

# “Gotong-Royong” (Mutual Assistance of Indonesia) According to Soekarno in Max Scheler’s Axiology Perspective

Agustinus Wisnu Dewantara  
STKIP Widya Yuwana Madiun – Indonesia

## Abstract

“Gotong-Royong” (mutual assistance of Indonesia) According to Sukarno in Max Scheler’s Axiology Perspective aims to find analytically the objective meaning of the principle of gotong-royong in the perspective of axiology. Axiology selected as an object to be formal because this research focused on “gotong-royong” as a typical value of Indonesia. This theme is expected to contribute to the life of the Indonesian people today who seem to live in a crisis of mutual cooperation in various fields. Sukarno summarizes Pancasila in a single value, namely the “gotong-royong” or he describes as Ekasila. The essence of Pancasila finds a great challenge today.

The research in this dissertation is a qualitative study philosophy. The research model used a qualitative research by conducting a literature study. Hermeneutics is then used to search for meaning in this study. Methodical elements used in this study are: *verstehen*, historical analysis, analytic language, and heuristics. Sukarno’s speech will be studied by following the hermeneutics of Dilthey. The results of the analysis of Dilthey then will be the material that will be discussed from the standpoint of axiological objectivism of Max Scheler.

The meaning of “gotong-royong” of Soekarno found in this research is to work together, help each other, shoulder to shoulder, cooperation, deliberation, and mutual respect as a nation. The “gotong-royong” was not the result of subjective feelings of Sukarno. The value of gotong-royong is exist without speech of Soekarno, and attached to Indonesian. Pancasila is not created by Sukarno or the founding fathers. Sukarno, in the language of Scheler, precisely found the values of Pancasila and gotong-royong that has lived a long time in the Earth Indonesia. Gotong-royong as a value, in this line of thought Scheler fixed and objective. The practice of gotong-royong appears in the shared ethos..

**Keywords:** “gotong-royong” (mutual assistance of Indonesia), axiology, objectivism

## I. RESEARCH BACKGROUND

Republic of Indonesia has the founders that gave very brilliant mind. The founders of Indonesia exchanged their ideas to search of a solid foundation for the founding of this nation at the time preparing for independence. Soekarno is one of the figures whose ideas are used as the foundation of the state. Sukarno had proposed Pancasila as the foundation of state [28]. Soekarno even summarizes Pancasila in a single value: “gotong-royong” or he describes as Ekasila.

The practice and the principle of gotong-royong is not only by the Indonesian. Korea also has a collectivist practices named *Semaul Undong*. The practice of cooperation and gotong-royong thus belong to other nations as well. The interesting thing is Soekarno turned out to make gotong-royong as the typical practice of Indonesia as a summary of Pancasila. It affirms that there are unique in the gotong-royong, and only Sukarno, who explicitly praised the “how great was the state gotong-royong” [42]. The practice of gotong-royong has been around since the year 400 AD. Suwarno [56] notes that in the King Mulawarman of the Kingdom of Kutai ordered the people to cooperate in the form of festivity. Bintarto [8] in his writing that the term “gotong-royong” first appears in the writings of the customary law and also in various essays on the social aspects of agriculture. Notonagoro [27] says that mutual help is the charity of all for the benefit of all, or the efforts of all to happiness together.

Soekarno proclaimed state of gotong-royong in a speech June 1, 1945. Soekarno want to offer a basic state accommodate all elements of the nation in the frame together. Sukarno’s speech when summarizing Pancasila became Ekasila that contains the value of gotong-royong on the one hand, it is of political nuance. Gotong-royong as a summary of Pancasila on the other hand is also a value. Pancasila itself also contains a string value, namely: divinity, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice. A political speech that is apparently still have axiological dimension. The question then is relevant to ask now is: how the reality of that value today? If

in the past in various places (particularly in rural areas) of gotong-royong, so be upheld, whether it is still the case today? Are globalization and individualism which intensified today helped erode the principle of gotong-royong and as the impact participated also undermines nationalism Indonesia as a nation?

All of the above encourage researchers to observe whether the values of gotong-royong previously echoed by Sukarno could objectively found in perspective Max Scheler's theory of value and resilient to face the challenges of this era in the frame of Indonesia. As a typical value of Indonesia, gotong-royong necessary and feasible investigated axiological. Max Scheler approach is required to observe in terms of the objective of the principle of gotong-royong. Various phenomena of deterioration and challenges in the blossom of gotong-royong would have got a new meaning when it was found that the principle of gotong-royong does exist objectively in the middle of the Indonesian people, especially studies that specifically examined the principle of gotong-royong from the point of view of Max Scheler has so far not found.

## **II. RESEARCH OBJECTIVE**

This study aims to explore the idea of starting the founding of this nation, especially Soekarno idea of the value of mutual cooperation in terms of the theory of the value of Max Scheler. The purpose of research will be outlined schematically in the following points:

- a. This research seeks to discover the meaning of gotong-royong according to Sukarno.
- b. This research seeks to find analytically the objective meaning of gotong-royong of Soekarno in the perspective of Max Scheler axiology.

## **III. LITERATURE REVIEW**

Soekarno proposed Pancasila as *Philosophische Grondslag* (basic, philosophical, or soul) of Indonesia's independence. Soekarno proposed to summarize the five basic into Trisila, namely: socio-nationalism (summary of nationality and humanity), socio-democratic (summary of social justice and democracy), and Deity [30]. Not stopping there, Soekarno summarize Trisila again into the Ekasila (gotong-royong). Suwarno [56] argues that the five principles derived from the principle embodied in Indonesia typical values, namely "gotong-royong." Suwarno [56] says that this formulation want to avoid those who do not agree with Pancasila, so Sukarno felt the need to offer an alternative, namely Trisila and Ekasila. Sukarno himself at the end of his speech stressed again to receive Pancasila.

"Gotong-royong" is the potential value on the Earth Indonesia [10]. Value of cooperativeness there, drawn by the call and human nature Indonesia is wrapped by the same historical experience. "Gotong-royong" is a balance between the needs/interests of individuals in relation to the needs of communities that occur on a reciprocal basis [10]. Why is that? Because man (especially Indonesian) experience fullness in relationship with society. It thus admirably reflected through the mechanism of deliberation to reach consensus in addressing each issue so that no collision between individuals [25].

Agreement on value of gotong-royong itself was actually already looked when BPUPKI convened to discuss the Constitution. This agreement is raised by the Chairman. The same was said by Hatta when it responded to the speech of Sukarno and Radjiman. Constitution which is a derivative product of the declaration of independence and the basic state itself had agreed to stated the sake of gotong-royong, scrape out the idea of individualism. Although later emerged the debate stating whether Ekasila is really squeezed, compromise, or simply a symbol of Soekarno [3], but the fact can not be denied is agreement that the principle of gotong-royong is a hallmark of Indonesian, Supomo, Hatta and Yamin even say the same thing [42].

Gotong-royong is not unfamiliar to the people of Indonesia. Koentjaraningrat [22] says that the actual word "gotong-royong" was not found in the ancient Javanese literature, inscriptions past, and historical cultures of other ethnic groups in Indonesia. Further, Koentjaraningrat [22] explains that although the terms of gotong-royong is a relatively new term, but the actual essence of the concept of gotong-royong has been rooted for a long time in the life of rural communities in Indonesia, especially in rural Java. Since hundreds of years ago in rural communities in Java to know the various terms that refer to this principle of gotong-royong. The word "gotong royong" primarily became known during the Japanese occupation, when the Investigating Committee Efforts Preparation of Indonesian Independence (BPUPKI) first using the term [22].

Koentjaraningrat [22] defines the gotong-royong as a human exertion without pay for a project or a job that is beneficial to the public or that is useful for development. Gotong-royong found in many communities that are rooted in the traditions of rural agriculture or agriculture. Farming tradition need to work together since the start sowing seeds, plant, care, until harvest. Gotong-royong becomes a way of life in an agrarian society in the form of community, or in terms of Tonnies called the *gemeinschaft* [53].

Bintarto [8] says that gotong-royong is a concrete social behavior. The principle in terms of Scott referred to as the moral principle of reciprocity between individuals that are not based on money and materials, but in the hope to find help behind at the moment they need it later [41]. This principle according to Scott based on a simple idea, that everyone should help those who've helped him [41]. Further Scott [41] argues that the moral principle of reciprocity in the rural community of Java is called the "gotong-royong".

The word "gotong-royong" nuanced Javanese culture, but the practice of that also founded in various places in Indonesia. Aceh recognize the value of mutual cooperation embodied in the tradition of "khanduri," namely the ritual is done collectively to seek blessings, safety, and thank God [31]. The people of Bali do "gotong-royong" activities in various religious ceremonies and Subak [8]. Bintarto [8] also said that there is also a tradition of "gotong-royong" in the Dayak people in Kalimantan when they open fields. "Gotong-royong" can also be found in the local tradition Bugis in South Sulawesi in a social institution called minawang [4]. Various practices (with different names) in various layers give a certain characteristic in Indonesian society. Indonesia was inspired by the community cooperativeness value.

#### **IV. THEORETICAL BASIS**

The theory of the value of Max Scheler be formal object of this study. Max Scheler using the phenomenological approach towards axiology and values in general, so that makes it resistant to criticism of the relativist and subjectivist. Values and emotions (which he says is very subjective) have actual objective reference. Max Scheler then shift the view Kant into an axiological objectivism that is based on facts that can be observed phenomenological.

Scheler argued that the value of a quality that does not depend on the carrier. The quality of a value will not change if the carrier is changed, and also not damaged when the carrier is destroyed. The value of beauty is not drawn from a beautiful view, because the value of beauty is already there before the existence of the scenery. In addition to not depend on the object that is visible (eg sculpture, painting, etc.), the value does not depend on the subject judge. Scheler argued that the value of a quality that is not dependent upon any cases, do not change with the change of goods, not relative, and absolute. Objectivism axiological Scheler thus very nuanced absolutist. Scheler also rejected the view of the subjectivists which found the existence of the value depends on psychological factors. Values are also not dependent on age. Values did not depend on

humans who are living them. Indeed, the world is constantly changing and the history of the world continued to roll, but for Scheler a value does not change according to the changing times.

The research model that used in exploring this theme is a qualitative study philosophy. The data specifically collected through literature sources. The data obtained through these sources then searched its meaning. Hermeneutics at this point plays a major role to search for the meaning behind the various reference data. Sukarno's speech will be studied by following the flow of hermeneutics of Dilthey.

#### **V. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

##### ***A. Axiological Objectivism of Max Scheler***

Axiology is the branch of philosophy that specifically talked about values. Axiology, as a science and become a branch of philosophy, has emerged in the 19th century [6]. Axiology thus a new science, although it actually talks about the value has been discussed since ancient Greece, such as Plato and Aristotle Questioning what is goodness, virtue, justice, and so forth.

The theory of objectivism in axiology emerged as a reaction against the relativism of values promoted by the subjectivism. Objectivist found that value can not be hung on the subject only, because if so definitely will not be found criteria of morality stable and sturdy. Man in the mindset of subjectivism would have acted arbitrarily and at will because they do not have a definite basis of morality. Max Scheler pioneered axiological objectivism view to finding a solid foundation for the theory of value and ethics objectively.

Phenomenology for Max Scheler is the most appropriate way of doing philosophy to talk about human life, because the phenomenological experience is the experience of the most pure and direct. Philosophy which is based on phenomenology has a goal to be in direct contact with reality and the world. Phenomenology arrange themselves to capture the essence of which can be captured directly through intuition sebagai something that is a priori. Phenomenology also acknowledged the understanding a priori which says that the knowledge of the true essence precedes sensory experience and not rely on sensory experience. Principles of fundamental phenomenology of Husserl is then later used Max Scheler to explain that the value of the a priori, absolute, independent of the human experience, and detailed hierarchically.

### **B. Values according to Max Scheler**

Max Scheler said that the value is a reality that is hidden behind the facts and realities of the other [37]. Other realities, according to Scheler, are the carrier of values, as a body could be a carrier of the amount of red, beautiful, and other values. There is a relationship between the value and the carrier. Value must be sought behind the other realities that are constantly changing, however, a variety of value there is not a human creation.

Max Scheler argues that the value really is a reality that actually exists, and not just "presumed to exist." There is a very rich world of values hidden behind this visible world. Values are a priori quality that is not dependent on the carrier. Values thus not changed, still, and not relative. Scheler rejects all the arguments for the value relativism. Value does not depend on an understanding of the subject, even where the value does not depend at all on the human ability to feel and catch it. Scheler also rejected the historical relativism which says that the value depends on the history and development of the times.

Human do not create value, but rather find a value that already exist objectively. Human also are not passive recipients of reality to manifest themselves. Values have been provided to the feeling intentional, meaning that the value of acts can be captured by the human mind. Scheler argued that the value of human experience is not with his intellect, but rather uses his feelings. Humans relate to various values by relying on the sensitivity of heart when the experience and bring in that value. The human heart can understand a lot of value on many levels, because in the human heart there is a "*wertapriori*" (arrangement catcher value) in accordance with the objective hierarchy of values [37]. Scheler [37] has argued that the man had a heart operation in an analog manner similar to the logic of the mind.

Human grow in the act, and make real human values in action. Human do not have the theoretical knowledge about the value and then realize them in action, because it is from experience when a value will increasingly displays that value. Value is the object of the action feel intentional. Humans who do not have the feeling intentional will not have the experience would be of value. A human group could uphold a values / value groups. Values upheld this joint could serve as guidelines for the behavior of the human groups. This is called the ethos. Max Scheler thus understands the ethos as unitary values of the most prominent and upheld by a particular group in behavior. Ethos the Prussians proposed Scheler as an example of a nation (group of people) who have a particular ethos [37]. The role models play a major role in the development of the

ethos. A saint has prompted many to believes, a fair and encourages others to imitate his justice.

Scheler argued that the value is a non-formal qualities that have a hierarchy. Scheler argued that the existing values are not the same lofty and high. There is a higher value, and there is also a lower value than the other. Scheler found levels of value from lowest to highest based on various criteria above: enjoyment value, the value of vital / life, the value of spiritual / psychological, and sanctity / holiness.

Scheler circuit hierarchy of values above can not be inferred empirically. High or low a value based on a priori essence, but man can decide only in the context of acts of specialization ( "preferring"). Action interested in this value is a priori specialization. When a person chooses a lower value there was the humiliation of specialization. So it can not be said that a higher value is always more desirable. Hierarchy of values is thus always is fixed and does not depend on who is preferred. This preference is based actions by intuitive activity.

### **C. "Gotong-royong" According to Soekarno**

Analysis of the text for a speech in front of BPUPKI Assembly on June 1, 1945 shows that Sukarno addressed using coherent logic. Soekarno at the start of his speech trying to convince listeners that independence should be achieved now. Soekarno then pointed out that in terms of now of independence is not the same as rapidly, because the basis of an independent country to be thoughtful and explored for a long time. Soekarno at the end of his speech outlined the basic state since a long time.

Context analysis showed that Soekarno addressed the Assembly in order to find the basis for Indonesia's independence. The ambiance of war and the desire for independence becomes a frame of BPUPKI. The trial itself was marred by various thoughts in search of a solid basis for the establishment of the Indonesian state. The context of the debate between Islam and the Nationalists also became a frame of speech Sukarno. Darmaputera [9] at this point to conclude that Indonesia's independence 'is not an Islamic state and not a secular State,' but the state Pancasila.

Semantic analysis shows that mutual cooperation can be interpreted as: work together, help each other, and shoulder to shoulder to achieve desirable results. Gotong-royong found from "*karyo*" and "*gawe*" with a very distinctive Indonesia. Gotong-royong covers cooperation, deliberation, and mutual respect. Gotong-royong for Sukarno became the essence and summary of Pancasila itself.

Symbolic analysis showed that Soekarno wear some symbolism to convey his ideas on Pancasila and Ekasila. Five, three, and one is the symbolism Soekarno to accommodate the growing aspirations of the time. Soekarno understand the tendency of Indonesian society that takes into account the number symbol. Ekasila (containing gotong-royong) on the one hand symbolizes, but it is actually a philosophical spark too. Gotong-royong is a symbol of the peculiarities of Indonesian society that emphasizes togetherness. Recognized diversity and unity as a nation respected in the nature of togetherness. The idea of togetherness, nationality, justice, and prosperity becomes dream of the people. Pancasila, imbued with the spirit of mutual cooperation, merge all social differences. Here lies the advantage of Pancasila as the ideal foundation for the life of the nation, even in a society.

Philosophical analysis showed that mutual help is a long life philosophy rooted in the cultures of Indonesia, and later proposed to be the basis of the state. Indonesian nation formerly was not thinking about a systematic philosophy for living together, but the philosophical values that have developed since the beginning of time later systematized by Sukarno, and then summarized into gotong-royong.

The meaning of "gotong-royong" is echoed by the Soekarno actually consistent with Sukarno's speeches put forward after that. Sukarno's speech on February 21, 1957 when it formed a *Cabinet of Gotong-Royong* underlined how proud Soekarno of Indonesia to the original value, because it reflected the soul of the nation of Indonesia. This is consistent with the analysis of symbolic against Sukarno's speech on June 1, 1945 which said that gotong-royong is a symbol of the peculiarities of Indonesian society that emphasizes togetherness.

#### ***D. Axiological Reflection of the Value of "Gotong-Royong"***

##### ***1) "Gotong-Royong" as Objective Values of Indonesia***

A nation has certain values as a trademark. Gotong-royong historically became indigenous Indonesian culture that has been practiced by the ancestors of the nation until now. This culture proved to be a huge contribution to the realization of a common goal. Value of mutual cooperation reflected in the nation's philosophy, Pancasila. Values of divinity embodied the spirit embodied in the mindset, attitude, and behavior of members of the community to look after each other humanitarian values, fair conduct, concerned with common interests rather than personal or group interests, and develop a culture of unity. Characteristic of the Indonesian nation lies in the gotong-royong. Gotong-royong led to Soekarno then summarize Pancasila became

Ekasila. Soekarno then proudly mentioned that Indonesia is a country of Mutual-Aid. Gotong-royong is thus interpreted as a very high value by the founders of this country, so it is also called as a summary of Pancasila itself.

Sukarno found that all peoples and cultures Indonesia upholds cooperativeness, and questions can be posed in terms of the theory of objectivism Scheler is: is it true that mutual cooperation does exist objectively on Indonesian soil and are also objectively exist in every human being Indonesia? Even if the principle of gotong-royong exists, then why today the value eventually fades? Is gotong-royong turned out to be subject to the age (as if in ancient times upheld so great and now the withdrawal for outdated)?

Value according to Scheler is objective and absolute, as well as of gotong-royong. Of gotong-royong, thus also from the world of values and does not depend on the subject (human Indonesia) I've even lost my idealism against the principle of gotong-royong itself. The existence value depends on psychological and psychophysical factors for Scheler also is a thing that does not make sense. Consequently, the existence of gotong-royong on Indonesian soil also is an objective reality that is totally dependent on the psychological aspect and the psychophysical humans Indonesia, even Soekarno though (although simultaneously it must be admitted that the Pancasila and gotong-royong is extracting genius of Soekarno).

Soekarno indeed put forward the concept of gotong-royong the country, but the reality of cooperativeness all the Indonesian people have been there before Sukarno spoke about the value of this. This is reflected in an analysis of the speech of Soekarno in the previous chapter. Scheler mindset in this regard, said the discovery of gotong-royong, not the result of psychological or psychophysical reaction Sukarno, nor the result of subjective feelings of Sukarno. Value cooperativeness existed even without Sukarno spoke about it, and attached to the Indonesian people. Scheler rejected the immanence of nature on the subject. Itself value thus does not depend on the subject. Scheler said that values are not a human creation, and the human task was to find the value. Scheler's argumentation leads to the understanding that Pancasila is not created by Sukarno and the founding fathers. Sukarno, in the language of Scheler, just found the values of Pancasila and gotong-royong that has lived a long time in the Indonesia. Soekarno just dug. Soekarno thus not a creator of gotong-royong when proclaimed State of Indonesia as a country of cooperation.

Scheler argued that the value is a quality that is not dependent on the carrier. The quality of a value

will not change if the carrier is changed, and also not damaged when the carrier is destroyed. Of gotong-royong, as a quality, is also not dependent on the carrier, which is all the Indonesian people. If now and someday in Indonesia earth humans are increasingly individual, it does not make the value of mutual help change quality. Gotong-royong remains valuable even if one day there is no man on earth Indonesia.

How Scheler theory can answer the question of cooperativeness crisis today? Even if the principle of gotong-royong exists, then why today as if this value is missing? Is gotong-royong turned out to be subject to the age (as if in ancient times these values upheld so great and now the withdrawal for outdated)? Scheler argued that the value of a quality that is not dependent upon any case, do not change with the change of goods, not something relative, absolute, and does not depend on age. The tendency nowadays eclipsed the value of mutual help (especially in big cities), but in the eyes of Scheler actually happened cooperativeness value remains the great, because greatness is not hung on the situation, the people, places and specific times.

Scheler said that the value is hidden behind another reality, because the value is there if there is a carry or carry it. How does this apply to the values of Pancasila and cooperativeness itself? The value of divinity, humanity, unity, democracy, and justice summarized to the principle of gotong-royong thus also hidden behind another reality. Indonesian was not able to find the value of mutual help himself. Gotong-royong is present when all citizens of the nation to work together to achieve justice, unity, respect humanity of another human being, consulted to achieve consensus, and realize their relationships with God and others. Pancasila and the principle of gotong-royong be worth if it all does not stop merely formulation and Sukarno's speech, but carried by all the Indonesian people in good life. Pancasila and the value of the gotong-royong is typical of Indonesia and is recognized as the fundamental values of the nation, although not always the same can be realized by various groups and at every stage of the nation's history. Max Scheler thought opens the widest possibilities for the implementation of gotong-royong in the future that may be totally different from the practice of past and present, because the most important is the principle of gotong-royong is absolute and upheld in every age.

Scheler argued that the values set by the hierarchy. Hierarchy of values is not made based on the will of man, but objectively exists between these values. Man is said to act properly when respect the hierarchy and choose a higher value. Soekarno say how great the state collectivist named Indonesia. This explanation led to the understanding that the people of Indonesia put gotong-royong as high weighted

values among many other values. Scheler puts sanctity / holiness as the highest value. Does the placement of gotong-royong by Soekarno such great to beat the value of chastity (or in Pancasila named as the value of the Godhead)? Soekarno in his speech said that the Deity of the Indonesia is the belief that imbued the original culture of Indonesia. Is the original Indonesian culture? That is gotong-royong. Gotong-royong in the hierarchy Scheler actually included in the value of life (vital value), because our close relationship to human life, but Soekarno put gotong-royong in a position at once vital and sacred as well as connecting with God as the Source of Value.

Scheler argued that humans understand the value of the heart. Openness of heart makes man capable of capturing value, until eventually people were able to experience and realize the value of it. Of gotong-royong, thereby captured and experienced by the Indonesian people with heart, that is to say: the nation has a long time ago (although with the mind that has not been honed and has not been educated to a high level) already appreciate the value of a joint effort with the depth of his heart. Sukarno was thus caught by the liver and then put coherently and logically in a speech. Education about the value of cooperativeness groove Scheler thought would be effective if it involves the heart rather than mere ratio.

Scheler argued that only human traits such as good and bad. The act is said to be good or bad because it is connected with man, and so it is with a group of nations being worth it or not because it constitutes a human being. Values are upheld together by a group could serve as guidelines for the behavior of the human groups. Scheler call it ethos. Ethos as a series of values that are embodied by a particular group can change from every age although values remain their own. Ethos demonstrates the ability of a group to take part in creating a world of infinite value was limited in that group. Scheler at a point of saying the need for a role model that is able to realize the values of the infinite in the finite life are assured. Gotong-royong turns out to be together with all the ethos of human Indonesia. This nation has long upheld the principle of gotong-royong and making behavioral guidelines together. Scheler argued that the history of the development of ethos is central to the history of the nation, Indonesia needs to constantly develop and deepen the ethos of gotong-royong in its history.

## 2) *Gotong-royong as Objective Nature of Indonesia*

Gotong-royong arises from the peculiarities of Indonesian society that promote togetherness and unity in nature is recognized diversity and unity as a nation respected. Soekarno at this point was about Questioning the quirk, idiosyncrasy, naturalness, or

what the nature of man and the Indonesian nation. Thinking style ala philosopher who wanted to give grounding in natura is very apparent, though not explicitly revealed in his speech. Soekarno thus want to find basic philosophical indisputable when ascribing human nature of Indonesia inherent in the spirit of cooperativeness. Sukarno's speech on the birth of Pancasila is obviously very philosophical as well grounded. Explanation from the concept of nature is the start something of his essence.

Soekarno find that the essence of human natura Indonesia is in the gotong-royong. Indonesian nature charge identical to gotong-royong made Sukarno's speech is worth a philosophical as well grounded as interesting to listen to. This is the intelligence Soekarno. Many leaders spoke of the gotong-royong, but in the hands Soekarno gotong-royong systematized as a summary of the values of Pancasila. Gotong-royong has the meanings carried Soekarno's prioritization of togetherness and the spirit of brotherhood among the plurality of race, religion, race, culture, creed, understand, and class. Mutual help contain the spirit of cooperation and work together to realize a better Indonesia for all citizens.

Terminology of nature in philosophy is very important, because it deals directly with the authenticity of the reality in question. Natural meaning, when presented in the context of the debate about men, it refers to the natural reality brought about by humans from birth, since it is, since the presence, not the result of artificial and not artificial, and not a mere temporal. Something that is natural thus have a fixed value, natural, universal, and radically touched a whole.

Questions are then eligible to ask is: what nature of human and Indonesian state? Hatta [18] says that nature Indonesia is on gotong-royong. Indonesian nature synonymous with the spirit of mutual cooperation, according to Hatta became nature Indonesian economy as well. Sukarno did not say explicitly that the kind of the Indonesian nation is the gotong-royong, but if Sukarno said that the essence of Pancasila is the gotong-royong itself, it is clear that Indonesia's human-kind is to live with other human beings. Indonesian man according to Soekarno must recognize the reality of other human beings, and for which there is the concept of cooperation.

There are some similarities when comparing what is proposed Soekarno with what was written by Aristotle. As Aristotle was about ascribing nature state in humans that require other humans with zoon expression politic, Sukarno also ascribing nature State of Indonesia independence on human natura Indonesia upholding cooperativeness. Indonesia

proposed state Soekarno must be a state of mutual help anyway. Ideal country as it would presuppose the cooperation of mutual interest. Gotong-royong state should pursue the common good, because it is not possible to achieve the common good in a spirit of anti collectivist very individualistic. Countries that want initiated Sukarno, in line with Aristotle, thus becoming the highest embodiment of human life to achieve the common good / common welfare / bonum commune. Nature of countries actually directed to the common good. All state enterprises should thus continue to promote the common good rather than personal welfare / class, and it was done by upholding the values of harmony through gotong-royong.

### 3) *Gotong-royong as Vital Values of Indonesia*

Scheler argued that there is a hierarchy in the overall value system. Hierarchy is the case objectively value between the various values. Gradation according to Scheler values ranging from the lowest are: pleasure, followed by vital values, on it there is a spiritual value, and the highest is the value of holiness. Gotong-royong is certainly not appropriate incorporated into the value of enjoyment. Gotong-royong in Scheler glasses also do not belong to the spiritual values, or even holiness. Gotong-royong in the hierarchy Scheler actually belong to the vital values, as concerned with human life. The placement of gotong-royong as a vital value in the value gradation occurs priori. How it is used to analyze the spark Soekarno that glorifies gotong-royong as the sum of Pancasila?

Gotong-royong as a value is a vital value that is lower than the spiritual value and sanctity. It is based on a priori essence, but man can decide only in the context of acts of specialization ("preferring"). Soekarno interested in the principle of gotong-royong at the top of the spiritual value and holiness. Soekarno at this point is precisely to say that as the vital values, mutual cooperation plays an important role in the life of humanity and society for the nation of Indonesia. Gotong-royong as a value turned out to be more interested in Indonesian society. This is evident in the long history of the nation which was later found by Soekarno. Gotong-royong and is therefore not an artificial subjective Sukarno when summarizing Pancasila into Ekasila.

Scheler puts sanctity / holiness as the supreme value in the hierarchy. Does the placement of gotong-royong by Soekarno such a great beat the value of holiness (or in Pancasila named as the value of the Godhead)? Sukarno when peal Ekasila actually puts a gotong-royong in a strategic position. Gotong-royong for Sukarno not only is the value of that vital together. Sukarno to say that the gotong-royong for the people of Indonesia and has a spiritual dimension

and holiness. This is reflected in the practice of the nation of Indonesia, which reveal the holiness and spiritual life in living with others peacefully. Soekarno connect gotong-royong at once with the God as a Source of Value. Soekarno thus puts the principle of gotong-royong as a value that has a high weight.

### ***E. Critical Analysis of Value of Gotong-royong***

The context of debate Sukarno's speech is evidently still life context state in Indonesia. The Indonesian people had been agreed not to make religion as the basis, but the tendency to play the religious issue was still just encountered. Narrow fanaticism often become a stumbling block to live together, to keep intact a sense of togetherness tolerance is becoming increasingly fragile. Latief said that this is the true moral of mutual help that. Pancasila and the morality of gotong-royong then have a axiological base [24].

The tendency to substitute the value of gotong-royong to individualism, consumerism and materialism is already keenly felt in major cities. It certainly can not be separated from the context of the age. Rapid and fundamental changes in the governance of adult life and relationships between nations have occurred as a consequence of globalization. Intensification of social relationships on a global scale makes all countries, including Indonesia, not only face a potential explosion of pluralism from within, but also the diversity of the external pressure.

Indonesian society is a plural society consisting of diverse ethnicities, religions, languages, cultures, customs, and so forth. The plurality on the one hand is actually a priceless wealth, but on the other hand could be a time bomb split horrible if each citizen does not understand the true meaning of national unity. Confirmed the identity politics of collective identity-based differences in ethnicity, language and religion experienced a tidal wave across the globe. The shift from authoritarian regimes to democracy brought good news in the restoration of freedom of expression and association in Indonesia, but he simultaneously contain the potential threat of the strengthening of fundamentalism in various ways, for example: fundamentalist of religion, ethnicity, and race (even accompanied by expressions of violence accompanying). Poespowardojo [30] at this point to say that the spirit of unity is fostered, today face the crisis and raised in symptoms of provincialism, sectarianism, and primordial.

Gotong-royong as a summary of Pancasila meets the challenge of intense today. Gotong-royong as the implementation of Indonesia's religion,

humane, upholds unity, promotes discussion, and justice, are now perceived worsening. The survey of Kompas results conducted last June 1, 2015 in commemoration of the birth of Pancasila demonstrate this. A total of 60.9% of respondents felt increasingly absence of economic justice. 33.3% of respondents feel the decline of the spirit to deliberation. 48.9% of respondents said that national unity is undermined by factional interests. 36.8% of respondents felt increasingly declining sense to tolerate. Decades of independence is still filled the separatist movement (even with frame religious), dissatisfaction with the area above the center, elitism, collusion-corruption-nepotism style reforms, autonomy and regional expansion that did not solve the problem, various brawl, amok period Tolikara, and a row issues. Is this the name "gotong-royong crisis"?

"The crisis of gotong-royong" certainly is not a crisis of values itself. Gotong-royong as a fixed value is meaningful and glorious, mutual help is a summary of the foundation of the state (Pancasila). Latief [24] even expressly says that mutual cooperation is not just a summary, but the basis of all the precepts of Pancasila. Gotong-royong remains a noble value. The impression that emerged today is: adage gotong-royong raised by the speech, when in fact the terminus of gotong-royong in Soekarno's speech appeared on the reality of Indonesian society which contemplated the Soekarno long ago and there is an objective basis. Gotong-royong in the flow of thought Scheler not belong Soekarno for subjective. Soekarno only systematized philosophy of the nation that is found in the reality of this nation's past, present, and future later, therefore this nation there is a large and long project to restore the original value (gotong-royong) in the life of the nation.

Sukarno Indonesia initiated the typical multicultural country with explores the concept of cooperation. As an objective concept, principle of gotong-royong should always be presented as an idealization. Gotong-royong is precisely what makes pluralism bloom prolifically. Mutual help also makes all the elements are there can feel equal and contribute something for Indonesia. So, it is not wrong if the concept of mutual cooperation is the basis for building a multicultural Indonesia. Why? Because terminus of mutual help itself, too, is a spark prioritization of multicultural spirit who appreciate the difference for the future progress are objective and are shared.

Scheler found that upheld values shared by a group could serve as guidelines for the group's behavior. This is called the ethos. Scheler later said the need for a role model that is able to realize and maintain this shared ethos. Such explanations will be necessary to understand the values and ethos of gotong-royong. Gotong-royong ethos is already

exists and must exist in the Indonesia? Role models who can be expected to maintain the continuity of gotong-royong, this? The behavior of the elite who shamelessly fight over power, compete for the seat, fighting for own aspiration, is actually making a model figure increasingly getting away for the blossoming of gotong-royong.

Manipulation of the value of gotong-royong actually surfaced using collectivist practices itself. Gotong-royong and is therefore often interpreted negatively, for example: corruption jointly, each covering up mistakes in certain agencies, to cooperate in crime or terrorism, a coalition to tackle the legitimate government, and so on. Various parties feel have worked together and did the culture of Indonesia, but in vices. Manipulation of the value of mutual cooperation arose because of the subjective meaning mischaracterized the principle of gotong-royong. This may indicate a failure of the Indonesian people to understand the value. It also indicates a failure to understand the objective world contextually.

## VI. CONCLUSION

First, Gotong-royong as a value, certainly deserves to be studied axiological. The crisis of gotong-royong today makes Axiology Max Scheler get a room also for studying it. Value according to Scheler is objective and absolute, as well as of gotong-royong. Gotong-royong, thus also from the world of values and does not depend on the subject, even Indonesia lost the idealism of gotong-royong itself.

Second, the Scheler mindset in this case say that the discovery of gotong-royong not the result of psychological or psychophysical reaction Sukarno, nor the result of subjective feelings of Sukarno. Scheler's argumentation leads to the understanding that Pancasila is not created by Sukarno and the founding fathers. Sukarno, in the language of Scheler, just found the values of Pancasila and gotong-royong that has lived a long time in the Indonesia. Soekarno just dug. Gotong-royong in the hierarchy Scheler actually included in the vital value, but Soekarno put it in a position at once vital and sacred as well as connecting with God as the Source of Value. Gotong-royong as a value is fixed and objective existence, but collectivist practices embodied in the collective ethos turns must always be fought.

Third, the study Axiological against the principle of gotong-royong for Indonesian nationalism contributed several new findings, namely: of gotong-royong, the foundation of how Indonesia live up to something that is considered valuable, and realized in various dimensions of life,

also in view of a typical Indonesian nationalism. Gotong-royong turned out to deserve to be the basis of Indonesian nationalism. Indonesian nationalism built on solidarity and not to be chauvinistic. This makes gotong-royong has dimensions of humanity that can actually be binding solidarity and unity among nations. Gotong-royong as a nation must also be extended to gotong-royong between nations. Gotong-royong should be attractive value of the Indonesian nation. Crisis of values makes this nation should be interested in the principle of gotong-royong through education cooperativeness. All of this will lead to pride as a nation that has a gotong-royong as primacy.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Abdillah, Baiquni, 2011, Gotong-Royong Cermin Budaya Bangsa dalam Arus Globalisasi, STMIK Amikom, Yogyakarta
- [2] Abdurrahman, Moeslim, 2007, Krisis Sosial, Krisis Politik, Krisis Bangsa Majemuk, Impulse, Yogyakarta
- [3] Adams, Cindy., 1966, Bung Karno Penyambung Lidah Rakyat Indonesia, Gunung Agung, Jakarta
- [4] Ahimsa, Heddy Shri. 2007. Patron Klien di Sulawesi Selatan: Sebuah Kajian Fungsional Struktural. Keppel Press, Yogyakarta
- [5] Aristotle, 1985, Nicomechean Ethics, translated by Terence Irwin., Cambridge
- [6] Bahm, Archie., 1962, What is Value: An Introduction to Axiology, Lasalle, Illinois
- [7] 1980, Axiology: The Science of Values, World Books, Albuquerque, New Mexico
- [8] Bintarto, R., 1980, Gotong Royong: Suatu Karakteristik Bangsa Indonesia, PT Bina Ilmu, Surabaya
- [9] Darmaputera, Eka., 1989, Pancasila: Identitas dan Integritas Bangsa Indonesia, Gunung Mulia, Jakarta
- [10] Darmodiharjo, Dardji., 1979, Pokok-Pokok Pembahasan Pancasila Dasar Filsafat Negara Republik Indonesia, Laboratorium Pancasila IKIP Malang-Usaha Nasional, Surabaya
- [11] Frondizi, Risieri 1963, What is Value, an Introduction to Axiology, (translated by Solomom Lipp) Lasalle, Illinois
- [12] Geertz, Clifford., 1965, The Social History of an Indonesian Town, MIT Press, Cambridge
- [13] Geertz, Hildreed., 1983, Keluarga Jawa, Grafiti Press, Jakarta
- [14] Hadiwardoyo, Purwa., 2013, "Nilai-Nilai Kemanusiaan dan Hikmat bagi Pendidikan" dalam Pidato Dies Natalis XXX, Sanata Dharma, Yogyakarta
- [15] Halliday, Fred, 2001, "Nationalism" dalam The Globalization of World Politics: An Introduction to International Relations, University Press, Oxford
- [16] Haryatmoko, 2010, Dominasi Penuh Muslihat Anti Kekerasan dan Diskriminasi, Gramedia, Jakarta
- [17] 2015, "Modalitas Pendidikan Nilai," dalam KOMPAS 30 September 2015
- [18] Hatta, Muhammad., 1958, "Lampau dan Datang" dalam Karya Lengkap Bung Hatta, 2000, LP3ES, Jakarta
- [19] Hutchinson, John dan Smith, Anthony D, 1994, "Nationalism" dalam Oxford Readers. University Press, Oxford
- [20] Kartodirjo, Sartono., 1977, Sejarah Nasional Indonesia III-IV, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Yogyakarta
- [21] Kellas, J. G., 1998, The Politics of Nationalism and Ethnicity, London: MacMillan Press
- [22] Koentjaraningrat., 1974, Kebudayaan Mentalitas dan Pembangunan, Gramedia, Jakarta

- [23] Kusuma, A.B., 1995, "Menelusuri Dokumen Historis Badan Penyelidik Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan," dalam Sejarah Lahirnya Pancasila, Yayasan Pembela Tanah Air, Jakarta
- [24] Latief, Yudi., 2012, Negara Paripurna, Gramedia, Jakarta
- [25] Magniz Suseno, Franz., 1991, Etika Jawa, Gramedia, Jakarta
- [26] Notonagoro, 1962, Pancasila Dasar Filsafat Negara Republik Indonesia (Kumpulan Tiga Uraian Pokok-Pokok Persoalan tentang Pancasila), Universitas Gajah Mada, Yogyakarta.
- [27] 1975, Pantjasila Setjara Ilmiah Populer, Panjuran Tudjuh, Djakarta
- [28] Notosusanto, Nugroho (ed), 1977, Sejarah Nasional Indonesia IV, Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta
- [29] Plamenantz.,1996, "Nationalism: The Nature and Evolution of an Idea," dalam "Arti dan Keberadaan Nasionalisme" Analisis CSIS Tahun XXV edisi Maret-April, CSIS, Jakarta
- [30] Poespowardojo, Soerjanto., 1998, Filsafat Pancasila (Sebuah Pendekatan Sosio-Budaya), Gramedia, Jakarta.
- [31] Prasetyo, Kuncoro Bayu., 2009, "Menjadi Aceh di Panti Asuhan: Studi tentang Sosialisasi Anak Aceh di Panti Asuhan Pasca Bencana," Pascasarjana Antropologi Universitas Gadjah Mada, Yogyakarta
- [32] Redaksi KOMPAS, 2015, "Nilai-Nilai Keutamaan Makin Merosot," dalam KOMPAS 12 Agustus 2015
- [33] 2015, "Membumikan Gagasan Ideal Pancasila: Jajak Pendapat Kompas," dalam KOMPAS 1 Juni 2015
- [34] 2015, "Pancasila Masih Sebatas Retorika," dalam KOMPAS 1 Juni 2015
- [35] 2015, "Apa Kabar Revolusi Mental?" dalam KOMPAS 5 September 2015
- [36] Rochmadi, 2011, Menjadikan Nilai Budaya Gotong-Royong sebagai Common Identity dalam Kehidupan Bertetangga Negara-Negara ASEAN, Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang
- [37] Scheler, Max, 1973, Der Formalismus in de Erthik und die materiale Wertethik, (translated by. Manfred S. Frings & Roger C. Funk) Bern, Francke, Verlag
- [38] 1954, The Nature of Sympathy (translated by. Peter Heath), Routlegde and Kegan Paul Ltd, Broadway House, London
- [39] 1961, Men's Place in Nature (translated by. Hans Meyerhoff), The Noonday Press, New York
- [40] 1994, Ressentiment, Marquette University Press, Milwaukee Wisconsin
- [41] Scott, James, 1988, Moral Ekonomi Petani, LP3ES, Jakarta
- [42] Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia, 1995, Risalah Sidang Badan Penyelidik Usaha-Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan Indonesia (BPUPKI), Jakarta.
- [43] Selamat, Shelomita, 2009, "Pendidikan Multikultural sebagai Upaya Mewujudkan Perdamaian di Indonesia", dalam Perspektif, Vol. 4 No. 1, Malang
- [44] Soekarno, 1948, "Uraian tentang Pantjasila" dalam Suluh Indonesia, Jakarta
- [45] 1952, Harapan dan Kenyataan, Kementrian Penerangan RI, Jakarta
- [46] 1957, Kepada Bangsa-suku, Panitia Pembinaan Djiwa Revolusi, Jakarta
- [47] 1958, Pantja-Sila sebagai Dasar Negara, jilid 1, Kementrian Penerangan RI, Jakarta
- [48] 1958, Pantja-Sila sebagai Dasar Negara, jilid 2, Kementrian Penerangan RI, Jakarta
- [49] 1958, Pantja-Sila sebagai Dasar Negara, jilid 3, Kementrian Penerangan RI, Jakarta
- [50] 1960, Di Bawah Bendera Revolusi Vol 1, Panitia Di Bawah Bendera Revolusi, Jakarta
- [51] 1965, Capailah Bintang-bintang di Langit: Tahun Berdikari, Departemen Penerangan RI, Jakarta
- [52] 2015, Filsafat Pancasila menurut Bung Karno, Media Pressindo, Yogyakarta
- [53] Soekanto, Soerjono, 1982, Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar, Grafindo, Jakarta
- [54] Soeprapto, Sri., 2012, Konsep Inventif Etika Pancasila Berdasarkan Filsafat Pancasila Notonagoro, UNY Press, Yogyakarta
- [55] Sudiard, Sonny., 2010, Nasionalisme dan Konflik Etnik: Sebuah Konsekuensi dari Globalisasi, Universitas Mulawarman, Samarinda
- [56] Suwarno., 1993, Pancasila Budaya Bangsa Indonesia (Penelitian Pancasila dengan Pendekatan Historis, Filosofis, dan Sosio-Yuridis Kenegaraan), Kanisius, Yogyakarta
- [57] Sunoto, 2000, Mengenal Filsafat Pancasila: Pendekatan melalui Metafisika, Logika, dan Etika, Yogyakarta, Hanindita
- [58] [58] Suryadinata, Leo (ed), 2000, Nationalism and Globalization: East and West. Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, Singapore
- [59] Sutarto, Ayu, 2004, Menguak Pergumulan antara Seni, Politik, Islam, dan Indonesia, Kompyawisda, Jember.
- [60] Widarmanto, Tjahjono., 2015, "Politik Kebudayaan" dalam JAWA POS 31 Mei 2015
- [61] Wahana, Paulus, 2004, Nilai Etika Aksiologis Max Scheler, Kanisius, Yogyakarta.