capitalism often have the same basic ideas. Second, in democracy, the people are the holders of the highest authority that gives orders to the State and the government. Democracy and capitalism are equally concerned with freedom, competition without protection and intervention, all left to the market or the people to drop their choices without coercion from anyone.[5]

Democracy as an Indonesian political system turned out to be incompatible with democratic principles, because, during the Old and New Order periods, democracy had been adapted for the political interests of the regime in carrying out repressive actions against the people, resulting in ups and downs to the implementation of democracy. It did not only happen in Indonesia but also occurred in several other countries. Based on a report from the Economist Intelligence Unit (EIU) in 2010, countries that were initially (in 2008) included in the category of full democracies, such as France, Italy, Greece, and Slovenia, were thrown into the list of countries implementing flawed democracies. The implementation of democracy was not getting better but was getting worse and stagnant so that the third wave of democracy, as predicted by Samuel P. Huntington, stagnated. In 2006, a report submitted by EIU entitled "Democracy in Retreat" revealed that democracy suffered a setback. Two years later (2008), this institution released a report entitled "Democracy in Stagnation," which stated that democracy was in stagnation. This report was based on research conducted by

EIU in 167 countries with criteria, namely the electoral process and pluralism, civil liberties, government functions, political participation, and political culture.

If the five criteria used by the EIU to assess whether democracy or not a country were employed to measure the course of democracy in Indonesia, then Indonesia is included in the category of flawed democracies. Benchmarking countries that are flawed democracies are countries holding elections that have caused many problems, not yet developed political culture, and have low political participation. In the 2009 elections, there were 42 cases reported to the Constitutional Court, so the Constitutional Court decided to do a recount in 6 places, and 2 places had to be re-pollled. Likewise, in the post-conflict local election in 2010, there were 320 cases reported to the Court to request a decision because there were alleged problems in the selection process from voter registration to the vote-counting process. Political culture is still low because political education is not carried out optimally. Meanwhile, the political participation of Indonesian people is also low because people who have the right to vote do not use their rights by nearly 40%.

According to the 2010 EIU report, referring to the members of the Organization of Islamic Conference (OIC) index, not only Indonesia was included in Flawed Democracies, there were several other countries included in this category, such as Malaysia, Mali, Guyana, and Suriname. Whereas, other countries fell into the category of authoritarian states, and none were included in the group of countries that implemented democracy in full (Full Democracies). Iraq, Lebanon, Palestine, Turkey, and Pakistan were included in the Hybrid Regimes, while Algeria, Saudi Arabia, Bahrain, Iran, Morocco, and Egypt, for example, were included in the Authoritarian Regimes State group.

As a Muslim country with the largest Muslim population in the world, Indonesia experiences ups and downs in practicing democracy in the life of the nation, state, and religion. In 2006, EIU included Indonesia in the group of full democracies countries due to its success in holding elections in 2004. However, from 2008 to 2010, it fell into a flawed democratic country because the 2009 elections were colored by protests from political parties participating in the election.[6]

The ups and downs of democracy in Indonesia are not only in practice but also in understanding democracy. In fact, at first, there were no problems implementing democracy because the first elections in 1955 were held democratically, characterized by free, fair, and honest confidentiality. Herbert Feith said Indonesian Muslims made a positive contribution to the implementation of democracy. This situation was until the fall of the New Order. However, in the reform era, various kinds of attitudes and opinions about democracy emerged, both those who accepted and rejected democracy. The dynamics of the implementation of democracy in Indonesia can be seen from the modification of the implementation of democracy adjusted to the political developments that occur. Therefore, this study revealed various models of democracy in Indonesia from the Old Order to the Reform Order.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research is a qualitative study to find the essence of each phenomenon.[7] One of the qualitative research strategies developed is case studies discovering scientific truth in-depth and over a long period to find trends, patterns, directions, and interactions of many factors that can spur or inhibit change. Case studies are beneficial for understanding a case comprehensively and knowing its prospects in the future. The term used by McGow and Watson is the scientific method, which is analyzing data objectively, logically, and systematically to describe, explain, and predict what can be observed. [8]

The approach is historical-phenomenological. The historical approach is trying to look at the history of the past critically and chronologically, relying on four main activities: (1) the collection of objects originating from that era and the collection of relevant printed, written, and oral materials; (2) getting rid of materials that are not authentic; (3) compiling reliable testimony about authentic materials; (4) compiling a reliable testimony into a meaningful story or presentation.[9] The processes of the historical approach in this research were heuristics (searching for and finding historical sources), critics (assessing the authenticity and credibility of a source), *auffassung* (synthesis of facts obtained through source criticism), and *darstellung* (presentation in written form).[10]

The phenomenological approach is to see the authenticity (basic) of faithful facts and data, or according to Max Weber's term, a *verstehen* approach is expressing the motives and thoughts behind an action.[11] *Verstehen* has two ways of working: first, identifying the understanding of actions as desired by the actor; and second, recognizing the surrounding context and which is used to understand it, or symbolic interactionism. Characteristics of the phenomenological approach is a process of meaning or interpretation of data (hermeneutics) of the past for the benefit of the future.[9]

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Indonesia is a country that is unique in implementing democracy because from independence until 2020, democracy implemented in Indonesia is very varied, once called liberal democracy, guided democracy, Pancasila democracy, and some even call half-hearted democracy, not commonplace democracy, semi-democracy, and collusive democracy. Even though various types of democracy developed in Indonesia,[10] Indonesia still called itself a democratic country and its officials claimed to be a democrat.[12]

Judging from the periodization of Indonesia's political history, it consists of the government's period during the revolution of independence, parliamentary government, guided democracy, and the New Order with Pancasila democracy. The journey of democracy in Indonesia is under political developments, divided into four periods, including liberal democracy (1945-1959), guided democracy (1959-1966), and Pancasila democracy (1966 - 1998), and in the reform era, it comes back to liberal democracy (1998-2020).[1]

3.1. Liberal Democracy (1945-1959)

The Liberal Democracy System or the Parliamentary Democracy System was practiced at the beginning of independence, which was psychologically just a stage of searching for its identity as a nation after being free from the grip of imperialism. This search process found a form of democracy that had been carried out by other countries and considered the practice of democracy to be successful. It was no exaggeration to practice a democracy that already existed in other countries. At the beginning of independence, Indonesia did not have the democratic experience, because, for almost 350 years, it was in the shackles of imperialism that curbed the life of the nation-state and religion. This period enacted the first period of the 1945 Constitution, the RIS Constitution, and the Provisional Constitution of 1950. Judging from the time of its enactment, liberal democracy did not last long because it was only 14 years old. It ended after Sukarno issued the Presidential Decree on July 5, 1959, which contained the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly and returned to the 1945 Constitution.[6][4][13]

Indications of liberal democracy are, first, the dominance of political parties in determining the direction of the State's journey. Second, there is no political stability due to the dismantling of pairs of cabinet members. Third, press freedom is without control, after the censorship and banning rules are revoked. The president does not have government responsibilities because the cabinet is led by the Prime Minister, who is responsible not to the president, but to the parliament. The cabinet's composition is determined by the majority of votes in parliament, so there is no long-lived cabinet. The cabinet can be overthrown by parliament at any time, and the parliament can be dissolved by the government at any time. The official organs in parliament are political parties, political power, and decision-makers in this liberal democratic system are only political parties.[13]

According to Afan Gaffar, the failure of liberal or parliamentary democracy: first is the dominance of political flow so that it gives consequences for conflict management. Second, the socioeconomic basis is still fragile. The third is equality of interests between President Sukarno and the Army, who were equally unhappy with the political process that was running. Sukarno's presentation from the civilian and Army was the presentation from ABRI, both of whom had different leadership styles, such as Herbert Feith's statement of solidary makers and administrators. Meanwhile, Adnan Buyung Nasution stated that it was different from Feith. According to him, the failure of liberal or parliamentary democracy was due to civilian and military leadership styles similarity.[6][3][13]

3.2. Guided Democracy (1959-1966)

President Sukarno's speech on August 17, 1959, with the title "Rediscovering Our Revolution" conveyed the principles of Guided Democracy: first, each person was required to serve the public interest, society, nation, and state; and second, each person had the right to a decent living in the community, nation, and state. Guided Democracy is a

democracy "led by wisdom in consultation/representation". On the other hand, Sukarno gave an understanding of Guided Democracy as a family democracy without the anarchy of liberalism and dictatorship autocracy. A democracy "bases its system of government on deliberation and consensus with the leadership of central power in the hands of an elder, who does not dictate, but leads and nurtures. All of this is indeed pleasant to hear, rational, and per Indonesian culture; however, it is tough to apply in life. In reality, it was precisely Sukarno, with his power in his hands, acting authoritarian, dictatorial, and comfortably eliminating his political opponents, even though they were instrumental in seizing Indonesian independence.[4][14]

Indonesian political experts noted that there were five political characteristics in the era of guided democracy: first, press freedom had been suppressed during this time because several presses, such as the *Abadi Daily* from Masyumi and the *PSI's Daily Guidelines*, were banned. Second, the centralized power management system was getting stronger, so central and regional relations were getting weaker. Third, it obscured the party system because political parties' presence was a supporting element of the tug-of-war of three political forces, namely Sukarno, the Army, and the PKI. Fourth, many of Sukarno's political opponents from Islamic and socialist circles became political prisoners. Fifth, the DPR-GR formation was only for Sukarno's political interests because the parliamentary recruitment system was determined by him.[15]

3.3. *Pancasila Democracy (1966-1998)*

At the Army Seminar II held in 1966, the Pancasila Democracy intentions were formulated, namely reestablishing the principles of the rule of law with legal certainty that had value for the benefit of the people, guaranteed human rights, and avoided abuse of power. For this reason, the institutions and work arrangements of the New Order must be institutionalized and kept away from personal ties (depersonalization, institutionalization). This formula has anticipated that power spread within existing institutions, not controlled by just one person, is oligarchic. There were efforts to strengthen legislative and judicial institutions. However, it was difficult to fulfill because the existence of a legislative body was nothing more than a puppet that was freely played by President Soeharto. Likewise, the judiciary whose officials were appointed and dismissed by the President, logically, were also in the same boat with the legislative body and always following the policies taken by the President. [13][2]

It is no exaggeration to say that Pancasila Democracy is easy to express, but difficult to implement. The precepts in Pancasila and their interpretations are only a matter of upgrading, but they are not permeated by the meaning contained therein, let alone made into a work program that benefits them. Therefore, the implementation of democracy in Indonesia during the Old Order, New Order, and the Reformation Era was said to be a half-hearted democracy, an

unusual democracy, a pseudo of democracy, and a collusive democracy.[3]

1) Half-Hearted democracy was proposed by Idrus Marham in his dissertation "Half-Hearted Democracy: A Case Study of Political Elite in the 1999-2004 DPR RI". It is said that democracy was half-hearted because members of parliament as political elites who had full power in discussing the Political Draft Bill in 2002 and 2003 did not work optimally in fulfilling democratic aspirations. On the contrary, the political elite prioritized political negotiations and barter so that, in many cases, it produced articles that were substantially far from the spirit and essence of democracy. The procedure in making decisions was often used as an instrument to protect the interests of the political elite so that the decision did not touch the substance of the problem that was in line with the ideals of reform and democracy. The DPR's political elite was in the two pendulum dynamics of interests, namely, subjective and objective. If the subjective interests were at odds with or against the aspirations of reform, the DPR's political elite would tend to hinder and hold the democratization process. On the other hand, if his subjective interests coincided with the aspirations of reform, the DPR's political elite tended to facilitate the process of democratization.

2) Uncommon Democracy, or uncommon democracies, was introduced by Afan Gaffar sourced from TJPemper. This democratic model does not meet the requirements of democracy, as many people understand both normatively and empirically as applied in the United States, Canada, Australia, English, French, and Dutch. Uncommon democracies are run in many Scandinavian countries, such as Denmark, Sweden, Norway, Iceland, Chile, Israel, India, Colombia, and Japan. The main characteristic of this type of democracy is that one dominant party is capable of outperforming other political parties, which Giovanni Sartori said, "this party is dominant in that it is significantly stronger than the others.[16] Party domination is obtained through a democratic political process, namely general elections, with the acquisition of 60% of seats.[17]

In Indonesia, it could only be obtained by Golkar in the New Order period in the 1977 to 1997 general elections. TJ. Pempem made the characteristics of a political party said to be dominant over other parties, including dominance in numbers, dominance in bargaining positions, dominance in government, and dominance over time in power. Using this characteristic framework, Golkar was precisely said to be the dominant party during the New Order, but not right in the current Reformation Era. In the New Order democracy, which was implemented, it was an unusual democracy because even though six elections were held, there was no rotation of power from one party to another.[18] The one who won the election was still Golkar so the president was also from Golkar, namely Suharto. It was unusual because the presidential elections were carried out by parliament, and Suharto was always a single candidate and agreed upon by consensus to be determined to be President. It can be said that Indonesia's uncommon democracy also occurred at the beginning of the reform, namely the 1999 election results won by PDIP. With

parliamentary manipulation, the presidential candidate from PDIP was defeated by the PKB presidential candidate, who ranked fourth with 51 seats (11%). It was an unusual democracy in Indonesia. Although his party won the election, it might not necessarily be in power. Likewise, political parties, which got the most votes at the provincial and city or district level, did not have to be the number one person in the area because often, the political party won was insignificant with the winners of candidates for governor or mayor/regent.[19]

3) Pseudo-democracy or pseudo-democracies were introduced by Juan Linz and Seymour Martin Lipset to describe countries that implement democracy, but not like liberal democracy implemented in developed countries. Democracy as a procedure has been carried out, for example, elections, but the substance is not the participation of the people who freely and consciously channel their political aspirations. However, they are forced to vote for the ruling political party due to intimidation and psychological and physical pressures. The results of procedural elections still give birth to the domination of power, "the reality of authoritarian domination". Indonesia was included in the pseudo-democracy with a value of 6, along with several other countries: Algeria, Angola, Belarus, Cameroon, Congo, Egypt, Kenya, Mauritania, Niger, and Yugoslavia.[3]

4) Collusive democracy was popularized by the Economist magazine on October 23, 2010, citing Harvard Kennedy School: Ash Center for Democratic Governance and Innovation in the report "From Reformation to Institutional Transformation: A Strategic Assessment of Indonesia's Prospect for Growth, Equity, and Democratic Governance." This democracy was used by Dan Slater, "Indonesia's Accountability Trap: Party Cartels and Presidential Power after Democratic Transition." Collusive democracy illustrates the implementation of democracy in the period of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, who tended to choose co-options and consensus rather than fair political competition.[15]

3.4. Liberal Democracy (1998-2020)

Political reform is more felt by the community than other field reforms because the results of the reform will involve the entire Indonesian nation. After the 1945 Constitution was amended by the People's Consultative Assembly (MPR), which began in 1999, it became a momentum for political reform and consolidation of democracy in Indonesia towards a better political life. Amendments to the 1945 Constitution were not without dynamics. There were pros and cons, namely those who agreed with the amendments, and those who did not agree with the amendments. Those who agreed argued that the 1945 Constitution is not a holy book that is undoubtedly true, but a human product that is limited by time and space. The condition of the Indonesian people in 1945 was different from the present conditions. There have been changes in the life of the nation and state. Even, there were leaps in the development of human civilization, the articles in the 1945 Constitution were no longer relevant to the present

conditions. Therefore, amending is a historical necessity. Those who disagreed with the amendments to the 1945 Constitution had a reason that the articles were still relevant to the current situation and the hard work of the country's founding fathers, so there was no thought to make changes. Besides, if the constitution is amended, it is feared that all articles and verses will be changed so that it will lose the spirit and soul of independence, and it has implications for the life of the nation and state. PDIP commanded by Amin Aryoso did not approve the amendments to the 1945 Constitution because it was feared that it would endanger the Republic of Indonesia. Although some disagreed with the amendments, the people's demands to make amendments were so severe that to organize a more democratic, just, and dignified future, the amendment to the 1945 Constitution could not be avoided.[20]

In addition to amending, political reform is changing the laws of political parties, which during the New Order were not democratic because they only provided opportunities for the victory of government parties and dwarfed other political parties. Therefore, two things are very striking to make changes to the order in the political universe in Indonesia, namely the amendment to the 1945 Constitution and the making of a new Political Party Law. There are thirty-seven (37) articles contained in the 1945 Constitution, almost all of them are amended, except Article 4, which consists of two paragraphs: paragraph (1) The President of the Republic of Indonesia holds government authority according to the constitution, and (2) in carrying out his obligations, the president is assisted by a vice president. This article is not tampered with because it is still very relevant in this reform era that carrying out the mandate of the 1945 Constitution still needs the President and Vice President.[20]

The first amendment (1999) changed Indonesia's political order because, in addition to reducing the president's authority, it also limited the president's term of office to two times (10 years). Initially, the term of office of the president was not limited. While still being elected by the House of Representatives (DPR), the president would continue to hold office so that from 1974 to 1997, Suharto was always elected as president. The position of president twice, as the constitution in several developed countries, is under the sunnatullah, which has been exemplified by the Prophet Muhammad, who served as president for ten years in Medina. The limitation for these two periods is under the capacity to work under the mandate of the constitution. If more than that, it will usually apply authoritarian, and if not controlled, he will use the position for personal, family, and crony interests. In many cases of presidents served more than two terms, such as President Sukarno and Suharto in Indonesia. Tunisian President Zine al-Abidine Ben Ali was in power for 23 years (1987-2011). Egyptian President, Mohamed Hosni Mubarak, who was in power for 30 years (1981-2011), was also forced to resign by a reform movement, consisting of the Muslim Brotherhood, Supporters of Al-Ahwy and Zamalek Football, New Waft — a liberal movement led by el-Sayyid el-Baradie, a Facebooker community, a socialist group called the Youth Movement on April 6, 2008, and Egyptian activists returning

from Overseas centered in Tahrir since Tuesday, January 25, 2011. Likewise, the mass movement, which held a demonstration, demanded that Libyan President Gaddafi, who had been in power for more than 40 years to resign from the president's seat. All of which illustrates that having been in power for more than two periods (10 years) had strong resistance. Indeed, the position of the president is only twice under Sunnatullah.[11]

In the second amendment in 2000, some additional chapters and articles are essential in human life, namely the Chapter on Human Rights (HAM), which consists of 11 articles. The spirit of this chapter is that in the reform era, the people and government protect and preserve human rights. In the third amendment of the results of the 2001 MPR Plenary Session, four points stood out because they were not yet presented in Indonesian governance, namely the General Election, the Regional Representative Council (DPD), the Judicial Commission (KY), and the Constitutional Court (MK). First, regarding elections, there are fundamental changes in the electoral system organized by independent institutions: General Election Commission (KPU). In elections, the President and Vice President are elected directly in one package proposed by political parties or a combination of several political parties. Couples who get more than 50% of the total votes in the election with at least 20% of the votes in each province spread over more than 50% of the provinces in Indonesia, are appointed as President and Vice President. It includes the termination of the president and vice president.[6][21]

The second is regarding the Regional Representative Council (DPD) in Chapter VII A, the development of article 22 of the 1945 Constitution. Article 22 consists of 3 paragraphs, developed into three articles containing 14 paragraphs. Of these four verses, the DPD has the authority to participate in discussing the draft law on regional autonomy and other draft law relating to the State Budget, education, tax, and religion, as well as discussion of the relationship between the center and the regions. Meanwhile, the DPD does not have the right to submit a draft law to the DPR to become a law, as is the right owned by the DPR. It is where the DPD cannot be said to be like the senate in the American political system with bicameral (two houses). In the bicameral system, the parliament consists of the lower house, which comes from the national representative of the people, and the upper house is the representative of the state or province, or state. Every draft law passes through these two houses to be discussed before getting a decision, whether enacted, rejected, or postponed. The DPD does not have the function of approving a draft law to become a lawyer like the DPR. On the contrary, it merely provides consideration. Even in discussing the draft law, the involvement of the DPD is only limited to the first level of discussion or the general view stage. After that, the DPD members must leave the session because the draft law will be further discussed by the parliament and the government. It is the reality that it turns out that the DPD is weak and does not have sharp teeth to participate in bringing this nation towards progress in all areas of life. The uniqueness of Indonesia increases again. In

addition to its democratic system called pseudo-democracy, half-hearted democracy, unusual democracy, it has a parliamentary system that is half bicameral, too soft of bicameral, pseudo bicameral, weak bicameral, unicameral plus, and sissy bicameral. Whereas, in terms of people's legitimacy, DPD members are bigger than the DPR because the DPD is elected by the people based on the district system, while the DPR is based on proportionally open constituencies (electoral districts).[20]

The third is the Judicial Commission (KY). Under the amendments to the 1945 Constitution, KY is an independent institution with the authority to propose the appointment of a Chief Justice to maintain and uphold the dignity of honor and the behavior of judges. If there is a rogue judge or gives an unfair decision, KY must impose sanctions on the judge. Many legal cases involve judges to expedite, alleviate, and even release suspects from legal indictments. KY is like a police policeman so that the judge in carrying out his law enforcement duties, is genuinely based on the provisions of applicable law. KY's vision is the realization of an honest, clean, transparent, and professional judicial authority. Meanwhile, its mission is the daily commitment, action, and enthusiasm of all human resources in the Judicial Commission, which is directed to achieve the vision of the Judicial Commission. Its job was first to prepare prospective justices who were noble, honest, brave, and competent; secondly, encourage the development of judicial resources into individuals who serve and uphold the law and justice; and third, carrying out supervision of the administrators of judicial power that is effective, open, and trustworthy.[22]

Fourth, the Constitutional Court (MK) has the authority to adjudicate at the first and last levels whose decisions are final to test the law against the constitution, decide upon disputes over the authority of the State institutions whose authority is granted by the constitution, decide upon the dissolution of political parties, and decide on disputes about election results.

It is also obligatory to give a decision on the opinion of the DPR regarding alleged violations by the President and/or Vice President according to the constitution. According to the constitution, it is also obligatory to decide on the DPR's opinion regarding alleged violations by the President and/or vice president. The second amendment is Law Number 3 of 1975 concerning Political Parties and Working Groups, which was then replaced by Law Number 3 of 1985 that is no longer relevant to demands for reform in the political field, so a new law is needed that can accommodate the interests of the wider pluralist and multiculturalist community.[23]

Even though democracy has been implemented, it cannot be separated from criticism. It indicates that it has not been implemented maximally and has not been substantial. According to Joseph Schumpeter[5], democracy is institutional planning to reach political decisions in which each person gains the power to decide by fighting to compete for the people's voice. There are two keywords in this sense: power and competitive, meaning that in democracy, anyone has the same right to obtain power, but to get power, a person must dare to compete with others honestly and with dignity through constitutional procedures. According to Robert

A. Dahl, it is said that a country is democratic if it meets five standards: effective participation, equality in voting, clear understanding, carry out supervision, and followed by adults.[24]

Procedural democracy triggers the ruler's desire to preserve his power forever. However, with the limitation of holding power only twice, the political dynasty (hidden monarchy) emerged, wrapped in democracy. The monarchic form is shrouded in procedural democracy. At the same time, democracy and monarchy are two contradictory systems. In the hands of certain people, they can be reconciled into a hidden monarchy. For this reason, democracy in the reformation era needs to be reviewed and returned to representative democracy, such as the content of Pancasila.[25]

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of the research and discussion above, it can be concluded that: many countries choose democracy as a political system to regulate their nation and state. This system is marked by the freedom of the people involved in determining the direction of the nation and country. In its implementation, democracy is not under the principles of democracy as a whole but rather adjusted to the conditions of the people. The regime has a strong influence in implementing democracy. Indonesia as a democratic state from the beginning of independence until the reform era in implementing democracy is adapted to the condition of the nation and the desires of its rulers so that there are terms of guided democracy, Pancasila democracy, and liberal democracy. Pancasila democracy during the New Order was controlled by the authorities for 32 years so that the people who experienced boredom were born reforms marked Soeharto's resignation from the seat of the president. In the reform era, the political euphoria marked by the birth of many political parties that participated in the general election did not bring the overall good of the nation. Returning to representative democracy is the right choice according to the wishes of Pancasila.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The researchers would like to thank all the components that support the accomplishment of this research, especially to the rector, director, head of the study program, LPPI (Lembaga Pengembangan Publikasi Ilmiah) in Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta.

REFERENCES

- [1] B. Effendy and M. Pertiwi, "Indonesia's Democratic Venture: History, Practice and the Challenge Ahead," *Stud. Islam.*, vol. 19, no. 3, 2012, doi: 10.15408/sdi.v19i3.356.
- [2] Z. Zulfadli, "Kontestasi Ormas Islamis di Indonesia," *Al-Tahrir J. Pemikir. Islam*, vol. 18, no. 1, p. 63, 2018, doi: 10.21154/altahrir.v18i1.1176.
- [3] A. B. Nasution, "Towards Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia 1," in *Southeast Asian Constitutionalism*, Melbourne, 2011, pp. 1–44.
- [4] B. S. Jamil, Robit Nurul, Sumarjono, "Soekarno's Idea About Indonesia Revolution in 1945-1957," *Hist. Lima.*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 12–27, 2017.
- [5] Joseph A. Schumpeter, "Capitalism, Socialism and Democracy.," *Eur. Leg.*, vol. 18, no. 2, pp. 262–263, 2013, doi: 10.1080/10848770.2012.755671.
- [6] B. B. Hering and H. Feith, *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia*. 2007.
- [7] Muthoifin, "The Performance of Sharia Financing Amid the COVID-19 Pandemic in Indonesia," *Univers. J. Account. Financ.*, vol. 9, no. 4, pp. 757–763, 2021, doi: 10.13189/ujaf.2021.090421.
- [8] C. Williams, "Research Methods," *J. Bus. Econ. Res.*, vol. 5, no. 3, pp. 65–72, 2007.
- [9] Muthoifin, "Shariah Hotel and Mission Religion in Surakarta Indonesia," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 4, pp. 973–979, 2019, doi: 10.18510/hssr.2019.74133.
- [10] S. A. R. Muthoifin, Sudarno Shobron, "Humanist islam in indonesia ahmad syafii maarif perspective," *Humanit. Soc. Sci. Rev.*, vol. 7, no. 6, pp. 780–786, 2019.
- [11] D. Sudarno Shobron, Ari Anshori, Muthoifin, "Method for Developing Soft Skills Education for Students," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 7, pp. 3155–3159, 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080744.
- [12] D. Held, *Demokrasi & tatanan global: dari negara modern hingga pemerintahan kosmopolitan-Democracy and the global order: from the modern state to cosmopolitan governance*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar, 2004.
- [13] Y. A. Muhaimin, "Perkembangan Militer Dalam politik di Indonesia 1945-1966," Gajah Mada University Press, 2005.
- [14] Rusadi Kantaprawira, *Sistem politik Indonesia: suatu model pengantar*, no. 101. Bandung: Sinar Baru Algesindo, 2002.
- [15] A. Mudzakkir, "Islam Dan Politik Di Era Kontemporer," *Epistemé J. Pengemb. Ilmu Keislaman*, vol. 11, no. 1, pp. 31–48, 2016, doi: 10.21274/epis.2016.11.1.31-48.
- [16] G. Pasquino, "the Political Science of Giovanni Sartori," *Eur. Polit. Sci.*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 33–41, 2005, doi: 10.1057/palgrave.eps.2210003.
- [17] D. Pavlovikj, "Investing in Youth for a Sustainable Future," in *5th International Student Congress 2018*, 2020, no. March.
- [18] Muthoifin, Nuha, and S. Shobron, "Education and Leadership in Indonesia: A Trilogy Concept in Islamic Perspective," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 4282–4286, 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080954.
- [19] M. Nuha, Sudarno Shobron, "Education and Leadership in Indonesia: A Trilogy Concept in Islamic Perspective," *Univers. J. Educ. Res.*, vol. 8, no. 9, pp. 4282–4286, 2020, doi: 10.13189/ujer.2020.080954.
- [20] D. Indrayana, *Indonesian Constitutional Reform 1999-2002 an Evaluation of Constitution-Making in Transition*, no. December. 2008.
- [21] M. N. S. Syah, "Challenges of Islamic Education in Muslimworld : Historical , Political , and Socio-Cultural Perspective," *QJIS Qudus Int. J. Islam. Stud.*, vol. 4, no. 1, 2016.
- [22] M. A. K. H. Sudarno Shobron, Syamsul Hidayat, Muthoifin, "Political Strategy of Muslim Minorities in South Thailand," *Int. J. Adv. Sci. Technol.*, vol. 29, no. 6, pp. 3899–3913, 2020.
- [23] E. U. Jocson and W. Adihartono, "A Comparative Analysis of the Status of Homosexual Men in Indonesia and the Philippines," *J. Southeast Asian Hum. Rights*, vol. 4, no. 1, p. 271, 2020, doi: 10.19184/jseahr.v4i1.12810.
- [24] Muliadi Anangkota, "Klasifikasi Sistem Pemerintahan Perspektif Pemerintahan Modern Kekinian," *CosmoGov J. Ilmu Pemerintah.*, vol. 3, no. 2, 2017.
- [25] E. C. Syamsul Hidayat, Sudarno Shobron, Muthoifin, "Pancasila and Communism Perspectives on Islamic Thought," *Int. J. Psicososial Rehabil.*, vol. 24, no. 8, pp. 3500–3508, 2020.