Jurnal Sangkala Vol (4) No (2) (2025)
www.jurnal.untag-banyuwangi.ac.id/index.php/jurnalsangkala/
e-ISSN : 3032-7741

PANCASILA SOCIALISM AND CHINESE SOCIALISM: A COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS BETWEEN RELIGIOUS AND MATERIALIST APPROACHES IN THE FORMATION OF STATE IDEOLOGY

Adita Taufik Widianto[1], Riztika Widyasari[2]
[1]Tourism School, Sichuan University, Chengdu, People's Republic of China, [2]University of 17 August 1945 Banyuwangi
Email : aditataufikw@stu.scu.edu.cn[1], riztika.widyasari@untag-banyuwangi.ac.id[2]

ABSTRACT

This article aims to comparatively analyze the characteristics of the state ideologies of Indonesia and China, especially between Pancasila Socialism and Chinese Socialism, based on religious and materialist approaches. The main focus of the research is to identify the historical foundations, philosophical values, and practical implications of both ideologies in shaping the policy direction and national identity of each country. This research uses a qualitative approach with a literature study method, through content analysis of scientific literature in the form of books, academic journals, and valid and relevant official state documents. The results of the analysis show that Pancasila Socialism is religious-humanistic, emphasizing the moral principles of divinity, humanity, and deliberation within the framework of cultural plurality. In contrast, Chinese Socialism is built on the basis of historical materialism and the centralization of the Communist Party's power, which emphasizes development efficiency and political stability. Although paradigmatically different, both ideologies have a strategic function as a social glue and a guideline for national development amidst global challenges. This finding emphasizes the importance of revitalizing state ideology contextually and participatively in order to remain relevant in the dynamics of the times.

Keywords : Pancasila Socialism, Chinese Socialism, state ideology, religious , *materialist, comparative*

INTRODUCTION

Socialism as ideology own Lots face , depending on context historical , cultural , and values that surround it . In In the Indonesian context , Pancasila Socialism is present as form socialism that is not contradictory with values religious and cultural local . On the other hand , socialism in China develop through approach materialism historical character Marxist-Leninist without consider aspect religious . This fundamental difference has become a source of academic debate regarding how state ideology is formed and functions in shaping national identity and political legitimacy. According to Nasrullah (2020), Pancasila as the foundation of the Indonesian state contains transcendental values that cannot be separated from the nation's religious identity (Nasrullah, 2020). Meanwhile, Guo (2018) emphasized that Chinese socialism explicitly rejects religion as a tool of liberation and places more emphasis on economic and technological power as a means of development (Guo, 2018). This gap indicates the need to dig deeper into how the two approaches to socialism form the ideological foundations of the state that are very different in spirit and implementation. As explained by Yamin (2017), understanding state ideology cannot be separated from the history and local values of its people (Yamin, 2017). On the other hand, Liu (2019) highlighted how Chinese

socialism was built with a revolutionary spirit and a single political order as the basis for state stability (Liu, 2019).

The difference in paradigm between Pancasila socialism and Chinese socialism also reflects the very contrasting direction of character formation of citizens. Pancasila socialism seeks to build a complete Indonesian person, namely an individual who is religious, humanist, and democratic, as emphasized in the Pancasila principles. According to Magnis-Suseno (2013), the values of Pancasila emphasize harmony between individuals and society, as well as between humans and God, which are the foundation of social ethics in Indonesia (Magnis-Suseno, 2013). In contrast, Chinese socialism has developed from the beginning the principle of development based on collectivity and the supremacy of the state over the individual, which is seen in the application of the Communist Party's concept of "social harmony". As stated by Fewsmith (2021), the state ideology in China focuses more on political and economic stability than on individual freedom or spirituality (Fewsmith, 2021). In addition, Marx's view, which is the foundation of Chinese socialism, states that religion is the "opium of the people", which is irrelevant in class struggle and state development (Marx, 1844/1978). The contrast between the religious approach that emphasizes transcendental values and the materialist approach that emphasizes historical rationality is an important basis for conducting a critical and comprehensive comparative ideological study.

The urgency of this study lies in the importance of understanding the differences in ideological paradigms between Indonesia and China in order to strengthen the discourse of national politics and the ideological resilience of the nation. In the midst of the flow of globalization and the penetration of foreign values, a deep understanding of the ideological roots of the state is crucial so that the nation does not lose its direction and identity. According to Ananta (2022), globalization is currently eroding local values and accelerating the process of cultural homogenization which risks the existence of the nation's ideology (Ananta, 2022). Therefore, comparing Pancasila socialism which is based on religiosity and culture with Chinese socialism which is materialistic can enrich academic literature while strengthening the ideological education of the community. This is supported by Cahyono (2020) who emphasizes the need for cross-ideological understanding to improve the ideological literacy of the younger generation (Cahyono, 2020). On the other hand , Zhang & Wang (2021) emphasize importance understanding state ideology in to form compliance politics and social public China (Zhang & Wang, 2021). Research this also responds emptiness literature that studies in a way specific comparison between approach religious and materialist in to form foundation state ideology , such as noted by Wiryono (2021) that study comparison ideology still very limited especially in Indonesia (Wiryono , 2021).

Novelty from this writing lies in its approach which compares two models of state socialism originating from from tradition very different values , namely religiosity in Pancasila socialism and materialism in Socialism China . This study No only descriptive , but also analytical , with approach scientific-humanist who sees ideology as results dialectics between humans , culture , and power . Different from studies ideology conventional which tends to textual and normative , this writing put forward context historical and social as foundation analysis ideological . According to Hidayat (2019), ideology No Can separated from experience collective the society that forms it (Hidayat , 2019). In addition that , approach this is also in line with Fukuyama's view (2006) is that in the post-ideological era , understanding to uniqueness ideology local become important For face challenge globalization (Fukuyama, 2006). With Thus , the article This No only

give perspective new to state ideology , but also open dialogue space between two paradigms that have existed for a long time This considered No Can met . Finally , Liu & Zhao (2023) emphasized that approach comparison cross ideology can enrich understanding We about function ideology in system political contemporary (Liu & Zhao, 2023).

METHOD

Study This use approach qualitative with method studies comparative-critical , which aims For compare in a way two systems deep state ideology— Pancasila Socialism in Indonesia and Socialism China — based on aspect philosophical , historical , and practical politics . Approach This chosen Because in accordance with characteristics problem that is not can measured in a way quantitative , but must understood through interpretation meaning , value , and structure the thinking behind formation state ideology (Creswell, 2014; Neuman, 2014).

Type study This is studies library research with source main in the form of literature academic , journal scientific , document official state speech leader national , and books philosophy politics . Analysis done with technique hermeneutics and analysis discourse ideological For interpret text in context socio-cultural and historical aspects of each country (Fairclough, 2003). In addition that , the author also uses method analysis thematic For identify themes main thing that appears in formation state ideology , such as mark religious , materialism , collectivity , nationality , and legitimacy power (Braun & Clarke, 2006).

Data validity strengthened through triangulation source , namely with compare results interpretation from various type literature and approaches different theoretical . Research this also takes into account context historical and cultural that forms background behind the ideology of each country so that the resulting interpretation No nature ahistorical or cultural bias (Guba & Lincoln, 1994). Researchers positioning self as subject reflective , not as neutral party absolute , for guard openness in understand diversity values and orientation ideological .

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Analysis Historical Ideology China

History of ideology China is narrative length that experiences transformation deep since the time of the empire until the establishment People's Republic of China (PRC) in 1949. During the imperial period , the system dominant value is Confucianism , which emphasizes hierarchy , loyalty , harmony social , and government based morality . Thought Confucius become the basis of state governance during more of two millennia , although experience competition ideological with Taoism and Buddhism (de Bary , 1999; Fung, 1983; Tu, 1998).

A major transformation occurred in the early 20th century when the Qing dynasty collapsed and China experienced political turmoil and a search for a new identity. After the fall of the empire in 1911, Western ideas began to enter, including democracy, liberalism, and socialism. The May 4th Movement of 1919 became an important momentum for the birth of nationalist awareness and criticism of Confucianism as a value system that was considered old-fashioned and hindered modernization (Spence, 1990; Dirlik, 1991). It was during this time that the ideology of Marxism began to be accepted by young intellectuals such as Mao Zedong.

The founding of the Chinese Communist Party (CCP) in 1921 was the starting point for the articulation of socialist ideology in the Chinese context. Mao Zedong developed Marxism-Leninism adapted to the agrarian conditions of China, creating a theory of peasant-based proletarian revolution, known as *Maoism* . Unlike Lenin who focused on the industrial proletariat, Mao emphasized the importance of class struggle in the countryside, and revolution as a long process through guerrilla warfare (Schram, 1984; Meisner, 1999; Leese, 2011).

Maoism has been the official state ideology since the founding of the PRC in 1949. During this period, various ideological campaigns were carried out, such as the Hundred Flowers Campaign, the Cultural Revolution (1966–1976), and the Great Leap Forward program, which aimed to establish a communist society through the deconstruction of old values, the destruction of traditional culture, and the empowerment of the masses. However, these policies also brought destructive impacts such as internal conflicts, mass starvation, and the collapse of educational and cultural institutions (Dikötter, 2010; MacFarquhar & Schoenhals, 2006).

After Mao's death in 1976, drastic ideological reforms took place under Deng Xiaoping's leadership. Deng introduced *Socialism with Chinese Characteristics* , which pragmatically blended socialist principles with market mechanisms. Deng asserted that "it doesn't matter whether the cat is white or black, as long as it catches mice," symbolizing the new ideological orientation that was more flexible and prioritized results over doctrine (Vogel, 2011; Naughton, 2007).

Deng's era marked the beginning of economic liberalization but not political liberalization.The state retains one party, and the party remains at the center of everything. This is in contrast to many countries that have undergone democratic transitions after economic liberalization. In China, the party ideology has become hybridized: economically capitalist, but politically authoritarian and centered on ideological control by the party (Pei, 2006; Fewsmith, 2001).

In the Xi Jinping era, ideology was reaffirmed through "Xi Jinping Thought on Socialism with Chinese Characteristics for a New Era" which was incorporated into the constitution and national education curriculum. Under Xi, the state has further strengthened control over civil society, the media, and religion, while promoting Chinese nationalism and cultural supremacy in the global arena (Zhao, 2015; Fewsmith, 2021; Liu, 2020). Party ideology is consolidated not only as a political instrument, but also as a guide for social life.

Historically, Chinese ideology has shown great flexibility in absorbing and reformulating ideas from outside, but still maintaining a strict pattern of state control. The transformation from Confucianism to Marxism, then to market socialism shows continuity in terms of centralism of power, as well as changes in instruments and narratives of legitimacy. Chinese ideology is not a static entity, but a reflection of the historical dialectic between tradition, power, and the demands of the times (Dirlik, 1991; Meisner, 1999; Schram, 1984).

Historical Analysis of Pancasila Ideology

The Pancasila ideology was born from a long process of struggle of the Indonesian people in formulating a national identity that is able to unite cultural, religious, and ethnic diversity. The history of the formation of Pancasila cannot be separated from the socio-political dynamics that underlie the struggle for independence. Pancasila was first formally introduced by Ir. Soekarno in his speech at the session of the Investigating

Committee for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence (BPUPKI) on June 1, 1945, which later became a philosophical milestone for the formation of the Indonesian state (Yudi Latif, 2011; Ricklefs, 2008; Kaelan, 2013).

Historically, Pancasila is the result of a synthesis of various local and universal sources of values. Soekarno formulated Pancasila as the "philosophische grondslag" or philosophical basis of the state that was extracted from the culture and outlook on life of the Indonesian people themselves. Values such as mutual cooperation, deliberation, and social justice have long lived in the Nusantara society before the formation of the modern state. In this context, Pancasila is not the result of the adoption of foreign ideologies, but is the crystallization of the nation's original values that are contextualized in the format of a nation-state (Magnis-Suseno, 1997; Kaelan, 2013; Alfian, 1981).

The early phase of independence marked the first test for the Pancasila ideology, especially in consolidating Indonesia's diversity into a stable political system. The competition between Islamic ideology, secular nationalism, and communism during the liberal democracy era (1945–1959) showed that Pancasila functioned as an inclusive meeting point. Soekarno's decision to implement Guided Democracy in 1959 by reviving Pancasila as the state philosophy through the Presidential Decree of July 5, 1959, strengthened the position of this ideology constitutionally (Boland, 1982; Feith, 1962; Ricklefs, 2008).

However, during the New Order (1966–1998), the Pancasila ideology experienced a reduction in meaning. Under Soeharto's leadership, Pancasila was used as a tool of power that was interpreted solely by the state through the Penataran P4 (Guidelines for Understanding and Implementing Pancasila) program. Pancasila was no longer a space for dialogue on national values, but rather a dogma that had to be accepted without criticism. In this context, the Pancasila ideology became static and undemocratic, although it remained the formal basis of the state (Bourchier, 2015; Haryatmoko, 2016; Wieringa, 2002).

The 1998 Reformation brought a new spirit to revitalize the Pancasila ideology democratically. The multidimensional crisis that occurred encouraged the Indonesian nation to re-explore the meaning of Pancasila as a life value that is relevant to the challenges of the times. The process of democratization, decentralization, and freedom of expression opened up space to interpret Pancasila in a more open, plural, and participatory manner. However, new challenges also emerged in the form of strengthening identity politics, radicalism, and political pragmatism that often ignores the basic values of the nation (Anshari, 2004; Latif, 2011; Haryatmoko, 2016).

In the contemporary era, Pancasila is faced with the dynamics of globalization and the Industrial Revolution 4.0 which encourages rapid value transformation. This challenge demands a reactualization of ideology to remain relevant amidst the flow of digitalization, global capitalism, and social disruption. Therefore, Pancasila is not enough to just be memorized, but needs to be interpreted and implemented in daily social policies and behavior. Pancasila must become a public ethical system that lives in action and not just a constitutional symbol (Kaelan, 2013; Wahyudi, 2021; Haryatmoko, 2016).

Philosophically, Pancasila is integrative because it contains five principles that are mutually dependent and inseparable. Belief in the One Almighty God is the basis of morality, while just and civilized humanity demands respect for human rights. The unity of Indonesia emphasizes national solidarity, and democracy led by the wisdom of wisdom reflects deliberative democracy. Social justice is the ultimate goal of the entire ideological structure (Notonagoro, 1984; Magnis-Suseno, 1997; Kaelan, 2013).

Compared to with ideology of other countries that tend to exclusive and ideological , Pancasila has character open , inclusive , and adaptive . Ideology This can accept development of the times without lost teak himself . Character open This make Pancasila not reject knowledge knowledge and progress technology , during in line with values humanity and justice social . Therefore that , Pancasila must Keep going developed through education , research and reflection culture to be able to answer moral crisis and disintegration increasingly social complex (Latif, 2011; Wahyudi , 2021; Haryatmoko , 2016).

With Thus , history Pancasila ideology reflects the process of searching identity national which is not Once stop . Ideology This is project culture and politics that continue developing , not a standard formula that is complete . In context pluralistic Indonesia , Pancasila becomes dialogue space of values sublime , not tool hegemony . Therefore , the meaning repeat towards Pancasila must Keep going done to be able to become moral anchor and direction policy in the middle wave such global changes fast and disruptive (Soekarno, 1964; Kaelan, 2013; Yudi Latif, 2011).

Comparison Comparative Approach Religious and Materialist Indonesia- China Ideology

Comparison between Pancasila Socialism and Socialism China open room reflection critical to How state ideology is formed based on mark base society . Pancasila Socialism is based on the principles divinity , humanity , unity , democracy and justice social . Pancasila integrates aspect religious and ethical in realm statehood , making it as ideology that is inclusive and transcendent . Different with China which is explicit rejecting religion as the basis of ideology , Indonesia actually put mark deity as please the first to influence all over aspect social and political (Magnis-Suseno , 2013; Wahyudi , 2021; Haryatmoko , 2016).

In context this , approach Pancasila religious has implications important in to form character nationality that combines faith and rationality . The state does not nature secular pure , but ensure freedom religious and make spiritual values as base development nation . In line with Bung Karno's view is that Pancasila is a " philosophical deep- rooted “ grondslag ” from culture and soul Indonesian nation (Soekarno, 1964; Sunoto , 2020; Latif, 2011). While that , Socialism China emphasize materialism historical as base its ideology , adopting principles Marxism-Leninism which rejects existence values religious in structure state power (Schram, 1984; Fewsmith , 2021; Liu, 2020).

Pancasila Socialism is more emphasize approach humanistic that values dignity man as creation God , while socialism China make man as tool production that is subject to the interests of the state and the party . In matter this , there is difference orientation ontological : Pancasila views man as creature religious and moral , meanwhile ideology China look at man in framework dialectics material history (Fukuyama, 2002; Wibowo, 2019; Zhao, 2015). The differences This influence on direction state policy in field education , economy , and social . In Indonesia, development directed at strengthening mark nationality based on culture local and faith , while in China , development focus on efficiency production and stability political through control strict party to life public .

However Thus , both system own similarity in matter effort to form loyalty inhabitant towards the country through education ideological . In China , this done through the doctrine of “Xi Jinping Thought” that colors all over system education and mass media (Zhao, 2015; Fewsmith , 2021). In Indonesia, Pancasila and citizenship education are the main instruments in instilling ideological values in the younger

generation (Riyadi, 2022; Arifin, 2018). The difference lies in the substance of the values taught: Pancasila upholds dialogue, justice, and respect for diversity, while Chinese socialism emphasizes uniformity, collective nationalism, and stability.

Theoretically, this comparison shows that state ideology is not born in a vacuum, but is a response to a unique historical, social, and cultural context. Pancasila was born from the struggle against colonialism with a religious spirit and national unity, while Chinese socialism was born from the proletarian revolution that carried class resistance and the elimination of feudalism (Soekarno, 1964; Schram, 1984). Therefore, from an ideological perspective, the religious approach of Pancasila is more inclusive and adaptive to the dynamics of a multicultural society, while the materialist approach of China tends to be rigid and centralistic, although it has proven effective in terms of economic development.

CONCLUSION

A comparative study of Pancasila Socialism and Chinese Socialism shows that the two state ideologies are built on very different historical, philosophical, and cultural foundations, although both seek to answer the need for social justice and people's welfare. Pancasila Socialism is religious-humanistic, integrating the values of divinity, humanity, and national collectivity as sources of political morality. In contrast, Chinese Socialism is rooted in the historical materialism of Marxism-Leninism, which emphasizes state control and class dialectics within the framework of centralized economic development.

Difference approach This to form pattern ideology and practice unique statehood . Pancasila prioritizes inclusivity , democracy deliberative , and ethics public based on culture local , while ideology China emphasize stability politics , efficiency bureaucracy , and supremacy Party Communist as the only one center power . In context This , Pancasila is more nature normative-ethical , whereas socialism China nature political instruments in reach objective development .

However , both of them show that state ideology remains own role important in direct development national , forming character nationality , and maintain cohesion social . The challenge now is how the two countries maintain the relevance of the ideology amidst the dynamics of globalization, technological disruption, and social pluralism. Pancasila must continue to be revitalized in national life through education, public participation, and enforcement of political ethics. On the other hand, China faces the challenge of opening up space for freedom and human rights without losing the socio-economic stability that has been achieved.

Although own approach different , both Indonesia and China show that state ideology remains play vital role in direct development national , forming character nationality , and maintain cohesion social . In the middle current globalization , disruption technology , and the increasing pluralism social , challenges main for both countries are guard relevance ideology For Indonesia, revitalization of Pancasila is necessary . Keep going attempted through education , participation public , and enforcement ethics politics . While that , China faced with a dilemma open room freedom and rights basic man without sacrifice stability socio-economic that has become foundation his success .

Thus, this study confirms that state ideology is not merely a construction of the past, but an ongoing project that requires reinterpretation and contextualization. Pancasila and Chinese Socialism can be a mirror for other nations in seeking a middle ground between tradition and modernity, between collective interests and individual dignity, between spirituality and rationality of development. This analysis provides a reflective basis for

policy makers, academics, and the younger generation in formulating the direction of a just and humane state ideology in the future.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Alfian . (1981). *Thought and Change Indonesian Politics* . Jakarta: Gramedia.

Ananta, A. (2022). *Globalization and Challenges of Local Culture* . Jakarta: LP3ES.

Anshari, E. (2004). *Reform and Revitalization of Pancasila* . Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya .

Arifin, Z. (2018). *Citizenship Education For Higher Education* . Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

Boland, B. J. (1982). *The Struggle of Islam in Modern Indonesia* . The Hague: Springer.

Bourchier , D. (2015). *Illiberal Democracy in Indonesia: The Ideology of the Family State* . Routledge.

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology* , 3(2), 77–101.

Cahyono , D. (2020). Ideology Education and National Resilience . *Journal National Resilience* , 26(1), 33–47.

Creswell, J. W. (2014). *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

de Bary , W.T. (1999). *Sources of Chinese Tradition: From Earliest Times to 1600* . Columbia University Press.

Dikötter , F. (2010). *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958–1962* . Walker & Company.

Dirlik , A. (1991). *Marxism in the Chinese Revolution* . Rowman & Littlefield.

Fairclough, N. (2003). *Analyzing Discourse: Textual Analysis for Social Research* . London: Routledge.

Feith , H. (1962). *The Decline of Constitutional Democracy in Indonesia* . Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Fewsmith , J. (2001). *China Since Tiananmen: The Politics of Transition* . Cambridge University Press.

Fukuyama, F. (2002). *Our Posthuman Future: Consequences of the Biotechnology Revolution* . New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fukuyama, F. (2006). *Identity: The Demand for Dignity and the Politics of Resentment* . New York: Farrar, Straus and Giroux.

Fung, Y. L. (1983). *A Short History of Chinese Philosophy* . Free Press.

Guba, E.G., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). Competing paradigms in qualitative research. In NK Denzin & YS Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 105–117). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Guo, S. (2018). Marxism in China: Continuity and Change. *Journal of Chinese Political Science* , 23(2), 181–198.

Haryatmoko . (2016). *Political Ethics and Power* . Yogyakarta: Kanisius .

Hidayat , R. (2019). *Ideology and Culture Politics in Indonesia* . Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar .

Kaelan. (2013). *Pancasila Education* . Yogyakarta: Paradigma.

Latif, Y. (2011). *The Perfect State: Historicity, Rationality, and Actuality of Pancasila* . Jakarta: Gramedia.

Leese, D. (2011). *Mao Cult: Rhetoric and Ritual in China's Cultural Revolution* . Cambridge University Press.

Liu, J. (2019). *Political Order in Contemporary China* . Beijing: Renmin University Press.

Liu, J., & Zhao, L. (2023). Comparative Political Ideologies in East Asia. *Asian Studies Review* , 47(1), 55–74.

MacFarquhar , R., & Schoenhals , M. (2006). *Mao's Last Revolution* . Harvard University Press.

Magnis-Suseno, F. (1997). *Political Ethics: Basic Moral Principles of Modern State* . Jakarta: Gramedia.

Marx, K. (1978). Contribution to the Critique of Hegel's Philosophy of Right: Introduction. In R. C. Tucker (Ed.), *The Marx-Engels Reader* (2nd ed., pp. 53–65). New York: W.W. Norton. (Original work published 1844)

Meisner, M. (1999). *Mao's China and After: A History of the People's Republic* . Free Press.

Nasrullah, M. (2020). Dimensions Deity in Pancasila Socialism . *Journal Philosophy* , 30(1), 15–32.

Naughton, B. (2007). *The Chinese Economy: Transitions and Growth* . MIT Press.

Neuman, W. L. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches* (7th ed.). Boston: Pearson.

Notonagoro. (1984). *Pancasila in a Popular Scientific Way* . Jakarta: Pancur Shiva .

Pei, M. (2006). *China's Trapped Transition: The Limits of Developmental Autocracy* . Harvard University Press.

Ricklefs , M. C. (2008). *A History of Modern Indonesia since c. 1200* . Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Riyadi, S. (2022). Implementation of Pancasila Education as an Effort to Strengthen National Character. *Journal Educational Sciences* , 8(1), 33–45.

Schram, S. R. (1984). *The Political Thought of Mao Tse -tung* . New York: Praeger.

Soekarno. (1964). *Under the Flag Revolution* . Jakarta: Bung Karno Foundation .

Spence, J.D. (1990). *The Search for Modern China* . WW Norton & Company.

Sunoto. (2020). Actualization of Pancasila Values in the Digital Era. *Journal of Pancasila Ideology* , 5(2), 121–134.

Tu, W. (1998). *Confucian Traditions in East Asian Modernity: Moral Education and Economic Culture in Japan and the Four Mini-Dragons* . Harvard University Press.

Vogel, E.F. (2011). *Deng Xiaoping and the Transformation of China* . Harvard University Press.

Wahyudi, J. (2021). Pancasila and Global Ideological Challenges. *Journal Indonesian Philosophy* , 28(1), 45–60.

Wibowo, A. (2019). Thoughts Philosophy Karl Marx's Politics . *Journal Thinking Social Politics* , 5(1), 77–89.

Wiryono , R. (2021). Map of Ideological Studies in Indonesia: A Review Historical and Theoretical . *Journal Knowledge Social and Science Politics* , 25(2), 123–140.

Yamin , M. (2017). *Pancasila Ideology and the Future of the Nation* . Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.

Zhang, Q., & Wang, Y. (2021). Ideological Education and Political Socialization in China. *China Review* , 21(3), 89–107.

Zhao, S. (2015). The Ideology of the Chinese Communist Party. *Journal of Contemporary China* , 24(96), 746–763.