



THE DIALECTICS OF NATION-BUILDING: PANCASILA AS THE IDEOLOGICAL COMPROMISE IN THE BPUPK AND PPKI PROCEEDINGS (1945)

Abdurakhman^{1*}, Dwi Mulyatari², Rostineu³, Yuda Benharry Tangkilisan⁴

¹ Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, E-mail : abdurakhman.hum@ui.ac.id

² Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, E-mail : dwi.mulyatari@ui.ac.id

³ Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, E-mail : rostineu31@ui.ac.id

⁴ Universitas Indonesia, Depok, Indonesia, E-mail : yuda.tangkilisan@ui.ac.id



©2026 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License (CC-BY-SA) (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>)

DOI : [10.30983/islam_realitas.v12i1.10401](https://doi.org/10.30983/islam_realitas.v12i1.10401)

Submission: November, 13 2025	Revised: September, 14 2026	Accepted: September, 14 2026	Published: September, 14 2026
-------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	-------------------------------

Abstract

Pancasila, as the philosophical foundation of the Indonesian nation, represents a fundamental ideological compromise agreed upon by major factions during the BPUPK and PPKI proceedings in 1945. The intellectual dynamics among nationalist, Islamic, and moderate-pluralist factions during this period serve as a crucial key to understanding post-independence political developments. This study aims to examine key internal debates within BPUPK and PPKI using historical research methods combined with a contextual analysis of state-religion relations. The findings demonstrate that Pancasila emerged not merely as a temporary political consensus, but as a dynamic middle ground capable of harmonizing diverse national visions during the independence transition. Furthermore, this historical compromise offers significant implications for managing potential religious-secular polarization and maintaining national stability in modern Indonesia.

Keywords: BPUPK, ideological compromise, Pancasila, PPKI, state-religion relations.

Abstrak

Pancasila sebagai fondasi filosofis bangsa Indonesia merupakan bentuk kompromi ideologis mendasar yang disepakati oleh faksi-faksi utama dalam sidang BPUPK dan PPKI pada tahun 1945. Dinamika pemikiran antara faksi nasionalis, Islam, dan moderat-pluralis pada periode tersebut menjadi kunci utama untuk memahami perkembangan politik pascakemerdekaan. Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk mengkaji perdebatan kunci di internal BPUPK dan PPKI dengan menggunakan metode penelitian sejarah melalui pendekatan analisis kontekstual relasi agama dan negara. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan bahwa Pancasila lahir bukan sekadar sebagai konsensus politik sementara, melainkan sebagai jalan tengah dinamis yang mampu menyelaraskan keberagaman visi kebangsaan pada masa transisi kemerdekaan. Kompromi historis ini memberikan implikasi penting dalam mengelola potensi polarisasi agama dan sekuler serta memelihara stabilitas nasional di Indonesia modern.

Kata Kunci: BPUPK, kompromi ideologis, Pancasila, PPKI, relasi agama dan negara.

Background

History records that the establishment of Pancasila as the state foundation of the Republic of Indonesia emerged through dialectical debate,¹ reflecting the complex socio-political dynamics within the sessions of the Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Independence (BPUPK) and the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian Independence (PPKI). Although national historical literature commonly appends the word "Indonesia" to form BPUPKI, this article consistently uses the term BPUPK in accordance with official records in the session archives.

The dialectical debate within these BPUPK and PPKI proceedings did not occur in a vacuum; rather, it was driven by a clash of ideas among factions representing Indonesia's political spectrum at the time. Broadly speaking, this arena of intellectual exchange was divided into three main ideological axes: the secular nationalist group advocating for the separation of religion and state affairs, the Islamic group championing sharia principles as the foundation of governance, and the moderate or pluralist group seeking to bridge these two extremes. It was this encounter and dialogue

¹ According to the Great Dictionary of the Indonesian Language (KBBI), dialectics is defined as a method of reasoning through dialogue to investigate a problem. In this study, dialectics is understood as the exchange of opposing

ideas and arguments to reach a new understanding. Through this process, Pancasila emerges as an ideological synthesis agreed upon by all parties.



between groups that ultimately underpinned the emergence of fundamental national consensus.

During the BPUPK and PPKI sessions in the months preceding the proclamation, an intense ideological tug-of-war emerged between secular nationalist and Islamic factions regarding the state's foundational philosophy. (Kahin, 1952). Reviewing the debate that accompanied these tensions is very important, because it is from there that we can understand how the founders of the nation formulated the basis of the state of the Republic of Indonesia not solely based on the ideological dominance of one group alone, but through a process of compromise and intensive political negotiation. Pancasila, in this case, is not just a symbol of nationality, but a result of a minimum consensus that unites ideological differences in a pluralistic Indonesian society (Latif, 2011; Kaelan, 2013). This deliberative process endowed Pancasila with a flexible yet value-bound framework.. It is designed to be a meeting point between religious ideas, local values, and modern state principles (Magnis-Suseno, 2001).

Observing the socio-political dynamics of Indonesia today, where the meaning and position of Pancasila are still often debated in various religious and national discourses, revisiting these foundational moments provides essential context for modern political dynamics. By retracing the crucial moments in 1945, this article aims to show that the ideological compromise that gave birth to Pancasila as the Basis of the State was an important foundation that allowed Indonesia to remain intact as a very pluralistic nation to this day.

Existing scholarship primarily frames the 1945 proceedings as an ideological deadlock between Islamists and secular nationalists (e.g., Effendy, 2003; Latif, 2011) or a structural state-building process (Notosusanto, 1984). While Kaelan (2013) highlights the cultural-political dialectic, literature often overemphasizes the polarization rather than the pragmatic mechanics of negotiation. This article offers novelty by shifting the focus from the ideological rift to the dialectical mechanics of compromise itself, demonstrating how opposing

factions systematically transformed an impasse into a dynamic “middle way” consensus that redefined the Indonesian state model.

Based on the above background and literature review, this article will focus on the historical process and tension that occurred, especially between Secularism and Religion in the BPUPK and PPKI sessions which also had an impact on the political dynamics of Indonesia after independence. The research questions asked are: 1) What are the political dynamics of Indonesia ahead of the proclamation of independence; 2) What are the dynamics of the ideological debate between secular nationalist groups and Islamic groups in the BPUPK and PPKI sessions?; 3) What are the implications of this ideological compromise on the continuity and interpretation of Pancasila in the political history of post-independence Indonesia?

This article utilizes a historical method combined with the contextual analysis of the relationship between the state and religion, to examine the process of the birth of Pancasila as an ideology resulting from compromise among various political and social forces in the early days of Indonesian independence. The historical method, which includes heuristic, verification, interpretation, and historiographic stages, is used to trace the dynamics of the ideological debate that took place from the BPUPK and PPKI sessions, to the ratification of the 1945 Constitution.

The primary sources used include the Minutes of the BPUPK and PPKI Sessions published by the State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia. Data verification is carried out through internal and external criticism, through comparison between secondary data in books and published scientific articles. Meanwhile, the interpretation process is directed by highlighting the dialectical process between secular nationalist groups, Islam, and other national groups, which seeks to formulate a philosophical basis for an independent Indonesian state. Within this framework, the analysis of state and religious relations is used to understand the socio-political context behind the ideological negotiations. This analysis helps to explain how the basic issue of the state becomes an



arena of compromise between the aspirations of the Islamic state and the ideals of the national state, as well as how Pancasila is then positioned as a meeting point that accommodates religious values without placing a particular religion as the basis of the state (Boland, 1985; Noer, 1978). This approach allows for a more critical understanding of Pancasila, not just as a final political document, but as the result of a dynamic interaction between power, religious identity, and national demands. In the historiographic stage, this article seeks to reveal that ideological compromises in Pancasila are not static, but continue to be tested and reinterpreted as the Indonesian political context changes.

Political Dynamics Ahead of the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence

The end of 1944 to August 1945 was a turning point in the history of the Indonesian Nation, which was marked by various important events leading up to the proclamation of Indonesian independence on August 17, 1945. It began with a promise by Japanese Prime Minister Koiso Kuniaki on September 4, 1944, which stated that Japan would give independence to Indonesia in the future (Kanahele, 1967). This continued with the involvement of Indonesian nationalist figures in the Japanese Military Government, among others as advisors (*Sanyo*) in departments formed by Japan. In addition, opportunities were also opened with the establishment of BPUPK (*Badan Penyelidik Usaha-usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan/Dokuritsu Junbi Cosakai*) on April 29, 1945. BPUPK had held trials twice, on May 29-June 1 and July 10-17, 1945 (Poeze and Nordholt, 2023), before it was dissolved and its duties were replaced by the PPKI (Indonesian Independence Preparatory Committee). This strategic window energized nationalist groups to proactively build and enthusiasm for Indonesian nationalist groups to be proactive in preparing for Indonesian independence and laying the foundations for an independent Indonesian state.

Meanwhile, the Japanese military government that occupied Indonesia seems to have taken into account, by looking at the Japanese war conditions

in several combat areas that had been pushed by the allied forces, making it impossible to retract Koiso's promise. Actually, Koiso's promise does not show certainty when exactly Indonesia will become independent. The Japanese Commander-in-Chief in Dallat also did not convey the condition of the Japanese war to Sukarno, Hatta, and dr. Radjiman Wediodiningrat. However, the summoning of Sukarno and Hatta and the chairman of the PPKI, dr. Radjiman, to Dallat, Vietnam to meet General Shigetada, the Commander-in-Chief of Japan in Southeast Asia, showed that Japan was actually on the verge of defeat in the Pacific War. Thus, according to the direction of the top leadership of Japan, Sukarno and Hatta together with the PPKI were tasked with preparing for Indonesian independence by conducting PPKI sessions.

While Sukarno, Hatta and Radjiman were on their way back from Dallat, in Saigon to Jakarta, youth groups in Jakarta and other major cities in Java had heard about Japan's defeat to the Allies on August 15, 1945 (Poeze and Nordholt, 2023). They began to gather and discuss the implementation of Indonesian independence. Upon the arrival of Sukarno and Hatta in Jakarta on August 16, 1945, the youth group delegates immediately conveyed their opinion that Indonesian independence should be implemented immediately without going through and without the approval of the PPKI session, considering that the PPKI was a body formed by the Japanese occupation government. However, Sukarno-Hatta, who tended to be cautious, insisted that the implementation of the Proclamation of Independence must go through the PPKI session, because the Japanese army who was still armed at that time could cause misunderstandings and could result in many casualties on the Indonesian side.

The tension between Young and Old Groups in the context of preparing for Indonesian independence shows the dynamics of Indonesia's independence struggle which is full of differences of views and political interests. The 1945 Rengasdengklok incident was the peak of the tension between the two camps, namely between



the Old Group with Sukarno, Hatta as the main figure, and the Young Group which tended to be revolutionary with its figures Sutan Syahrir, Wikana, Chaerul Saleh, Sukarni and friends. On August 16, 1945, Sukarno and Hatta were taken by a group of young men to Rengasdengklok and asked to proclaim independence that same day without influence from Japan (Poeze and Nordholt, 2023). The Rengasdengklok incident showed the spirit of a young group that wanted to immediately proclaim Indonesian independence and take advantage of the existing momentum without having to be hampered by Japanese interests. The Rengasdengklok incident served as a pivotal catalyst in accelerating the momentum toward self-determination.

In the context of the tension between these two groups, the presence and role of Ahmad Subarjo as a nationalist figure and diplomat became an important part of the process towards the proclamation of Indonesian independence. The conflict between the old and the young could be overcome with the involvement of Ahmad Subardjo, who brought Sukarno-Hatta back to Jakarta to prepare for the proclamation of independence at the residence of Admiral Maeda, the Commander of the Naval Liaison Office in the Army/*Kaigun Bukanfu* area. Ahmad Subardjo worked in the Japanese Navy Liaison Office headed by Admiral Maeda. Under the leadership of Admiral Maeda, the Japanese military government knew the data on the movements of nationalist and Indonesian youth leaders thanks to reports provided by Ahmad Soebardjo (Innaman N, 2019; Rohadi, 2021). Because of Admiral Maeda's sympathy for the struggle of the Indonesian people and his consistent attitude towards the Japanese government's promise (*Janji Koiso*) for Indonesian independence, his residence was used as a gathering place for old and young groups to discuss preparations for independence which would be

held the next day, August 17, 1945 (Poeze and Nordholt, 2023). Maeda's residence was considered a safe place for nationalist and youth leaders because it had legal (diplomatic) immunity in the Army's territory.

Admiral Maeda's attitude in providing space for discussion can be seen as an important protection to ensure that the process of formulating the proclamation text can run safely and smoothly. Thus, the contributions of Ahmad Soebardjo and Admiral Maeda in the process of formulating the proclamation text became complementary and very crucial. Moreover, Ahmad Soebarjo is one of the figures of the independence movement who is also active in the BPUPK and also PPKI. This shows that Ahmad Soebarjo's role is not only involved in the formulation of ideas and the text of the proclamation of independence, but also seeks to provide supporting facilities so that the process of drafting the text of the proclamation of independence of Indonesia can take place safely and smoothly.

The formulation of the proclamation text occurred until it was ready to be read on Friday, August 17, 1945 at Sukarno's residence, Jl Pegangsaan Timur 56, at 10.00 a.m.² (Poesponegoro and Notosusanto, 2009). Originally, the reading of the proclamation text by Sukarno was to be held at Ikada Square, but due to the great enthusiasm of the youth who came to the location while the Japanese soldiers were still on guard with their weapons, the implementation was finally transferred to Sukarno's residence. Thus, there was an agreement between the Old and Young groups in the implementation of the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence.

The Dialectics of Nation-Building: Debating the Foundational Ideology in the BPUPK (1945)

The Investigation Agency for Preparatory Efforts for Independence (BPUPK)³ or *Dokuritsu*

² The proclamation was read precisely at 11.30 Javanese time during the Japanese occupation or at 10.00 current Javanese time. See: Marwati Djoened Poesponegoro and

Nugroho Notosusanto, 2023, *Indonesian National History* Volume VI, Balai Pustaka.

³ BPUPK was not established on March 1, 1945, because that date was only the planning of the formation



Junbi Cosakai was formed on April 29, 1945.⁴ This body has the task of studying and investigating matters related to political, economic, governance and matters necessary in the effort to establish an independent Indonesian state. In his opening speech, the chairman of BPUPK, Dr. Radjiman Wediodiningrat stated that what state basis will be used for the country that we will form later (Abdurakhman, 2004). In relation to the speech, then BPUPK members made a speech to submit their proposals on the basis of the state. The formulation of the basis for the independent state of Indonesia by the Investigative Agency for Preparatory Efforts for Independence was marked by a fierce but constructive debate between the two main ideological factions, namely, the secular nationalist group and the Islamic group. BPUPK held its official session twice: the First Session (May 29–June 1, 1945) and the Second Session (July 10–17, 1945). The debate centered on determining the philosophical and juridical foundations of the state, especially regarding the position of Islam in the state system.

The First BPUPK Session: The Idea of an Islamic State versus Secular Nationalists

The first session of the BPUPK which took place from May 29 to June 1, 1945 focused on the formulation of the state constitution. At the first session, 32 BPUPK members gave speeches, 11 people on May 29, 10 people on May 30, 6 people on May 31 and 5 people on June 1. However, only a few figures such as Mohammad Yamin, Soepomo, and Soekarno, who stood out in the discussion in the national history books, presented their proposals regarding the five founding principles of the state, while Islamic figures were not mentioned. The subsequent ideological debate within the BPUPK sessions was directly

precipitated by the formal proposal to establish Islam as the foundation of the state. (Abdurakhman, 2004). The Islamic figure who proposed Islam as the basis of the state in its entirety was Ki Bagus Hadikusumo. It was this proposal that then gave rise to a dialectic of thought between the nationalist and Islamic groups. The main focus of the difference of views is the proposal from the Islamic faction who wants Islam as the basis of the state.

In his speech on May 29, 1945, Yamin proposed the basic proposal of the state consisting of five (5) important values, 1) Principle of Nationality; 2) Humanitarian Principle; 3) Divine Principle; 4) Popular Sovereignty and; 5) People's Welfare. Meanwhile, Ki Bagus Hadikusumo conveyed the idea of Islam as the basis of the state in its entirety. He explicitly stated that Islam is "capable and sufficient and appropriate to be the joint of national government in our country Indonesia". The statement delivered on May 31, 1945 underlined the efforts of the Islamic faction to build the country on the teachings of Islam. According to Ki Bagus Islam has four (4) main teachings: 1) The Teachings of Faith or belief in Allah and the Unseen; 2) The teachings of worship, service and devotion to Allah; 3) The practice of doing good deeds (doing good) and 4) The teaching of jihad in the way of Allah.

On the other hand, Nationalist figures, including Soepomo and Sukarno, sought to position religion, especially Islam, as the ethical and moral foundation in national and state relations, without making it a formal ideology of the state. Soepomo proposed three (3) basic forms of the state, namely: Individual theory, group theory and integralistic theory. The integralistic proposed by Soepomo is an eastern integralistic.⁵ The

through the Saiko Sikikan proclamation dated March 1. The announcement was followed up by Gunesikan through a proclamation dated April 29, 1945 to form Dokuritsu Junbi Cosakai. See: the birth of the 1945 Constitution, by R.M. AB Kusuma, Center for the Study of Constitutional Law, FH UI, 2004, p. 7

⁴ It is noted that BPUPK is not only established in Java but also on the island of Sumatra. In Java, it is responsible for Saiko Shikikan tantara to the XVI while in Sumatra, it is

responsible for Saiko Shikikan tantara to the XXV. See: George Mc Turnan Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*, New York: Cornet University Press, Ithaca, 1952, p. 121

⁵ In SNI volume VI there is a slightly different interpretation, as if Soepomo put forward the foundations of the state which amounted to five, Unity; Family; Balance of birth and mind; Deliberation; and People's Justice.



integralistic understanding was no longer used in the idea of forming the Constitution after Soepomo understood Soekarno's explanation that the preamble was used as the basis for the drafting of the Constitution (Abdurakhman, 2004). Soekarno's speech began by explaining his understanding of independence followed by the state's basic proposals. According to Soekarno, many speeches by BPUPK members have not answered the request of the chairman of BPUPK, the basis of an independent Indonesia (Yamin, 1959). In essence, Soekarno's Speech proposed the foundation of the state which he called Pancasila, whose precepts consisted of 1) Nationality; 2) Internationalism; 3) Representative deliberations; 4) Welfare and; 5) Godliness. In addition to offering Pancasila, Soekarno also offered for those who did not like Pancasila to be able to use Trisila, which consisted of 1) Socio Nationalism; 2) Socio-Democracy then; 3) Godhead. Soekarno also emphasized that the three precepts could be squeezed into Gotong Royong.⁶ Soekarno's speech received an extraordinary response from BPUPK members. Hatta in his memoir said that "*among the members who were ready to answer Dr. Radjiman's questions was Sukarno*" (Hatta, 1978).

With the emergence of Pancasila proposed by Soekarno, Pancasila and Islam for the first time faced each other in the history of determining the country's policy. This debate, which tends to be emotional and confrontational, was finally agreed to be brought to the forum for dialogue to reach a compromise. Before the second session of the BPUPK took place, some members realized that a dispute like this would cause the BPUPK to fail in carrying out its duties. Therefore, during the recess they held a meeting with *the members of Chuo Sangi-in* to resolve their differences. They then agreed to form a team that was able to bridge the differences between the two groups, known as the Committee of Nine in early June 1945. The nine members of the committee consist of four (4) from the Muslim

community and five (5) people from the national community with the task of finding a middle way between Islam and Nationalism. The committee tried to formulate a state basis that could be accepted by both parties.

The Committee of Nine managed to reach a consensus, when M.A.A. Maramis had a dialogue with Abikusno Tjokrosujoso and Abdul kahar Muzakkir, agreeing that in the country that would be established later, Muslims were obliged to carry out Islamic Sharia (Noer, 1987). The Committee of Nine succeeded in drafting the preamble to the Constitution containing four (4) paragraphs. The first paragraph contains philosophical views on independence and colonialism. The second paragraph contains national ideals. The third paragraph contains the declaration of independence with recognition as the Grace of Allah, and the fourth paragraph, contains the formulation of the government's duties and the formulation of the basic foundations for carrying out these duties (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995).

The work of the Committee of Nine is a manuscript known as the Jakarta Charter, dated June 22, 1945, which is the preamble to the draft Constitution. The Jakarta Charter contains five principles of Pancasila, where the first precept is a crucial point of compromise for Godhead, with the obligation to carry out Islamic Sharia for its adherents. This additional phrase, known as the "seven words", is a political concession to accommodate demands for the formalization of Islamic law by Islamic groups. Dr. Sukiman called this agreement the *Gentlemen Agreement* while M. Yamin referred to it as *the Jakarta Charter* or Jakarta Charter (Abdurakhman, 2004).

⁶ The record of Soekarno's speech was first published by the Indonesian Ministry of Information in 1947 in Yogyakarta with the title: The Birth of Pancasila.



The Second BPUPK Session: The Dialectics of the Seven Words in Shaping the Draft Constitution

The results achieved by the Nine Committee (Sub-Committee) were then brought to the second BPUPK session, which was on July 10-17, 1945, with the agenda not only of the basic problems of the state but also of discussing the draft declaration of an independent Indonesia, the draft preamble to the Constitution and the draft of the Constitution (Abdurakhman, 2004). The Jakarta Charter is proposed to be the Preamble to the Constitution. The ratification of the Jakarta Charter in the draft Constitution has again sparked a debate on the status of the "seven words". On July 11, 1945, Johannes Latuharhary voiced his objection because the formulation was considered to threaten adherents of other religions and customs, this view was supported by Wongsonegoro and Djajadiningrat (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995). Responding to the objection, Islamic figures such as K.H. Wahid Hasyim assured that the imposition of sharia would not occur because of the principle of deliberation. Despite their persistence in fighting for Islam as the basis of the state, Wahid Hasyim and other Islamic figures showed a compromising attitude by prioritizing national unity over formal recognition of Islam (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995). This is in line with what Salim said related to the function of Islam as *rahmatan lil alamin*, which is in line with the promise to protect other religions (Yamin, 1959).

On July 16, 1945, BPUPK finally approved the draft Constitution containing the Declaration of an Independent Indonesia, the Preamble which included the Jakarta Charter/Pancasila, and the Body of the Constitution. Demonstrating the willingness to compromise for national cohesion, Soekarno emphasized the spirit sacrifice during the session: "Er is groothed in offer...(There is greatness in sacrifice) (State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia, 1995). This quotes directly demonstrates that the adaption of Pancasila was achieved through intentional, mutual sacrifice

rather than ideological defeat. In other words, the debate in the dialogue between Islam and Pancasila in the BPUPK I and II sessions is a reflection of the extraordinary efforts of the nation's founders to unite two different ideological currents. These efforts culminated in the birth of the Jakarta Charter as a historical compromise document. Although the "seven words" were successfully maintained in the draft Constitution approved by the BPUPK, the broader spirit of unity ended the debate.

The Dialectics of State Formation: Compromise and Consensus in the PPKI Deliberations

If in the BPUPK sessions the ideological argumentative dialogue between Islam and Pancasila reaches a compromise point through the birth of the Jakarta Charter, then the PPKI sessions become the next stage of dialectic, which leads to further compromise in the context of the formation of a truly independent state. The Indonesian Independence Preparatory Committee (PPKI/ *Dokuritsu Junbi Inkaei*) is an institution or body formed on August 7, 1945 by the Government of the XVI Army (AD) of the Imperial Japanese Empire which ruled over the islands of Java and Madura. PPKI replaced the Investigation Agency for Preparatory Efforts for Independence (BPUPK) which was formed on May 28, 1945.

The task of PPKI is no longer just to discuss the basic concept of the formation of an independent state, but also to prepare for the handover of government power from the Japanese army to the Indonesian nation. Thus, PPKI is tasked with preparing the implementation and process of the declaration of independence. In addition, PPKI also has the responsibility to improve and ratify the draft constitution for the independent state of Indonesia, which had previously been prepared by BPUPK (Yunarti, 2003). The main source containing the list of PPKI members and the minutes of their trials is listed in the work of Yamin (1959), which contains only two trials on August 18 and 19, 1945. Meanwhile, the



work of Bahar et al. (1995) contains the minutes of the four-day trial, August 18 and 19 plus August 20 and 22, 1945. Meanwhile, Kusuma's work (2004) recontains a treatise by Bahar et al. (1995).

During the BPUPK session on May 31, 1945, Soepomo explicitly argued against an Islamic state model to protect religious minorities, stating: "Jika kita mendirikan negara yang berdasarkan Islam, maka negara itu tidak akan bersatu...." (If we establish a state based on Islam, the nation will not be unified...)" (Bahar et al, 1995)

PPKI Membership and Leadership

Compared to BPUPK which has 62 members under the leadership of dr. Radjiman Wediodiningrat, the Indonesian Independence Preparatory Committee (PPKI) appears with a slimmer composition. Simplifying the number of members does not reduce the strategic significance of PPKI. The membership of BPUPK has previously been a representative forum for various social backgrounds, ranging from age, religion and belief, political stream, gender, region and ethnicity, economy, profession and educational background, including but not least the thoughts and goals of independence. This diversity reflects the broad spirit of nationalism even though BPUPK was formed and based on the island of Java which is under the authority of the XVI Army of Japan. The independence plan they formulated actually covered the entire archipelago, including the territory of the XXV Army in Sumatra and the Second Southern Fleet of the Japanese Navy in Eastern Indonesia. (Kusuma, 2004)

Meanwhile, the membership of PPKI when it was formed only amounted to 19 people from former BPUPK members. However, it later increased to 25 people at the policy of Soekarno, who was appointed as chairman along with Mohammad Hatta as deputy. The additional 6 members who are not members of BPUPK are, Mr. Abdul Abas representing Sumatra (North), Dr. M. Amir from Sumatra (West), Teuku M. Hasan from Sumatra (Aceh), A.A. Hamidhan from Kalimantan (South), Mr. I Gusti Ketut Pudja from

Bali, Dr. GSSJ Ratulangie, and Mr. Iwa Koesoemasoemantri from West Java.

The composition of PPKI membership still shows diversity from various backgrounds. However, the emphasis is more on representation and representation of regional origins. Religious and belief representations still emerge, while gender representation is no longer visible. In PPKI, there are no more female members. The professional background of bureaucrats, politicians and legal education dominate the membership, which seems to be attributable to the body's scope of duties. Several figures from BPUPK are no longer members of PPKI, such as M. Yamin, Hoessein Djajadiningrat, Margono Djojohadikusumo, A.A. Maramis and Agoes Salim. (Bahar et al, 1995)

The trip of the PPKI leaders on August 9, 1945 to Dallat, South Vietnam where the Japanese Supreme Military Headquarters Command in Southeast Asia was located, marked an important phase in the run-up to the proclamation. Dallat is located about 150 kilometers northeast of Saigon, now known as Ho Chi Minh City, the capital of the Democratic Republic of Vietnam. Sukarno, Hatta, and Radjiman Wediodiningrat fulfilled the invitation of the Japanese Commander-in-Chief in Southeast Asia, Commander General Terauchi, on August 12, 1945. The three PPKI representatives (Soekarno, Hatta, and Radjiman Wediodiningrat) went to Dallat accompanied by a Japanese interpreters and interpreters, namely Nomura and Myoshi (Yunarti, 2003). The journey was taken by air and through the battlefield so that occasionally the aircraft on board experienced air attacks from Allied forces. However, they succeeded and arrived safely in Dallat.

During the meeting, Commander General Terauchi conveyed the decision of the Empire of Japan to grant independence to Indonesia. Terauchi the Commander-in-Chief also conveyed instructions that the first trial be held no later than August 18, 1945. Other information states that the first session of the PPKI was planned to take place in Jakarta on August 19, 1945 and independence would be granted on August 24, 1945 (Boland



1985). However, based on reports from three members of PPKI, Dr. Mohammad Amir, Teuku Mohammad Hasan and Mr. Abdul Abbas, who were transiting in Singapore to Jakarta, the meeting of the group stated that the first session was planned on August 16, 1945 (Yuliarti 2003). This difference in information shows that there is a coordination gap between the Japanese military authorities in Daltat and in Jakarta. At the meeting, there was no information on whether the promise of independence was conveyed to the three PPKI members.

To obtain the firmness of the promise of independence from the Japanese side, there was no dialogue, let alone debate about the next policy of the promise. On the plane during the air trip, Soekarno and Hatta emphasized that the promise was in line with the line and journey of their struggle for independence. It does not seem to have crossed the slightest thought in the minds of the three that the determination of independence would provoke a response and rejection. In other words, on their way home, they interpreted it as the culmination point of the long-desired struggle for independence.

PPKI and the Proclamation of Independence

Political developments and the decline of the war for Japan took place very quickly, especially after the second bombing of Nagasaki on August 9, 1945, forcing Japan to surrender unconditionally to the Allies on August 15, 1945 (Anderson, 1972). The change in the global situation in early August 1945 became a key factor for Indonesian youth groups to accelerate the momentum of Indonesia's proclamation of independence. News of Japan's defeat spread quickly to various parts of Asia, including Indonesia, and created a tense political situation. Previously, Japan had promised independence to Indonesia through the formation of PPKI on August 7, 1945. However, after the defeat of Japan, the PPKI's political position became ambiguous. Nationalist leaders such as Sukarno and Hatta still clung to the independence plan that would be announced through the PPKI mechanism, in accordance with the promise of the

Japanese military government. However, the situation changed drastically after Japan officially surrendered to the Allies. In the view of Indonesian youth groups, this condition is a golden opportunity for the Indonesian nation to immediately declare independence on behalf of its own nation, not a gift from Japan (Bahar, et al., 1995)

Young figures such as Sutan Sjahrir, Wikana, and Chaerul Saleh played an important role in pressuring national figures Sukarno and Hatta, to act immediately. For these young figures, waiting for the PPKI session is the same as strengthening the impression of Indonesian independence is the result of Japanese politics. Apparently, the views of these young figures originated from the thoughts of Sjahrir, who actively followed international developments so that he had learned the news of Japan's defeat from foreign radio broadcasts. Syahrir emphasized the importance of moral and political legitimacy, that the Indonesian nation must proclaim independence on the basis of its own strength (Notosusanto, 1979).

When Soekarno and Hatta returned from Singapore on August 14, 1945, to their greeters at Kemayoran Airport, Soekarno stated that independence would be obtained more quickly as Jayabaya said "when corn ripens and blooms" (Rose 1991). There are many variations about the expression of Jayabaya's prophecy, including those that state: "there will come a 'yellow-haired Kate Jago Kate' who rules Java for the age of corn. Then the land of Java will be led by Ratu Adil". Jago/rooster, kate, yellow-feathered, is analogous to a Japanese soldier, while the age of corn (3.5 months) is analogous to the 3.5 years of Japanese colonialism in Indonesia. This prophecy is widely believed by most Javanese people and is associated with Japanese colonialism and Indonesian independence.

Although there was a common vision and mission for the realization of Indonesian independence, for the young group, the attitude of Soekarno and Hatta was considered too cautious towards Japan, so they urged the PPKI leader to immediately declare Indonesian independence.



Basically, Soekarno and Hatta prefer to be in a corridor that has been planned and prepared beforehand, namely PPKI. In other words, Soekarno-Hatta was considered not to pay much attention to the issue of the image of the "gift of independence" from Japan. Meanwhile, young people prefer a declaration of independence regardless of the shadow of the Japanese military. These differences of opinion could not be reunited, so the Rengasdengklok incident occurred on August 16, 1945. Where the youth from the Menteng 31 group brought Soekarno and Hatta to Rengasdengklok in Karawang, with the aim of distancing the two leaders from Japanese influence and urging them to immediately proclaim independence (Yuliarti, 20013). Thanks to Ahmad Subardjo's intervention, the dispute in Rengasdengklok was resolved and Soekarno-Hatta returned to Jakarta to prepare the proclamation text, which was carried out at Admiral Maeda's residence.

Although there were sharp differences of view, the dialogue that took place at Admiral Maeda's house on the night of August 16 to August 17, 1945 in the morning resulted in a mutual agreement. Previously, a number of PPKI members from outside Jakarta were already at the Des Indes Hotel waiting for certainty. The PPKI leadership immediately went to the government and political authorities to obtain approval and direction for the meeting venue. Both groups (Young and Old Groups) received protection from the Navy's representative, Rear Admiral Tadashi Maeda, to be able to travel in the midst of the imposition of a travel ban at night. The place to discuss and prepare for the proclamation of independence was held at Maeda's residence on Jalan Miyododori (now Jalan Iman Bonjol no. 1, Menteng, Central Jakarta). The focus of the discussion was the preparation of the proclamation text, which had actually been prepared by BPUPK but at that time no one held a copy or remembered its contents. In the discussion, the text of the proclamation was formulated by Soekarno, Hatta, and Ahmad Soebardjo, with the final drafted by Sayuti Melik. Maeda did not participate and he

chose to rest in her bedroom located on the 2nd floor of her residence.

The text of the Proclamation was then read by Soekarno who was accompanied by M. Hatta on the morning, August 17, 1945 at Jalan Pegangsaan Timur No. 56, Jakarta at around 10.00 Jakarta time. After that, the Saka Merah Putih (national flag) was raised with a perfect attitude of respect and followed by singing the first verse of the song Indonesia Raya, created by Wage Rudolph Soepratman. This event shows that Japan's defeat not only marked the end of colonial rule in Asia, but also opened up a new political space for the Indonesian nation to determine its own destiny. The quick reaction of young people shows a keen political awareness of global change and the importance of taking national initiatives. Thus, the proclamation of Indonesian independence was not an event that occurred by chance, but the fruit of historical dynamics, diplomacy, and the courage to take advantage in the midst of world chaos after World War II (Kahin, 1952).

The national and folk leaders who attended the Indonesian independence proclamation ceremony expressed their gratitude without excessive ceremony because they were worried about the arrival of the Japanese army. Only a few parts of the event were captured by the camera photographer brothers, Frans Soemarto Mendur and Alex Impurung Mendur of the daily Asia Raya. Alex and Frans Mendur secretly captured the moment of the proclamation of Indonesian independence on August 17, 1945, which then played an important role as a documentation of the nation's history. (Latest Maluku, 2019, August 17). The results of the photo shoot were hidden under a tree in the yard of the house to avoid being seized by the Japanese soldiers. Only a year later, at the commemoration of the First Proclamation of Independence, the proclamation text and photos of the event were published.

Until now, there has been no conclusion and firm statement that the Proclamation of Indonesian Independence is a part, series and task of PPKI. However, various sources show that there is an inherent connection between the



momentum of the proclamation and the existence of PPKI. Moreover, the event was attended by the vice chairman and a number of his members. When looking at Soekarno's role as the sole proclaimer who read the text of independence, it is difficult to deny that the institutional context and the political support behind it were not connected to PPKI. The involvement of the vice chairman and a number of PPKI members in the events of August 17, 1945 shows that the proclamation was not a stand-alone action, but part of the internal dynamics of the committee. Structurally and symbolically, PPKI is a political forum that prepares the direction and legitimacy of the post-independence government. In fact, the initial stages of state administration, including the formation of the constitution and the election of the President and Vice President, took place under the authority of the PPKI (Bahar et al., 1995). In the absence of historical evidence of the presence of Japanese officials or representatives at the event, there was no formal "surrender of independence" ceremony from the Japanese authorities. This shows that the act of proclamation was a political expression born from a national initiative, not the result of the mandate of Japanese military power.

Official trial of PPKI

After the proclamation of independence was carried out, the next day PPKI continued the trial that had been planned in advance. The PPKI members received an invitation dated August 17, 2605 in the year of Japan (the same as 1945), to attend the event which took place at the Komonfu building (now Jalan Pejambon number 2, Jakarta). In another part of the same source, it is said that the meeting took place in the Tyuuoo Sangi-In (Chuo Sangi In) building (Bahar et al., 1995). In the invitation, on the lower right side is written Zimukyoku, which means local government and in the attachment of the invitation on the upper left side are the words Dokuritsu Zyunbi Tyoosakai (Dokuritsu Junbi Cosakai).

The agenda for the discussion of the first meeting of PPKI was the inauguration of members, establishing the Constitution

(Constitution), electing the President and Vice President, which developed into discussing the structure of government, the formation of the Central Indonesian National Committee (KNIP). Apparently, the inauguration of members, including additional members, was not carried out and the committee immediately convened. The trial on August 18, 1945 resulted in the establishment of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the election of the President of the Republic of Indonesia, namely Soekarno and Vice President, M. Hatta (Bahar et al. 1995). The determination of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and the election of the President and Vice President took place without debate and PPKI members approved the results of the session's decision.

The PPKI trial continued until the next day, August 19, 1945, at 08.30-09.55 WIB or 10.00-11.25 Japanese time, in the same building. The agenda for discussion is the priority of the program, the regional structure, and the formation of ministries/departments (Bahar et al., 1995). PPKI completed its duties in the next two trials, which took place on August 20 and 22, 1945. In the third session, PPKI discussed and established a War Victims' Family Assistance Agency and the People's Security Agency. Then in the last trial PPKI discussed the National Committee and the Indonesian National Party. At the same time, PPKI was dissolved (Yunarti 2003). The series of PPKI trials from the first to the last trial went relatively quieter.

Conflict and Compromise in the PPKI Conference

In general, conflict refers to a state of disharmony, differences and antagonism between the parties involved. Based on differences and incompatibilities, the form of conflict ranges from verbal conflict to violence, namely clashes. Brawls, resistance, rebellion and war are violent conflicts. Demonstrations (demonstrations) which are a form of disagreement often end in clashes. Although verbal conflict, in words such as debate, can be nuanced in violence when accusations,



cornering, insults and harassment occur that cause psychological and physical In the BPUPK and PPKI sessions held a few consequences.

A pattern of conflict that appears in the PPKI trials, as well as BPUPK, is *silent conflict*. The causes of conflicts like this range from the existence of a supervisory structure to a political culture. The discussion and debate among PPKI members is much different from similar circumstances during the national movement, which showed direct and open debate, in various forums and writings, especially in the press. The cultural polemic of the 1930s showed a sharp debate among the Indonesian intellectual elite. The situation that was more or less similar to the atmosphere of the PPKI session was during the Youth Congress in Jakarta on October 27 and 28, 1928, which triggered a pledge, namely Soempah Pemoeda (Historical Buildings Foundation, 1985). At that time, the state of the meeting was influenced by the supervision of the Dutch East Indies secret police, *the Politieke Inlichtingen Dienst* (PID) so that the participants of the meeting had to be careful in expressing their opinions and to show unity and unity.

Differences and conflicts of views were seen at the time of the establishment of the State Constitution and the Constitution, including the issue of the president, the Ministry of Religion and the Indonesian National Party (PNI) as the State Party (*Staat Partij*). If a conflict arises, the conflict takes place in a *silent conflict*. In the records of the minutes of the PPKI trials, including the minutes of the BPUPK trials, there appears to be no loud and conspicuous debates and arguments. The situation in the BPUPK trial is certainly inseparable from the involvement and presence of the Japanese side who still have not declared their surrender to the Allies. Meanwhile, the situation at the time of the PPKI trial took place, Japan had lost the war but still carried out the obligations of the allies to maintain the *status quo*. The proclamation of independence was an event that escaped Japanese supervision, but it was the result of a compromise between two groups that ultimately united on one view, namely accelerating the proclamation of Indonesian independence.

Even so, the Japanese troops continued to monitor and maintain the situation to keep it orderly and under control.

Apparently, the PPKI trial was deliberately not hindered and not dissolved because officially there was no policy and decision of the supreme Japanese ruler on the island of Java to dissolve the body. On the other hand, PPKI members also do not want to create noise and disorder that can affect the security and safety of the Indonesian people, who hope for the results of PPKI's decision in completing and forming newly independent state institutions. Their full attention is on preparing the structure of the newly independent state. Therefore, compromise and consensus are prioritized and put forward in the midst of differences of views and ideas.

Before starting the PPKI trial, according to M. Hatta (1970), the envoy of Eastern Indonesia came to meet him and said that if the state constitution to be ratified contained the words "with the obligation to carry out Islamic sharia for its adherents" in the first precept, as stated in the Jakarta Charter of June 22, 1945, then the territory of Eastern Indonesia would separate from the Republic of Indonesia. The elimination of the "seven words" was not merely a concession by the Islamic faction, but a reciprocal strategic compromise. Evidence of this institutional negotiation is reflected in three core revisions: (1) Replacing "Ketuhanan dengan kewajiban menjalankan syariat Islami bagi pemeluk-pemeluknya" with "Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa" to maintain monotheistic values while removing legal exclusivity ; (2) Amending Article 6 Paragraph 1 to drop the requirement that the President must be a Muslim, prioritizing national inclusivity over sectarian privilege; and (3) Reestablishing the Ministry of Religious Affairs as a structural compromise to ensure state protection of religious interests without declaring a formal Islamic state.

The next debate was about the ratification and discussion of the establishment of the Ministry of Religion. In the PPKI session on August 19, 1945, the discussion of the establishment of a state ministry, including the proposal to establish a



Ministry of Religion, became one of the important agendas. This proposal was first raised by Muhammad Yamin in the BPUPK session, but in the PPKI session that rejected Yamin's proposal only 6 out of 27 members. Most of the other members approved the formation of a special ministry of religion (Isnaeni in *Historia.id*, October 24, 2021).

Historical Implications for Pancasila Interpretation

The development of the post-proclamation situation of independence still shows uncertainty and waiting, under the supervision of the Japanese military. Movements to seize independence in the sense of control of government facilities, weapons and community services began to occur. The people's sovereignty emerged and spread in several cities, not only in Jakarta. The fighters stormed the Japanese army headquarters to seize the weapons. They also took over the means of transportation, after controlling the Domei news agency, to spread the news of independence throughout Indonesia and the international arena. Also, a number of government facilities were not spared from the action (Anderson, 1972). At the national level, there have been several events that reflect differences and conflicts between affiliated political groups and elites. These events were a *silent coup*, a political coup, the Madiun rebellion and DI/TII (Darul Islam/Indonesian Islamic Army). The roots of these differences and conflicts reach far back to the time of the national movement under Dutch East Indies colonialism.

The typology of the Indonesian nationalist movement and independence struggle is Nationalist, Religious (especially Islamic), and Socialist groups, which include Communists. Nevertheless, according to Yamin (1959), compromise in establishing Pancasila as the basis of the state not only resolved the debate between secular nationalist groups and Islamist groups, but also became a flexible ideological foundation for a pluralistic Indonesian state. This shows that, although the establishment of Pancasila as the basis of the state has gone through a long process of

debate and compromise, in line with the development of the times which includes advances in science and technology, challenges to its flexibility and ability to reduce conflicts will still occur. The compromise process itself has historically provided implications or even opportunities for continued re-interpretation of Pancasila as the basis of the state. The following explanation will show how the implications of the compromise process are on the interpretation of Pancasila in the dynamics of Indonesian political history.

In the early period of independence until the end of the 1950s (1945–1959), Pancasila became a field of ideological contestation between nationalist, Islamist, and communist groups. In the Parliamentary System of Government in the era of Liberal Democracy, debates about the basis of the state and the application of Islamic sharia continued to emerge, such as in the Constituent Debate of 1957–1959 (Feith, 1962). However, when the Constituent Assembly failed to reach a new consensus, President Sukarno issued a Decree of July 5, 1959 that restored the 1945 Constitution, which explicitly "animated the Jakarta Charter." This decree shows how the 1945 ideological compromise again used Pancasila as a tool of legitimacy to overcome the political impasse.

In the era of Guided Democracy (1959–1965), Sukarno interpreted Pancasila in a revolutionary way through the concept of Nasakom (Nationalist–Religious–Communist), an attempt to integrate the three main ideological forces in Indonesian society (Legge, 1972). Here, the initial ideological compromise turned into political syncretism, in which Pancasila was positioned as an ideology capable of overcoming the class antagonism and global ideology of the Cold War. However, this interpretive flexibility also makes Pancasila vulnerable to politicization. Sukarno used Pancasila as an ideological instrument to maintain power and get rid of the opposition under the pretext of "anti-revolution."

The most significant change in the interpretation of Pancasila occurred during the New Order period (1966–1998). After the



G30S/PKI incident, the Suharto regime affirmed Pancasila as the only principle in the life of the nation and state. Through the policy of "single principles" (Law No. 8 of 1985), all socio-political organizations are required to be based only on Pancasila. The policy is intended to prevent ideological conflicts, but in practice it actually gives birth to a monopoly on state interpretation of Pancasila. The government through BP7 (Education Development Agency for the Implementation of Guidelines for the Appreciation and Practice of Pancasila) standardizes the interpretation of this ideology through the doctrine of P4 (Guidelines for the Appreciation and Practice of Pancasila). As a result, Pancasila has experienced hegemonic institutionalization. Pancasila has become a symbol of loyalty to the state and is no longer a deliberative space for ideological discussions (Crouch, 1988).

After the fall of the New Order, Pancasila faced a crisis of legitimacy. Many people see it as a symbol of indoctrination inherent in Suharto's authoritarianism. However, entering the Reform era, there was an effort to re-politicize Pancasila through an academic and constitutional approach. The amendment to the 1945 Constitution emphasizes the position of Pancasila as the source of all legal sources, not a mere tool of power (Asshiddiqie, 2006). In the context of contemporary politics, Pancasila is interpreted in a more plural and contextual way. The government and civil society are trying to reaffirm basic values such as social justice, mutual cooperation, and interreligious tolerance as guidelines for public life. However, the dynamics of identity politics and the emergence of post-Reform Islamic populism again tested the limits of ideological compromise inherited by PPKI. According to Mujiburrahman (2006), the debate about the "Islamic state" has not completely disappeared, but has been transformed into a debate about the role of religion in the public sphere. The emergence of organizations such as Hizbut Tahrir Indonesia (HTI) and the wave of religious conservatism show that the space for Pancasila's ideological compromise continues to be

tested. The government then responded by affirming Pancasila as the final ideology through the establishment of the Pancasila Ideology Development Agency (BPIP) in 2018, which functions to strengthen education and internalize Pancasila values in society (BPIP, 2019).

The ideological compromise that gave birth to Pancasila made it resistant to the changing times. In the era of globalization, Pancasila no longer only functions as the basis of the state, but also as an ideological identity that distinguishes Indonesia from other countries' models, both purely secular and theocratic (Magnis-Suseno, 2011). However, the interpretation of Pancasila is now faced with new challenges in the form of economic liberalization, digital polarization, and the penetration of transnational ideologies. In this context, Pancasila must be revitalized not through formal indoctrination like the New Order period, but through critical education and democratic citizenship praxis. As stated by Kaelan (2013), Pancasila should be understood as a living philosophical system, not a dead dogma, he demands hermeneutic openness so that it is always relevant to the challenges of the times. Thus, the ideological compromise of the PPKI has provided two great legacies, namely first, interpretive flexibility that allows Pancasila to survive in various political systems. Second, the potential for ambiguity makes it vulnerable to abuse by authoritarian regimes. Indonesia's political history shows that stability and democracy can only be maintained if Pancasila is interpreted openly, participatorily, and contextually.

Conclusion

The process of the birth of Pancasila in 1945 is a historical and political event that is full of ideological meaning. The results of the study show that Pancasila was not born spontaneously or through the domination of one particular ideological group, but as a result of political and moral compromise between the two main forces at that time: the secular nationalist group and the Islamic group. This compromise is rooted in a shared awareness of the importance of maintaining



the integrity of a pluralistic nation in the midst of an unstable political situation ahead of independence.

In the BPUPK sessions, the dialectic between the two groups found a common point through the formulation of the Jakarta Charter (June 22, 1945). Despite containing the aspirations of Islamic ideology in its first precept formulation, the Jakarta Charter was finally agreed to be amended by the PPKI on August 18, 1945, by changing the phrase "with the obligation to carry out Islamic sharia for its adherents" to "The One Godhead." This change is a crucial moment in Indonesia's political history that confirms that national consensus takes precedence over the ideological interests of factions.

Within the framework of the theory of the relationship between religion and the state, according to Boland (1985), the dialectic in the BPUPK and PPKI sessions reflected the "fundamental struggle regarding the meaning of nationality and the role of Islam in the nascent Indonesian state". In addition, Noer (1978) emphasized that the decision to remove the seven words shows that there is a high political awareness among the founders of the nation to maintain national unity in the midst of religious and ethnic diversity. Meanwhile, Hefner (2000) stated that the position of Pancasila reflects the model of a "*religiously friendly state*", which is a state that respects religion without making it a formal legal basis. This view is in line with the concept of positive secularization by Nurcholish Madjid (1992), who asserts that the institutional separation between religion and the state actually allows religious values to animate social life more authentically.

Philosophically, the ideological compromise in 1945 also reflects the basic principles of Pancasila philosophy as explained by Kaelan (2013), Latif (2011), and Magnis-Suseno (2001): Pancasila is an open value system that unites elements of religiosity, humanity, and nationality. Its openness allows Pancasila to continue to be interpreted according to the development of the times without losing its moral and historical foundation. The ideological compromise that gave

birth to Pancasila was not just a momentary political result, but the moral foundation of the Indonesian nation. He showed that independence was not only achieved through armed struggle, but also through the nation's ability to dialogue, compromise, and respect differences. The spirit of compromise is a noble legacy that needs to be maintained in the midst of contemporary ideological challenges such as identity politics, intolerance, and social fragmentation. Thus, recalling and understanding the meaning of the ideological compromise of 1945 means reaffirming the basic spirit of nationality: *Bhinneka Tunggal Ika* within the framework of Pancasila.

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge Universitas Indonesia for academic and institutional support during the conduct and preparation of this study.

Declarations

Author Contribution Statement

Abdurakhman contributed primarily to the conceptualization and design of the study. Dwi Mulyatari contributed primarily to data analysis and interpretation. Rostinue and Yuda B Tangkilisa contributed primarily to manuscript editing, academic language refinement, critical revision, and preparation of the final manuscript. All authors reviewed and approved the final version of the manuscript.

Funding Statement

This research received no specific grant or external funding from any public, commercial, or not-for-profit funding agency.

Data Availability Statement

The data generated and/or analyzed during this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request, subject to applicable confidentiality, privacy, and ethical requirements.

Declaration of Interests Statement

The authors declare no financial or non-financial competing interests related to this study.

AI Use Statement

During manuscript preparation, the authors used OpenAI ChatGPT (GPT-5.6 Sol) to assist with initial drafting, structuring, and language refinement. All AI-assisted content was critically reviewed, revised, and verified by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the accuracy, originality, and integrity of the final manuscript.

Additional Information

Correspondence and requests for materials should be addressed to: abdurakhman.bnm@ui.ac.id].



[Abdurakhman] [0000-0002-7434-1612](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7434-1612)

[Dwi Mulyatari] [0000-0002-3192-2345](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3192-2345)

[Rostineu] [0000-0002-7672-502X](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7672-502X)

[Yuda Benharry Tangkilisa] [0000-0002-8004-1106](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8004-1106)

References

- Anderson, Benedict R. O'G., *Java in a Time of Revolution: Occupation and Resistance, 1944–1946* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1972).
- Anderson, Ben, *Revolusi Pemoeda: Pendudukan Jepang dan Perlawanan di Jawa 1944–1946* (Jakarta: Pustaka Sinar Harapan, 1988).
- Anshari, Endang Saifuddin, *Piagam Jakarta 22 Juni 1945 dan Sejarah Konsensus Nasional antara Nasionalis Islami dan Nasionalis “Sekular” tentang dasar Negara Republik Indonesia 1945–1959* (Jakarta: Rajawali, 1986).
- Asshiddiqie, J., *Konstitusi dan Konstitusionalisme Indonesia* (Jakarta: Konstitusi Press, 2006).
- Bahar, Saaforeidin, Ananda B. Kusuma, and Nannie Hudawati (eds.), *Risalah Sidang badan Penyelidik usaha-usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia (BPUPKI), Panitia Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia (PPKI) 28 Mei 1945–22 Agustus 1945* (Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia, 1995).
- Brackman, Arnold, *Indonesia Communism: a History* (New York: Frederick A. Praeger, 1963).
- Hatta, Mohammad, *Sekitar Proklamasi 17 Agustus 1945* (Jakarta: Tintamas, 1970).
- Kahin, George McTurnan, *Nasionalisme dan Revolusi di Indonesia: Refleksi Pergumulan Labirnya Republik* (Solo: UNS Press, 1995).
- Kahin, G. M. T., *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1952).
- Kusuma, A. B., *Labirnya Undang-undang Dasar 1945 Memuat Salinan Dokumen Otentik Badan Oontok Penyelidiki Oesaba2 Persiapan Kemerdekaan* (Jakarta: Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, 2004).
- Madjid, Nurcholis, *Islam, Kemodernan, dan Keindonesiaan* (Jakarta: Mizan, 1992).
- Noer, Deliar, *The Modernist Muslim Movement in Indonesia 1900–1942* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).
- Noer, Deliar, *Partai Islam di Pentas Nasional 1945–1965* (Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti, 1987).
- Notosusanto, Nugroho, *Proklamasi 17 Agustus 1945* (Jakarta: UI Press, 1979).
- Poesponegoro, Marwati Djoened and Nugroho Notosusanto, *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia, Jilid VI* (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2009).
- Poeze, Harry and Henk Schulte Nordholt, *Merdeka: Perang Kemerdekaan dan Kebangkitan Republik yang Tak Pasti (1945–1950)* (Jakarta: Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2023).
- Rose, Mavis, *Indonesia Merdeka Biografi Politik Mohammad Hatta* (Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama, 1991).
- Sularto, St and D. Rini Yuniarti, *Konflik di Balik Proklamasi: BPUPKI, PPKI dan Kemerdekaan* (Jakarta: Kompas, 2010).
- van Dijk, Cornelis, *Darul Islam: Sebuah Pemberontakan* (Jakarta: Pustaka Utama Grafiti, 1995).
- Yamin, Muhammad, *Naskah Persiapan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, jilid I* (Jakarta: Yayasan Prapanca, 1959).
- Yayasan Gedung-gedung Bersejarah, *Bunga Rampai Sumpah Pemuda* (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 1985).
- Yuliarti, Y., *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia: Pergerakan Nasional hingga Proklamasi* (Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2003).
- Yuniarti, D. Rini, *BPUPKI, PPKI, Proklamasi Kemerdekaan RI* (Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas, 2003).
- Pardi, I Wayan, ‘Kembali Kepada Undang-Undang Dasar 1945: Diskursus Pembukaan UUD 1945 dalam Perspektif Sejarah’, *Historia: Jurnal Pendidikan dan Peneliti Sejarah*, 2.2 (2019), 97–104 <https://doi.org/10.17509/historia.v2i2.15775>.
- Isnaeni, H. F., ‘Sejarah Pembentukan Kementerian Agama’, *Historia*, 24 October 2021, <https://www.historia.id/article/sejarah-pembentukan-kementerian-agama-dlgxk> [accessed 29 October 2025].
- MalukuTerkini, ‘Kisah Heroik Mendur Bersaudara di Balik Foto Proklamasi 1945’, 17 August 2019, <https://www.malukuterkini.com/20>



19/08/17/kisah-heroik-mendur-bersaudara-di-balik-foto-proklamasi-1945/?utm_source=chatgpt.com#:~:text=Frans%20tertangkap%20kemudian%2C%20namun%20ia [accessed 29 October 2025].

Sumarto, H. M. Wasiri Dirjo, 'Sejarah Singkat Setengah Abad Pertama Negara Kesatuan

Abdurakhman, *Benturan Tak Berujung: Studi Interaksi Nasionalis Islam dan Nasionalis Sekuler 1908-1959*, (Fakultas Ilmu Pengetahuan Budaya Universitas Indonesia, 2004)

Republik Indonesia', *Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia*, 2022, https://www.kompas.com/stori/read/2023/11/07/170847479/12-kementerian-pada-awal-kemerdekaan-indonesia?lgn_method=google&google_btn=onetap [accessed 12 November 2025].