

Pancasila in a National Curriculum: Political Education or Indoctrination? Case Study: Indonesian School of The Hague

Ibnu Andy Wicaksana¹

Received: October 6th 2023 | Accepted: July 10th 2024 | Published: July 24th 2024

Abstract

This article examines the operation of Pancasila, the Indonesian state ideology, in school courses in an Indonesian school in the Netherlands, “Sekolah Indonesia Den Haag” (SIDH). It aims to examine the way Pancasila is taught at SIDH, whether it functions as political education or political indoctrination. The study was conducted using qualitative data analysis, with data from interviews and field observations. The findings show that the way Pancasila is taught at SIDH is a dynamic process consisting of both cultural value and critical engagement to help students understand Indonesia's cultural heritage and instill national identity. The findings also indicate that Pancasila is taught as political education, predominantly relying on rote memorisation and prescribed textbooks, within the context of Dutch liberal cultural values. This leads to identity conflicts among the students. The findings in this study can inform policymaking in education and the formulation of curriculum. For example, to promote a more holistic understanding among students, we can foster critical thinking and open dialogue and encourage interdisciplinary exploration. Investing in teacher professional development may also facilitate meaningful teaching beyond nationalistic symbolism.

Keywords: Pancasila; Ideology; Education; State Indoctrination

¹ Department of Politics and Government, Gadjah Mada University. Email: ibnu.andy.w@mail.ugm.ac.id



Introduction

This article explores the implementation of Pancasila ideology within the educational context of “Sekolah Indonesia Den Haag” (SIDH) or the Indonesian School of The Hague. The selection of SIDH as a case study is due to its distinctive status as an Indonesian school situated in Den Haag, the Netherlands. Established in 1955 as “De Indonesische School in Den Haag”, the institution initially operated from a modest city centre location. Witnessing a surge in popularity as more Indonesian families settled in the Netherlands, the school expanded, culminating in the establishment of a purpose-built facility in Bezuidenhout in 1982. Today, SIDH stands as a prominent educational institution for Indonesian children residing in the Netherlands, delivering comprehensive curricula for different levels of education from

preschool to high school. Adopting the Indonesian curriculum, the school embeds cultural values and traditions into its agenda, fostering a bond through a shared heritage. The Indonesian curriculum includes the implementation of Pancasila ideology as a fundamental component of the educational system. Pancasila is the foundation of the Indonesian state, comprising five principles that represent the nation's philosophical, social, and political values. The five principles are (1) belief in one God, (2) just and civilised humanity, (3) the unity of Indonesia, (4) democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations among representatives, and (5) social justice for all Indonesian people. In the context of this study, it is essential to define the terms political education and indoctrination to establish a clear



foundation for the exploration of whether Pancasila education in SIDH aligns with either concept.

Previous studies have focused on phenomena at SIDH. For example, Mustain et al. (2021) examined the cultural aspects among elementary school students at SIDH. They explored the impacts of cultural encounters in a foreign setting, revealing the challenges faced by students in navigating two distinct cultures. Huda et al. (2021) investigated the internalisation of tolerance through Islamic education at SIDH, emphasising the importance of promoting open-mindedness and acceptance in an international school environment. Husni Mubarak (2021) addressed the broader educational framework of the implementation of the 2013 curriculum at SIDH and a school in Kuala Lumpur. Since previous studies have discussed

the implementation of Islamic education, cultural clashes between Dutch and Indonesian influences, and the application of the 2013 curriculum, this study focuses on Pancasila ideology. This focus aligns with the broader theme of assessing the cultural and educational dynamics in Indonesian schools abroad.

Aside from examining the implementation of Pancasila ideology at SIDH, this study also focuses on assessing cultural contexts within a new educational framework, emphasising the critical distinction between providing a political education narration and an indoctrination on the value of Pancasila. The focus on Pancasila as a subject of study marks a difference from the earlier works, contributing to the scholarly discourse on Indonesian education abroad. This study complements and

extends those discussions by covering Pancasila education and analysing how SIDH navigates the interplay between political education and potential indoctrination concerning Pancasila ideology. This study seeks to contribute to the broader discourse on political education, ideological exploration, and educational practices.

A key distinction between political education and indoctrination is the critical engagement and the allowance of diverse perspectives. Political education is when the teaching primarily focuses on encouraging students to explore the meaning of Pancasila, analyse its principles within the context of Dutch cultural discourse, and engage in open discussions that involve examining various viewpoints. Meanwhile, political indoctrination is when the teaching methods prioritise a rigid adherence to Pancasila's

principles without room for questioning, discussion, or exploration of differing viewpoints.

Identifying the boundary between “political education” and “political indoctrination” requires carefully examining specific indicators. Indoctrination is when the educational process imposes a singular interpretation of Pancasila without acknowledging its complexity or discourages students from critically evaluating its principles in light of different cultural contexts. Likewise, a doctrinal approach may also dismiss dissenting opinions or questions about Pancasila without thoughtful engagement. Moreover, a doctrinal approach may also place an overemphasis on rote memorisation of Pancasila's points without fostering an understanding of their philosophical underpinnings. Conversely,



political education encourages students to explore how Pancasila's principles manifest in real-life situations, with an appreciation for the diverse interpretations that might arise.

The distinction between political education and political indoctrination hinges on how an educational institution encourages critical thinking, open dialogue, and a nuanced exploration of ideological principles. The examination of Pancasila education at SIDH within this framework sheds light on whether the institution's approach leans more towards thoughtful analyses or inadvertently limits students' intellectual autonomy through a more doctrinal mode of instruction. By examining the teaching methods, materials, and outcomes, this study aims to provide insights into the nature of ideological education and its impact on students' ability to

navigate complex socio-political landscapes.

This study employs a qualitative research design to comprehensively understand the implementation of Pancasila ideology in SIDH. Qualitative data for this research was collected through six interview sessions. The first session, which comprised student interviews, was conducted on June 1, 2022, followed by a student focus group discussion on June 2, 2022. Subsequently, teacher interviews took place on June 8, 2022, and a teacher focus group discussion was held on June 9, 2022. Further interviews were held on June 14, 2022, involving students' guardians, parents, and representatives from the Indonesian Embassy in The Hague. The interview series concluded with a session with the SIDH Headmaster on June 15, 2022. The students, aged 15-17, were classified as minors;



hence, the interviews and focus group discussions were conducted in their dormitory and were supervised by their teachers and guardians. The purpose of using qualitative data is to gain a deeper understanding of the challenges and opportunities in implementing Pancasila ideology in the context of education and to explore the perspectives and experiences of those directly involved.

The interviews used open-ended questions to allow for more detailed and nuanced responses. The interview responses are recorded and transcribed for analysis. Qualitative data analysis involves a process of coding and categorisation, where the responses will be organised into themes and patterns. This allows for a more comprehensive understanding of the perspectives and experiences of the interviewees and will provide

valuable insights into the challenges and opportunities in implementing Pancasila ideology at SIDH. In addition to interviews, secondary data sources such as academic papers, policy documents, and reports are also be consulted to provide a broader context for the implementation of Pancasila ideology in education and to identify any relevant national or international policies that may impact the implementation of Pancasila ideology at SIDH.

Background

Indonesia's educational system is shaped by the country's historical and cultural context, including its adherence to the Pancasila ideology. The implementation of Pancasila ideology in education is characterised by both continuity and change, reflecting the country's evolving political, social, and cultural conditions (Adha, 2020). One of the earliest



and most significant efforts to implement Pancasila ideology in Indonesian education was the establishment of the National Education System (Sistem Pendidikan Nasional) in 1963, which aimed to produce loyal, nationalist citizens adhering to Pancasila ideology. To achieve this goal, the system integrated Pancasila ideology into the curriculum, textbooks, and pedagogical practices. During the New Order regime under President Soeharto from 1966 to 1998, there was a shift towards a more authoritarian approach to implementing Pancasila ideology in education. The government enforced strict adherence to Pancasila ideology in education, often through coercive measures such as mandatory recitation of the Pancasila principles in schools (Adha, 2020). This approach was criticised for stifling intellectual freedom and

creativity in education (Suryadarma & Jones, 2013).

In the post-New Order period, the approach to implementing Pancasila ideology in education was less rigid. With the integration of the new curriculum, known as Kurikulum 2013, the Indonesian government aimed to modernise and improve the quality of education while addressing the diverse needs of students in a multicultural society (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2014). This curriculum emphasised the importance of character education, including the cultivation of Pancasila values such as religious tolerance, social justice, and national unity. Under Kurikulum 2013, Pancasila education was integrated into various subjects across the curriculum rather than being taught as a separate subject. This approach aimed to expose students to Pancasila principles



holistically, allowing for a more comprehensive understanding of its significance in shaping Indonesian society (Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2014). Furthermore, the introduction of the Kurikulum Merdeka (Freedom Curriculum) in 2021 places a stronger emphasis on promoting Pancasila values within the educational system. The Kurikulum Merdeka seeks to provide students with greater autonomy and flexibility in their learning while instilling a sense of national identity and civic responsibility (Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, 2021).

In these curriculum reforms, the teaching of Pancasila has become more integrated and interdisciplinary, reflecting a broader recognition of its

importance in shaping students' moral and ethical development. Rather than being confined to a single subject, Pancasila education is now infused throughout the curriculum, allowing students to explore its principles in various contexts and applications. The era of Kurikulum 2013 and Kurikulum Merdeka has seen a greater emphasis on critical thinking and active citizenship, with Pancasila education as a foundation for fostering these skills. Students are encouraged to engage in discussions and debates about contemporary issues from a Pancasila perspective, enabling them to develop their analytical abilities and contribute meaningfully to society (Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia, 2021). The integration of Pancasila ideology into the



Indonesian education system reflects a deeper commitment to promoting national unity, diversity, and civic engagement. Through innovative curriculum approaches and pedagogical strategies, educators aim to equip students with the knowledge, skills, and values necessary to thrive in the modern world while upholding the principles of Pancasila.

Over time, Pancasila education has evolved beyond its traditional role as a subject of instruction, becoming a platform for critical discourse and political education. This transformation marks a shift from a state-centric narrative to a more open discussion format, allowing for greater intellectual freedom and creativity in interpreting and applying Pancasila principles (Adha, 2020). This change suggests that Pancasila education is no longer a mere tool for state propaganda but an

evolving subject that encourages thoughtful analysis and discussions (Fitriasari et al., 2019). These positive developments in the national curriculum anticipate significant improvements in the implementation of Pancasila ideology at institutions, including SIDH, particularly in fostering critical thinking and facilitating open dialogues among students. However, it remains essential to consider the impact of these changes, particularly in schools located outside Indonesia, such as SIDH, which serve as representations of the Indonesian education system abroad. The key concern lies in distinguishing whether the implementation of the curriculum at SIDH, especially with older-generation teachers, leans more towards political indoctrination or political education.



Key Concepts

Educational theorists have nuanced perspectives on distinguishing between political education and indoctrination. Paulo Freire's construct of critical pedagogy states that political education focuses more on dialogic learning that cultivates critical consciousness (Freire, 1970). This approach promotes active engagement with societal realities and encourages learners to question prevailing ideologies instead of passive acceptance, which is often associated with indoctrination (Chalaune, 2021).

In education and ideological transmission, the philosophical insights of John Stuart Mill and Jürgen Habermas (1981) provide valuable perspectives that both align with and contrast against each other—a dichotomy between political education and indoctrination. John Stuart Mill's emphasis on pluralism, individuality, and diverse

perspectives, as articulated in his work such as "On Liberty". Mill advocates for the engagement with viewpoints even when they contradict one's own, viewing this as a means to foster intellectual growth and critical thinking. In this regard, Mill's ideas align closely with the principles of political education, which prioritise analytical thinking and the capacity to engage critically with various viewpoints.

Conversely, indoctrination tends to stifle intellectual growth by imposing a singular perspective, as highlighted by scholars like Habibi (1996). Indoctrination restricts the opportunity for individuals to explore alternative viewpoints, hindering their ability to think independently and critically. Jürgen Habermas, in his book *The Theory of Communicative Action* (1981), provides a critical perspective from discourse ethics and democratic theory,



adding another dimension to this comparison. Habermas stresses the significance of rational communication and mutual understanding in moral and political decision-making. His framework resonates with the goals of political education, which seeks to nurture citizens capable of reasoned dialogue and deliberation (Culp, 2020). Habermas's critique of ideological indoctrination underscores its potential to obstruct open discourse, which is a vital aspect of democratic political education (Susen, 2018).

Samuel Freeman's (2002) concept of "reasonable disagreement" extends this comparison. Freeman emphasises the value of creating an environment conducive to the exploration of diverse viewpoints, a concept integral to political education. This notion stands in stark contrast to indoctrination, which tends to suppress dissent

and discourage the expression of differing opinions (Reidy, 2007). Mill and Habermas both emphasise the importance of exposure to diverse perspectives and reasoned dialogue, but Mill focuses on individuality and intellectual autonomy, which aligns more with political education. Meanwhile, Habermas emphasises rational communication and mutual understanding, leaning more toward political education and less toward indoctrination. From these various discourses, an outline can be delineated, and three pivotal factors can be identified to differentiate between political education and political indoctrination.

One crucial indicator in distinguishing between political education and political indoctrination is the approach to learning. Drawing from Paulo Freire's construct of critical pedagogy, political education



places a strong emphasis on dialogic learning that cultivates criticality among learners (Freire, 1970). In this educational paradigm, students are encouraged to engage with societal realities, question prevailing ideologies, and develop a critical understanding of complex issues. This is in contrast with passive acceptance in indoctrination, where individuals are expected to adhere to prescribed beliefs without criticality. Thus, the presence of dialogic learning and the cultivation of critical consciousness are key indicators of political education.

Another essential indicator pertains to the extent of exposure to diverse perspectives within the educational environment. The benchmark is John Stuart Mill's pluralistic philosophy, which emphasises the importance of encountering diverse viewpoints (Mill, 1859). In political education,

the priority is exposing learners to a wide range of perspectives, including those that may be contradictory to their own beliefs, which can foster intellectual growth and stimulate critical thinking. Conversely, political indoctrination tends to impose a singular perspective, often without allowance for alternative viewpoints. Indoctrination restricts individuals from exploring diverse perspectives, thereby hindering their capacity to think independently and critically. Thus, exposure to diverse perspectives is a critical indicator in distinguishing between political education and indoctrination.

The next indicator is the promotion of rational communication and open discourse. Jürgen Habermas's discourse ethics highlights the democratic significance of rational communication and mutual understanding in moral



and political decision-making (Habermas, 1981). In alignment with this framework, political education seeks to nurture citizens capable of reasoned dialogue, deliberation, and the respectful exchange of differing opinions. Open discourse is encouraged, and dissenting viewpoints are welcomed. Conversely, political indoctrination obstructs open discourse and rational communication, discourages dissent, suppresses the expression of diverse viewpoints, and limits the opportunity for meaningful dialogue. Therefore, an educational environment that promotes rational communication and open discourse is an indicator of distinguishing political education and political indoctrination.

Findings

Prior research about curriculum implementation, although not directly related to

Pancasila education at SIDH, provides insights into how curriculum can shape students' perspectives (Mubarok et al., 2021). The finding serves as a foundation to examine the relationship between Pancasila education, political education, and indoctrination at SIDH. Therefore, this study is built upon the insights of Mill, Habermas, and Freeman, as well as the implications of prior qualitative studies examining the implementation of Pancasila ideology in the Indonesian education system. These studies collectively indicate the impact of Pancasila ideology on shaping students' civic identity, moral values, intercultural competencies, and broader national identity. By drawing parallels between these studies and the challenges and opportunities posed by SIDH's international setting, the



ideological education at SIDH can be understood.

The investigation into the influence of Pancasila ideology on civic education resonates with SIDH's commitment to nurturing responsible Indonesian citizens in a global context (Suharno, 2020). As the school operates abroad, the analysis can explore how SIDH fosters a sense of unity and responsibility among its students while considering the impact of international exposure on students' civic engagement and understanding of Indonesian identity. Indonesia's historical narratives and SIDH's international composition invite an exploration of how the school navigates these complexities (Nugroho, 2020). This can lead to insights into whether SIDH's implementation of Pancasila bridges Indonesian historical

narratives and global perspectives.

The exploration of Pancasila's impact on promoting positive moral values aligns with SIDH's daily operations and curriculum (Kariyadi & Suprpto, 2017). The analysis can delve into how SIDH's international atmosphere shapes the cultivation of virtues like honesty, respect, and responsibility among students with diverse cultural values. The study on the role of Pancasila ideology in promoting cultural diversity and religious tolerance holds particular relevance to the diversity among SIDH's students (Subagyo, 2020). Aside from the contrast between Indonesian collectivism and Dutch individualism, the analysis can explore how SIDH fosters cross-cultural understanding, religious tolerance, and respect for diversity, which ultimately contributes to the student's



holistic development as global citizens.

Students and Teachers' Perspectives

SIDH, as an Indonesian school abroad, emphasises the importance of Pancasila in shaping its educational philosophy. This is in line with the Indonesian government's efforts to promote Pancasila as a guiding principle for national development. According to a report by the Ministry of National Education and Culture, the government recognises Pancasila as the foundation of the national education system and should be integrated into all levels of education (Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan, 2019). Pancasila is integrated into every aspect of the school's curriculum and activities. For instance, in addition to regular classroom instruction, the school offers extracurricular activities that

promote Pancasila values, such as the Scout program, the student government program, and the traditional Indonesian arts and culture program. The school's principal promotes this to ensure that students not only learn about Pancasila but also experience its values in practice.

The teachers at SIDH also view the implementation of Pancasila as an essential part of their role in promoting Indonesian culture and values (Interview session three, June 8, 2022). In a focus group discussion session two on June 9, 2022, several teachers expressed their belief that Pancasila is a critical element of Indonesian identity and that it is their responsibility to pass on this knowledge to their students. They also noted that Pancasila education is not limited to the classroom but also occurs through various activities and events organised by the school. The teachers also



highlighted the importance of regularly assessing students' understanding and applying Pancasila values.

Students at SIDH also value the implementation of Pancasila ideology in their schools. In a survey conducted with 11 secondary school students at SIDH, all of them believed Pancasila education was essential and that it helped them better understand Indonesian culture and values. They also appreciated the various Pancasila-related activities and events organised by the school (Interview session one, June 1, 2022). Furthermore, from the focus group discussion session two on June 2, 2022, some students also noted that they felt a sense of pride in their Indonesian identity and culture due to learning about Pancasila.

The Indonesian community in The Hague also supports the implementation of Pancasila

ideology at SIDH. For instance, the Embassy of the Republic of Indonesia in The Hague has organised cultural events and educational activities that promote Pancasila values at the school (Interview session five, June 14, 2022). Members of the Indonesian community, such as parents of SIDH students, have also expressed their support for the school's commitment to Pancasila education. Overall, the qualitative data conclude that the implementation of Pancasila ideology at SIDH is viewed as an essential part of promoting Indonesian culture and values among the school's teachers, students, and the wider community. The school's commitment to Pancasila education is reflected in its curriculum, extracurricular activities, and its partnership with



the Indonesian community in promoting Pancasila values.

During the first interview session on June 1, 2022, students were asked to recite the points of Pancasila and elaborate on the deeper meanings, such as the significance of the first point, "Belief in one God", and its implementation. Their responses were often templated from textbooks. For instance, M, a social science major in grade 11, explained that "Belief in one God" exists because the country has various religions, which unite them under a common belief in God. She added that its implementation promotes religious tolerance in Indonesia. In other interviews, other students gave similar answers.

Although students could recite the points of Pancasila, their understanding remained largely superficial. Students expressed familiarity with primary actions, such as

tolerating others' religions and races, but their understanding lacked depth and critical analysis. The students' responses indicate the feelings bound by national mandates to uphold Pancasila, suggesting that the ideology's implementation might be perceived as a form of compliance rather than genuine internalisation. In the second focus group discussion on June 9, 2022, teachers admitted their reluctance to delve deeper into Pancasila and stimulate critical thinking among students. They feared being unable to answer more complex questions. This reluctance stemmed from their educational backgrounds, where teaching methods were traditionally rigid. Teachers struggled to meet these expectations despite the principal's encouragement to adopt new methods aligned with the independent learning



curriculum, which promotes critical thinking. Additionally, the educational discourse in the Netherlands, which emphasises critical thinking, further complicated their ability to adapt.

The pattern of rote memorisation over genuine understanding was evident across the interviews. When probed further about other points of Pancasila, students reiterated textbook definitions without demonstrating a deeper or personal connection to the principles. For example, when discussing the second point, “just and civilised humanity”, the students uniformly echoed textbook explanations about treating others respectfully and fairly. However, they struggled to provide concrete examples of how this principle is applied daily

(focus group discussion session one, June 2, 2022).

D and K, students of social science majors in grade 10, exemplified the prevalent view among the students. They highlighted the school's emphasis on recognising all religions in Indonesia, conforming to the nation's principles as mandated by Indonesia's Constitution. While this demonstrates some exposure to the ideological concepts, their responses lacked insight into the deeper philosophical foundations and historical context of Pancasila. One teacher, Miss D, admitted that teaching Pancasila at SIDH is challenging due to the different discourse surrounding topics like LGBTQ+ in the Netherlands. She voiced worries about the Dutch education system's inclusive approach to LGBTQ+ issues, contrasting it with her belief that Pancasila holds a different



stance despite no academic basis suggesting Pancasila opposes LGBTQ+ rights. This highlights incomplete understanding among teachers about Pancasila, primarily shaped by their educational background and societal narratives regarding the principle of "Belief in one God," which some interpret as a justification to reject LGBTQ+ rights. As a result, she was reluctant to elaborate further on the topic during her lessons, fearing she might not adequately address the students' inquiries and the potential conflicts arising from the differing cultural perspectives.

Furthermore, the headmaster of SIDH, Mr H, shared an incident where a student named D.E, from grade 10, was held back because she refused to acknowledge Islam in a religion class, despite her parents stating otherwise (interview session six, June 15,

2022). This incident highlighted the challenge of implementing Pancasila when the cultural discourse in the Netherlands vastly differs from that of Indonesia. In the Netherlands, religious freedom and individual beliefs are highly respected, which contrasts with the more collectivist nature of Pancasila, which emphasises national unity and identity.

Despite acknowledging the importance of contributing to the nation, a common finding among the students was a limited understanding of the underlying principles of Pancasila. Many students could not articulate each principle's deeper meanings and historical significance. This finding raises questions about the effectiveness of the implementation process, as memorisation without comprehension may hinder the development of a genuine



appreciation and transformative understanding of the ideology.

Moreover, the data revealed a lack of connection between Pancasila and students' daily lives. From the writer's point of view, the ideology's implementation at SIDH might not be effectively integrated into the students' experiences and cultural contexts. Without a tangible connection to their lives, students may struggle to perceive Pancasila as a guiding framework for their actions and decision-making processes. The limited understanding of Pancasila's philosophical foundations among students indicates the need for a more profound and moving beyond memorising its principles. It focuses on deeply understanding Pancasila's ideas, encouraging students to think critically, reflect, and apply them in real-life situations. Engaging students in critical discussions and

encouraging them to explore the historical context and underlying values of Pancasila could foster a deeper understanding and appreciation for the ideology. Additionally, incorporating real-life case studies and practical applications of Pancasila principles in students' daily lives could enhance the relevance and resonance of the ideology within the school community.

The qualitative data collected from interviews with students further highlights the challenge of the implementation of Pancasila ideology at SIDH, indicating an inclination towards a more propagandistic approach rather than critical thinking and genuine understanding. The data revealed that the students' answers were pro forma and lacked depth, suggesting limited exploration and critical questioning about Pancasila ideology. The responses appeared to align with



a predetermined narrative, emphasising conformity to national mandates and the recognition of all religions in Indonesia, without delving into the philosophical foundations or historical context of Pancasila. This pro forma response pattern raises concerns about the level of intellectual engagement and critical inquiry encouraged within the educational environment. It points to conformist learning rather than nurturing independent thinking.

The lack of critical questions about Pancasila, exemplified by the student who was hesitant to admit her religious beliefs, highlights the need for a more inclusive and open discourse at SIDH (interview session six, June 15, 2022). Allowing students to ask critical questions and engage in discussions about the ideology would promote a more authentic understanding of Pancasila.

And its practical application. Emphasising rote memorisation without encouraging critical inquiry may contribute to the perception of Pancasila as a mere formality, reinforcing that it serves as a tool for national propaganda rather than an ideology to guide ethical and moral decision-making.

Indoctrination Teaching Method Tendencies in the Pancasila Subject

The insights from the interviews conducted with students at SIDH reveal an unsettling tendency to provide formulaic responses when inquired about Pancasila ideology. While they can readily recite the points of Pancasila, their comprehension remains superficial, unable to articulate the philosophical foundations. The school's pedagogy, centred around rote memorisation and ceremonial observances (interview session six, June 15,



2022), could contribute to this limited understanding, raising concerns about the lack of internalisation.

Likewise, the interview session two, June 8, 2022, with teachers revealed that the predominance of Pancasila instructions is rooted in the usage of prescribed textbooks without substantive philosophical deliberations. The lack of comprehension among educators further impedes their efficacy in communicating the idea to students.

Discussion

The examination of the implementation of Pancasila ideology at SIDH suggests a certain inclination towards indoctrination rather than an understanding of the ideology. The limited depth of students' understanding and their recourse to pro forma responses indicate a doctrinal approach rather than an

environment that nurtures critical thinking and exploration. It is evident that while teachers at SIDH make efforts to teach Pancasila's practical application in real-life scenarios, the examples and discussions remain rooted in the Indonesian cultural context. This disparity becomes pronounced when students are exposed to the more liberal and open Dutch cultural discourse. The ideological education at SIDH tends to be more into doctrinal rigidity, as demonstrated by Miss D's reluctance to delve into topics like LGBTQ+ rights due to a potential mismatch between Pancasila's stance and the Dutch discourse.

The demarcation between political education and political indoctrination necessitates an examination of specific markers. Indoctrination is when the educational process constructively imposes a singular



interpretation of Pancasila, failing to acknowledge its inherent complexity or restraining the critical evaluation of its principles in the context of diverse cultural perspectives. Indoctrination is also indicated by a condition when responses to opposing viewpoints or queries related to Pancasila are dismissed. The next indicator is an overemphasis on the rote memorisation of Pancasila without fostering an understanding of the philosophical foundations. Conversely, an educational approach encourages students to understand how Pancasila's principles manifest in real-life situations, exhibiting a keen awareness of the possibility of multiple interpretations, which aligns more harmoniously with the principles that underpin political education. In sum, the examination of Pancasila education at SIDH raises the

question of whether the institution's pedagogical approach cultivates informed and engaged citizens equipped for thoughtful analysis.

Conclusion

The exploration of Pancasila ideology's implementation at SIDH reveals the leaning towards indoctrination, raising concerns about its impact on the understanding of the ideology. The limited depth of students' comprehension indicates a doctrinal approach that restricts critical thinking and genuine exploration. Political indoctrination, characterised by the imposition of beliefs without fostering independent thought, can have negative consequences for students' intellectual growth and societal contributions.

The Indonesian and Dutch cultural discourses further complicate the situation, resulting in hesitation to



acknowledge religion. This suggests the challenges of implementing Pancasila in a cultural context that values individual beliefs. To address these challenges, SIDH can learn from Sekolah Republik Indonesia Tokyo, which has successfully implemented Pancasila while harmonising it with Japanese-rooted philosophy. This approach enables students to maintain their Pancasila core while aligning with Japanese discourse, resulting in a high-quality education that prepares students to thrive in diverse cultural contexts.

While teachers at SIDH strive to teach practical applications of Pancasila, the discomfort around discussing topics like LGBTQ+ rights indicates unpreparedness to address differing perspectives. Such an approach risks stifling critical thinking and discouraging open dialogue, eroding the true

essence of Pancasila. This underscores the significance of an educational environment that nurtures critical thinking and open dialogue. It calls for a balanced pedagogical approach that encourages students to engage with Pancasila's principles while upholding their individual beliefs and perspectives.

In conclusion, implementing Pancasila ideology at SIDH reveals the need to evaluate whether the teaching is more of political education or indoctrination. The latter's detrimental impacts are not only incongruent with Pancasila's principles but also hinder the development of well-rounded and critical thinkers. By fostering an environment that promotes open dialogue, encourages exploration, and respects diverse viewpoints, SIDH can move toward political education.



They can learn this from the experience of Sekolah Republik Indonesia Tokyo in integrating Pancasila with another cultural discourse.





References

- Adha, M. M. (2020). Kekuatan Nilai-nilai Pancasila dalam Membangun Kepribadian Masyarakat Indonesia. *Al-Adabiya: Jurnal Kebudayaan dan Keagamaan*, 15(1), 121-138.
- Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi Republik Indonesia. (2021). *Kajian Akademik Kurikulum untuk Pemulihan Pembelajaran*. Jakarta: Pusat Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran Badan Standar, Kurikulum, dan Asesmen Pendidikan Kementerian Pendidikan, Kebudayaan, Riset, dan Teknologi.
- Chalaune, B. S. (2021). Paulo Freire's Critical Pedagogy in Educational Transformation. *International Journal of Research Granthaalayah*, 9(4), 185–194.
- Culp, J. (2020). Discourse ethics, epistemology, and educational justice: A reply to Harvey Siegel. *Theory and Research in Education*, 18(2), 151-173.
- Direktorat Jenderal Guru dan Tenaga Kependidikan. (2019, September 17). *Perlunya Penanaman Nilai Pancasila di Berbagai Jenjang Pendidikan*. Retrieved from gtk.kemdikbud: <https://gtk.kemdikbud.go.id/index.php/read-news/perlunya-penanaman-nilai-pancasila-di-berbagai-jenjang-pendidikan>
- Fitriasari, S., Masyitoh, I. S., & Baehaqi. (2019). The Role of Pancasila Education Teachers and Citizenship in Strengthening Character Education Based on Pancasila Values. *Advances in Social Science, Education, and Humanities Research*, 534-540.
- Freeman, S. (Ed.). (2002). *The Cambridge Companion to Rawls*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed*. New York: Continuum.



- Habermas, J. (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action : The Critique of Functionalist Reason* (First Published). Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Habibi, D. (1996). J. S. Mill's Grand, Leading Principle. *Iyyun: The Jerusalem Philosophical Quarterly*, 79-104.
- Huda, M. M., Falah, R. Z., Amanina, N., & Mubarak, M. A. (2021). Internalisasi Sikap Toleransi Melalui Pembelajaran PAI di Sekolah Indonesia Den Haag. *Edification Journal: Pendidikan Agama Islam*, 3(2), 191-210.
- Kariyadi, D., & Suprpto, W. (2017). Membangun Kepemimpinan Berbasis Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Dalam Perspektif Masyarakat Multikultural. *Citizenship Jurnal Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 5(2), 86-96.
- Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan. (2014). *Konsep dan Implementasi Kurikulum 2013*. Jakarta: KEMENTERIAN PENDIDIKAN DAN KEBUDAYAAN.
- Mill, J. S. (1859). *On Liberty*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Mubarak, H., Rohmaedah, I., Aini, A. Q., Rahmawati, W. A., Mahanani, S., & Yustiani, R. (2021). IMPLEMENTASI KURIKULUM 2013 DI SEKOLAH INDONESIA DEEN HAAG BELANDA DAN SEKOLAH INDONESIA KUALA LUMPUR MALAYSIA. *Jurnal Keislaman dan Ilmu Pendidikan*, 3(1), 68-81.
- Mustain, A. S., Ruhma, N., Asrofah, A. N., Rohmaniah, A., Mubarak, H., & Ulya, F. (2021). Dampak Pertemuan Dua Kultural di Sekolah Indonesia Luar Negeri (Sekolah Indonesia Den Haag-sidh) pada Siswa Tingkat Pendidikan Sekolah Dasar. *Journal of Educational Learning and Innovation*, 1(1), 24-32.
- Nugroho, S. S. (2020). Implementasi Konsep Pendidikan Karakter Ki Hajar Dewantara Berbasis Nilai-Nilai Pancasila Bagi



Mahasiswa Generasi Mileneal. *YUSTISIA MERDEKA: Jurnal Ilmiah Hukum*, 6(2), 89-94.

Reidy, D. A. (2007). Reciprocity and Reasonable Disagreement: From Liberal to Democratic Legitimacy. *Philosophical Studies: An International Journal for Philosophy in the Analytic Tradition*, 132, 243-291.

Subagyo. (2020). Implementasi Pancasila Dalam Menangkal Intoleransi, Radikalisme Dan Terorisme. *Jurnal Rontal Keilmuan PKn*, 6(1), 10-24.

Suharno. (2020). Urgensi Revitalisasi Pancasila dalam Membangun Karakter Kebangsaan. *JPK (Jurnal Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan)*, 5(1), 23-33.

Suryadarma, D. & Jones, G. W. (2013). *Education in Indonesia*. Singapore: ISEAS Publishing Institute of Southeast Asian Studies.

Susen, S. (2018). Jürgen Habermas: Between Democratic Deliberation and Deliberative Democracy. *The Routledge Handbook of Language and Politics*, 43-66.