ABSTRACT: The Indonesian nation is faced up to the nation’s character crisis. The indication of nation’s character crisis is shown by the values shift, attitudes, and Indonesian behaviors. The cause factors can be traced historically. This study, by using the qualitative approaches and historical methods, tries to examine the nation’s character education of Indonesia. The findings show that since the beginning of independence in 1945, the nation’s character education has been proclaimed by the founders of the nation. The nation’s character education policy in the subsequent period gives effects to the nation’s character education model in the schools. In the Old Order era (1950-1966), especially in the Guided Democracy era (1959-1966), tend to be indoctrinated, include seven basic materials of indoctrination, such as: Pancasila, Political Manifesto, the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Indonesia Socialism, Guided Democracy, Guided Economic, and Indonesia Cultures. Similarly, during the New Order era (1966-1998) tend to be indoctrinated too through Guidelines for Instilling and Implementing the Pancasila, Pancasila Moral Education, and History Education of the National Struggle. In the longer term, indoctrination will give bad effects to the citizens. Based on historical reflection in earlier times, in the Reform era (1998 to date), the nation’s character education in the schools was integrated into every subject of study. Teachers and schools have the opportunity to develop a character education models in line with democratization, in order not to get caught up in indoctrination.
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INTRODUCTION

The Indonesian nation is faced up to the nation’s character crisis. The indication of nation’s character crisis is shown by the values shift, attitudes, and Indonesian behaviors right now. The Indonesians – who are accustomed to polite behaving, doing consensus in problem-solving, have high local wisdom in plurality, tolerance, and mutual help – begin to tend to become hegemonic groups that beat each other and behave dishonestly. All of it explains that there is an uncertainty of nation’s identity and character (Kemdiknas RI, 2010:2; and Gunawan, 2012).

The nation’s character crisis is also shown by increasing actions that affect the destruction of nation’s identity, such as fighting, vandalism, mutual abuse, and fighting between soccer supporters. The resolution of dissent by using violence and leading to horizontal conflicts include SARA (Suku, Agama, Ras, dan Antargolongan or Ethnicity, Religion, Race, and Intergroup relations)’s conflicts; it indicates that decreasing of humanity value and unity of the country which have the Bhinneka Tunggal Ika or Unity in Diversity (Ricklefs, 1992; Lestari, 2015; and Wibowo, 2018).

Setiawati Darmojuwono (2007)’s research from UI (University of Indonesia) in Jakarta, for example, shows that various bombings and riots in every region have changed the stereotype of Indonesia in the international views (Darmojuwono, 2007). Now, stereotypes about Indonesia are more harmful, such as terrorists, fundamentalists, corrupt, and bureaucratic (Varshney, Panggabean & Tadoeddin, 2004; Mahony, 2006; and Goebel & Herriman, 2013).

The Wahid Institute Reports mention that the practice of intolerance throughout 2013, which felt by minority religious groups, such as Ahmadiyah, Christian communities, and they accused of heresy, there are 245 cases about it (cited in Tempo, 15/4/2014). The Equivalence Institute reports that variables of freedom of religion or beliefs down into 0.10 percent, from 2.57 to 2.47 in 2016. Based on Equals data, there are 182 violations about freedom of religion start from December 8, 2016 (cited in http://wartakota.tribunnews.com, 12/12/2016).

Corruption occurs mostly in the environment include Executive, Legislative, Judicial, and BUMN (Badan Usaha Milik Negara or State-Owned Enterprise Body). The various events recorded by the media also imply the question of the nation’s character. It illustrates that institutional activity is trapped increasingly in the corrupt culture and even refers to materialistic pragmatic cultures (Indreswari, 2006).

According to the report of TI (Transparency International) institutions, about Indonesia’s CPI (Corruption Perception Index) for 2015, Indonesia is in 36 grades. Indonesia’s corruption ranking is in 88 ranks out of 168 countries. Indonesia’s CPI achievement is better from a year earlier that reached 34 in 2014. However, the achievement of Indonesia’s CPI improvements is still low, because of doing corruption in the law and political sectors continuously. The practice of bribery in law institutions is still rife (cited in Kompas, 27/1/2015).

In religion sides, religious ideologies can reduce the values of the nation’s character. Ma’arif Institute Research, in 2011, at the four of Senior High Schools in Pandeglang district, Banten; Cianjur district, West Java; Yogyakarta and Solo districts, Central Java, shows that school is a free space for any dissemination, including radical religious beliefs. In one of the Senior High Schools in Yogyakarta, according to the research, found the anti-nationalist doctrine that contained in the document of the mentoring module about what they studied (Gaus et al., 2013:185-186).

Nationalism is perceived as destructive of Islam from within and, therefore, nationalism becomes forbidden. In Solo, there was a contestation of various organizations which trying to come in the schools. From the facts which have found, it can be concluded that a school has become a contestation spaces of all religious ideologies that exist in Surakarta, Central Java (Niam, 2010; Dhofer, 2011; and Gaus et al., 2013).
According to A. Azra (2012), the nation’s character crisis of Indonesian, it cannot be separated from the failure of the education system (Azra, 2012:5). The achievement of national education is still far from the expectations mainly to compete with the global education levels competitively. Education is not only failed increasing the intelligence and skills of learners, but also failed in shaping the nation’s character (Sahlberg, 2006; and Azra, 2012).

Further, according to A. Azra (2012), the ending of New Order era in 1998 along with the emergence of the crisis in various aspects of nation’s life has also caused a crisis in the character and resilience of the nation (Azra, 2012:3). The increasing flow of globalization that brings various forms and global culture expressions is an important additional factor, which affects the erosion of the nation’s character progresses faster and broader. Furthermore, the nation’s character crisis causes disruption and dislocation in the social and cultural life of the nation, thereby threatening the integrity and resilience of the nation as a whole (Darmaningtyas, 2004; Assegaf, 2005; and Azra, 2012).

The 3rd President of the Republic of Indonesia, B.J. (Bacharuddin Jusuf) Habibie, who state that the reforms euphoria as a result of the traumatic nature of citizens against the misuse of the last powers in the name of Pancasila (the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia). It makes the reforms generation leave away everything, which they have understood as part of the past and replacing it with something new (Habibie, 2006).

As a result, there is a symptom of “national amnesia” about the importance of Pancasila presence, which is able to become an umbrella of nationality that overshadow all citizens who come from diverse ethnic, customs, cultural, linguistic, religious, and political affiliation. These symptoms can affect the waning of Pancasila values in the life of the nation and state (Habibie, 2006; Nurdin, 2015; and Komara, 2017).

H.A.R. Tilaar (2012) mentions that the life of non-economic areas, such as national unity, equity, both on citizens or regions, getting striking disparities, causing envy, and social conflict between tribes and inter-region. The imbalance of inter-regional development in Indonesia is severe. Indonesia became the world’s worst country concerning equitable distribution of development geographically (Tilaar, 2012:487).

Probably, based on the study of J.H. Estrada et ál. (2011), Indonesia is an outlier, because it has the value of a CV (Coefficient of Variation) of more than one regional income for data period 2004-2008 (Estrada et ál., 2011). The CV, which is so large, shows that higher inequality. Other countries whose have CV value is less than 0.8, including China, which is also poorly known for equitable regional development (cited in Republika, 14/5/2016).

According to Y. Latief (2011), the crisis which happens in Indonesia also occurs due to problems of political linkage and cultural diversity. If politics as a linked knot has been fragile, the rich cultural heritage of the archipelago cannot be tied to be a sharp broomstick, but just a flake of fragile broomsticks (Latief, 2011).

More specifically, S. Kartodirdjo (2014) reveals some main problems which are faced by the Indonesian nation’s after Reform era (Kartodirdjo, 2014:288-290). The issue revolves around issues of religious prejudice, inter-ethnic sentiment, exclusivism, sectarianism, and communalism that leading to the structural transformation of Indonesian citizens in all its dimensions (cf Mastuhu, 2003; Kartodirdjo, 2014; and Saidek, Islami & Abdoludin, 2016).

The nation’s character education policy cannot be separated from the various problems and challenges which is faced by the Indonesian nation’s in its time. These policies affect the learning models of the nation’s character values in the school. It will change from time to time (Mulder, 2001; Surakhmad, 2008; and Hartono, 2017).

This paper will analyze the model of nation’s character education in its historical perspective and reflective in the present and to the future. By using
the qualitative approaches and historical methods (Creswell, 2003; Sjamsuddin, 2007; Williams, 2007; Watz, 2011; and Kartodirdjo, 2014), it will analysis about the nation’s character educations in an Old Order era (1950-1966); in New Order era (1966-1998); and in the reflections at present of Reform era (1998 to date).

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

The Nation’s Character Education in an Old Order Era, 1950-1966. The nation’s character development has been an essential agenda since the beginning of Indonesian independence on August 17, 1945. It was proclaimed as the primary goal of education at the time. UU (Undang-Undang) No.4 Tahun 1950 tentang Dasar-dasar Pendidikan dan Pengadjaran di Sekolah, Pasal 3 (Law No.4 Year 1950 on Basic Education and Teaching in the School is regulated in Article 3) affirms that the purpose of education and teaching is to establish capable’s citizens and democratic citizens also responsible for the welfare of citizens and homeland. While Article 4 asserts that education and teaching are based on the principles, which are outlined in Pancasila (the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia), the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and on Indonesian national culture (cited in Bourchier & Legge, 1994; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

Educational activities at the homeland in the early days of independence is directed at consolidating nationalism values, national identity, and the development of the ideological foundations of life as a nation and as a state. The efforts to inflame the spirit of nationalism at that time were very high, so that B. Maftuh (2008) and A. Azra (2012) have seen it as the second phase of nationalism growth in the Republic of Indonesia (Maftuh, 2008:135; and Azra, 2012).

The first President of the Republic of Indonesia, Ir. Soekarno, brings the spirit of nation and character building in education (Nugroho, 2017). Excessively, intellectualistic colonial education is replaced by education that can make a personality, can develop self-confidence, and generate courage, initiative, and spirit to work (Oey, 1971; Hering, 2001; and Saidek, Islami & Abdoludin, 2016).

A few months after proclamation of Indonesian independence, Ki Hadjar Dewantara, the First Minister of Education, released a General Instruction that proclaims to remove of the colonial education system and prioritizing patriotism. In the General Instruction, it was stated that education should build the spirit of nationalism; and teachers replaced the colonial teaching system with teaching to build the spirit of nationality (Dewantara, 2004; Hartono, 2017; and Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017).

The General Instruction above instructs all principals and teachers to: (1) raise up the Bendera Merah Putih, or Red-and-White Flag, every day in the schoolyard; (2) singing the national anthem of the Great Indonesia or Indonesia Raya; (3) stopping raising the flag of Japan and removing the Kimiyago, a Japanese national anthem; (4) eliminating Japanese lessons, as well as ceremonies which is from the Japanese army; and (5) giving spirit to all students (Dewantara, 2004; Yamin, 2009; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The Old Order government in Indonesia (1950-1966) carried out educational reforms that led to personality education or character education including: the limitation of learning materials until the knowledge that was ready used effectively; the effort toward individualization and learners activeness; releasing rigid class relationships; assigning learners to do more work in groups; connecting schools with citizens; and giving more attention to the development of nationalist, ethical, aesthetic, and character minds (Ricklefs, 1992; Bourchier & Legge, 1994; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2017).

The basic education of independence based on Pancasila, which is the state philosophy, although only on the determination, because it has not been explained how to lay the foundation on each lesson. The curriculum at that time was called the “Lesson Plan of 1947”, or more popular with the Leer Plan (in Dutch language), which meant lesson plan. The
1947 Lesson Plan is also political, which does not want to see the education world is still applying the Dutch curriculum. The arrangement of 1947 Lesson Plan is straightforward, containing only two main points that are the list of subjects and teaching hours, and the outlines of the teaching. The 1947 Lesson Plan focused on character education, the awareness of nation and state rather than intellectual education as the antithesis of colonial model education (Sanjaya, 2007:8; Sutisna, 2011; and Hartono, 2017).

The systems change after the Decree of the President on July 5, 1959. President Soekarno, the 1st President of the Republic of Indonesia, released a Manipol (Manifesto Politik or Political Manifesto). From the ideological side, according to Wardiman Djojonegoro (1996), the Manipol was indoctrinated in all layers of the Indonesian peoples at all levels of education, so that it cannot make specified other interpretations other than the government has set (Djojonegoro, 1996; Oey, 1971; and Bourchier & Legge, 1994).

Regarding education policy, the national educational principles are Pancasila and Manipol USDEK (Manifesto Politik tentang Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Sosialisme, Demokrasi dan Ekonomi Terpimpin, serta Kepribadian Indonesia or the Political Manifesto on 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy and Economy, and Indonesian Culture). The purpose of national education is to give birth to Indonesian socialist citizens, who have noble moral, responsible for the implementation of socialist society of Indonesia, just and prosperous both spiritual and material and the soul of Pancasila, namely: (1) Belief in the One and Only God; (2) Just and Civilized Humanity; (3) the Unity of Indonesia; (4) Democracy Guided by the Inner Wisdom in the Unanimity Arising out of Deliberations Amongst Representatives; and (5) Social Justice for All the People of Indonesia (cf Nishimura, 1995; Djojonegoro, 1996; and Tanirejdj, Afandi & Faridli, 2012).

The concept of socialism in education at this time provides the basis that education is the right of all groups of society without looking at social class (Yamin, 2009:87). The Minister of Education and Culture (1957–1966) draws up a short-term plan, which will then be followed by long-term plans to adjust education policy with the Manipol USDEK. A short plan was devised a plan, which called Sapta Usaha Tama (Seven Main Endeavors). Sapta Usaha Tama contains:

1. controlling to the apparatus and efforts of the Ministry of PP and K or Teaching, Education, and Culture;
2. encouraging arts and sports;
3. encouraging the “business page”;
4. obligating to savings;
5. requiring to cooperative enterprises;
6. holding a community class; and
7. establish working teams within Upper School or Senior High School and University (Sutisna, 2011; Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

As a step to implement the Sapta Usaha Tama is formed a special term, which called business affairs of Sapta Usaha Tama and Panca Wardhana. Panca Wardhana (Five Matters) supports the process of a new education system that includes: (1) the development of intelligence; (2) national moral development; (3) emotional artistic development; (4) skill development; and (5) physical development (Sanjaya, 2007; Sutisna, 2011; and Hartono, 2017).

Further details of Panca Wardhana, that to adopt the educational policies of Manipol USDEK, are instructed and established the Panca Wardhana as an educational system which contains the principles of: (1) the development of love of the nation and the homeland, national/international/religious morals; (2) the development of intelligence; (3) artistic emotional development or sense inner beauty; (4) the development of keprigelan or handicraft; and (5) physical development (Sanjaya, 2007; Sutisna, 2011; and Hartono, 2017). Since the time, all school activities both curricular and extracurricular have a lot of changed and have to adjust to the instructions above. Based on the subject of the school, Pancasila and Manipol USDEK were subjected to basic
education up to university (Nurdin, 2015; Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

Panca Wardhana has implications for education. The curriculum should be directed to develop the qualities of education that expressed in the Panca Wardhana with Manipol USDEK spirits. The goal of education will change from creating a good human and democratic human into a good socialist human and be pioneering in defense of Manipol USDEK. A prominent change in the curriculum is the presence of Civics subjects, which directed to the establishment of citizens who have characterized by Manipol USDEK (Sutisna, 2011; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

Liberalism and individualism are enemies and must be cleansed in Civics lessons, because it is unsuitable with the mind and spirit of Manipol USDEK. Civics is a subject of ideological education of the nation and become the beginning of ideological education in the curriculum. This subject is a subject that contains subject matter that is determined by ideology and politics (Nurdin, 2015; Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The goals of an education system based on the principles of Panca Wardhana is to create an Indonesian socialist human being based on their creativity, feeling, intention, and creation on the following principles: (1) the personality and culture of Indonesia; (2) high patriot spirits; (3) based on Pancasila; (4) enthusiastic to gotong-royong or mutual cooperation; (5) has a pioneer spirit or self-help and creativity; (6) moral human beings and noble-minded; (7) unpretentious awareness and priority of honesty; (8) consciousness to prioritizing obligations rather than rights; (9) awareness of prioritizing public interest rather than personal interest; (10) willingness to sacrifice and live frugally; (11) recognize Guided Democracy principles; (12) recognize Guided Economic principles; (13) discipline; (14) have the ability to appreciate time; (15) rational and economics thinkings; and (16) working awareness to build more by working hard (Sutisna, 2011; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

The education policy on the Sapta Usaha Tama and Panca Wardhana is contained in the instruction of the Minister of PP & K (Pengadjaran, Pendidikan, dan Kebudajaan or Teaching, Education, and Culture) No.1 of 1959. The character education model during the Old Order era was also reinforced by the MPRS RI (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Sementara Republik Indonesia or Provisional People’s Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia) Decree, No.11/MPRS/1960, about the Outline of the National Development Plan of the First Planning at 1961-1969 (Oey, 1971; Ricklefs, 1992; and Hartono, 2017).

In an Article 2 of TAP MPRS/II/1960 stated that the development strategy of the mental/religious/spiritual sectors is implementing the political manifesto in the field of mental/religious/spiritual and cultural coachings by guaranteeing the spiritual and material requirements, so that every citizen can develop their personality and national cultures of Indonesia and reject the bad influences of foreign culture. The next strategy is to establish Pancasila and Manipol USDEK as subjects in basic education up to universities (Nurdin, 2015; Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The character education policy was carried out centrally, as explained by H.A.R. Tilaar (2012), that the educational policy of this period is directed to the process of indoctrination and rejects all cultural elements that come from outside or foreign cultures (Tilaar, 2012:2). The materials which given was not only about Pancasila and UUD 1945 (the 1945 Constitution) of the Republic of Indonesia, but also materials which contain the sovereigns political view of the time. The indoctrination materials were known as “seven staple of indoctrinations”, or called TUBAPI (Tudjuh Bahan Pokok Indoktrinasi) consisting of Pancasila, Manipol, and USDEK (Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

History records that in the next period, especially in the New Order era (1966-1998),
what the Old Order era (1950-1966) did was seen also as an indoctrination efforts (Nurdin, 2015; Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The Nation’s Character Education in the New Order Era, 1966-1998. The New Order era government brought the jargon of economic development. At this time, national education was directed to give the younger generation to be able to bring the nation and the state being on a line with other countries, which and more advanced quickly. Education was regulated by a national education system that is closely related to the political life of the nation at that time (Mulder, 2001; Tilaar, 2012; and Hartono, 2017).

At this time, education became an instrument of implementation of development programs in various fields, especially in the field of pedagogy, curriculum, organization, and evaluation of education, are directed to the acceleration of development implementation. Educational activities in this era, are colored by centralist policies that lead to the function of education as an instrument of national economic development (Assegaf, 2005; Haridza & Irving, 2017; and Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017).

Character education was contained explicitly in the highest political product of state institutions, for example the MPR RI (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Republik Indonesia or People’s Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia), in the form of GBHN (Garis-garis Besar Haluan Negara or Broad Outlines of State Policy). The character education of the nation, at this time, was manifested in TAP MPR No.II/MPR/1978 on the Guidelines for Instilling and Implementing Pancasila (the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia) or Ekpraseetia Pancakarsa, which called as P-4 (Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila or Guidelines for Internalization and Implementation of Pancasila) for all members of Indonesia society (Maftuh, 2008; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

To implement and follow up the TAP MPR No.II/MPR/1978 is issued Presidential Instruction No.10 of 1978 about Upgrading of Employees of the Republic of Indonesia concerning results of General Meeting of the People’s Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia at 1978. The next step is to organize the upgrading of P-4 for the citizens in general, as well as the civil servants in their respective agencies. For this activities, it was made Non-Departmental Government Institution which called Implementing Education Developments of Guidelines for Instilling and Implementing Pancasila as BP-7 (Badan Penasihat Presiden tentang Pelaksanaan P-4) by Presidential Decree No.10 of 1979 (Anggono, 2014:506-507; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

Since 1983, the upgrading of P-4 was a thing which must be followed by every new student in all schools throughout Indonesia. The New Order era government asserted that P-4 was an operational guide to practicing Pancasila in daily life, including in education. The purpose of the upgrading of P-4 is the realization of the attitude and behavior of all government apparatus and citizens following the Pancasila and UUD 1945 (Undang-Undang Dasar or the 1945 Constitution) of the Republic of Indonesia. The indoctrination process has occurred in the application of P-4 upgrading that done in every school, from elementary school to university, which contains about Pancasila grains. Upgrading P-4 became an essential and decisive element for the future of students during the New Order era (Maftuh, 2008; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

The Pancasila Moral Education subjects, at that time, stood alone in the structure of the curriculum program at all levels of school. In the P-4 concept, Pancasila was broken down into 36 grains, which become the standard of man’s ability to understand about Pancasila, both at school or society. Upgrading P-4 is encouraged to start from village areas up to national level, including universities, lecturers, and students (Nurdin, 2015; Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

In the 1994 Curriculum, Pancasila Education has been transformed from stand-alone subjects, and then combined into PPKN (Pendidikan Pancasila dan...
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Kewargaan Negara or Pancasila and Citizenship Education) subjects. Pancasila education is integrated as knowledge to strengthen the mind and spirit of nationality through citizenship sciences (Surakhmad, 2008; Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

Before the implementation of the 1984 Curriculum, in 1983, the lesson of PSPB (Pendidikan Sejarah Perjuangan Bangsa or History Education of the National Struggle) was defined as compulsory subjects. This determination was based on the decision of the Minister of Education and Culture No.0461/U/1983, which have signed by Nugroho Notosusanto (Sardiman & Yuliantri, 2012; Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The PSPB positions as the primary matter and the compulsory subject of the curriculum got a stronger legal position, when the MPR RI has released the TAP MPR No.II/MPR/1983, which PSPB declared as part of Pancasila education. Thus, the education of ideology has been done through Pancasila education, which has a component of the Guidelines for Instilling and Implementing the Pancasila or P-4; PMP (Pendidikan Moral Pancasila or Pancasila Moral Education); and the PSPB (Sardiman & Yuliantri, 2012; Hartono, 2017; and Komara, 2017).

The substitution of the Civics lesson during the Old Order era (1950-1966) became the PMP during the New Order era (1966-1998) had a considerable political impact. Civics subjects taught the rights and obligations of citizens, as well as the state’s obligations to their citizens. Thus, every students/learner has been taught to be critical to the state (Mulder, 2001; Tilaar, 2012; and Hartono, 2017).

The prevailing PSPB, since the 1984 Curriculum, was seen as a hegemonic educational endeavor that inherent in political nuance, because it focused only on the role of the TNI-AD (Tentara Nasional Indonesia – Angkatan Darat or Indonesia National Army) who against the PKI (Partai Komunis Indonesia or Indonesian Communist Party) in 1965-1966. Through the subjects of PSPB, it is expected that the formal education graduates have a high appreciation towards ABRI (Angkatan Bersenjata Republik Indonesia or Indonesian Armed Forces); PMP; P-4; or PSPB, and can be said to be an effort of the New Order government to create the character of the Indonesian nations (Mulder, 2001; Nurdin, 2015; and Hartono, 2017).

The Nation’s Character Education in the Reflections at Present. During the Old Order era (1950-1966) and New Order era (1966-1998), character education was characterized by patterns of indoctrination values inculcation. According to H.A.R. Tilaar (2012), indoctrination is a pattern of implementation (praxis) in education based on powers. Learning of indoctrination education praxis also follows the pattern of indoctrination (Tilaar, 2012:146).

Particularly, during the New Order era of the mid-1980s, ideologists government attempted to incorporate a collection of ideas of “national indoctrination” into coherent state theory (Bourchier, 2007:3).

This indoctrination does not just happen in Indonesia. Gonzalo de Amezola (2007) examines indoctrination through historical learning in Argentina. The result is that all history textbooks, published between 1956 and 1983 in Argentina, have always included the concept of homeland, authority, order, and rank. The dictatorship is described as an inevitable and natural thing in the Argentine government (Amezola, 2007).

The same phenomenon also occurs in Russia. According to Victor Shnirelman (2009), historical views in history textbooks in Russia is highly centralized and controlled by the state. An alternative view outside the official discussion of the state is not allowed to appear in the books. The implications of this centralization and uniformity of views are the existence of certain ethnic groups in Russia, who isolate and their collective memory not recognized by the state (Shnirelman, 2009).

During the Reform era in Indonesia (1998 to date), character building becomes the mainstream of national development. This
is reflected in the national development mission, which positioned the nations character education as the first mission to realize the vision of national development, as stated in the RPJPN (Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional or National Long-Term Development Plan) of 2005-2025, based on the Law of the Republic of Indonesia No.17, 2007, which namely the realization of nation characters that is strong, competitive, noble, and moral based on Pancasila, which characterized by the character and behavior among society of Indonesia are diverse, faithful and be piety to God Almighty, virtuous, tolerant, mutual cooperative, patriotic spirited, dynamic, and science-oriented (Hartono, 2017; and Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

Law Number 20 of 2003 about National Education System or UUSPN (Undang-Undang Sistem Pendidikan Nasional), at Article 3, mandates that national education function to develop the ability and create the character and civilization of dignified nation in order to create intelligent nations, which aims to improve the students skills to be a human who believes and piety to God Almighty, have noble character, healthy, knowledgeable, capable, creative, independent, and become democratic and responsible citizens. UUSPN and RPJPN are a solid foundation for implementing nations character education operationally (Tilaar, 2012; and Hartono, 2017).

In the term of nation’s character education, the 2004 Curriculum referred to as the KBK (Kurikulum Berbasis Kompetensi or Competency-Based Curriculum), which eliminates the word of Pancasila (the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia) from PPKn (Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan or Citizenship and Pancasila Education) lessons become Civics or Citizenship Education, without mentioning Pancasila anymore. This year has also generated the concept of life skill (life skills training), which is implemented in the learning as part of the effort to create a good personality, having excellent skills, both in the daily life or after graduated from school (Maftuh, 2008; Nurdin, 2015; and Komara, 2017).

Learning from the last era in Indonesia that tends to be indoctrination, character education in the Reform era does not become a specific subject. Character education of this model occurs in naturally, when implemented naturally and informally too. Therefore, there is no need for particular subjects on character education. Also, there is no need for programmatic attempts to develop character education that eventually falls on formalism, or even indoctrination (Koesoema, 2007:9).

At the implementation of KTSP (Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan or the School-Based Curriculum), in 2006, the nation’s character was not included as the subject but integrated into the subjects of the learning process, self-development, and school culture. After the implementation of KTSP 2006, for approximately five years, character education has decreased (Sutisna, 2011; Haridza & Irving, 2017; and Hartono, 2017).

In the national discussions, in 2010, was proclaimed the target of education in 2010 by 10%; in 2011 by 30%; and in 2012 up to 100%. The concept of character education reaches its peak in 2011 and 2012 with a syllabus and RPP (Rencana Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran or Lesson Implementation and Planning) based on character formats. The syllabus and RPP models have begun to integrate with the components value that is part of character education, such as responsibility, respect or be tolerant for others, and some other values (Hartono, Haryanto & Asrowi, 2018).

The 2013 Curriculum gives opportunities for students in developing the domain of attitudes, knowledge, and skills that is outlined in the SKL (Standar Kompetensi Lulusan or Graduates Competency Standard) at the elementary school, junior, and senior high school/vocational level, which are further elaborated in the KI

---

Historical Reflections

(Kompetensi Inti or Core Competencies), which consisting of KI on spiritual attitudes; KI on social attitudes; KI on knowledge; and KI on skills (Haridza & Irving, 2017; and Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017). This KI is like an umbrella for all subjects, which have taught at a particular school level. KI is elaborated in each subject in the form of KD (Kompetensi Dasar or Basic Competence), which includes KD on religious attitudes; KD on social attitudes; KD on knowledge; and KD on skills. In the learning process that teachers do to the students should include KD on spiritual attitudes; KD on social attitudes; KD on knowledge; and KD on skills, so that the developing competencies in the students’ self is certainly comprehensive from all domains of attitude, knowledge, and abilities. Then, the schools and teachers can develop innovative learning models according to student characteristics and learning needs (Haridza & Irving, 2017; Komara, 2017; and Wahyudin & Suwirta, 2017).

CONCLUSION

The nation’s character education in Indonesia has been declared since the beginning of Indonesian independence in 1945. The nation’s character education policy in the next period affects the nation’s character education models in the schools. In the Old Order era (1950-1966), especially in the Guided Democracy era (1959-1966), tend to be indoctrination with TUBAPI (Tudjuh Bahan Pokok Indoktrinasi or Seven Primary Materials of Indoctrination) contents, namely Pancasila (the five basic principles of the Republic of Indonesia) and Manipol USDEK (Manifesto Politik tentang Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Sosialisme, Demokrasi dan Ekonomi Terpimpin, serta Kepribadian Indonesia or the Political Manifesto on 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy and Economy, and Indonesian Culture).

During the New Order era (1966-1998) also tend to be indoctrination through upgrading the P-4 (Pedoman Penghayatan dan Penguamalan Pancasila or Guidelines for Internalization and Implementation of Pancasila), PMP (Pendidikan Moral Pancasila or Pancasila Moral Education), and PSPB (Pendidikan Sejarah Perjuangan Bangsa or History Education of the National Struggle). Based on historical reflection in those days, in the current of Reform era (1998 to date), the nation’s character education in every school is integrated into every lesson, self-development activities, and school cultures. Schools and teachers have the opportunity to develop a character education models in line with democratization to not contaminate with indoctrination. Then, the schools and teachers can develop innovative learning models according to student characteristics and learning needs to internalize the nation’s character values in each Indonesian.3
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