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ABSTRACT
Indonesia, as a country with the Pancasila philosophy, has values that include individualism and collectivism. However, in practice, there is sometimes a misalignment between the concepts of individualism and collectivism in the implementation of Pancasila democracy. This study aims to identify and analyze the alignment between the concepts of individualism and collectivism in the context of Pancasila democracy. This research uses qualitative research methods. The data collection technique in this research is literature study. The data that has been collected is then analyzed in three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation and conclusion drawing. The results showed that Pancasila democracy is an ideal government system to balance individualism and collectivism. Individualism and collectivism can be harmonized in Pancasila democracy by implementing several strategies, including strengthening character education to instill Pancasila values, increasing community participation in the democratic process, and empowering communities through sustainable development programs.
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Introduction
Democracy is an actual and global issue, said to be actual democracy is part of international issues in addition to economic, environmental and human rights issues. It is said to be global because almost most countries in the world make democracy a system in organizing their government (Gandamana, 2017). Understanding about Democracy as a system in organizing individual and human dimensions as social beings. As an individual being, humans want freedom, a government in exercising its power cannot be separated from an understanding of human philosophy with all the dimensions that exist in it, especially regarding the human dimension as a creature of freedom, and property rights to something.

The basic concept of humans as individual beings has given birth to values about Human Rights. Humans as social beings have a strong tendency to associate, group, interact and socialize. Humans as social beings have given birth to collective values such as mutual cooperation, help, protection of each individual to be able to enjoy a peaceful, safe happy and prosperous life. In the social community called society, it is often questioned about individual
rights on the one hand with collective/social rights on the other hand, moreover at the highest level of society called the State, it is often contested between the rights of the people and the sovereignty of the State (Romadlon, 2016).

This issue has long been addressed by scholars and at the same time becomes an endless struggle between individualistic liberalists who consider individual rights to be something absolute, therefore social/collective rights must be placed under the subordination of individual rights. Similarly, with regard to state sovereignty in the social contract theory of John Locke and Rousseau, state sovereignty originates from the people where individuals have surrendered some of their rights to the state, as a consequence the state must be subject to the will of the people. In contrast to the view of the socialist/collectivist group, which considers humans as social beings in their own right, social rights are something that is absolute, therefore individual rights must be under the subordination of social/collective rights. Likewise, the sovereignty of the state is absolute, therefore the people must be subject to the state.

An extreme view that emphasizes the supremacy of collectivity over individuality has been seen since ancient Greece in the concept of “ideal state” proposed by Plato in the “Republic” or Aristotle’s concept of “The best possible State” in Politics (Darmadi, 2022). In Plato’s concept of the ideal state, not only individual people but also private groups such as families are considered not entitled to individual property rights, which are considered an inseparable part of Plato’s concept of the Republic, so that the individuality of property rights no longer needs to be questioned (Nurhayati, Hermasari, Firmanulloh, & Hermansyah, 2022). This view that prioritizes collectivity is also seen in the concept of theocracy among Catholics in medieval times and in extreme Socialism driven by Marx which was influential in Europe until the end of the 20th century. This school of thought subordinates individuality under collectivity (Salamuddin & Repantu, 2015).

It’s becoming common in every conflict of understanding to always look for a solution as an exit after knowing each one’s weaknesses to then be combined between understanding one with the other. Theoni Hegel tries to combine the idea of individual autonomy with the superior power of collective society which he believes is reflected in the state of dualism between the individual and society must be eliminated by formulating a conception of the state. Hegel’s view follows the “Organicist State” model. The state is initially a single organism and integrates all the components of the people into relationships of a functional nature. He connects the concept of a state with a family that originates from two autonomous individuals who then form a unity of family organisms (Nurdin, 2019).

In the Pancasila philosophy, the conception of man as an individual and social being is contained in the formula of the Principles of Fair and Civilized Humanity, and the Indonesian Principle of Unity. In the will of a just and civilized humanity, the people of Indonesia recognize, respect and grant equal rights and freedoms to every citizen to exercise the human rights (Kesuma, Amirudin, Subandi, Lazwardi, & Istihana, 2019). However, these human rights freedoms do not interfere and must respect the human rights of others. This attitude shapes the National Perspective adopted and developed by the Indonesian people, which gives freedom in the expression of human rights while remembering and respecting the rights of others as well as fostering tolerance and cooperation (RELIOKTAPIA, 2015). With the help
of the Union of Indonesia, the people of Indonesia give priority to the interests of the nation and the country. But the greater interests of the community should be above the interest of the group, the tribe, or the individual. This attitude colours the national vision/national vision adopted and developed by the Indonesian people who prioritize the integrity of the nation and the country by keeping in mind, respect, and accommodate the interests of the groups, tribes, and groups.

Pancasila's philosophy harmonizes man as an individual, so that both makhluksocials are given equal space for movement according to the values contained therein. It's not an easy thing to be able to reconcile social values on one side with individual values in the other. It is in the statement that it creates a shock and conflict that in the end individual values will not be willing to be subordinated to social values or otherwise to the general interest and the people, as in the settlement of land or agrarian problems for example; on the one hand, the right of ownership is a right of succession, the strongest and full right in accordance with the provisions of article 20 of the Agrarian Declaration (Act No. 5 of 1960), while on the other hand the right is granted as a right that functions socially according to article 6 (UU no. 5 tahun 1960). It depicts that individual rights have not been given a proper place so that ownership is easily removed, transferred without the will of the owner. Things like this have caused disappointment and a sense of injustice in society itself.

The antagonism between individual rights and the demands of society gives rise to a conflict between the ideas of collectivists and individualists, who were very influential in the process of forming a State about the formation of a State, according to Thomas Hobbes, starting from a state which he described as a wild life, in which all men are hostile to one another or a state of war between all men (bellum omnium contra omnes) and the nature of one to another is as though it were a nature of serigala. (Homo homini lupus). In such circumstances, in order to be able to protect the common interests of all human beings, who are originally competing in power, it is considered that all people must surrender their authority to a single authority that has the right to rule and regulate all public interests and the authority of one in the view of Hobbes is the King (Harefa & Fatolosa Hulu, 2020).

The Hobbes Social Contract theory that puts power or sovereignty in the hands of the King or State differs greatly from the social contract theory of Jean Jacques Rousseau, who does not recognize the one absolute power (Pauvoir Absolut) which he acknowledges as the supreme power in the state is the will of the general public, where the sovereignty of the people is the basis of the state. What Rousseau said was that the common nature of mankind in the Primitive phase of society, then changed by the emergence of property rights and by the invention of technical and mechanical tools. Rousseau argued that this was the cause of inequalities in society, which had caused conflicts and wars among humans and caused a chaos in society (disorde social). In order to repair the chaos of this society, the rich are forced to call on the poor to unite and form a strong joint government.

With the belief that they will be able to obtain a guarantee of public peace and freedom for humans, all groups of people in society are forced to take a path to enter into a collective agreement (a Contrat social). In addition to the notion of state sovereignty on the one hand and the notion of popular sovereignty on the other, there is also the notion of natural law that seeks the joints of the state in human nature in general in relation to society, which in turn has
given birth to the notion of Marxism based on “historisch materialism” or dialectical matrialism. According to this school, the state is a historical phase in the development of society caused by conflicts between groups and groups. State power in that phase as a general power (Public Authority) is centered in the hands of a certain group that is closely related to the ruling class where according to the socialist ideology envisioned by the Marxist school, all class conflicts (classess society) have disappeared (Gadjong, 2019).

Understand the sovereignty of a state in which the gravity of the power of an unlimited or absolute state is entirely different from that of the People’s Sovereignty in which state power is not absolute, but is limited by law. In the maintenance of government, it turns out that they both use the democratic model, with a variety of differences. On the terms of democracy there are what are called Constitutional Democracy, Parliamentary Democracies, Leading Democracies, Pancasila Democracies, People’s Democracies, Soviet Democrats, National Democrats and so on (Mafakhir, 2021). From the description above, democracy has always been linked to the problems of individualism and collectivism in society in the exercise of state power. In the exercise of democracy, on the one hand, absolute sovereignty of the state exists in accordance with the concept of collectivism; on the other hand, sovereignty of the State must clearly define its boundaries according to the concepts of individualism.

The purpose of this research is to understand the true meaning of Democracy and to understand the discourse of individualism and collectivism in democracy which is expected to develop the concept of Democracy as input and improvement of existing concepts and their application in the administration of the Indonesian Government.

Theoretical Framework.

As is known, the idea of democracy has existed since ancient Greece (6th to 5th century BC) which can be referred to the Athenian state (Polis) and the thoughts of Aristotle, Plato and so on. However, the idea of democracy then disappeared from the western world since the Romans were defeated by Western Europe and the West was controlled by Christians who built authoritarian governments and suppressed the freedom of their people. (Mahfud MD. 1999: 269). Before Athens recognized democracy, the Athenian city-state was a monarchy and then an oligarchy. When one person held the government, the form of state was called Monarchy. The term Monarchy comes from the Greek words “monas” which means “one” and "arkheim" which means "to rule". The person who ruled was called a "tyrant" from the word "tyranos". After the rule of the tyrants passed, Athens recognized the rule by several people together. This form of state was called Oligarchy (the word "Oligai" in Greek means "several"). It was not until around 594 BC. Salon, the very wise statesman, laid the foundations of democracy. The peasants were freed from all their debts, while the Greeks who had been made slaves had to regain their freedom. From then on the Athenians were forbidden to take their countrymen as slaves.

In the beginning, the idea of Democracy as a state was not highly esteemed, even renowned scholars such as Plato, viewed democracy as no better than aristocracy. Similarly, Aristotle saw Monarchy as the ideal form of state; while Hobbes was even more extreme, seeing democracy as the culprit of the war that occurred in Athens. The destruction of Athens, according to Plato, was not only due to the external factors of Sparta’s invasion and defeat in the Peloponnesian war, but also due to internal factors of political disintegration and
disorientation due to the implementation of a democratic system of government. Sparta’s victory over Athens also demonstrated the fact that Sparta’s aristocratic principles of state life were superior to Athens’ democratic system.

These historical facts are reflected by Plato in his works, especially the Republic. In this book, Plato explicitly shows his sympathy and admiration for Sparta’s authoritarian state system and his antipathy to democracy. Plato accused democracy of being the cause of Athens becoming weak and disintegrative and unstable (Suhelmi, 2001). According to Aristotle, if power lies in the hands of the people and aims at the interests of all society, then the form of the state is Polythea, but if the state is held by many people (poor, less educated) and aims only for their interests, then the form of the state is democracy. Democracy seems to have a negative connotation and Aristotle did not call it an ideal form of state (Suhelmi, 2001).

Hobbes’ social covenant theory regarding the formation of the state, which is fully bound to the covenant is the individuals. The state itself is free and not bound by the covenant. It is above the individual, the state is free to do what it wants. Hobbes’ version of the state has absolute power and its power cannot be divided. Divided power would lead to anarchy, civil war or religious war within the state. Hobbes did not deny that absolute power could give birth to a despotic State. The state will act arbitrarily without any power to control it. However, according to Hobbes, a despotic state is still far better than anarchy due to the division of state power.

Democracy, which adheres to the principle of power sharing, was considered the culprit of the civil war in Athens. According to Hobbes, absolute monarchy with only one ruler is the best form of state (Nursanik & Mursidah, 2020). According to Thomas Aquinos (1226-1274 AD) the best form of state (Optima Civitas) is Government by one person or monarchy With a single ruler the diversity of views, goals and ideals of the state (Political Pluralism) which is destructive can be avoided. The ruler, based on the values of morality and natural law, can personally set the goals and ideals of the state. This is difficult to do when the state is ruled by several or many people (Johan, 2018).

The democratic state as an ideal type was initiated and re-emerged during the European Enlightenment (XVIII century). The Age of Enlightenment was a time when the ideas of democracy were of particular interest. Many thinkers such as Rousseau, Locke, Voltaire, Montesquieu, they are some of the pioneers of the ideas of Western democracy that are embraced today based on the ideas of the social contract of Jon Locke, Rosseau and Montesquieu’s Trias Politik. The basic ideas of social contract theory are that state sovereignty is not something that is taken for granted and comes from God, but sovereignty is a product of social agreements, the world is controlled by laws based on nature which contains universal principles of justice, because state power comes from the people there must be guarantees of individual rights in society, the need for control of power so that the state authorities do not abuse power, while the Trias Politica theory requires the separation of power (separation of power) of the state, where state power should not be centralized in a particular ruler or body.

In the next stage of development, the idea of a democratic state developed in line with the development of the concept of the rule of law (rechtstaat) in several Western countries, which was pioneered by continental European thinkers such as Immanuel Kant (1724-1804) and Frederich Julius Sthal and Dicey, Anglo Saxon thinkers. Meanwhile, in the Eastern world
in the same century, a model of social democracy (Marxist Leninist Democracy) was also
developed, which was first implemented by Lenin after successfully overthrowing the power
of Tsarist Russia in 1917. Regarding the good and bad of a form of state cannot be separated
from its actualization in realizing the purpose of the state. What is the purpose of the state
according to Plato, namely: organizing the interests of its citizens and trying to make citizens
live well and happy (good life) based on justice, justice rules and must be incarnated in the
state.

With regard to the purpose of the state, the typology of state forms according to Plato is
grouped into the ideal form or the form of mind and the corruption form or the form of
degeneration. The ideal form is a state of mind that seeks to achieve and organize perfection,
Good and Good life and public interest based on justice. Justice reigns and must be incarnated
in the state. This can be broken down into three forms of state of mind, namely:
a. Monarchy (monarchie or monarchy)
b. Aristocracy (Aristocratie or Aristocracy)
c. Democracy (Democratie or Democracy)

Research Methods

This research uses qualitative research methods. Qualitative research method is a
research approach that aims to understand social phenomena or human behavior in depth
through the collection and analysis of non-numerical data, such as text, images, or sounds.
This method focuses on interpreting the meaning of the data obtained, rather than measuring
phenomena with numbers (Abdussamad & SIK, 2021). The data collection technique in this
research is a literature study. Literature study is a process of collecting data by referring to
written sources of information that are relevant to the research topic. In this case, researchers
will collect data from various literature sources, such as books, scientific journals, articles,
research reports, and other documents related to the concepts of individualism and
collectivism in the context of Pancasila democracy. The data that has been collected is then
analyzed in three stages, namely data reduction, data presentation and conclusion drawing.

Results and Discussion

The desire to create a democratic environment is a great hope for humanity, as it
provides opportunities for wider participation in the political decision-making process.
Democracy is a country’s political system and also reflects the political culture of a nation.
Winston Churchill recognized that democracy is imperfect and not an ideal system of
government. However, he also recognized that until now no other system has been proven
better than democracy (Rosana, 2016). This shows that democracy is unique as a system of
government.

Etymologically, the term “democracy” comes from the Greek language, where “demos”
means “people” and “kratos” means “government”. It describes a system of government in
which power and authority are vested in the people (Aswandi & Roisah, 2019). Democracy
can take two main forms: direct democracy and representative democracy. Direct democracy
refers to a situation where every citizen is directly involved in political decision-making. This
means that they directly decide through majority procedures on various political issues.
However, in large societies, direct democracy may not be practical, and this is where
representative democracy comes in. Representative democracy involves the election of representatives by the people to represent their interests and wishes in the legislative body. These representatives, chosen through elections, are responsible for representing the interests of the people and making decisions that affect society (Khairazi, 2015).

The definition of democracy shows that the people hold the power, make and determine the highest decisions and policies in the administration of the state and government and control the implementation of policies whether carried out directly by the people or their representatives through representative institutions. In a democratic system, the state operates according to the wishes of the majority of the people, but also pays attention to the rights of minorities. This means that decisions taken by the government are based on majority support, but also take into account the interests and rights of minority groups (Wardhani, Ibrahim, & Christia, 2020).

Democracy is very suitable to be implemented in Indonesia given its cultural diversity. As a country with diverse ethnicities, religions and beliefs, Indonesia will be more stable if its government system is able to maintain a balance between freedom, equality and unity (Mustopa, Muradi, & Sumadinata, 2023). Democracy reflects the guarantee of both values, namely individualism and collectivism for the people. Individualism is reflected in the aspect of freedom given to each individual, while collectivism is reflected in the effort to create unity and solidarity in society.

Individualism is reflected in the recognition of individual rights in all aspects of life. According to Locke, he expressed the view that every individual is endowed by nature with fundamental rights to life, liberty, and property that are their personal property and should not be interfered with or revoked by the state (Triputra, 2017). According to various views, individualism asserts that individual freedom is something that must be guarded and protected seriously. Such freedom includes the right of individuals to determine the truth from their own perspective. Individuals have the right to determine what they consider best for themselves, and their judgment should be free from external pressure or the influence of doctrines that may prevail in the surrounding environment. Individual judgment should be objective and neutral, unaffected by group values, especially coercive ones (Azmi, 2013).

Democracy protects those human rights and individual freedoms, by giving people the opportunity to express their opinions, fight for their rights, and actively participate in shaping their future. It provides an important platform for people to engage in decision-making processes that affect their lives (Ulfiyati, Muhamad, & Akbari, 2023). Every individual is considered valuable and has a significant role in the democratic process, including in their right to participate in elections, express their opinions, and engage in other political activities.

On the other hand, democracy also embraces collectivism. Collectivism is a cultural value where people are bound in strong bonds, and each individual is expected to maintain loyalty to the group and focus on the interests of the community in which they live (Reza & Liauw, 2021). Collectivism can be interpreted as an individual's awareness of the community in which they live. In a collectivist culture, interactions, associations, and communications are characterized by a spirit of cooperation and dependence between individuals. This culture emphasizes the importance of “interdependence”, where each member in the community
needs the contribution and support of others to solve problems or conflicts in their lives (Syarizka, Nareswari, & Irwansyah, 2021).

Within the framework of democracy, the values of collectivism are reflected in the spirit of gotong royong, awareness of the importance of building a just and prosperous society together, and recognition of the importance of cultural and social diversity in the formation of national identity. This shows that in Indonesia’s democratic system, cooperation and solidarity between individuals are highly valued and upheld in an effort to achieve common progress and community welfare.

Meanwhile, Indonesia’s democratic system is built on the foundation and strength of Pancasila (Wartoyo, 2019). Pancasila is the main foundation of the Republic of Indonesia in forming and regulating government, policies, and laws. Pancasila comes from Sanskrit, consisting of “panca” which means five, and “sila” which refers to principles or principles. This means that Pancasila can be explained as the five basic principles that serve as the foundation for the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Husna & Najicha, 2023).

Pancasila democracy is defined as a form of democracy that is reflected in the Indonesian people’s deep belief and understanding of the values of Pancasila. This means that democracy is not only adopted, but also internalized and aligned with the moral principles of Pancasila. The system emphasizes the principles of kinship and gotong royong aimed at improving the welfare of the people, with values such as religious awareness, truth, love, and noble character, and in accordance with the character and sustainability of Indonesia. State administration in Pancasila democracy is carried out by the people themselves or at least with their consent (Ningsih, Dara, & Putri, 2023).

Pancasila democracy is considered the optimal system of government to regulate the relationship between individualism and collectivism. The harmony between individualism and collectivism in Pancasila democracy is about creating a balanced equilibrium between individual rights and collective interests. Although each individual has recognized rights, these rights must not conflict with the interests and welfare of the collective society (Febriansyah, 2017). This indicates that although individual rights are recognized, in practice they must be in line with the common interest and welfare. The opinion confirms that individual rights, including property rights and human rights are recognized, but national interests or common interests are still placed above individual interests (Aswandi & Roisah, 2019).

The following is a summary of the values contained in each of the Pancasila precepts according to (Sari & Najicha, 2022):

1. The first precept, Belief in One God.
   - The values in this precept include belief in one God Almighty, providing religious freedom, and respecting the diversity of religious beliefs in Indonesian society. This precept is considered the source of basic values in the life of the Indonesian nation.

2. The second precept is a just and civilized humanity.
   - This precept contains human values, such as fair treatment of others, respect for human rights, and cultured behavior. These values encourage individuals to be fair to others and interact with the environment and God Almighty.

3. The third precept, the unity of Indonesia
Unity is the central value in this precept, reflecting the spirit of “Bhineka Tunggal Ika” (diversity but one purpose). Unity is considered a dynamic factor that promotes peace in Indonesian society and is key to the survival of the nation.

4. The fourth precept, Democracy led by wisdom in representative deliberation.
   This precept reflects the values of democracy, freedom and responsible leadership. Democracy, either directly or indirectly, allows the people of Indonesia to choose and determine the leaders of their country.

5. The fifth precept, Social justice for all Indonesian people.
   Social justice is a value found in this precept, covering all aspects of society such as politics, law, economy, social and culture. This value emphasizes that every citizen has the right to feel fair and equal treatment in all aspects of life.

It underscores the fundamental principles on which the Indonesian state is based. Individualism in Pancasila democracy is reflected through an emphasis on the principles of humanity, unity, and social justice, which form the ethical basis for upholding human rights in Indonesia. The implementation of human rights enforcement involves various issues, including the right to religion, freedom of speech, the right to justice, and economic and social rights (Husna & Najicha, 2023).

Pancasila recognizes the importance of recognizing human rights, which include basic rights such as the right to life, development, and the pursuit of happiness. This is reflected in the first and second precepts of Pancasila. The first precept affirms belief in God Almighty, provides freedom of religion, and respects the diversity of religious beliefs in Indonesia. Meanwhile, the second precept emphasizes a just and civilized humanity, which includes fair treatment of fellow human beings and respect for human rights. The second precept highlights the importance of Indonesian society to respect and protect human rights and promote social welfare.

Meanwhile, collectivism in Pancasila democracy is reflected in several aspects. First, the Indonesian state is responsible for creating prosperity for all its people, as mandated in the second and fifth precepts of Pancasila. The meaning of the second and fifth precepts of Pancasila contains the concept of justice that must be realized in the common life. This justice is based on the principle of social justice, which includes justice in human relationships with themselves, fellow humans, their nation and country, and human relationships with God (Febriansyah, 2017).

In addition, the value of helping each other and working together to achieve common goals is also part of the nation’s noble values reflected in the third principle of Pancasila. Pancasila democracy also encourages the active participation of all citizens in the political decision-making process. This is done through a deliberative process of consensus and fair and clean elections, reflecting the prioritization of the common interests of society. This principle, which requires every decision to be made through a process of deliberation and consensus by considering the interests of all parties, is reflected in the fourth precept of Pancasila.

This finding shows that the Pancasila democratic system is a just and equitable legal system that ensures that individual rights are protected and the collective interests of society
are safeguarded. This reflects the harmony between individualism (through the protection of individual rights) and collectivism (through the enforcement of laws for the common good). The alignment between individualism and collectivism in Pancasila Democracy results in several significant benefits for Indonesian society:

a. Preventing conflict

Indonesia is a country rich in cultural diversity and identity. This diversity can lead to conflict, whether due to differences in interests, values, resource competition, inequality, injustice, or interpersonal tensions (Binawan & Najicha, 2023). However, by striving for a balance between individual rights and common interests, conflict can be prevented through the granting of fair rights to each individual, fair dispute resolution, and recognition of common interests. Thus, the Pancasila democratic system can play a role in maintaining stability and peace in society.

b. Increasing community participation

The harmony between individualism and collectivism involves active contributions from the community. When people feel respected and involved in the decision-making process, they are more likely to be actively involved in the country's development (Zitri, Rifaï, & Darmansyah, 2023). This phenomenon creates an inclusive environment that strengthens people's sense of belonging to the country's development process. This means they will be more motivated to participate in efforts for common progress.

c. Realizing social justice

The balance between individualism and collectivism in the Pancasila democratic system also helps realize social justice for all Indonesians. Through adjusting individual interests while paying attention to collective needs and interests, this system seeks to create conditions in which every individual has an equal opportunity to develop and contribute fairly to society (Ningsih et al., 2023).

The harmony between individualism and collectivism makes a significant contribution to society. However, it is important to remember that achieving a balance between these two values is not easy. It requires continuous efforts from all parties to ensure that individualism and collectivism remain in line and support each other. In the context of Pancasila democracy, there are several strategies that can be implemented to harmonize these two values. First, strengthening character education is key to instilling the values of Pancasila, which includes the spirit of togetherness and unity in the life of the nation.

Character education is an effort to educate individuals to make wise decisions and apply them in everyday life, so that they can have a positive influence on their environment (Ismail, Suhana, & Zakiah, 2020). Through character education, individuals have knowledge and understanding of the values of Pancasila. So that they can make decisions wisely and act in accordance with the moral values upheld by Pancasila.

The second strategy, increasing public participation in the democratic process, is very important. Active participation from the public can increase government legitimacy, strengthen human rights demands, and promote accountability and transparency in political decision-making (Fitriani, Budiyani, Hardika, & Choerunissa, 2023). This ensures that
people’s aspirations and interests are reflected in policy-making so that people feel they have an important and active role in driving the country’s development.

Finally, community empowerment through sustainable development programs is also an important step. It aims to ensure that all levels of society can benefit from development, creating equality and justice in society. Community empowerment not only focuses on the basic needs of the community, but also seeks alternatives for local economic growth. This has a relationship with the progress and change of the nation in the future, especially in the ability of the community to influence economic growth (Rahmat, Banjarhanor, Ma’rufah, & Widana, 2020).

The implementation of these strategies is expected to help the harmony between individualism and collectivism in Pancasila democracy to be maximally achieved. Creating a society that is fair, inclusive, and has the capacity to provide great benefits, such as reducing conflict, increasing community participation, and realizing social justice for the progress of the Indonesian state.

Conclusion

Pancasila democracy is considered an ideal system of government in balancing the concepts of individualism and collectivism. To harmonize these two concepts in the context of Pancasila democracy, several strategies are needed. First, strengthening character education is key to instilling the values of Pancasila, which includes the spirit of togetherness and unity in the life of the nation. Next, increasing community participation in the democratic process is an important step to ensure that the aspirations and interests of the community are reflected in policy-making. Finally, community empowerment through sustainable development programs is a real effort to ensure that all levels of society can benefit from development, thus creating equality and justice in society. By implementing these strategies, it is hoped that the harmony between individualism and collectivism in Pancasila democracy can be optimally realized, creating a just, inclusive and empowered society.

Bibliography

The Harmony Of Individualism And Collectivism In Pancasila Democracy


