

Politics of Education in Indonesia: The Era of Soekarno, Soeharto, and Reformation

Sunarso Sunarso^a, ^aYogyakarta State University, Indonesia, Email:
sunarso@uny.ac.id

This research was conducted with the aim of describing the development of education politics in Indonesia in the Sukarno Era, the Suharto Era, and the Reformation Era. This type of research was a literature study using a qualitative approach. A literature study was carried out by inventorying, examining, or testing written materials in the form of reference books, related legislation, journals, magazines, newspapers, and other written materials related to the problem under the study. Data that has been collected was first verified. In this study, the technique of checking the validity of the data was taken through confirmation between documents. The results showed that (1) The education politics of the Sukarno era in the early independence period 1945-1950 was coloured by the spirit of revolution, and the education aimed to instil the soul and spirit of patriotism. The education politics in the 1950-1959 period was coloured by liberal democracy, and education aimed to shape capable human beings and democratic citizens who are responsible for the welfare of the people and the motherland. The politics of education in the 1959-1966 period was coloured by Guided Democracy and the Manipol USDEK (Political Manifesto/1945 Constitution, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy, Guided Economy, and Personality), and education aimed to encourage deceptive Indonesian socialist citizens. (2) The education politics of the Suharto era was marked by a passion for implementing Pancasila purely and consistently, as well as a passion for carrying out economic development. Education aimed to shape human development with the spirit of Pancasila, which can support the success of economic development. (3) The politics of education in the Reformation era was marked by a spirit to create a democratic society that obeys the law.

Key words: *Politics, education, the Soekarno era, the Soeharto era, the reformation era.*



Introduction

Education and politics are two essential elements in the socio-political system in every country, both developed and developing countries (Dirman et al., 2019). The two are often seen as separate parts, which do not have anything to do with each other. In fact, both of them work together in the process of forming the characteristics of people in a country. More than that, the two support and complement each other. Educational institutions and processes play an important role in shaping the political behaviour of the people in the country (Dirman et al., 2019). Vice versa, political institutions, and political processes in a country have a big impact on the characteristics of education in the country. There is a close and dynamic relationship between education and politics in each country. The relationship is an empirical reality that has occurred since the early development of human civilization and is of concern to scientists (Sirozi, 2001: 3).

In the West, the study of the relationship between education and politics was first noted by Plato in his book, Republic. According to Plato, philosophers occupy the highest strata in society. Citizens with secondary education, military, and police are in the middle strata. People who supply the country's economic needs occupy the lowest status among all. Education must be adjusted carefully to the reproduction of the system. The lower classes are educated to obey and are convinced by political myths that their status is formed by natural causes (M Sirozi, 2001: 1).

In modern society, in general, education is a vital political commodity. Educational processes and institutions have diverse political aspects and faces and have several essential functions that have an impact on the political system and political stability. In modern society, education is the responsibility of the government. Public education is political because it is controlled by the government and affects the government's credibility. Because of the large political nuances of educational policies, various political factors that have nothing to do with education also influence the control of education and how education policies are made.

The politics of education is interpreted as a deposition of state politics, a translation of the nation's traditions and values, as well as a system of people's conceptions about the shape of the state in the education system (Kartini Kartono, 1977: 28). Between the political order of a nation and the education system, they mutually reinforce each other. The politics of education aims to clarify the direction of educational progress for the development of a better nation going forward (George F. Kneller, 1977: 128).

The politics of education in each era is the answer to the problems faced by that era. The politics of education cannot be separated from the current political context. Political policy in Indonesia has always had a large and direct influence on national education. Political changes

always lead to changes in education policy. During the colonial period, educational policies were implemented in the interests of the colonizers. After independence, the orientation of education is in the interests of the wider community, nation, and state. Political development is always faster than educational change. Political decisions taken by individuals/groups in a particular government have broad implications for society. Therefore, improving educational practices must be accompanied by the improvement and renewal of their policies. This research was conducted with the aim of describing the politics of education in the Sukarno Era, the Suharto Era, and the Reformation Era. Based on the background of the problem, this research focuses on the following problem: How was the educational politics of the Sukarno Era, the Suharto Era, and the Reformation Era?

Literature Review

John Dewey (1963: 89-90) views education as a reconstruction or reorganisation of experience to make it more meaningful, so that it can direct the next experience. According to Dewey, education should be based on experience, active interaction of individuals with their environment, where education is a reconstruction of experiences. Past experience is used to understand current events or experiences. Also, it is further to direct the experience to come. For Dewey, the main objective of education is the growth or reconstruction of experiences, which determines the direction and control of subsequent experiences.

John S Brubacher (1978: 371) argues that education is the process of developing human potential, abilities, and capacity that is easily influenced by habits. It is then refined with good habits, supported by media and arranged so that education can be used to help other people or himself in achieving the goals set.

Education involves two things (1) The whole process of a person to develop abilities, attitudes, and behaviours that are positive in the community where he lives. (2) The social process can cause a person to develop social abilities and individual abilities optimally (Carter V. Good, 1985: 145).

According to Driyarkara (1980: 142), the core of education is the humanisation of young people. Education in Driyarkara's view is a fundamental act in the form of interpersonal communication, and in that communication, a process of humanising youth occurs, in the sense of a process of hominisation (the process of making someone a human) and humanisation (the process of developing human humanity). Thus, education must help people to know and want to act like humans. Basically, education is the development of young people to the human level.

Meanwhile, Ki Hajar Dewantara (1977: 20) states that education is a demand for the growth of children. Education demands all the natural strengths that exist in children so that they, as human beings and members of society, can achieve the highest safety and happiness. According to Ki Hajar Dewantara, education must be based on respect for the independence of the child's soul. Children must be able to grow and develop according to natural nature (natural innate), and there should not be coercion of innate independence from children. Education must be *Tut Wuri Handayani*, meaning guiding from behind, which fosters the independence of children and not scares or punishes, which kills the independence of the child's soul (Sodiq A. Kuntoro, 2007: 143). Ki Hadjar Dewantara wants Indonesian education to reflect national values and not to imitate other nations because of different perspectives. Education must be based on strengthening reasoning in thinking and having morality, being civilized, and having a high sensitivity to the interests of the nation over small and narrow interests.

Every nation will undoubtedly state its educational goals in accordance with the values of life that are being fought for the advancement of its people. Although each nation has a different purpose in life, in general, there are some similarities in various aspects. Education for each individual is a dynamic influence in the development of body, soul, social sense, decency, and intelligence.

Politics of Education

There are four definitions of the politics of education (Ali Mahmudi Amnur, 2007: 5). First, education politics is a method of influencing others to achieve educational goals. Secondly, the politics of education is more oriented to how educational goals can be achieved. Third, education politics talks about methods to achieve educational goals; for example, the education budget, government policies, community participation, and so on. Fourth, the politics of education talk about the extent to which educational attainment as a shaper of quality Indonesian people, a buffer of the national economy, and a shaper of a nation of character.

In the theory of hegemony from Gramsci (Nezar and Andi, 1999: 50), it has been put forward that as long as a state runs with repressive power, it actually also runs a hegemonic power through an ideology capable of perpetuating its power. One of them is through educational institutions. This institution is considered to be very strategic because it has the primary function in transforming all cognitive knowledge, values and skills to the students. These cognitive loads and values can actually be entered and filled with ideological content by the dominant group (state authorities), which subsequently are forced to be willing to instil educational ideals and state interests.

Education in Indonesia has been hegemonyed by the state for so long, almost all devices related to state processes must be controlled by the state. Waidl (2000: 43), in his writings, revealed that some forms of state control were most clearly seen.

First, as a consequence, the provisions of the centralisation of the curriculum, material, and references to the educational process were formulated by the state. The community does not have the right to propose education empowerment because the best thing to know is the country's needs. It does not matter whether curriculum content denies individuality because what matters is state communalism. To strengthen control over the material, the state creates ideological subjects that are in accordance with what the state wants, such as a long experience in PMP (Moral Education of the Pancasila) material, National History, and History of National Struggle Education (PSPB). This way of thinking about political life should not be an alternative discourse outside of the state. Thus, students are invited to believe and absorb material that contains ideology directed by the state. In this centralised curriculum, the methods used in education should not potentially be an embryo of resistance to the state. All must be directed towards total submission to the state. Although the teaching and learning methods vary, the way of thinking has been co-opted in the state's integralism ideology. Because education is aimed at the success of the country's will, education itself is not an empowerment effort aimed at participants. Students are not the subjects of education that their abilities are developed, but rather as objects of a state program called education, and what is important is compliance and loyalty.

Second, the teacher is not a human being who is free to teach something he believes, but instead, he must be an agent who conveys the desires of the state through teaching materials provided, especially subjects that are loaded with state ideology. To achieve this goal, the teacher must be "fostered" and "disciplined" from the rules. Their loyalty to the state is demanded without reserve, so teachers are very afraid of their superiors who take care of their destiny (in this case, the Regional Office of the Ministry of Education). This method is indeed effective in disseminating the country's views. As a result, the teacher suppresses more freedom of student expression because the teacher himself is pressured to express. The teacher is the state representative and the state apparatus in the class. If so, education is not a vehicle for mutual learning between teachers and students as the knowledge community to achieve the good of the future, but a vehicle for oppression from the dominant group. The hope of education being an exercise of freedom and justice seems to be impossible (Farida Hanum, 2004: 8).

Research Methods

This type of research was a literature study using a qualitative approach. A literature study was carried out by inventorying, examining, or testing written materials in the form of

reference books, related legislation, journals, magazines, newspapers, and other written materials related to the problem under study. Data that was collected were first verified. In this study, the technique of checking the validity of the data was taken through confirmation between documents.

Research Results and Discussion

The Politics of Education in the Sukarno Era

The politics of education in the Soekarno era could be divided into three periods as the political dynamics influenced it. (1) Period of 1945-1950, (2) Period of 1951-1959, (3) and Period of 1959-1965.

1. Period of 1945-1950

After independence, the guidelines for implementing education were based on the 1945 Constitution. At the suggestion of the KNIP Workers' Board, in December 1945, an Education Inquiry Committee was formed by the Minister of Teaching and Culture Education (Abd. Rachman Assegaf, 2005: 55).

According to Abd. Rachman Assegaf (2005: 56), the spirit of revolution was very dominant in this period. Various social and political upheavals emerged and coloured the beginning of independence so that the operationalisation of the government transition was not yet stable. In the Dutch period, education aimed to form elite classes and cheap educated workers for the purpose of strengthening the form of colonialism. During the Japanese period, the aim of education was to create labour and military mobilisation to assist the Japanese occupation government against allied troops. Then, post-independence in 1946, it was through the Ministerial Decree PP and K, as follows. Education was stated to instil the soul and spirit of patriotism, which was operationalised through general instructions by the first Minister of Teaching, Ki Hadjar Dewantara, addressed to all school principals and teachers to (1) Raise "The Red and White" every day in the school grounds; (2) Intone the national anthem "Indonesia Raya"; (3) Stop the flying of the Japanese flag and eliminate the song "Kimigayo"; (4) Abolish Japanese lessons and all ceremonies originating from the Japanese Army; (5) Give nationalism to all students (Djumhur, 1976: 200).

Following this, several Indonesian Educational Congress were held. The first was in Solo (1947), then as a follow-up, the Committee for the Establishment of the Basic Law on Education and Teaching was formed in 1948, by the Minister of PP and K (Mr. Ali Sastroamidjoja); also, the Congress of Education was in Yogyakarta (1949). The entire outcome of the Congress was a significant material for the birth of Law on Education and

Teaching Basics (UUPP) No. 4 of 1950. It was the first Law on National Education, which also ended this period and entered the next period (Ary H. Gunawan, 1986: 35).

2. Period of 1950-1959

During this time, education in Indonesia has been perfected. The aim of education and teaching at that time was to form capable human beings and democratic citizens who were responsible for the welfare of the people and the motherland. In 1952, the government, in this case, the Ministry of Education, Teaching and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia, issued a "Decomposed Teaching Plan" for People's Schools, which was useful for teachers as a guide in teaching and learning in primary schools (Abd. Rachman Assegaf, 2005: 65). The types of lessons were Indonesian Language, Regional Languages, Numeracy, Natural Sciences, Life Sciences, Earth Sciences, and History. In one year, there were eight months of study time, and each subject was broken down into eight parts for each class, namely for the first, second, third month, through to the eighth month. Educators in each class already have had guidelines on things that needed to be taught based on the allotted time (Abd. Rachman Assegaf, 2005: 66).

Provisions regarding the basis of education and language of instruction are as follows. (1) Education and Teaching are based on the principles contained in Pancasila, the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia, and the culture of Indonesian nationality (article 4). (2) Indonesian as a unitary language is the language of instruction in schools throughout the Republic of Indonesia (article 5, paragraph 1), while in kindergarten or the three lowest classes in local schools, local languages may be used as the language of instruction, article 5 paragraph 2 (UUPP No. 4 of 1950).

Of the several principal contents UUPP No. 4 of 1950 above, when compared to the education system that prevailed in the previous period (1945-1950), there appeared to be developments and changes, similarities, and differences. Equally, the basis and ideology of education still referred to Pancasila as the state philosophy. The nation's culture and Indonesian language were used as the language of instruction, while differences were in the purpose of education, which was originally to instil the spirit of patriotism and nationalism, that in UUPP No. 4 of 1950 article 3 clearly states the formation of capable human beings and democratic citizens who are responsible for the welfare of society and the motherland.

3. Period of 1959-1965

In accordance with MPRS Decree No. II/MPRS/1960, it has been formulated that Indonesian socialist people are a part of Indonesian socialism, which was the goal of a universal national development plan that was a just and prosperous society based on Pancasila. In its

implementation in schools in accordance with the soul and the MPRS Decision, the curriculum content must be adjusted to the decision. In accordance with the MPRS decision, through Presidential Decree of Republic of Indonesia No.145 of 1965 concerning the Names and Formulations of the National Education System Parent, among others, was formulated regarding the development of Indonesian people as follows. (1) New Indonesian people with the spirit of Pancasila Manipol USDEK, and are able to struggle to achieve these goals. (2) Manpower sufficient to carry out development. (3) The personality of sublime national culture. (4) High science and technology. (5) The movement of the mass action is the entire power of the people in the development and revolution (Abd. Rachman Assegaf, 2005: 75).

A very close link between education and politics at that time was formulated as follows. The education as a means of revolution in an atmosphere of self-reliance required changes in all fields, especially in the field of education. With the above policy, the goal of national education from pre-school education to higher education was aimed at giving birth to what was called Indonesian socialist citizens, who were moral, responsible for the implementation of Indonesian socialist society, just, and prosperous both spiritually and materially, and with the spirit of Pancasila. The moral content of national education was Pancasila Manipol/USDEK. The politics of national education was the Political Manifesto of the Republic of Indonesia, and therefore, the basic strategy for implementing democratic national education must give birth to complete patriots based on Pancasila Manipol/USDEK. To carry out this education, a National Education Council was formed through the Presidential Decree of the Republic of Indonesia No. 146 of 1965 concerning the Basics of the Pancasila National Education System. Further, elaborated on "Panca Bhakti National Education", the objectives of national education, the moral content of national education, and the politics of national education.

Furthermore, in the Presidential Decree, the national education system consisted of 1) Ordinary education (pre-school education, basic education, secondary education, and higher education). 2) Specific education. 3) Special education. In addition to school education, there are also social education, and education outside of school relations. The soul of the educational curriculum includes 1) The spirit of carrying out the mandate of the people's suffering in mutual cooperation for the achievement of a just and prosperous society blessed by God Almighty. 2) The spirit of guided democracy that prioritizes deliberation to reach consensus. 3) The spirit of the love of the nation and the motherland and the spirit of national unity with diversity, personality, and national culture. 4) A sense of humanity in the form of friendship with all nations of the world in the spirit of NEFO to build a new world free of imperialism, colonialism, and neo-colonialism. 5) Trust and a sense of devotion to God Almighty as a characteristic of the Indonesian people.

The Politics of Education in the Soeharto Era (New Order)

The strengthening of the role of the New Order government physically and financially became a starting point for further intervention in education. Until the mid-1970s or the first ten years of the New Order, in fact, there was still what was referred to as teacher autonomy and educational autonomy. However, after that year, along with the increasingly strong political role of the New Order authorities, the teacher autonomy and educational autonomy were diminishing and gradually disappeared (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 12).

The New Order regime was fully aware that educational institutions could be an effective control mechanism for wild thoughts in the community. Therefore, various control mechanisms (physical and mental) through education continued to be carried out by the New Order regime. First was through the school uniform, then content of the subject matter, and proceed to the more detailed, namely in the supervision of the behaviour of individuals involved in the management of education. The root of the problem of education was not only the problem of budget constraints but also the strong intervention of the New Order authorities, which made the ideological and political burden borne by national education very heavy, while the process of intelligence itself was diminishing (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 9).

1. Indoctrination of Ideology

The political burden in education began to be felt when there was a change of lessons from Civic or Citizenship to PMP (Pancasila Moral Education) lessons since 1976. The substitution of Civic lessons into PMP had considerable political implications. In Civic, lessons learned were to recognise the rights and obligations as citizens, and also the obligations of the state towards its citizens. Thus, since childhood, every student has been taught to be critical of their rights as citizens and state obligations towards their citizens. In other words, the Civic lesson would foster a critical attitude for each student. It was clearly less profitable for the authorities. Because if every school graduate became very critical, then the authorities would be confused, giving answers to every demand of their citizens. Whereas, in PMP subjects, the emphasis was only on being obedient and submissive to the ideology of the state, but less well acquainted with their rights. Thus, it was natural that later, educational products born from PMP subjects were devout, and not critical people (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 10).

After the presence of the Tap MPR on Pancasila Living and Practicing Guidelines (P-4), the political burden on national education was increasingly heavy that PMP lessons did not just stop there. However, it continued on the form of P-4 upgrading, which must be followed by every student from kindergarten to university, and also the teachers. From 1983-1997, the P-4

levelling became an obligation that must be followed by every new student. Upgrading P-4 then became a new project for the subjects of Pancasila (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 14).

In addition to PMP subjects, history subjects were also widely used by authorities to support their interests. An example was the National History course, which greatly highlighted the material of the 1965-1966 events that featured the New Order ruler as a Hero. The books of National History since the early days of the New Order were mostly as anti-PKI campaigns. Therefore, in all historical material, especially the events of 1965-1966, the atrocities of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) and the heroism of the Army in saving Pancasila as the basis of the state was emphasized, so that it later gave rise to the commemoration of the "Pancasila Sanctity Day", which is commemorated every year. However, since Gur Dur became President, the term was replaced with the name "October 1 commemoration" (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 13).

The mastery of educational institutions as a vehicle for ideology and political indoctrination of the New Order did not stop at changing the design of Civic subject matter to PMP, changing the substance of National History lessons, adding PSBP lessons, or uniforming clothes nationally, but also mastery of teachers. The teacher's organisation, which later became known as the PGRI, which was established on November 25, 1945, in the form of a Trade Union at its Congress on November 23-25, 1973, in Jakarta, changed its status to a Professional Organisation. Along with the change in status, there was also a change in political affiliation. During the New Order period, PGRI was known as one of the professional organisations that became the basis for the support of the Group of Work (Golkar), so that members of the PGRI were identified with Golkar. (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 17).

The change in status clearly affected the scope of the teacher's organisation, namely the Workers Union, which aimed to fight for the rights of teachers to become an organisation bound by certain professional codes of ethics. Moreover, its role as a supporter of Golkar obviously could forget the fate of its members if the members were not in line with Golkar's demands. Once the size of the grip of the bureaucracy, which was strengthened by the teacher organisation, caused the teacher to lose his autonomy. The teacher was then very accustomed to working on the basis of implementation instructions and technical instructions only. All orders would be carried out if there were implementation instructions and technical instructions because they were afraid of being blamed (Darmaningtyas, 2004: 9).

2. Educational Development

If in the Old Order era, education was dominated by the politics of Manipol USDEK as well as laws and regulations that were based on political directions that smelled of Manipol and

USDEK. Thus, the New Order sought to realign national education in line with national ideals. The first *repelita* was announced to take effect on April 1, 1969, then on April 28-30, 1969, the government, being the Ministry of Education and Culture, gathered 100 educational thinkers in Cipayung to identify national education problems. In the meeting, the experts concluded that the development of education was determined by external factors such as political, economic, socio-cultural, and internal factors. These two factors must be carefully identified, and then a strategy and a program of prevention were developed. It was realised that, at that time, the government did not yet have a general strategy that was comprehensive and clear, which was caused by several things. First, the government agencies that administered education did not have clear authority. The responsibilities and functions of these bodies were confused and therefore the direction was less clear and efficient. Second, the education providers were not yet professional. This meant that ability of the education providers has not been able to carry out the education process professionally and not only the numbers were still lacking, but also many were interfered by political elements. Third, the implementation of education was too under political influence. Fourth, educational institutions that were less professional and were not strengthened by research teams. At that time, politics was commander, while professionalism was at number two. The number of education experts at that time was also still very limited. (Tilaar, 1995: 113).

The Cipayung Conference had three objectives. First, identifying all problems in the field of education. Second, arranging priorities for various problems to be solved in the direction of national development. Third, looking for alternative solutions. In the well-known conference, it has been stated that the basic strategy of national education development was not just formulating to achieve quantitative targets, but also formulating the contents of the education system, such as the structure, curriculum, and methodology of education. The problem of education was not only determined by internal problems, but it also depended on external problems, such as politics, economics, and social culture. Furthermore, two things that were highlighted at the conference were the importance of "relationships" and "innovation". Furthermore, Tilaar (1995: 114) explains that: The conference also paid attention to the five educational crises put forward by Philip Coombs, as follows: 1) There was an explosion in the number of children who wanted to get an education. 2) There was no harmony between the community needed and what was taught in schools. 3) The limited source of education funding. 4) The quality of education needed to be improved. 5) The absence of work efficiency.

The five factors of the education crisis, according to Philip Coombs' thought above, still needed to be supplemented again by the unclear factor in the direction of national education. Indeed, Law No. 4 of 1950 concerning Education was inadequate in the development of a society that began to change. Likewise, the Law governing tertiary education was still based on the ideology of the Old Order, as well as education for primary and secondary schools still

based on Pantja Wardhana, which was nothing but a reflection of the Manipol USDEK. In the Cipayang conference, the experts asked for attention regarding the formulation of the direction of national education. Although it was slow, the hope of these experts could only be fulfilled after twenty years with the issuance of Law No. 2 of 1989 concerning the National Education System (Tilaar, 1995: 115).

Politics of Education in the Reformation Era

In the Habibie era, the revocation of P-4 was carried out in an effort to avoid indoctrination of the practice of Pancasila. Revocation of P-4 as the substance of the Pancasila and Citizenship Education Study (PPKn) was a blessing because it freed the ideological-indoctrinated burden in the formation of good citizens. Thus, the PPKn study must be returned to the basic values of the Pancasila, which were originally contained in the Preamble to the 1945 Constitution. In other parts, P-4, as a political product to practice the values of Pancasila, should be understood as a mere instrument. When the P-4 instrument was deemed inadequate, then it was revoked, then the repeal of MPR Decree on P-4 should not be understood as revoking the Pancasila itself from the basis of the Indonesian state (Samsuri, 2010: 15).

The prominent political step in education reform played by the MPR, as the highest institution in 2002, was the amendment to Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution. In the fourth amendment process to the 1945 Constitution, the discussion began at the MPR Workers' Board meeting, Ad Hoc II Committee meeting (which was between others examining the amendments to Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution) to the plenary meeting of the 2002 MPR Annual Session, there were arguments and rationalisations of the need for amendments to Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution as the basis of political education in Indonesia. In discussions directly or indirectly with regard to the proposed amendment to Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution, the factions in the MPR would always associate with Article 32 of the 1945 Constitution on culture (Samsuri, 2010: 15).

According to Amien Rais, the fourth amendment to the 1945 Constitution, which established the national education system with the aim of enhancing faith and devotion as well as a noble character in order to educate the life of the nation, was very much in accordance with identity as a religious nation. It means that according to Amien Rais, the Indonesian people wanted education not only to have a material side but to also contain religious breath and spiritual values. However, the other important thing from the amendment to Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution was that the education budget must be at least 20 percent of the State and Regional Budget. According to Amien Rais, the provision was expected to be able to encourage improvement in the quality of Indonesian human resources (Minutes of the 7th Plenary Meeting of the 11th Annual MPR Session, August 2002). Some strategic steps related to education reform have also been carried out, including:

1. New Paradigm of Education

To seize opportunities while facing challenges in the global era, education in Indonesia in the Reformation era requires a new paradigm that is suitable and in accordance with the demands, changes, and developments of the times. According to Tilaar, the new paradigm of educational politics in the Reformation era must refer to the following: first, education is aimed at forming a new democratic Indonesian society. Second, to achieve a democratic society, it requires education that can foster democratic individuals and societies. Third, education is directed to develop behaviour that can respond to internal challenges as well as global challenges. Fourth, education must be able to direct the birth of a united and democratic Indonesian nation. Fifth, in the face of a competitive and innovative global life, education must be able to direct the ability to compete in the framework of cooperation. Sixth, education must be able to develop diversity towards the creation of an Indonesian society that is united above the rich diversity of society. Seventh, education must be focused on Indonesian society so that every Indonesian person feels proud to be an Indonesian person (Sam M. Chan, 2005: 114).

Past experience has taught us that the politics of education of the Old and New Order making education as a means of indoctrination to create benefits for the power of the ruling regime. Education was directed at creating citizens' obedience to the state. When critical and vocal figures emerged, they had to deal with an anti-criticism authority. It is not uncommon for some critical activists and politicians to be banned, imprisoned, and even killed for reasons of maintaining national security and stability. The ruling regime often equated the interests of the authorities with the interests of the state.

The fall of Soeharto from power in May 1998, together with the monetary, economic, and political crises, has led to reforms not only in the political and economic fields but also in education. Reform in the field of education was basically a repositioning and even reconstruction of education as a whole. Educational reform, repositioning, and reconstruction must clearly involve a critical reappraisal of the achievements and problems facing national education (Azyumardi Azra, 2006: xiii).

2. The Role of the State in Education

The reform era was marked by a change in the policy of centralistic to decentralised education, which was marked by a change in the role of the state in education. As described by Tilaar (2003: 268), an overview of the changing role of the state in education is as follows:

Table 1: Change in the Role of the State in Education

Role	Past	Present and Future
Equitable Education	Target-oriented	Quality-oriented
Quality	Achieved through pseudo-evaluation and standardization through a centralized examination and a standardized national curriculum	As a top priority according to regional needs
Process	Not important, what is important is the achievement of quantitative targets	Very important because what matters is the change in educational behaviour and "outcomes"
Method	Indoctrination	Dialogical
Management	The state and its bureaucracy play a central role	Management is centered on school institutions
Implementation of education	Government as the main actor	The government as a partner is enough to set direction
Social transformation	Focused and oppressive	Democratic and grass-root
The development of democracy	Determining the democratic life frame is limited to the procedure	Develop substantive changes in democratic behaviour
Socio-economic development of the local community	Not taken into consideration in the preparation of the curriculum	As one of the main components of curriculum development
Development of moral and religious values	Determined by the central government	Rooted in local culture and religion
Nationalism	Coercion from above and is formalistic. Ignoring regional identity	Multicultural approach
Funding	Funds are used as a tool for the preservation of government power	The central government bears part of the education fund in the framework of national equality, quality, and unity
Implementation of compulsory education 9-12 years old	Centrally determined by the central government	In accordance with the conditions and capabilities of the region. The implementation is in accordance with the socio-economic conditions of the region

Source: Tilaar (2003: 268).

In the Reformation era, the model for improving the quality of education also experienced a shift. In the previous era, they tended to obey the policies and recipes given by the World Bank and Unesco. In the current era of Reformasi, it has begun to apply the principle of democratization, which returns the rights, authority, and responsibility to the hands of teachers as the main manager of the education process.

Table 2: Educational Quality Improvement Model

Model	Description
Unesco	Encouraging improvements in the quality of schools in many countries, especially in developing countries. Every year, the Unesco Asia and Pacific Office alternately organises an innovation seminar focused on improving the quality of schools. The recipes offered include: (1) Schools are ready and open by developing a reactive mindset, leaving behind problem solving that emphasises the past, changing towards anticipating change that is oriented to how can we do things differently; (2) School quality pillars: learning how to learn, learning to do, learning to be, learning to live together; (3) Setting standards with clear indicators; (4) Improve the curriculum that is relevant to the needs of the community; (5) Improving ICT in the learning and management process. (6) Emphasising the development of teacher professional improvement systems; (7) Development of a school culture which is conducive to quality improvement; (8) Increasing parental participation; (9) Implementing Quality Assurance.
The World Bank	Focusing on the production function approach, which emphasises the function of inputs, both raw inputs and instrumental inputs (improving teacher quality). The recipe prepared: (1) Quality improvement must be made by increasing the quality of inputs; (2) Improving the quality of learning is determined by the quality of teachers and the presence of modern information and communication technology in learning; (3) The curriculum is prepared and standardised; (4) Management reform and improvement of school quality.
The Soeharto era	Tends to comply with World Bank policies. The recipes are (1) Reforming the IKIP curriculum that emphasises learning material and reduces subject matter; (2) Improving teacher quality through highly planned quality improvement projects and teacher training models ranging from theory, practice, to on the job training in schools for professionals; (3) Emphasising the availability of facilities: buildings, laboratories, and textbooks.
Reformation Era	The principle of democratisation that returns rights, authority, and responsibility to the teacher as the main manager of the education process. Recipe: (1) Establishing the MPMBS method, which then becomes MBS; (2) Developing the Competency-Based Curriculum (CBC), which subsequently

	developed into the Education Unit Level Curriculum (KTSP); (3) Declaration of the Minister of National Education that there is no longer a difference between public schools and private schools, except regarding the basic salary; (4) Developing school management and school culture; (5) Creating learning that is fun and enlightening; (6) Management and procurement of books that are cheap and equitable.
--	---

Source: Extracted from Zamroni (2009).

The results showed that the political dynamics of education in Indonesia could be outlined in the following table:

Table 3: The Dynamics of Education Politics from the Soekarno to the Reformation Era

Sukarno era	The Soeharto era	Reformation Era
The period 1945-1950 was coloured by the spirit of revolution. The purpose of national education was to instil the spirit and spirit of patriotism.	The dissolution of the PKI led to the closure of schools under its auspices and the organisations under it.	The politics of education in the Reformation era was based on the National Education System Law No. 20 of 2003.
The 1950-1959 period was coloured by liberal democracy. The aim of national education was to form capable human beings and democratic citizens who were responsible for the welfare of society and the motherland.	The goal of national education has changed to become a true Pancasila human.	The purpose of national education is to develop capabilities and shape the nation's character and civilization with dignity in the context of educating the life of the nation, aiming at developing the potential of learners to become human beings who believe in and fear God Almighty, have noble, healthy, creative, independent, and become democratic and responsible citizens.
The period 1959-1966 was colored by the USDEK Manipol. The aim of national education was to give birth to deceptive Indonesian socialist citizens.	P-4 upgrading must be given to every student who was accepted into school, in addition to the still existing Pancasila subjects. PMP and PPKn subjects were highly dominated by P-4 material.	

Processed from various sources

Conclusion

This study concludes that:

1. The Politics of Education in the Sukarno Era

The politics of education in the Sukarno era, the initial period of independence from 1945-1950, was coloured by the spirit of revolution, and education aimed at instilling the soul and spirit of patriotism. The politics of education in the 1950-1959 period was coloured by liberal democracy, and education aimed to shape capable human beings and democratic citizens who were responsible for the welfare of the people and the motherland. The politics of education in the 1959-1966 period was coloured by Guided Democracy and the Manipol USDEK, and education aimed at giving birth to deceptive Indonesian socialist citizens.

2. The Politics of Education in the Soeharto era

The politics of the New Order education was marked by a passion for implementing Pancasila purely and consistently, as well as a spirit to carry out economic development. Education aimed to shape human development with the spirit of Pancasila, which could support the success of economic development.

3. The Politics of Education in the Reformation era

The politics of education in the Reformation era was marked by a passion for creating a democratic society that obeys the law. The educational objectives listed in the National Education System Law No. 20 of 2003 aims to form people who have faith and piety, noble, healthy, creative, independent, and become citizens of a democratic and responsible, which can support the formation of civil society.

Suggestion

The politics of education must not serve the interests of the ruling regime, but must be based on the politics of the state that is in the constitution.

REFERENCES

- Abdul, R. A. (2005). *Politik pendidikan nasional (pergeseran kebijakan pendidikan agama islam dari praproklamasi ke reformasi)*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kurnia Kalam.
- Ahmadi, A. (1987). *Pendidikan dari masa ke masa*. Bandung: Penerbit CV Armico.
- Azyumardi, A. (2006). *Paradigma pendidikan nasional: Rekonstruksi dan demokratisasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Darmaningtyas. (1999). *Pendidikan pada dan Setelah Krisis : Evaluasi Pendidikan di Masa Krisis*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Darmaningtyas. (2004). *Pendidikan yang memiskinkan*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Galang Press.
- Dirman, L. O., Syamsumarlin, S., Raemon, R., Arifuddin, A., L. Aso, L., Samiruddin, T., & Udin, U. (2019). Political identity, conflict, and power practices in Indonesia. *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(7), 251-255.
- Djumhur, I. dan Danasuparta. (1976). *Sejarah pendidikan*. Bandung: CV Ilmu.
- Farida, H. (2004). *Hegemoni pendidikan*. Jurnal Fondasia. Fakultas Ilmu Pendidikan. UNY. Yogyakarta.
- George, F. K. (1977). *Foundation of education*. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Good, C. V. (1985). *Dictionary of education*. New York: Mc Graw Hill Book Company Inc.
- Gunawan, H. (1986). *Kebijakan-kebijakan pendidikan di Indonesia*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- Kartini, K. (1977). *Tinjauan politik mengenai sistem pendidikan nasional*. Jakarta: PT Pradnya Paramita.
- Kuntoro, S. A. (1997). *Menelusuri perkembangan pendidikan nasional di Indonesia: Peran pendidikan bagi integritas bangsa*. pidato pengukuhan Guru Besar. IKIP Yogyakarta.
- Kuntoro, S. A. (2007). *Menapak Jejak Pendidikan Nasional Indonesia dalam kearifan sang profesor*. Yogyakarta: UNY Press.
- Mahmudi A. (2007). *Konfigurasi politik pendidikan nasional*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Fahima.
- Moleong, L. J. (1989). *Metodologi penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: PT. Remaja Rosda Karya.



- Sirozi, M. (2005). *Politik pendidikan (dinamika hubungan antara kepentingan kekuasaan dan praktik penyelenggaraan pendidikan)*. Jakarta: PT Rajagrafindo Persada.
- Nezar, P. dan Andi, A. (1999). *Antonio gramsci: Negara dan hegemoni..* Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sam M C. (2005). *Analisis swot kebijakan pendidikan era otonomi daerah*. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (1996). *Limapuluh tahun pembangunan pendidikan nasional 1945-1995: Suatu analisis kebijakan*. Jakarta: PT Gramedia Widiasarana Indonesia.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (1999). *Pendidikan, kebudayaan, dan masyarakat madani Indonesia: Strategi reformasi pendidikan*. Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (2002). *Perubahan sosial dan pendidikan: Pengantar pedagogik transformatif untuk Indonesia*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (2003). *Kekuasaan dan pendidikan*. Magelang: Penerbit Indonesia Tera.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (2004). *Multikulturalisme tantangan-tantangan global masa depan dalam transformasi pendidikan nasional*. Jakarta: Grasindo.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (2005). *Manifesto pendidikan nasional: Tinjauan dari perspektif postmodernisme dan studi kultural*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- Tilaar, H.A.R. (2006). *Standardisasi pendidikan nasional: Suatu Tinjauan Kritis*. Jakarta: PT Rineka Cipta.