
CIVIC EDUCATION AT PUBLIC ISLAMIC HIGHER EDUCATION (PTKIN) AND PESANTREN

Azyumardi Azra

Syarif Hidayatullah State Islamic University of Jakarta, Indonesia

E-mail: azyumardiazra1@gmail.com

Received: 15th November 2015; Revised: 28th November 2015; Accepted: 29th December 2015

Abstract

With a brief foundation that covers some reviews of world literature on education and politics, the study points out the significance of developing a certain model of democracy education in the diverse country, Indonesia. The paper aims to establish the development and the excavation of democracy in Indonesia by presenting historical explanation on how Indonesian muslim scholars from UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta developed a suitable model of Indonesian civic education, which considers the elements of diversity as strengthening elements for democracy. Different from Shanker's view (1996) on the global challenge of civic education, this study shows the successful experience of Indonesian Muslim in the development and application of civic education as a compulsory subject in Islamic education institutions, namely Public Islamic Higher Education (PTKIN) and *pesantren*. Finally, it recommends further development and emphasizes the vital influence on rooting civic education in *Pesantren* since it will positively play an important role to strengthen the evolving democracy in Indonesia by integrating Islamic and Indonesian values.

Keywords: political education; civic education; democracy; PTKIN; *pesantren*; multicultural

Abstrak

Dengan melakukan review singkat terhadap beberapa literatur internasional tentang pendidikan dan politik, studi ini menunjukkan pengembangan model khusus pendidikan demokrasi di Indonesia sebagai negara multi etnis. Tulisan ini bertujuan untuk menggambarkan perkembangan dan pengembangan demokrasi di Indonesia dengan pemaparan historis tentang bagaimana muslim Indonesia khususnya di UIN Jakarta dalam mengembangkan model Civic Education yang tepat, yang mempertimbangkan elemen keberagaman sebagai penguat demokrasi. Berbeda dari pendapat Shanker(1996) tentang tantangan global terhadap pendidikan kewarganegaraan, studi ini menggambarkan pengalaman sukses muslim Indonesia dalam mengembangkan pendidikan kewarganegaraan sebagai mata kuliah wajib di institusi pendidikan Islam dengan nama Perguruan Tinggi Keagamaan Islam Negeri (PTKIN) dan *Pesantren*. Di bagian akhir, tulisan ini merekomendasikan pengembangan lebih jauh dan penekanan akan pentingnya pengaruh pendidikan kewarganegaraan di *Pesantren*, karena *Pesantren* memainkan peran penting untuk menguatkan pengembangan demokrasi di Indonesia dengan mengintegrasikan nilai-nilai keislaman dan keindonesiaan.

Kata kunci: pendidikan politik, pendidikan kewarganegaraan demokrasi, PTKIN, *pesantren*, multikultur

How to Cite : Azra, A. (2015). Civic Education at Public Islamic Higher Education (PTKIN) and *Pesantren*. TARBIYA: Journal of Education In Muslim Society, 2(2), 167-177. doi:10.15408/tjems.v2i2.3186.

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15408/tjems.v2i2.3186>

Introduction

The fall of President Soeharto from his long-held power in May 1998 has provided a great impetus for the implementation of democracy in Indonesia. With the introduction of liberal democracy by his successor, President B.J. Habibie, Indonesia is becoming the third largest democracy in the world after India and U.S.A. One should admit, however, that Indonesian people in general have had little experience in democracy. It is true that in the past, during the periods of Presidents Soekarno and Soeharto, Indonesia had implemented the so-called “*Demokrasi Terpimpin*” (“guided democracy”) and “*Demokrasi Pancasila*” (Pancasila democracy) respectively, but these were only camouflages for their authoritarian rules. Therefore, the era of reforms in post-Soeharto period is a crucial period for Indonesia to establish a more genuine and authentic democracy.

The growth and deepening of a genuine and real democracy in Indonesia cannot be taken for granted or through a trial and error process. Indonesian transition to democracy must be supported not by the strengthening of legal bases of democracy and deepening of democratic political processes, but also by educating citizens about what democracy is all about. In my observation, Indonesian people in general have a very obscure idea about democracy and related subjects. As a result, Indonesian march towards democracy has continued to be hampered by undemocratic attitudes and practices that in turn could even put the existence of democracy into question.

With respect to the growth and /deepening of democracy, education certainly plays an important role. To put it in more specific terms, Indonesia needs a democracy education in order to be able to strengthen the inchoate democracy in the country. There is a lot of discussion about

democracy education, especially in its relation with citizenship education or civic education. The discourse on this subject in fact is increasingly becoming much wider with the introduction of the ideas on “multicultural education”. The latest terms comes to the fore together with the introduction of ideas on multiculturalism that has a close context with the multicultural realities of Indonesia. This paper attempts to discuss all these complex issues in the context of some experiences of Indonesian Islamic education insitutions, including *pesantrens*.

Democracy Education and Civic Education

Democracy originally meant rule by the *demos*, the common people, or those who form majority of the population. But the meaning of the concept has evolved with time. Today, arguably, the best and most interesting conception of democracy—the one which gives us an ideal worthy of aspiration—is that which based on the principle of political equality. Democracy, in short, is a form of government which seeks to honor equally the independence and sovereignty of all citizens (Cf. Beitz 1989).

Furthermore, democracy refers not only to a set of rules, but also to a kind of culture, which is called democratic political culture that in turn originate from ‘civic culture’. Democratic institutions depend on, but also inspire and reinforce, a particular set of attitudes and behavior. This includes a belief in the equal dignity of all individuals; a resistance to hierarchy; a reluctance to identify with the exercise of power; a willingness to have one’s belief questioned, etc. The culture of democracy, then, is the culture of human rights and, at the same time, the idea of human rights is democratic at its core.

Democratic culture, no doubt, must be planted in a systematic way. As John Dewey (1927) argues, democratic or civic competence is worthy of cultivation and trust rather than suspicion and underestimation. In Dewey's view, the ability to participate in democratic processes is essential to "competent citizenship". In line with Dewey, Carole Pateman challenges arguments put forward by other scholars that question participation of average citizens, that their participation is impractical and unwarranted, and that it should be limited to voting for representation only.

Pateman points out that there is a powerful tendency in political thought to treat public as a "mass" that is "incapable of action other than a stampede" (Schumpeter), that is pathetic, whose lower socio-economic backgrounds tend to lead them toward mass authoritarianism (Dahl), and whose increased participation would threaten to undermine political stability. Little needs to be said about the low regard in this perspective and the political action it informs, hold for average citizens. This view of citizens is mirrored in many ways by the dismissive manner in which citizens are regarded in "mass-society" theory.

Drawing on Tocqueville's *Democracy in America* (1945), Pateman argues that the capacity for competent participation in democracy is derived experientially, and the feasible opportunity to participate in public life is a necessary precondition to that end. Tocqueville himself regards that participation in local public affairs as a means of enabling individuals to become effective participants in a national polity: "Town meetings are to liberty what primary schools are to science; they bring within it the people's reach, they teach men how to use and enjoy it" (Tocqueville 1945:63).

Such a precondition—together with other preconditions for the competent citizens—is at the forefront of the discourse on democracy

education by Amy Gutmann, whose various writings address the relationship between political education and public deliberation (1987; 1988). Gutmann views education as a means to equip citizens with the capabilities to deliberate on what constitutes a good society. In her book, *Democratic Education*, she presents two core principles, which she argues need to be placed on political and parental authority over education, namely "non-repression", and "non-discrimination"

"The principle of non-repression prevents the state, and any group within it, from using education to restrict rational deliberation of competing conceptions of the good life and the good society...Non-discrimination extends the logic of non-repression, since states and families can be selectively repressive by excluding entire groups of children from schooling or by denying them an education conducive to deliberation among conceptions of the good life and the good society...The effect of discrimination is often to repress, at least temporarily, the capacity and even the desire of these groups to participate in the processes that structure choice among good lives. Non-discrimination can thus be viewed as distributional complement to non-repression...No educable child may be excluded from an education adequate to participating in the political processes that structure choice among good lives" (Gutmann 1987:44-45).

Thus, for Gutmann, political education in the modern age necessitates state patronage, because in no other way can minimal guarantees be provided for universal democratic access to such an education. Furthermore, based on two-above mentioned principles, one can see that Gutmann is committed to the idea of a welfare state that is aimed at securing what she characterizes as a fundamental pre-condition for

enabling citizens to engage in democratic deliberation, namely democratic education. While the perspective does not dispute the fundamental contradictions of the welfare state, she maintains that the liberal tradition that characterizes such institutional forms as the outcome of a progressive movement toward democratic citizenship.

Gutmann argues that the highest aim of democratic education is to enable citizens to become competent interlocutors in democratic deliberation and decision making about what constitutes a good life. For her, the core value of democracy is “conscious social reproduction”, and the principal aim of education is political: to cultivate in children “the virtues, knowledge and skills necessary for political participation” in a democracy. While it may seem idealistic for one to think that such a burden can realistically be placed on state, it is difficult to imagine that citizens can develop such capacities. To that end, the educational process must impart to the young the core liberal virtues of autonomy, rational deliberation, or critical thinking, and tolerance for differing ways of life (Gutmann 1987:287, 290, 30).

Therefore, formal education, I would argue, should take a conscious role in transmitting, through instruction and example, the values and norms that underlie and sustain democracy. These include norms of tolerance, mutual respect, and free rational inquiry. When it comes to education, democratic states should not hesitate to promote these particular values and to oppose contradictory ones.

Democratic education, as implied in the discussion above, is basically equivalent to, if not almost identical with, “democracy education”. The principal aim of this kind of education is to prepare the young for active participation in a democratic society. Democratic citizenship is undeniably an important aspect of democracy

education. Therefore, in some other countries, particularly England, the name used to describe a kind of “democracy education” is “citizenship education”. Like democracy education, citizenship education is concerned with young people’s understanding of society and, in particular, with influencing what students learn and understand about the social world.

Citizenship education in England, however, has been characterized more by an emphasis on indirect transmission through school values, ethos and participation in school rituals than by direct delivery through subject teaching. Indeed, transmission has been weighted toward student exposure to good role models and sound habits rather than to direction through specified subject content. As David Kerr concludes, the intention of citizenship education in England has been to mould character and behavior rather than to develop civic awareness. As such, citizenship education in this country has been traditionally insular, largely devoid both of political concerns in contemporary society and of awareness of developments in other countries (Kerr 1999:204-5).

Even though democracy has long been established in many Western countries, democracy education or citizenship education, or later commonly called civic education has been gaining or regaining momentum only since the 1990. In the USA, for instance, public in general has become more aware of a great number rapid changes with far reaching consequences at both domestic and international levels. At the global level, increased interdependence in economic, political, cultural and communication systems have implication for citizenship education. Domestically, the increased public skepticism of politics, growing concern about a diminished civil society, and increased gap between the rich and the poor has brought public attention to education.

As a result, a number of programs for improving education have been introduced. As a part of an effort called “Goals 2000”, the American Congress funded the development of voluntary national standards in 10 curriculum areas; the standards in history, geography, and civics and government have particular relevance to civic education. Finally, in recent years, there have been appeals for greater attention to specifically to civic education. The American Political Science Association formed a task force on civic education, and a series of White House conferences culminated in recommendation to improve civic education in the United States (Hahn 1999:584-5).

At the global level, during the 1990’s there appears to have been a rapidly growing interest throughout the world in the development and implementation of educational programs in schools that are designed to help young people become competent and responsible citizens in democratic political systems. This interest has been mostly directly focused on civic education programs at the pre-collegiate level, although attention is increasingly being focused on students in colleges and universities and in some places in community and adult education, as the case in Indonesia mentioned below.

Given the fall of communist governments, the interest in educational programs supporting emerging democracies is not surprising. But attention to civic education or democracy education—both terms are used—has not been limited to post-communist or post-authoritarian states and other countries with a short history of democracy. It is apparent that there is widespread recognition in the established democracies as well that democracy requires more than the enactment of democratic legal framework and the establishment of democratic institutions. In order for democracy to work better, it must have strong roots on the minds and hearts of its citizens; democracy needs a

democratic political culture that supports it. And this can be possible through civic education or democracy education.

Trends in Civic Education

All these tendencies have led to the emergence of global networks and cooperation in the field of civic education. Having observed civic education programs in a number of countries, John Patrick (1997; cf. Quigley 2000:1-4) has identified nine trends in civic education for democracy:

Trend 1: Conceptualization of civic education in terms of three interrelated components. Many educators throughout the world focus their programs upon the development of civic knowledge, civic skills, and civic virtues. Civic knowledge consists of fundamental ideas and information that learners must know and use to become effective and responsible citizens of democracy. Civic skills include the intellectual skills needed to understand, explain, compare, and evaluate principles and practices of government and citizenship. They also include participatory skills that enable students to monitor and influence public policies. Civic virtues include the traits of character, dispositions, and commitment necessary for the preservation and improvement of democratic governance and citizenship. Examples of civic virtues are respect for the worth and dignity of each person, civility, integrity, self-discipline, tolerance, compassion, and patriotism. Commitments include a dedication to human rights, the common good, equality, and a rule of law.

Trend 2: Systematic teaching of fundamental ideas or core concepts. Civic educators are systematically teaching concepts of democratic governance and citizenship such as popular sovereignty, individual rights, the common good, authority, justice, freedom,

constitutionalism and rule of law, and representative democracy.

Trend 3: Analysis of case studies. Teachers are requiring students to apply core concepts or principles to the analysis of case studies. The use of case studies brings the drama and vitality of authentic civic life into the classroom and requires the practical application of fundamental ideas or concepts to make sense of the data of civic reality.

Trend 4: Development of decision-making skills. Teachers use case studies of political and legal issues to help students develop decision-making skills. Students are taught to identify issues, to examine the alternative choices and the likely consequences of each choice, and to defend one choice as better than the other.

Trend 5: Comparative and international analysis of government and citizenship. The global resurgence of constitutional democracy has aroused interest in the comparative method of teaching and learning about government and citizenship. Teachers are requiring students to compare institutions of constitutional democracy in their own country with institutions in other democracies of the contemporary world. The expectation is that this kind of comparative analysis will deepen students' understanding of their own democratic institutions while expanding their knowledge of democratic principles. Further, this kind of comparative analysis is likely to diminish ethnocentrism, as students learn the various ways that principles of democracy can be practiced.

Trend 6: Development of participatory skills and civic virtues through cooperative learning activities. Teachers are emphasizing cooperative learning in small groups, which requires students to work together to achieve a common objective. Through this kind of cooperative learning activity, students develop various participatory skills and the civic virtues

associated with them. Learners involved regularly in cooperative learning situations tend to develop such skills as leadership, conflict resolution, compromise, negotiation, constructive criticism, toleration, civility and trust.

Trend 7: The use of literature to teach civic virtues. Civic educators have recognized that the study of literature, both fictional and historical, exposes students to interesting peoples who exemplify civic virtues in dramatic situations. The characters in these stories, therefore, may become role models for students. At the very least, they are positive examples of particular civic virtues that can help student understand the meaning and importance of morality in civic life.

Trend 8: Active learning of civic knowledge, skills, and virtues. Civic educators are involving students actively in their acquisition of knowledge, skills, and virtues. Examples of active learning include systematic concept of learning, analysis of case studies, development of decision-making skills, cooperative learning tasks, and the interactive group discussions that are associated with teaching civic virtues through literary study. Intellectually active learning, in contrast to passive learning, appears to be associated with higher levels of achievement. Furthermore, it enables students to develop skills and processes needed for independent inquiry and civic decision making throughout a lifetime. These are capacities of citizenship needed to make a constitutional democracy work.

Trend 9: The conjoining of content and process in teaching and learning of civic knowledge, skills, and virtues. In their development of curriculum and classroom lessons, teachers are recognizing that civic virtues and skills, intellectual and participatory, are inseparable from a body of civic knowledge or

content. They assume that if learners would think critically and act actively and virtuously in response to a public issue, they must understand the terms of the issue, its origins, the alternative responses to it, and the likely consequences of these responses. This understanding is based on their knowledge, and the application of this knowledge to explain, evaluate, and resolve a public issue depends on the cognitive process skills of the learners.

Basic content or subject matter and fundamental cognitive processes or operations are interrelated factors of teaching and learning. To elevate one over the other—content over process or vice versa—is a pedagogical flaw that interferes with effective civic education. Both academic content and process—civic knowledge, virtues, and skills—must be taught and learned in tandem to fulfill the mission of civic education, which is the development of individuals with the capacity to establish, maintain, and improve democratic governance and citizenship in their country and throughout the world.

In the context of multicultural education discussed below, the proponents of civic education in America seem to have certain negative views. An example of them is Albert Shanker (1996). He argues that a challenge of education for democracy programs or, more precisely civic education, is posed by “multicultural education” that is based on “multiculturalism”. In his opinion, as practiced by some, multiculturalism takes the shape of something approximating a new ideology of separatism. “It challenges the idea of common identity and reject the possibility of common set of values. The groups espousing multiculturalism claim ‘group rights’ which would conflict with the notion of living in a nation based on a firm core of commonly held values” (Shanker 1996:2).

Civic Education in Indonesia

Civic education is not new in Indonesia. Deeply concerned with the unity of the nation after it was declared independent on August 17, 1945, the Indonesian Ministry of Education in 1962 introduced “Civics”, or also called “*Kewarganegaraan*”, “citizenship” [education] as a subject matter in the curricula of Senior High Schools (*Sekolah Menengah Atas/SMA*). The content of the subject consisted of topics related to Indonesian history, geography, economics and politics, speeches of President Soekarno, universal declaration of human rights, and United Nations (Somantri 1969). It is important to note that although the very terms “civics” was not used in earlier curricula of 1946 and 1957, there were such subject matters as *Tatanegara* (“state system”) and *Tatahukum* (“legal system”) that are now also included in democracy education, citizenship education, or civic education.

Later, in both curricula of 1968 and 1969 the terms “Civics” (translated as “*pengetahuan kewarganegaraan*”, knowledge on citizenship) and “*Pendidikan Kewarganegaran*” (citizenship education) were used interchangeably as names of subject matters. The content of these subject matters at all levels of education from elementary (SD/*Sekolah Dasar*) to junior and senior high schools (SMP/*Sekolah Menengah Pertama*, and SMA/*Sekolah Menengah Atas*) contained such topics as Indonesian history and geography, and the 1945 Indonesian national constitution, human rights, and social studies.

President Soeharto who rose to power in the late 1960s, after having introduced the so-called “*Demokrasi Pancasila*” (“Pancasila Democracy”), changed “*Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*” into “*Pendidikan Moral Pancasila*” (PMP/Pancasila Moral Education) in the curriculum of 1975. As one may expect the content of the PMP was

basically on various topics related to the national ideology of Pancasila that had been formulated in the *Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila* (P4/Guidance on the Internalization and Implementation of Pancasila). Based on the decree of Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat (MPR/Peoples' Consultative Assembly) II/MPR/1973, the PMP with that kind of content was no more than a political indoctrination to maintain the regime's political status quo. The introduction of Curriculum of 1984 even strengthened the PMP as a tool of political indoctrination of the regime (cf. Winataputra n.d).

Some changes, however, were again introduced by the Soeharto regime after the enactment of Law of National Education No. 2/1999. A new curriculum formulated in line with the Law; and the Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan (PPKn/Pancasila and Citizenship Education) as a subject matter was also introduced. This PPKn was made obligatory at all elementary and high schools. While at the university level, in addition to Pancasila course, there was another compulsory course named "Kewiraan", which was basically a course on various aspects of military doctrines. This "Kewiraan" course was another tool for the regime to justify the perpetuation of Indonesian military concept and practice of "*dwi-fungsi*", dual functions or roles as both military and social-political determinants of all aspects of the life of the country.

The fall of Soeharto regime in disgrace in the aftermath of Indonesian monetary, economic and political crises in May 1998, has brought rapid changes of far-reaching consequences in Indonesia. In the educational field, a new paradigm of national education, basically outline some concepts and guidelines of the reforms of national education, has been introduced in 1999. In line with the Indonesian transition to democracy, the content of PPKn has also been

adjusted; it is no longer expected as a tool for the indoctrination of the Pancasila. But, as Winataputra (n.d) argues, this subject matter remains insufficient as civic education, because much emphasis is still being put on the Pancasila. Again, although much is changing now in Indonesia, some signs indicate that much also be staying the same.

In contrast, at the university level some more drastic changes have been conducted. The *Kewiraan* course in most of universities has been dropped as a compulsory course; and at the same time the obligatory Pancasila course has been changed to the Pancasila Philosophy course by the Ministry of National Education. In a number of universities, a *Kewarganegaraan* course is also offered. In my observation, however, much of the things remain the same, particularly because of strong resistance from lecturers of Pancasila and *Kewiraan* courses who hold certificate from the National Defence Institute (Lemhanas/Lembaga Pertahanan Nasional) and feel to have the privilege to teach both courses. And, as one might expect, much of the content of the Pancasila Philosophy course remain the same.

Despite significant progress of civic education in Indonesia, there are still a lot of challenges that affect its acceleration of successful implementation. This tendency in Indonesia is similar to what Quigley (2000:6) finds in his observation on the practice of civic education in many countries. He concludes that the slow success of civic education is due to a number of factors as the followings; first, resistance from the older generation, including teachers/lecturers who continue to subscribe in beliefs and practices of authoritarian political cultures; second, slowness of institutional and pedagogical changes in schools; third, inadequateness of resources to carry out the civic education programs; fourth, resistance to democratic

teaching styles and empowerment of students; and fifth, low status of civic education program.

The Role of *Pesantren*

An important inroad of civic education in Indonesia was made by the State Institute for Islamic Studies (IAIN/Institut Agama Islam Negeri) Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta. Abolishing both the “*Kewiraan*” and Pancasila courses from its curriculum, the IAIN Jakarta in 1999 introduced “*Pendidikan Kewargaan*” (civic education). The use of term “*kewargaan*”, instead of “*kewarganegaraan*” indicates a special emphasis on civil society and civic culture than citizenship.

After one year of implementation as a pilot project at IAIN (now UIN/Universitas Islam Negeri, or State Islamic University) Jakarta, funded by the Asia Foundation, now the civic education course has been implemented in practically all Islamic higher educational institutions in Indonesia (Azra 2001). At the same time, a number of short training on civic education for student leaders, *pesantren* teachers, and Muslim preachers have also been conducted. In addition two text-books on civic education have been produced (2000; 2003).

The role of State Islamic Higher Educational Institutions (Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam/PTAIN) such as UIN/IAIN/STAIN and private Islamic Higher Educational Institutions (Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam Swasta/PTAIS) in the entrenchment of civic education in Indonesia is very important. It is true that the role of general schools and higher educational institution under the Ministry of Education and Culture is equally important. But because of Indonesia is a majority-Muslim country, then the Islamic educational institutions play an even greater role to strengthen civic education that is crucial for further consolidation of democracy. This will

will in turn sustain the compatibility of Islam and democracy.

Within those contexts, it is very important to also strengthen civic education in the *pesantrens*. It has long been known that the *pesantren* has a long tradition in the formation of the tradition of Indonesian *wasatiyyah* Islam, middle path or justly-balanced Islam. This distinctive kind of Indonesian Islam has the strong nature of inclusiveness, accommodation, tolerance and peaceful co-existence. Furthermore, Indonesian *wasatiyyah* Islam has been perpetuated in the *pesantren* through *santri* ethics such as hard-work, solidarity, togetherness but self-help.

The position of *pesantren* in the dynamic of Indonesian Islam is very crucial because its three kinds of roles: first, the transmission of Islamic knowledge; second, the maintenance of Indonesian Islamic tradition or more precisely, Indonesian Islamic orthodoxy (Ash’ariyah theology, Shafi’i school of *fiqh*), and Ghazalian Sufism); and third, reproduction of ‘*ulama*’.

With this kind of Indonesian Islamic orthodoxy, the *pesantrens* through the *kiyais* and *santris* became beacon and guardian of *wasathiyyah* Islam from infiltration of radical interpretation of Islam coming from other part of the Muslim world. Therefore, civic education is very important in the *pesantrens* for this will strengthen them to confront transnational ideas and movements that reject democracy.

The *pesantren* has long been independent vis-a-vis state. As a rule, practically all *pesantrens* were built by Muslim communities. But at the same time, *pesantren* is an indigenous institution. With the same token, the *pesantrens* is a good case of the amalgamation of Islam and local institution. And civic education in the *pesantrens* will also strengthen the merging of Islamicity and Indonesian-ness.

Conclusion

Following the fall of the New Order regime, Indonesia faced a new Era on the civic issues. Pancasila Education, that played a very important role in educating Indonesian citizen about their rights and responsibilities, was challenged and no longer appreciated. This was mainly because Pancasila Education was identified as part of the New Order's policies. Realizing the importance of its people's understanding of their rights and responsibilities as citizens, Indonesian government has made civic education as one of the compulsory subjects in every level of schools.

While it was just recently introduced in Indonesian education, civic education is not a new subject. *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan* (Indonesian term for civic education) had been introduced at the early development of Indonesian education. After *Reformasi* (*Reform*), civic education was introduced with different names, such as *Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan*, *Pendidikan Kewargaan*, and *Kewiraan*.

UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta had played an important role in bringing civic education into Indonesian Islamic education institutions. A number of *Pesantren* and *PTKIN* are among Islamic education institutions that enjoyed the presence of the 'new civic education'. The result of this effort was the increase of civic awareness among young Muslims in Islamic education institutions.

As a muslim majority country, the role of Islamic educations, including *pesantren* in the development of civic education is certainly important. *Pesantren* holds very strategic roles in strengthening democracy and protecting muslims from the infiltration of radical interpretation of Islamic teaching. Therefore, the development of civic education should take

deeper and broader roots to all Islamic education institutions. Nonetheless, there remains a lot to be done in order to continually improve civic education as a subject matter. It is necessary to further develop a model of civic education for *pesantren* due to its significant influence on establishing Indonesian democracy integrated to the Islamic and Indonesian values.

References

- Azra, A. (2001). *Pendidikan Kewargaan untuk Demokrasi di Indonesia. paper presented at Seminar Nasional, 1, on Pendidikan Kewargaan (Civic Education) in Perguruan Tinggi*. Puslit & ICCE IAIN Jakarta. 28-29 May, 2001.
- _____. (2002a). *Paradigma Baru Pendidikan Nasional: Rekonstruksi dan Demokratisasi*. Jakarta: Penerbit Buku Kompas.
- _____. (2002b). *Pendidikan Demokrasi dan Demokratisasi di Dunia Muslim. paper presented at Seminar Nasional, 2, on Civic Education in Perguruan Tinggi*, Jakarta: Indonesian Center for Civic Education (ICCE). Jakarta. 22-23 April, 2002.
- Beitz, C. R. (1989). *Political Equality: An Essay in Democratic Theory*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Branson, M. (1999). *Globalization and Its Implications for Civic Education*, Calabasas. CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Branson, M. (1998). *The Role of Civic Education: A Position Paper*. Calabasas. CA: Center for Civic Education.
- Burhanudin, Jajat et al. (2009). *Civic Values in Indonesia: Pengalaman Pemberdayaan Pesantren*, Jakarta: PPIM.
- Center for Civic Education (CCE). (1999). *Civic Education: Recent History. Current Status and the Future*. Calabasas. CA: CCE.

- Center for Civic Education (CCE). (1995). *The Role of Civic Education: A Report of the Task Force on Civic Education*. Calabasas, CA: CCE.
- Gutmann, A. (1988). Distributing Public Education in a Democracy. in Amy Gutmann (ed.). *Democracy and the Welfare State*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Gutmann, A. (1987). *Democratic Education*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Hahn, Carole L. (1999). Challenges to Civic Education in the United States. in Judith Torney-Purta, John Schwille & Jo-Ann Amadeo (eds.). *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Herengracht, the Netherlands: IEA.
- Hahn, C. L. (1998). *Becoming Political: Comparative Perspective on Citizenship Education*. Albany: SUNY Press.
- Kerr, D. (1999). Re-Examining Citizenship Education in England. in Judith Torney-Purta, John Schwille & Jo-Ann Amadeo (eds.). *Civic Education across Countries: Twenty-four National Case Studies from the IEA Civic Education Project*. Herengracht, the Netherlands: IEA.
- Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and Democratic Theory*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Patrick, J. (1997). Global Trends in Civic Education for Democracy. *ERIC Digest*. ERIC Clearinghouse for Social Studies/Social Science Education. ED410176. January. 1997.
- Quigley, C. N. (2000). Global Trends in Civic Education. paper presented at the Seminar for the Needs for New Indonesian Civic Education. Center for Civic Education (CICED). Bandung, March 29, 2000.
- Shaker, Albert. (1996). The Importance of Civic Education. *Issues of Democracy*. July 1996.
- Somantri, N. (1973). *Metode Pengajaran Civics*. Bandung: IKIP Bandung.
- _____. (1969). *Pelajaran Kewarganegaraan di Sekolah*. Bandung: IKIP Bandung.
- De Tocqueville, A. (1945). *Democracy in America, I*. edd & trans. H. Reeve & F. Bowen. New York: Random House.
- Winataputra, U. S. (2000). *Apa dan Bagaimana Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan: Menuju Suatu Paradigma Baru*. Jakarta: FKIP-UT.
- _____, n.d., *Perkembangan Pendidikan Kewarganegaraan sebagai Program Kurikuler di Sekolah*. unpublished paper.
- _____. (1999). *Civic Education Classroom as a Laboratory for Democracy*. Bandung: CICED.