Muharrik
Jurnal Dakwah dan Sosial

Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika: A New Reading of Sukarno's Politics from Philosophical Perspectives

Norbertus Antoin Binsasi[1], Ahmad Zubaidi[2,] Heri Santoso[3]

[1]Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia; email: norbertbinsasi@mail.ugm.ac.id
[2]Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia; email: ahmad.zubaidi@ugm.ac.id
[3]Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia, Indonesia; email: herisantoso@ugm.ac.id

Abstract	Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika are Indonesian political terms that are not only known by Indonesians but also by foreign researchers and observers, but they still contain much unclear understanding. This study wants to answer this ambiguity by exploring the existence and essence of Nasakom and linking it to Bhinneka Tunggal Ika using philosophical methods. The aim is to find a "new reading" about Nasakom, which ordinary people and politicians have seen as unfavorable. This research found that Nasakom can only be understood if we carry out a complete reading, namely a reading that involves three perspectives at once: from the perspective of Javanese cosmology, because Sukarno was Javanese; from the standpoint of Islamic cosmology, because Sukarno was a Muslim; and from a Western cosmological perspective, because Sukarno was also a modernist who adhered to rationalism. These three new readings found that the essence of Nasakom embodies the spirit of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. Nasakom embodies the principle of unity in diversity. Nasakom became politically destructive because one of its elements, the PKI, used the Nasakom stage to prepare the September 30, 1965 Movement. Still, Nasakom, from the purpose of its formation, was an ethical politics that embraced opposing parties.
Keywords	**Communism, Cosmology, Nationalism, Religion, Unity.**

Corresponding Author
Norbertus Antoin Binsasi
Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia; email: norbertbinsasi@mail.ugm.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Nasakom (Nationalism, Religion, and Communism) and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika are Indonesian political terms. Both Indonesian and foreign readers know Nasakom as one of Sukarno's controversial political policies in the Guided Democracy era (1960-1965), and today, it is not only contentious but also paradoxical because it unites what cannot be combined; Communism and religion, into one political force (Muskens, 1973, p. 147). Meanwhile, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is also known by the Indonesian people and foreign observers as the motto of the Republic of Indonesia, which describes prescriptively that the Indonesian nation is a nation that is diverse in ethnicity and religion but must remain one nation and one state, the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The official motto of the Indonesian Republic, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, i.e., 'Divided, yet one' or, in the standard translation, 'Unity in diversity,' reflects its complex reality. At the same time, it expresses an aspiration and a social and political principle. The phrase is not new. It was used in a Javanese poem by Mpu Tantular, who lived during the fourteenth

Century of the Christian era in the kingdom of Majapahit (Meuleman, 2006, p. 48). Both political terms are related to Sukarno. Nasakom was Sukarno's political policy to unite two opposing political forces, religion and Communism, into one political force. Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is also related to Sukarno because he was the first to recommend Empu Tantular's Sanskrit sayings to be made the motto of the Republic of Indonesia.

In the political debate and academic discourse, the most heated in the Sukarno era until now was not Bhinneka Tunggal Ika's idea but Nasakom's. Nasakom, as an abbreviation for "Nationalism, Religion and Communism" (Muskens, 1973, pp. 147–148), was Sukarno's most controversial political policy. With the Nasakom ideology, Sukarno wanted to unite two opposing political forces, Islam and the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI). The glue that holds these two opposing forces together is Nationalism, the ideology of Sukarno's party, the Indonesian National Party (PNI) (Dahm, 1987, pp. 122–154). In Sukarno's eyes, Islamic parties and the Indonesian Communist Party were two great national forces to realize the mission of independence by building a just and prosperous society. Therefore, the two must not be allowed to remain in their natural state of potential conflict but rather be regulated to become only one force.

Our question is: How far has research been carried out on Nasakom politics and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika? From literature studies, researchers found an unfortunate fact, namely that there is very little specific research on Nasakom. Is it because Indonesian researchers have condemned Nasakom as an evil ideology because it mixes religion and Communism? Or, because Nasakom was a political idea from the past that brought bitterness to national politics with the birth of the G30S in 1965? Foreign researchers also do the same; no special studies on Nasakom exist. However, we are still grateful to foreign researchers because they still mentioned Nasakom, such as Bishku, Kroef, Anderson, and Bunnel, for their research on Sukarno. First, Bihsku, who analyzed Sukarno as a charismatic leader, argued that Nasakom was accepted because Sukarno himself linked Nasakom with Pancasila, so rejecting Nasakom meant rejecting Pancasila (1992, p. 110). Second, Kroef, an Indonesian researcher, especially Sukarno, said that Nasakom was Sukarno's political maneuver to balance the PKI with the Armed Forces because Sukarno was always worried about military power to overthrow his power (1966, p. 258). Third, in line with Kroef, Bunnell considered that Nasakom was Sukarno's policy of accommodation towards two opposing forces (1966, p. 5). Fourth, Anderson said that Nasakom is a traditional Javanese syncretism used in politics (1966).

We also found some Indonesian researchers who studied Nasakom, such as Wiratama, Winata, and Besman. First, Wiratama et al. (2022, p. 66) analyzed Pancasila as the ideology of Indonesia and Nasakom, a concept that President Sukarno inflamed to unite the three largest groups at the beginning of Indonesian independence. This research concludes that these two ideologies seek to unite all elements in Indonesia. Second, Winata (2017, p. 728) researched and found that Nasakom is an ideology with three functions. The first function is that Nasakom is used as an ideology that offsets the political power and keeps Sukarno's position to avoid a coup d'etat. Another function is as an ideology of the nation's integrity guard. Some objectives are not aligned between these two functions, so to harmonize the need for a function of legitimacy. Third, Besman et al. (2021, p. 48) researched the handling of the problem of Communism in the Nasakom ideology through the policies and patterns of political communication of President Soekarno's government. He found that the approach adopted by President Soekarno failed. Soekarno tried to unite all the ideologies that developed then but did not consider the political competition between factions. This conflict even culminated on September 30 and the emergence of a new order.

Meanwhile, studies on Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, especially in the Reformation Era, can be mentioned below. First, Pursika (2009, p. 17) conducted an analytical study. He found that if we look at the social structure, the "diversity" of Indonesian society has two dimensions: horizontal and vertical pluralism. According to him, "single" reflects rationality, emphasizing similarities rather than differences. Second, Slamet Riyanto et al. (2023, p. 11) researched and found that the values of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika must be the substantial content of every law. This means that the central message of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika must be included in statutory regulations. Third, a study from a social anthropology perspective was carried out by Rahman et al. According to researchers, the diversity of the Indonesian nation is a wealth but also a disaster because it can cause division problems. Therefore, as a multicultural nation, Indonesia must develop multiculturalism in all constellations of life that breathe the values of diversity (Rahman et al., 2020, p. 15). Fourth, Mustansyir (1995, p. 93) conducted a study from the perspective of language philosophy regarding the ideas of uniformity and uniformity in language. He found that Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, as a reflection of the cultural diversity of the Indonesian nation, can also be analyzed using the concept of pluriformity from Wittgenstein's philosophy of language.

Fifth, Candria, et al. (2023, p. 366) conducted a study that concerned the policy of the Indonesian government that favored unity over diversity, which impacted, among others, the number of local languages in Indonesia. They found that because of the previous government policies, Indonesia is currently facing a challenging situation in which more than 400 regional languages are endangered and extinct. The policies were against the spirit of the Indonesian official motto, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, which values both unity and diversity. Sixth, Baihaki (2017, p. 55) researched that understanding "Bhinneka Tunggal Ika" must be concerned about and maintained by all elements of the nation because the diversity that has existed in Indonesia is a noble heritage deposited by the predecessors to be continued and maintained. Strengthening Bhinneka Tunggal Ika will be needed to reinforce the identity of Indonesia and become a unifying media for any different factions to unite and create a peaceful, secure, and prosperous life. Seventh, Butler conducted a study that seeks to show that the ideology of Pancasila (Five Principles) and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (Unity in Diversity) is a valuable basis for intercultural environments, peace, and harmony not only for Indonesia but for the whole of humanity in the world.

Based on the brief review above, it is found that not all researchers have entered into the issue of the existence and essence of Nasakom, nor have they connected Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. This study aims to explore Nasakom politics from a philosophical perspective (political philosophy) to find "a new reading" so that, ultimately, it arrives at "a new meaning." In the past and to this day, Nasakom is a political ideology that, although accepted, is criticized and ridiculed as very controversial. This political ideology mixes water and oil. This assessment is not wrong, but is that assessment the only reading of Nasakom's ideology? The answer is no. This study wants to show a new reading. Suppose so, far researchers have examined Nasakom from the perspective of social sciences, such as history, culture, politics, and law. In that case, this study, from a philosophical standpoint, will attempt to show the existence and essence of Nasakom in the eyes of Sukarno as a Nationalist, Islamist, and Marxist politician. After understanding the existence and essence of Nasakom, researchers will connect the unity ideology of Nasakom with the unity ideology of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika.

The novelty of this study lies in the fact that Nasakom is not only connected with Pancasila as is the study of social sciences (history, culture, sociology, politics, and law), where they all found that Nasakom's ideology is contrary to Pancasila. This study opens a new way of reading: it is no longer associated with Pancasila but with Bhinneka Tunggal Ika as one of the four pillars of the Indonesian

nation today. Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika are connected in this study not only because the genealogy of the two ideologies originates from Sukarno but mainly because of the relationship between the substantial content contained in Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. Nasakom contains "unity in diversity," and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika teaches "unity in diversity." From a philosophical perspective, in fact, the saying Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is not just a motto for the political ethics of the Indonesian people but rather a Metaphysical Principle (primum philosophicum) which, in its universal formulation, in Latin: "Ex Pluribus Unum" (Unity comes from the majority).

However, this newness does not erase the results of scientific studies so far or the understanding of the Indonesian people in general that Nasakom is a political ideology that is controversial and contradictory to Pancasila. That Nasakom conflicts with Pancasila and that Nasakom is very clearly in conflict with the religion guaranteed by Pancasila, we do not deny it. By accepting that understanding, we try to show a new way of reading (new meaning) the Nasakom reality from the perspective of the Bhinneka Tunggal Ika philosophy. So, this study is significant for Indonesian politics' history (past) and future. Moreover, because this study is a new perspective, the literature review regarding this study is minimal, if not nonexistent. Therefore, for us, the scarcity of scientific references does not indicate that the scientific level of this study is low but instead proves that the scientific level is high because researchers are encouraged to have scientific courage, to submit academic-philosophical arguments and proof about the relationship between Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, even though There has not been any study on that either.

Based on the problem map described above, this research question concerns the following three things: First, what was the existence and essence of Nasakom in Sukarno's political arena in the era of guided democracy? The existence of Nasakom has been discussed a lot in historical and political studies, while not much has been done about its essence. Second, what is the existence and nature of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika in the Indonesian nation-state, which is diverse in religion, ethnicity, and ideology? Third, how is the philosophical substance related between Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal? This question opens new insights into understanding Nasakom politics.

2. METHOD

As a philosophical study, researchers use the Philosophical Method (Baker & Zubbair, 1990, pp. 61–66). Philosophy recognizes that studies from political science, sociology, anthropology, and history regarding Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika are "the first-level sciences." In contrast, philosophy itself is only "the second level science." Therefore, this article has no tables, diagrams, matrices, or statistics. Thus, philosophy obtains data in two ways: first, directly encountering facts in the field and then analyzing them philosophically; secondly, indirectly, namely taking data from the results of studies in Political Science, Sociology, Anthropology, and History. This study is more concerned with the final method, namely by accepting the results of the latest studies from all scientific disciplines regarding Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika.

Thus, this study is library research, using several basic methodical steps in a philosophical study, such as interpretation, internal coherence, holistic, historical continuity, and heuristics. Before we explain how the five methodical steps answer the three questions above, we first affirm or clarify the terminology commonly used in philosophical studies, especially Western philosophy, namely the terms "philosophical method" and "philosophical research methodology ."The philosophical method is a way of philosophizing used by philosophers to discover the nature of reality or to discover the most profound causes of reality (ultima causa), such as E. Husserl's Phenomenology, Socrates' Maeutik

(Midwifery Method), Thomas Aquinas' Reduction Method and Descartes' Dubium Methodecum. Meanwhile, Philosophical Research Methodology is a way for a philosophical researcher to be a philosopher but can also be a philosopher or a person studying philosophy) to find answers to research questions. What is meant here is Philosophical Research Methodology, not Philosophical Method.

Therefore, this research does not mention or use one or several philosophical methods but uses the Philosophical Research Methodology, which is commonly used in Indonesia as stated by Bakker and Zubair, with methodical steps, or perhaps it is more appropriate to use the term "methodical elements" as following: (1) Interpretation: The data reported by empirical science studies regarding Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika are read for philosophical conceptions, namely the most fundamental conceptions regarding the existence and essence of Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika and what is the relationship between the two. (2) Internal coherence: All basic views regarding Nationalism, Religion, and Communism are investigated again according to their relationship. Researchers will look for authentic and logical dependence relationships on each other, in total or only in part. Then, the researcher will try to determine which element is the most central or dominant element of the idea and how it relates to Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. (3) Holistics: All elements of the philosophical conception of "Nationalism, Religion, and Communism" are used to assess the overall vision and appreciation of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. (4) Historical continuity: Researchers will pay attention to the line of historical development from thoughts about "Nationalism, Marxism, Islamism" to the political policy of "Nasakom" and its connection with the motto Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. (5) Heuristics: Finally, based on the methodical reflection above, the researcher will show a "new light" to form a new reading or meaning about Nasakom and its relationship with Bhinneka Tunggal Ika.

3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

3.1. Sukarno as a political thinker

Although in the study of history, political science, and anthropology, a distinction is rarely made regarding Sukarno as a "political thinker" and a "political actor" from a philosophical perspective, this distinction is needed so that we can "read" Sukarno correctly. Historical studies do not make this distinction because the focus of that science is only to display Sukarno's political events according to time sequence (Dahm, 1987, pp. 71–239), such as the period of struggle before independence (1926-1945), the period of the struggle for independence (1945-1949), a period of political upheaval in parliamentary democracy (1945-1957), a period of political unrest in Guided Democracy, and a period of political upheaval in Nasakom until Sukarno fell because of the G30S incident (1965).

However, for philosophy, Nasakom (1960) should not be read simply as a continuation of thoughts in writing in 1926, entitled "Nationalism Marxism Islamism" (Sukarno, 1959, pp. 1–19) but as the embodiment of ideas that had been expressed during the struggle for real politics, and that was possible for Sukarno to do because at that time he had mastered national politics with "Guided Democracy ."Therefore, within a philosophical framework, "Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism" are Sukarno's politics in abstracto (at the level of thought). At the same time, Nasakom is Sukarno's politics in concreto (at the level of embodiment). Therefore, in this analysis, the researcher divides Sukarno's political events not according to a time frame (periodization) but in terms of the relationship between the thought stage (in abstracto) and the implementation stage (in concreto). That is why the researcher divided this analysis (Onghokham, 1987), the first part about Sukarno as a political thinker (1926-1941) and the second part about Sukarno as a political actor (1945-1965).

In this case, of course, we admit that there are many criticisms from contemporary studies of periodization carried out by Bernard Dahm. This means they did not accept Sukarno's periodization of political thought as Dahm did. However, researchers in this case still use Dahm's periodization for two reasons: First, from a scientific point of view, criticism is the essence of science, let alone philosophy. Philosophy could only develop from Greek times to contemporary philosophy because of criticism and, according to Franz Magnis-Suseno, "Philosophy as a Critical Science" (1982). However, this criticism, epistemologically, does not prove the error of a thought or research but only confirms the existence of another perspective in looking at another reality. So, Dahm's views being criticized by contemporary studies does not mean that Dahm's periodization is wrong; it only indicates the existence of another perspective. Second, two experts critically introduced Dahm's work: Prof. Onghokam, an Indonesian historian who teaches at the University of Indonesia, and Prof. Harry. Benda, an expert on Indonesia from Yale University, United States, admits that this is the only study about Sukarno that is the most critical. For these two reasons, we use Dahm's periodization in this study.

At the stage as a political thinker, he synthesized the three ideologies into a harmonious relationship: "Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism ."The question is, why does the composition not start with Islamism but must start with Nationalism? The answer is that Sukarno placed Nationalism first not because his party had a nationalist ideology but because Nationalism in this order had the status of unifying two opposing ideologies, Marxism and Islamism (Sukarno, 1959, p. 22). In Sukarno's reading of Sukarno's thinking, Marxism and Islamism are two major opposing world ideologies that could give rise to conflict during Indonesia's struggle against colonialism. Therefore, he tried to find a "way" for these two great ideologies to become influential political forces to fight Dutch colonialism.

In Sukarno's reading, the opposing ideologies in this case were only between Marxism and Islamism, not Nationalism. He would later use this framework of thought to unite or balance two conflictual political forces, namely between religious parties, especially Islam, in the form of Masjumi and NU, and the communist party, in the form of the PKI. If we read Sukarno carefully, we can find differences between his thoughts on unifying or balancing the ideologies of "Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism" and the embodiment of these thoughts themselves into Nasakom politics. The era of 1926-1941 was the era in which he put forward the three great ideologies as an era of struggle, so Sukarno did not yet have the power to truly "unify" the three ideologies, and therefore, he only used abstract ideas: "Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism." Meanwhile, from 1945 to 1965, he held power, especially since 1959, when democracy changed from Parliamentary Democracy to Guided Democracy. Because of this, he realized the unification of the three ideologies into a national power line called Nasakom. However, why didn't he use the term Nasakom from the time of the struggle, but only in the Guided Democracy era? As explained above, the answer is that Sukarno appeared on the Indonesian political stage in two ways: during the struggle, he appeared as a "political thinker," and during the independence period with his government, he seemed indeed a "political actor."

In this case, we can assess Sukarno as a systematic political thinker. Why? Because if we read the political thoughts in "Under the Flag of Revolution carefully," we can find a discussion of each of the three ideologies in order of time. "Nationalism" was discussed by Sukarno in the period 1926-1931, then "Marxism" in a very short period, only two years, namely 1932-1933, and "Islamism" was discussed by Sukarno in a relatively long period, namely 1934-1941. It is called systematic here because thoughts about the three ideologies are addressed at a particular time. He only focused on one ideological theme during that time without mixing it with others. On this basis, researchers divide three stages of

Sukarno's political thought into three phases: the nationalist stage (1926-1931), the marhaenis (Marxist) stage (1932-1933), and the Islamist stage (1934-1941).

In the "nationalist stage," Sukarno tried to eliminate the conflict between various political alliances (Jong Java, United Minahasa, Sulawesi Raya, Jong Islamiten Bond, Jong Bataks Bond, and Jong Ambon), which reached its peak in the Youth Sumpa on October 28, 1928, where Sukarno himself was present. There were conflicts between various local struggle organizations, especially between the Islamic Union and the Communist Party. Even though Sukarno had succeeded in founding his party, the Indonesian National Party, he remained a member of the Islamic Union. He witnessed the open conflict between these two parties, while in Sukarno's eyes, the Islamic Union and the Communist Party were Indonesia's two great powers to face Dutch colonialism. For this reason, he thought about "common goals," and based on shared goals, a "common framework" was built, and ultimately, a "common basis" was created in the struggle (Dahm, 1987, pp. 78–80).

Sukarno's main effort was to find a way out of the conflict between Sarekat Islam and the Communist Party. Therefore, he spoke of a "single goal," namely "to achieve the welfare of the people of the Dutch East Indies." In Sukarno's eyes, the dispute was unnecessary and inappropriate because all movement members had one "single goal," which could only be achieved when they united in one united front. He made Sarekat Islam and the Communist Party aware that there was only one common enemy: colonialism. It is, therefore, time to find a common foundation on which a united front can be built. That foundation is Nationalism. Marxism is also a foundation, but it is a foundation for Marxists themselves; likewise, Islamism is also a foundation, but a foundation only for Muslims themselves, while the common foundation for Marxism and Islamism is Nationalism.

After that, he moved on to the "Marhaenis/Marxist stage ."Firstly, Sukarno introduced a new terminology into Indonesian Marxism, "marhaen". Marhaen is Sukarno's translation of the word proletariat from Western Marxism because there is no industry and no workers in Indonesia, but there is suffering. Marhaen is a small farmer with equipment who works in his fields and has a very low income, so he suffers. Therefore, the national struggle aims to free the tiny people from suffering and oppression by colonialism. To strengthen this view, Sukarno published an article entitled "Political Democracy and Economic Democracy," in which he warned the marhaen not to imitate democracy abroad because foreign democracy did not create prosperity for the marhaen. Sukarno wrote: "... this is not a democracy that we must emulate, not a democracy for us Indonesian Marhaen. Because such democracy is only parliamentary democracy, that is, only political democracy. Economic democracy does not exist." (Sukarno, 1959, p. 619).

For Sukarno, Marhaenism was only one element because apart from that, other things were important in people's lives, especially in societies that were being colonized, namely Nationalism and belief in God. Here, he remains at the nationalist stage, wanting to create a total unity of the ideology of "Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism ."In commemoration of the 50th anniversary of Karl Marx's death, Sukarno wrote: "Nationalism in the Eastern world then married with Marxism, becoming a new nationalism... This new nationalism is now living among the Marhaen Indonesian people" (Sukarno, 1959, p. 229).

After Sukarno saw that there was beginning to be acceptance and mutual understanding between the Marxists (marhaen) and the Muslims, he advanced to the "Islamist stage." As a Muslim, Sukarno knew Islamic doctrines about God and believed in Islam as the religion of Allah. However, he remained aware that he was a nationalist fighting for independence. Because of this, he described the Indonesian National Party, the party he founded, as one that "is neutral in matters of religion" (Dahm,

1987, p. 216) but not in the communist sense, which does not recognize the existence of God at all. Sukarno intended "being neutral in matters of religion" so that all religious beliefs could become members of the PNI.

3.2. Sukarno as a political actor

Sukarno has been President of the Republic of Indonesia since August 18, 1945, and exercises his powers based on the 1945 Constitution, which adheres to a presidential system. However, this system was changed to a parliamentary system, so Sukarno was only a symbol because real power was in the hands of the prime minister and parliament. Sukarno rejected the system because it smacked of Western democracy. This system of parliamentary democracy was what he rejected since the independence movement (1926-1945) because, according to him, the system was not by the essential spirit of the Indonesian nation, which relied on the power of a leader.

Then, he received support from the PKI (Anderson, 1966, pp. 141–143) as one of the winning parties in the 1955 election alongside Masyumi, PNI, and NU. He fought with the PKI to dissolve the parliamentary system because this system only created major conflicts between parties and gave rise to rebellions in the regions. Rebellions in the regions spread to islands outside Java. Facing this critical situation, Sukarno issued a state of war emergency (SOB). The uprising in the areas dealt a heavy blow to parliamentary democracy. It opened opportunities for Sukarno to realize his idea of a National Council even though his Mutual Cooperation Cabinet idea had not yet been implemented. In his PNI 30th anniversary speech, he firmly stated his desire to return to Marxism and socio-democracy, which emphasizes collectivism and rejects liberalism. For Sukarno, liberal politics would not bring Indonesia prosperity and social justice as stated in the Constitution.

Sukarno's dream of returning to power with a presidential system became increasingly open. The constituent council, which resulted from the 1955 election, experienced a tripolar ideology conflict in the constituent session in Bandung. In the constituent assembly, there was a tripolar conflict between three main sects: First, the PKI (the ideology of Communism) wanted socialism-economics as the basis of the state and rejected Pancasila and Islam; second, Masyumi and NU (religious ideology) wanted Islam as the basis of the state and reject Pancasila and communist Socialism; third, PNI (nationalist ideology) wants Pancasila as the basis of the state and rejects communist Socialism and Islam as the basis of the state. Political escalation in the constituent assembly continued and finally changed to a bipolar dichotomy between people who wanted Islam as the basis of the state and people who wished Pancasila as the basis of the State (Pranarka, 1985, p. 134).

Facing such political conflict, Sukarno, on February 21, 1957, put forward what was called the Presidential Concept. This conception contained Sukarno's criticism of the liberal democratic system, which was not based on the culture of the Indonesian nation and the spirit of the 1945 proclamation of independence. To realize this conception, on April 9, 1957, the President formed the Djuanda Cabinet, which, among other things, was tasked with creating a National Council and was successfully formed. July 12, 1957. Against the background of this political policy, on August 17, 1957, Sukarno made a speech (Pranarka, 1985, pp. 158–159).

"It turns out that the democracy we have been practicing so far has become a wild democracy. It turns out that disciplined zonder democracy, zonder democracy of leadership, is no longer compatible with the personality of the Indonesian people and the basics of life in the Indonesian nation. It turns out that democracy is in the zonder of discipline and the zonder of leadership has exploded into anarchy; has exploded into exploitation by small groups against the interests of the people at large. It turns out

that democracy in the zonder of discipline and the zonder of leadership has become a mere democracy, a democracy which is unable to give birth to new and constructive thoughts."

To end this debate, with the support and approval of the Armed Forces, especially Nasution, Sukarno issued a Presidential Decree of July 5, 1959, dissolving the constituent assembly and re-enacting the 1945 Constitution. With the strength of this decree, President Sukarno made a speech on August 17, 1959, explaining officially the July 5 Decree. 1959, and the speech was later declared the Political Manifesto of the Republic of Indonesia, which contained: (1) Return to the 1945 Constitution; (2) Indonesian Socialism; (3) Guided Democracy; (4) Guided economy; (5) Indonesian personality. The political manifesto and five policies became known as Manipol-USDEK.

The President then formed the National Front as a unified forum for all national forces. It was within the framework of the National Front that Sukarno issued the Nasakom policy, namely the bringing together of Nationalism, Religion, and Communism. Thus, Sukarno, as President, was equipped with two ideological tools, namely Manipol-USDEK and Nasakom. Manipol-USDEK, as mentioned above, is an acronym for the Political Manifesto, namely Sukarno's speech entitled Rediscovering our Revolution on the 14th Independence Day of the Republic of Indonesia, August 17, 1959, and USDEK is an acronym for the 1945 Constitution, Indonesian Socialism, Guided Democracy, and Indonesian Personalities. Even though Nasakom's thinking was born in 1926, it was only in 1961 that it could become a practical political policy. Why was Nasakom only formed in 1961? Because in that year, it already held full state power under the Guided Democracy system. Now, the concepts of Nationalism, Marxism, and Islamism are squeezed into one term, Nasakom. The question is, why not Nasamar (Nationalism, Religion and Marxism)? In 1926, he called Marxism, not Communism. As explained above, the answer is that in 1961, Sukarno was no longer a "political thinker" but rather a "political actor." Therefore, he did not use Marxism but Communism because Communism is a concrete embodiment of Marxist political ideology.

3.3 A New Reading of Nasakom

Based on the data above, researchers now carry out reading or meaning. However, because Sukarno was a figure from a traditional Javanese background, a Muslim, and a modernist, these three categories will be considered when reading or giving meaning to the Nasakom ideology. Let us read Sukarno only from the perspective of Javanese cosmology. We reduce Sukarno only within the limits of traditional Javanese values, as read by several foreign researchers, such as Anderson, Legge, Dahm, and Kroef. In the following, the researcher tries to broaden the perspective of reading Nasakom in three perspectives: Javanese, Islamic, and Western cosmology.

3.3.1 Nasakom and Javanese Cosmology

With the Nasakom ideology, Sukarno showed himself as a uniter of diversity, a uniter of various ideologies that were not only different but opposite. He claims to be a follower of Nationalism, Marxism and Islamism. "Sukarno was a mixture of all these isms." Foreign researchers, such as Anderson, Legge, Dahm, and Kroef, confirmed Sukarno's statement. All these researchers assess Sukarno as more of a Javanese who adheres to traditional Javanese cosmology, which views human existence in terms of relationships with others, nature, and the Divine. Traditional Javanese cosmology views reality as not being divided into various separate areas without any relationship to each other but as a comprehensive unity (Benda, 1987: xxxix). Human existence and essence cannot be understood, but they are in the totality of their relationship with nature and the divine. This differs from the Western view of humans,

nature, and the sacred as each separate reality. Therefore, it is understandable that Sukarno had a strong tendency to make efforts to unify, in standard terms in the field of cultural anthropology, syncretism, namely the combination of various elements that are not only different but opposite (Anderson, 1966, p. 59). So, Nasakom combines two opposing aspects, Religion and Communism, which are bound by the element of Nationalism inherent in each.

According to Soedjatmoko Anderson (Anderson, 1966, p. 58), "the main concept in the traditional Javanese view of life is that there is a direct relationship between a person's inner state and his ability to control his environment." If, in that environment, there are opposing forces, then that is where a person's leadership character can be proven, namely if he succeeds in controlling these opposing forces. The way to prevent it is by concentrating the two opposing forces. The ability to focus on opposites is a sign of power in that person or proof that that person is a ruler. However, according to Anderson, we need to properly understand the union of these two opposites, namely that "the essential characteristic of the union of opposites is not their combination but their simultaneous and dynamic combination in a compound." It shows the vitality of the ruler and, at the same time, the embodiment of his unity with the opposing parties, and he, as the ruler, is at the center of that unity. In his analysis, Anderson admits that this view lives in the palace environment. However, because the palace is the center of power, it still impacts wider society, and therefore, he still calls this phenomenon Javanese cosmology.

Anderson (Anderson, 1966, p. 69) calls this combination of opposites dynamic syncretism, and the most obvious example of this is Nasakom. Suppose people read Nasakom politics without the lens of Javanese cosmology. In that case, they will fall into the error of assessing Nasakom as an irresponsible political policy or manipulation of religious groups and communists to strengthen and perpetuate Sukarno's power. There are also, especially foreign observers and researchers, who read Nasakom only as a political maneuver and political compromise in the Guided Democracy era to weaken the influence of religious-based parties and parties based on the teachings of Communism. Such a reading, according to Anderson, "has not succeeded in placing Nasakom politics in the context of Javanese political thought ."Nasakom was not a political compromise, let alone a trick, but Sukarno's firm statement that he had power. As a person with power that could be called strong, Sukarno treated opposing religious and communist parties as playing a subordinate role in the totality of the guided democracy system. That means only Sukarno himself was the whole, self-sufficient, absorbing the opposing political forces within himself. Thus, the essence of Javanese cosmology in Nasakom politics is here: Unity is power, diversity is division, and scattering is weakness.

To emphasize the reading of Nasakom from the perspective of Javanese cosmology, where power is centripetal and oriented towards the center, the researcher also tries to explain the concept of Mandala, which lives in Java, even though the idea originates from India. A Mandala is a circle of influence (power) from the center outward. On the outside are the citizens furthest from power who have the potential to join other powers (enemy powers) quickly. If a ruler does not want his power weakened or usurped by neighboring powers, he must overcome this threatening power. Javanese political cosmology assumes that the amount of power is fixed, which means that if power in one place increases, power in other places decreases by the same amount. So, growing power in the periphery or the neighbors is directly proportional to reducing power in the center. The mandala concept has three ways to deal with threats: Destroying, tearing apart, and absorbing.

Sukarno, while facing the threat of the power of religious parties, especially Islam, and the power of the Indonesian communist party, chose the third path, namely absorbing, so as not to destroy

and tear apart the religious parties and the communist party. So, Nasakom was the absorption of two forces that could have destroyed Sukarno's power. Sukarno saw this absorption in the form of Nasakom as the voluntary submission of two opposing political forces that could threaten his power, as described in the history of kingdoms in Java: "raja sewu Negara Nugkul" (a thousand kings submitted to him) (Anderson, 1986: 81). In the Javanese understanding of power, a ruler is respected not because of his courage to fight on the battlefield to defeat his opponent. If a ruler uses that method, then it is to show that he is weak. The words of Raja Sewu Negara Nungkul contain the meaning of absorbing the powers around the ruler into his power so that he becomes even more powerful.

3.3.1 *Nasakom and Islamic Cosmology*

Sukarno was a Javanese; it cannot be denied. Likewise, Sukarno was a Muslim, which cannot be denied. Therefore, to obtain a complete reading of Nasakom, the researcher tries to analyze Nasakom from the perspective of Islamic cosmology. However, from the analysis above, there is strong evidence that Sukarno used a traditional Javanese view of power and concentrated power within himself through Nasakom politics. However, this does not mean that other perspectives are closed, in this case, Islamic cosmology, because Sukarno himself had a great tendency to combine everything into one, such as his claim that he was a Nationalist, Marxist, and Islamist. Therefore, analysis from the perspective of Islamic cosmology is not just an addition but something necessary for us to find a complete reading or meaning of Nasakom politics. The only thing that needs to be underlined here is which Islamic cosmology because Islam in the Sukarno era lived in two faces, namely Traditionalist Islam, which was close to Javanese culture, and Modernist Islam, which remained purely based on the normative sources of Islam, namely the Koran, and Hadith and because it goes against Javanese culture.

Traditional Islam in the sense of Islam where the appreciation of the Islamic faith is mixed and integrated with the Javanese worldview (Javanese cosmology). As explained above, Javanese cosmology views humans as not separate from nature and that the Divine and the Divine are immanently present in human life. So, there is no separation or distance between humans and the Divine. Traditional Islam also views God as immanent, so there is no sharp distinction between this world and the transcendental world. Traditional Javanese, who are also Muslims, view God as an immanent reality. According to Anderson (Anderson, 1966, p. 116): "For traditionalist Javanese who is strongly influenced by the idea of an immanent God in this world, almost all aspects of behavior can be said to have political content, insofar as these aspects may influence the distribution and concentration of power. That means power exists in the world, and humans live in a divine world.

This view is very different from Modernist Islam, which strictly makes a separation between humans and God, where between humans and God, there is an immeasurable distance, so Allah is transcendent. The transcendent God is omnipotent, so human power comes from God. Humans have power, which means that they have received God's mandate to advance their fellow humans. With this concept of trust, for Modernist Islam, there is a clear difference between God's (absolute) power and human (relative) power. In this fact of relativity, there is room for Modern Islam to implement democracy because all humans are equal before Allah; no human being is divine because there is only one God. There is a strict separation between the Creator (Allah) and His creation (humans). Thus, Anderson (1986:116) writes: "In Modernist Islamic cosmology, the Javanese conception of God as something formless and intangible, who fills the entire universe, has been replaced by a God who is sharply separated from His works. Between God and man, there is an immeasurable distance."

Thus, in Java during the Sukarno era, there were two faces of Islam: Traditional Islam, in C. Geertz's language Abangan Islam, and Modernist Islam. The question is: Which Islamic cosmology do we use to read Nasakom, where Sukarno himself was a Javanese and Muslim? Suppose we use the lens of Modernist Islamic cosmology. In that case, Nasakom is a political policy that should be rejected because it is a very politically irresponsible political policy in a country where most citizens are Muslim. That is why there has been a reaction of rejection of Nasakom politics, especially by Masyumi as an Islamic party with a modern outlook. However, we use the perspective of traditional Islamic cosmology (Islam integrated with traditional Javanese culture). In that case, Nasakom is not a bad policy but a good political policy because it tries to unite opposing parties. Therefore, in the eyes of NU, a traditionalist Islamic party, Nasakom is good, and they accept Nasakom. With this, NU entered Sukarno's government, while the modernist Masyumi did not enter the government and was even disbanded by Sukarno.

However, we must not simply simplify NU's attitude towards Nasakom, namely just because of the compatibility of Islamic cosmological views, which are integrated with Javanese culture and traditional Javanese cosmology, so that Sukarno could take advantage of this compatibility to involve NU in the Nasakom cabinet and support Sukarno. In other words, Sukarno utilized the traditional character of NU for his political interests. This kind of reading is not entirely correct because NU accepted Nasakom not only because its cosmological ideology was compatible with Sukarno's but also because NU wanted to carry out collaborative politics so that it could take part in government. By accepting Nasakom, NU can be categorized as a revolutionary party. As quoted by Legge (1972, p. 382), Sukarno said: "I am a friend of the nationalists, revolutionary nationalists. His friends are religious people, revolutionary religious people. I am a friend of the communists because the communists are revolutionary people." So, the measure of a party's revolutionary or counter-revolutionary character is determined by its attitude towards Nasakom: accepting Nasakom means revolutionary, rejecting Nasakom means counter-revolutionary, and NU is a revolutionary party because it agrees to Nasakom.

What is worth noting here is that it was only for political interests at that time that Sukarno was more accommodating to NU and distanced himself from Muhammadiyah even though he had been a Muhammadiyah cadre since the struggle and had been in contact with reformist Islamic figures such as Ahmad Hassan since the 1930s. This figure was essential and meaningful for Sukarno when exiled to Flores Island. During his exile, he wrote Islamic Letters from Ende to Ahmad Hassan, an Islamic reformist figure and chairman of the Islamic Union in Bandung. However, because Muhammadiyah's political direction was not in line with Sukarno's, Sukarno distanced himself from Muhammadiyah, and Muhammadiyah took an oppositional stance towards Sukarno.

3.3.2. Nasakom and Western Cosmology

Sukarno was not only a Javanese and Muslim but also a modernist who accepted rationalism as the superiority of modern humans in dealing with various human problems. Marx's philosophy and Marxist ideology exemplify Sukarno's recognition of Western views as beneficial for the development of Indonesian society. Foreign observers and researchers assess Sukarno as a nationalist who succeeded in marrying tradition and modernity. Nasakom politics also contains this marriage of tradition and modernity. Therefore, it is natural for us also to read Nasakom from the perspective of rational Western cosmology.

In the view of Western cosmology, humans, nature, and the Divine are separate fields from each other, like Islamic cosmology. In contrast to Islamic cosmology, which only distinguishes creator and

creation, Western cosmology recognizes this distinction. Still, it is open to a perspective on the relationship between creation and creator as monism or pluralism. Monism is the philosophical belief that everything that exists, both that which is created (naturata) and that which creates (naturans), is a unity. For monism, a plurality of reality is not genuine (virtual); what is real is only unity. Meanwhile, pluralism views any reality (humans, nature, and God) as standing alone and having its existence. Nothing is ordinary or the same between all these realities, so they are entirely different. These three realities are related, but their relationship in their respective positions differs. That unity cannot be known if there is unity or similarity between them.

There is a monism that recognizes matter. That is the philosophy of materialism, which leads to atheism (not acknowledging the existence of God). However, there is also a form of religious monism, namely pantheism, which views the Divine as residing in all created reality (Zoetmulder, 1990, pp. 12–13). That means the universe has a plurality of external empirical appearances, and this plurality is only the self-revelation of the Divine as One. In this way, pantheism is like the traditional Javanese ideology of the unity of humans with nature and the Divine. Both emphasize the Divine as immanent, not transcendent. This understanding of monism was once the philosophical basis of the Integralistic Staatsidee put forward by Supomo at the BPUPKI Session in the framework of the founding of the Indonesian state. According to Supomo, the Indonesian state must be an integralistic state, namely, a state that unites all parties and groups of people in society (Binsasi, 2022). The philosophical reference for this integralistic idea is Spinoza's Monism (Kisner, 2018), which teaches the unity between created nature and the creator, as expressed in his philosophical formulation: Deus sive natura (God or nature), which is responded to by the Javanese pantheistic monism ideology by Supomo (Kusuma, 2004, p. 131), in the formulation: Manunggaling kawula Gusti (unity between the people and leaders, or unity between humans with the Divine) (Yamin, 1959, p. 113).

In Western philosophy, a third way still reconciles monism and pluralism. If monism relies on the metaphysical understanding of univocity entis (there is a univoc) that everything that exists is the same, and pluralism depends upon the metaphysics of equivocity entis (there is an equivoc) that there are many things. Each of them stands alone; there is no unity at all. Between them, the third path or theory is analogia entis (there are analogs), namely the view that there is unity. At the same time, there are differences between all realities as they exist. Analogia entis creates a synthesis of answers to pluralism (plurality) and monism (unity) (Baker & Zubbair, 1990, pp. 282–283). Here, the ideology of analogia entis can solve or reconcile monism and pluralism, which is known in Western Philosophy as "The One and the Many Problem," with the following explanation (Bakker, 1992, pp. 289-290): First, from one side, we acknowledge that there are many goods, and they are many because there are differences between them. No two or more goods exist according to the same actus essendi. Second, from the other side, we also admit that the term exists is used realistically regarding all the different goods. So, everything is both different and the same. They are the same because they both exist and are different because they exist as this and that thing.

With this philosophical framework, we can read Nasakom in three ways: Univocitas entis (radical monism), equivocity entis (radical pluralism), and analogia entis (moderate monism). First, if we read Nasakom through the lens of radical monism, then that means that the unity of the three elements in Nasakom is a unity that kills each of those elements. Because, in this radical monism, there is only absolute unity without twoness or thirdness. Nasakom is indeed a unity, but it is not an absolute unity without recognizing the plurality of its elements. Sukarno did not aim to kill or eliminate the three elements but still recognized their existence and essence. So, the spirit of unity in Nasakom is not in the

sense of radical monism. Second, if we read Nasakom from the perspective of radical pluralism, then we automatically eliminate Nasakom itself. Radical pluralism, based on the ideology of entis equivocity, teaches that there is nothing in common between all realities as existing and, therefore, nothing that leads them to unity. Third, if we read from the perspective of moderate monism based on analogia entis, then we acknowledge that in Nasakom, there are similarities but differences.

This third answer is to the essence and existence of Nasakom in Sukarno's political constellation. He combined these three elements not to eliminate their existence in national politics but only to balance them, especially between Religion and Communism, so that they do not create political conflict between those who are opposites. Still, instead, they become political forces that can support Sukarno's political program. Therefore, in the eyes of Western cosmology, unification or merging is unity in the sense of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika (ex pluribus unum). Their unity is in the form of Nasakom, namely unity in diversity because, after all, religion is different from Communism.

However, with this understanding of Western cosmology, we do not intend to simplify the issue of Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, namely that the basis of Sukarno's ideal of Nasakom is the principle of Western metaphysics in the formula "Ex Pluribus Unum," with its central concept "analogia entis." That is not. Here, we want to show that even though Sukarno was not a Western philosopher but an Indonesian politician with a background in Indonesian philosophical thought, Nasakom's ideology, which was based on a unique Indonesian philosophy, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, was not typical of Indonesian philosophy. Regarding the substance of his thinking, it is the same as the primum philosopicum in the West, which reads "Ex Pluribus Unum." One of the contributions of this study is that it can show the quality of Indonesian philosophical thought, which is equivalent to Western philosophical thought, where Sukarno himself was very fond of quoting Western thought to justify his views. However, as discovered by Dahm, Sukarno's reading and quoting of thoughts and texts West often misquotes or quotes incompletely. Viewed in terms of the substance of philosophical thought, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is the same as the idea of unity (unum) and a plurality (Pluribus) in the primum philosopicum in the West, which reads "Ex Pluribus Unum ." One of the contributions of this study is that it can show the quality of Indonesian philosophical thought, which is on a par with Western philosophical thought, where Sukarno himself was very fond of quoting Western thought to justify his views, even though, as discovered by Bernard Dahm, Sukarno's reading and quoting of his thoughts. Western texts are often inappropriate, misquoted, or quoted incompletely. However, linking Nasakom with Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, where this Sanskrit formula is equivalent to Ex Pluribus Unum in Western Philosophy, is not because Sukarno often quoted Western experts, although incomplete, but for reasons of the substance of his philosophical thought.

3.3.2. Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika

Based on the above new reading of Nasakom, we finally find that Nasakom politics has weaknesses because it can "weaken" political power or influence, especially religious-based parties such as NU and communist-based parties such as the PKI party. Meanwhile, the Indonesian National Party (PNI), Sukarno's party, was not "weakened" by Nasakom but instead "strengthened" because Nationalism was the glue or unifier between religious-based parties and communist-based parties. Nasakom's concoction made a religiously enthusiastic NU become a national religious NU. Likewise, the PKI is no longer a PKI that is only a socialist spirit but rather a PKI that is a nationalist-socialist spirit. In that sense, Nasakom weakens the political power of religious and communist parties.

However, even though NU and PKI were slightly weakened, if not controlled or regulated by the authorities, Nasakom's politics remained in line with the motto.

The three types of new reading above, namely from the perspective of Javanese, Islamic, and Western cosmology, each contain the spirit of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, the spirit of unity in diversity. For example, in the analysis of Nasakom and Javanese cosmology, we find that Nasakom, as a syncretism, is a syncretism that does not erase the essence and existence of NU and PKI but only accommodates them in a common forum. Therefore, Nasakom here still contains the spirit of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika, which guarantees the equality of NU and PKI as strongly nationalist parties. Still, at the same time, they remain different from one another. Likewise with the Mandala philosophy, NU and PKI were not killed but only accommodated so that they did not become radical according to their ideology but became more moderate. Still, they remained different parties, one based on religion and the other based on Communism.

Likewise, in the analysis of Nasakom and Islamic cosmology, we find that NU is willing to join as one with the PKI not because it accepts the ideology of Communism but because NU wants to work together to build the nation. The spirit of cooperation with the PKI, which had an ideology opposed to NU, was not due to an attitude of accommodation with the PKI but rather an attitude of accommodation with the interests of power in Sukarno's hands. Likewise, on the contrary, the PKI was willing to unite with NU, which had a religious ideology, not because it wanted to carry out political accommodation with NU, but rather because it wanted to cooperate where the cooperation was not built based on similar ideologies but on differences. Thus, there is also the spirit of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika here.

Meanwhile, the latest analysis of Nasakom and Western cosmology clearly shows the spirit of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika because the Western view differentiates between radical monism and radical pluralism. Then, a middle way is found, with moderate pluralism based on the analogy of entis philosophy. This philosophy teaches that everything that exists has the same and different elements. This is clear from the understanding of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika as unity in diversity, which in the Western formulation is known as ex pluribus unum; unity comes from many. The meaning of many here contains the element "Bhinneka," and the term unity includes the meaning of "single." So, Nasakom, from a Western point of view, is in line with Bhinneka Tunggal Ika.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the study above, several central points regarding Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika were finally found. Firstly, Nasakom is not a continuation of the ideas of "Nationalism, Marxism and Islamism" from 1926, but rather a manifestation of Sukarno's political thoughts that were put forward during the struggle. So, "Nationalism, Marxism and Islamism" is a political thought. At the same time, Nasakom is a political policy, where the first is a political syncretism in abstracto (at the level of thought), and the second is a political syncretism in concreto (at the level of implementation). This means that Nasakom's politics emerged not only because he had mastered democracy in his hands, namely Guided Democracy, but because he had emphasized unity in diversity since the era of struggle.

Second, Nasakom can only be understood correctly when we read it in its entirety, that is, read it according to the Weltanschauung (world view) that Sukarno himself adhered to, namely as a traditional Javanese, a traditional Muslim, and a modernist. From this point of view, we finally find that Nasakom is not that bad. Of course, there is a downside, namely that it can weaken the existence of opposing parties because NU is no longer purely religiously enthusiastic but must have a nationalist-religious

enthusiasm; likewise, the PKI is no longer strictly socialist enthusiastic but must have a nationalist-socialist enthusiasm. Reading these three perspectives leads us to a rich understanding of Nasakom.

Third, Nasakom has a substantial relationship with the political ethics of the Indonesian nation, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. Nasakom is passionate about unity in diversity, which aligns with the essential spirit of the motto Bhinneka Tunggal Ika. The difference is that Nasakom is a political praxis or policy that unites and balances opposing political forces. At the same time, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is a political ethic and, therefore, not as concrete as Nasakom. Its abstract nature allows Bhinneka Tunggal Ika to be used or applied in various national social realities.

Finally, based on the results found in these three points, the author is aware that the results are limited only to a new reading of the relationship between "Nasakom and Bhinneka Tunggal Ika ."On this basis, the author recommends two future students understand Nasakom politics fully: First, "Nasakom and Nation-State" because Sukarno also emphasized the ideology of Nationalism: is Nasakom in line with Religionationalism or Ethnonationalism or another model of Nationalism? Second, Bhinneka Tunggal Ika and Medieval Western Philosophy. Why? Because the idea of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika is equivalent to ex pluribus unum, where this last term comes from Medieval Metaphysics (15th Century), which in terms of time is contemporary with the birth of the idea of Bhinneka Tunggal Ika in the Majapahit Kingdom in the 15th Century.

REFERENCES

Anderson, B. R. O. (1966). The Communist Party of Indonesia. By Justus M. Van Der Kroef. *The China Quarterly*, *28*, 141–143. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0305741000028381

Baker, A., & Zubbair, A. C. (1990). *Metodologi Penelitian FIlsafat*. Kanisius.

Besman, A., & Sjuchro, D. W. (2021). Management of Communism Issues in The Soekarno Era (1959-1966). *Rigeo*, *11*(5), 48–56. https://rigeo.org/menu-script/index.php/rigeo/article/view/732

Binsasi, N. A. (2022). *Filsafat Spinoza dan Penerimaan Supomo: Studi tentang Awal Pembentukan Negara Indonesia Merdeka*. UGM.

Bishku, M. B. (1992). Sukarno, Charismatic Leadership and Islam in Indonesia. *Journal of Third World Studies*, *9*(2), 100–117. https://www.jstor.org/stable/45197254

Bunnell, F. P. (1966). Guided Democracy Foreign Policy: 1960-1965 President Sukarno Moves from Non-Alignment to Confrontation. *Indonesia*, *2*, 37. https://doi.org/10.2307/3350755

Candria, M., & Wulandari, D. (2023). Bhinneka Tunggal Ika and Bahasa Daerah: Challenges in the Present and Future. *Proceedings International Conference of Culture and Sustainable Development*, *1*.

Dahm, B. (1987). Sukarno and The Struggle for Indonesian Independence. In *(No Title)*. LP3ES.

Kisner, M. J. (2018). *Spinoza, Ethics, Proved in Geometrical Order*. Cambridge University Press. https://philpapers.org/rec/KISSD

Kusuma, RM. A. B. (2004). *Lahirnya Undang-Undang Dasar 1945 Memuat Salinan Dokumen Otentik Badan Oentoek Menyelidiki Oesaha-Oesaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan disusun dengan dibubuhi Ulasan dan Catatan oleh Pengantar*. Universitas Indonesia.

Legge, J. D. (1972). *Sukarno: A Political Biography*. Allen Lane The Penguin Press.

Meuleman, J. (2006). Between Unity and Diversity: The Construction of the Indonesian Nation. *European Journal of East Asian Studies*, *5*(1), 45–69. https://doi.org/10.1163/157006106777998115

Muskens, M. P. M. (1973). Sejarah Gereja Katolik Indonesia, Jilid 4. *Ende-Flores, Nusa Indah*.

Mustansyir, R. (1995). Bhinneka Tunggal Ika dalam Perspektif Filsafat Analitik. *Jurnal Filsafat*, *1*(1), 46–58.

Onghokham. (1987). Sukarno: Pemikir atau Politkus? In *Sukarno dan Perjuangan Kemerdekaan*. LP3ES.

Pranarka, A. M. W. (1985). *Sejarah Pemikiran tentang Pancasila*. CSIS.

Pursika, I. N. (2009). Kajian Analitik terhadap Semboyan" Bhinneka Tunggal Ika". *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Pengajaran*, *42*(1 Apr).

Rahman, M. F., Najah, S., Furtuna, N. D., & Anti, A. (2020). Bhinneka Tunggal Ika sebagai Benteng terhadap Risiko Keberagaman Bangsa Indonesia. *Al-Din: Jurnal Dakwah Dan Sosial Keagamaan*, *6*(2), 1–16. https://doi.org/10.35673/AJDSK.V6I2.1183

Riyanto, S., Febrian, F., & Zanibar, Z. (2023). Bhinneka Tunggal Ika: Nilai dan Formulasinya dalam Peraturan Perundang-Undangan. *Legislasi Indonesia*, *20*(2), 1–13.

Sukarno. (1959). *Di Bawah Bendera Revolusi*. Panitia Penerbit di Bawah Bendera Revolusi.

Winata, L., & Purwaningsih, S. M. (2017). Nasakom Sebagai Ideologi Negara Tahun 1959-1965. *Avatara*, *5*(3), 728–737.

Wiratama, N. S., Budianto, A., & Sumarwoto, M. I. Z. I. (2022). Pancasila dan Nasakom dalam Mempersatukan Bangsa Indonesia (Kajian Kritis Sejarah Intelektual). *JEJAK: Jurnal Pendidikan Sejarah & Sejarah*, *2*(2), 66–76.

Yamin, M. (1959). *Naskah Persiapan Undang-Undang Dasar 1945, Jilid I*.

Zoetmulder, P. J. (1990). *Manunggaling Kawula Gusti. Pantheisme dan Monisme dalam Sastra Suluk Jawa*. Gramedia.