



The Ontological Foundations of Indonesia's National Education System in the Light of Pancasila

Siti Arina Hasanah¹, Asep Muhamad Maulana Ruhiyat²,
Sofyan Sauri³, Ilham Amar Nur Hadad⁴

¹Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

E-mail: sitiarinahasanah03@upi.edu

²Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

E-mail: asepmuhamadmaulanaruhiyat14@upi.edu

³Fakultas Pendidikan Bahasa dan Sastra, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Indonesia

E-mail: sofyansauri@upi.edu

⁴Fakultas Hukum, Universitas Islam Darul Ulum, Indonesia

Email: ilhamamar1234@gmail.com

Submitted: Dec 9, 2025; Reviewed: Feb 2, 2026; Accepted: Feb 26, 2026

Article's Information

Abstract

keywords:

Scientific
Pancasila,
Reconstruction.

Ontology,
Paradigm,

DOI :

<https://doi.org/10.25041/plr.v6i2.4883>

Critically examines Indonesia's national education paradigm by addressing the ontological tension between contemporary scientific rationality and the ethical-constitutional foundations of Pancasila. Drawing on a qualitative philosophical approach grounded in systematic hermeneutic analysis of primary normative texts, including the 1945 Constitution and Law Number 20 of 2003, the study reveals a structural inconsistency between technocratic, value-neutral models of education governance and the constitutional mandate to develop complete and dignified human beings. The findings demonstrate that this inconsistency constitutes not merely a pedagogical concern but a normative and constitutional problem within national education law. By proposing an integrative framework that aligns holistic scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics, this article contributes a conceptual foundation for reconstructing national education governance in accordance with Indonesia's constitutional values.

A. Introduction

Recent developments in Indonesia's public policy discourse have raised critical questions about the constitutional status of education within national priorities. Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution requires at least twenty percent of national and regional budgets to be allocated to education. However, current debates on fiscal classification and budget structuring sometimes



Pancasila and Law Review is a journal published by Faculty of Law, Universitas Lampung, under a Creative Commons Attribution-Share Alike 4.0 International License.

treat education as a supporting sector rather than a core developmental priority. Over the past two decades, global education systems have faced significant pressure from shifts in the scientific paradigm. The transition from a modern mechanistic and deterministic framework toward a complex, holistic, and non-linear paradigm has reshaped how states define education policy, graduate competencies, and national educational goals. International organizations such as UNESCO and the OECD emphasize education grounded in complexity, sustainability, and human values to address environmental, social, and technological crises. This shift extends beyond pedagogy and enters the legal and philosophical domain, as education functions as a constitutional instrument for shaping human character and national civilization.

In recent years, Indonesian education policy has increasingly emphasized measurable performance indicators, standardized assessments, and technocratic governance. Curriculum reforms, accreditation systems, and competency-based standards reflect efficiency-driven and outcome-oriented priorities. While these measures aim to enhance global competitiveness, they also reveal an implicit ontological orientation that reduces education to technical skill acquisition rather than ethical and human development.

This issue must be examined from an ontological perspective. Ontology, as the philosophical study of being, defines whether education is understood primarily as a tool for economic productivity or as the foundation for cultivating complete human beings. Ontological assumptions shape legal reasoning, policy direction, and institutional design. Without clarifying these foundations, education policy risks concealing deeper philosophical inconsistencies within its legal and regulatory framework.

In Republic of Indonesia, education occupies a strategic legal position. Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution establishes education as both a constitutional right and a state obligation. Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System further requires education to be grounded in the values of Pancasila. However, regulatory practice and policy implementation, including curriculum design, assessment standards, and learning orientation, often adopt technocratic and ostensibly value-neutral approaches derived from the modern scientific paradigm. This tendency raises fundamental questions about the philosophical coherence between the legal foundation of national education and the scientific ontology guiding educational practice. This article argues that the tension between contemporary scientific ontology and Pancasila's constitutional mandate constitutes a structural problem in national education law, not merely a theoretical inconsistency. When education governance applies reductionist and technocratic paradigms while affirming Pancasila as its philosophical basis, a normative gap emerges between constitutional ideals and policy logic. This gap forms the central focus of this study.

The primary legal issue examined is the philosophical inconsistency within Indonesia's national education paradigm, particularly the misalignment between contemporary scientific ontology and Pancasila's ethical and constitutional mandate. Specifically, national education lacks a reconstructed paradigm that incorporates the shift from mechanistic to holistic scientific ontology as the philosophical basis for education policy grounded in Pancasila. As a result, education risks producing graduates who are technically skilled but morally and socially fragmented, falling short of the constitutional goal of developing the complete Indonesian person.

This issue carries significant normative, theoretical, and practical implications. Normatively, paradigm inconsistency weakens legal certainty regarding the direction and purpose of national education, which must be rooted in Pancasila. Theoretically, it reveals a conceptual gap in Indonesian education law, namely the absence of an ontological and axiological framework that integrates developments in the philosophy of science with the state's foundational values. Practically, this lack of alignment produces an education system that develops competence without adequately fostering ethical, humanistic, and civic integrity, as required by the constitution.

Previous scholarship has examined Pancasila as the foundation of education mainly from normative or pedagogical perspective.¹ Other works discuss complexity and critical consciousness without addressing their ontological implications for education law.² This article fills that gap by identifying the ontological shift in science as the key philosophical basis for reconstructing Indonesia's national education paradigm, with Pancasila as its ontological and axiological compass. Unlike studies focused on curriculum reform, this research proposes a reconstruction at the level of legal and scientific philosophy. Its contribution lies in an integrative framework aligning scientific rationality with Pancasila ethics, providing a coherent foundation for education law and policy grounded in human dignity.

In legal philosophy, law is inherently value-laden. That law contains an internal morality guiding its development and application.³ Likewise, law as an interpretive practice grounded in moral principles.⁴ Education law therefore reflects both epistemological assumptions and ethical commitments. When education adopts a reductionist scientific ontology, its legal framework tends to prioritize efficiency, standardization, and instrumental rationality over moral development. A holistic ontology, by contrast, requires a legal orientation that recognizes ethical responsibility, relationality, and social justice.

In Indonesia, this issue is especially significant because Pancasila is the philosophical foundation of the legal system. The ontological and axiological basis of all state action, including education.⁵ National education law must reflect Pancasila not only formally but also in its conception of knowledge and human development. When educational regulation adopts paradigms that separate knowledge from values, a structural contradiction arises between constitutional principles and policy logic.

This contradiction reflects a broader tension between modern scientific rationality and legal ethics. Mechanistic paradigms derived from positivist science have shaped legal and educational institutions worldwide. That scientific paradigms shape both inquiry and institutional worldviews.⁶ In education, this reduces learning to measurable outputs and technical skills. When embedded in law, it risks turning education into an administrative instrument detached from ethical reflection. That instrumental rationality can displace moral and communicative reasoning within normative institutions.⁷

¹ Latif, Y. (2011). *Negara Paripurna: Historisitas, rasionalitas, dan aktualisasi Pancasila*. Gramedia, 110–160.

² Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum, 80–120.

³ Fuller, L. L. (1969). *The morality of law (Rev. ed.)*. Yale University Press, 33–44.

⁴ Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's empire*. Harvard University Press, 45–86.

⁵ Notonagoro. (1959). *Beberapa hal mengenai falsafah Pancasila*. Pantjuran Tujuh, 18–30.

⁶ Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.)*. University of Chicago Press, 43–51.

⁷ Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society (Vol. 1)*. Beacon Press, 85–101.

Pancasila offers a distinctive response by placing humanity, justice, and moral responsibility at the center of national life. Its second principle, Just and Civilized Humanity, affirms human dignity as the guiding orientation of social institutions, including education. In this respect, Pancasila aligns with contemporary philosophy of science, which emphasizes complexity, interdependence, and ethical accountability. That modern science must move beyond fragmentation toward a holistic view that integrates knowledge, values, and human consequences.⁸ Aligning education law with this ontological shift is therefore a legal and philosophical necessity, not merely a pedagogical adjustment.

Current national education policies, however, rarely articulate this alignment. Pancasila is often invoked as a normative slogan rather than as an ontological and axiological framework shaping the structure of knowledge. Regulations on curriculum, assessment, and governance frequently reproduce value-neutral assumptions rooted in outdated scientific paradigms. This weakens the coherence of education law and dilutes its constitutional purpose. That legal norms derive legitimacy not only from procedural validity but also from moral justification. Without a coherent philosophical foundation, education law risks losing normative authority.⁹

This article therefore treats the ontological transformation of modern science as the entry point for reconstructing Indonesia's national education paradigm. Pancasila should not function as an external moral addendum but as an axiological compass embedded within the very conception of knowledge. Integrating contemporary scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics enables education law to orient itself toward forming intellectually capable, morally responsible, and socially conscious individuals. Such reconstruction is essential if education is to fulfill its constitutional role in realizing a just and civilized society.

This study adopts a philosophical-hermeneutic approach based on systematic textual interpretation. It proceeds in three stages: identifying and contextualizing key normative texts, including the 1945 Constitution and Law Number 20 of 2003; critically interpreting them within their socio-historical and legal contexts; and developing a reconstructive synthesis to articulate a coherent ontological and axiological framework for national education. Primary sources were selected for their constitutional authority, philosophical relevance, and doctrinal influence in Indonesian legal scholarship. This approach grounds the proposed reconstruction in authoritative texts rather than abstract speculation.

B. Discussion

Education is never value-neutral. Every education system reflects philosophical assumptions about the nature of knowledge (ontology) and its ultimate purpose (axiology). In Indonesia, a key challenge lies in integrating the evolving ontology of modern science with Pancasila as the state's foundational ideology. Contemporary science requires a holistic and interconnected perspective rather than a fragmented one. At the same time, that scientific development in Indonesia must remain grounded in Pancasila as its philosophical foundation. The tension between the value-neutral claims of modern science and the value-based ethics of Pancasila forms the central focus of this study.

This discussion is organized into six sections: the ontological foundations of science, shifts in scientific ontology, the ethical role of Pancasila, paradigm tensions in the national education system, efforts to reconstruct the education paradigm, and their practical implications. Through this structure, the article demonstrates how the philosophy of science and Pancasila can

⁸ Morin, E. (1999). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future*. UNESCO, 15–28.

⁹ Alexy, R. (2002). *A theory of constitutional rights*. Oxford University Press, 21–35.

complement each other in shaping a coherent, humanistic, and globally responsive national education paradigm.

1. Analysis of the Ontology of Science

Ontology, as a branch of philosophy, provides the foundation of all scientific inquiry by addressing the nature of reality and what counts as being. Ontology as the doctrine of the essence of things, that it also concerns the limits of human understanding.¹⁰ Before explaining how something works, science must clarify what it is. This perspective is crucial in education. When knowledge is treated as fragmented facts, education encourages memorization and narrow specialization.¹¹ When knowledge is understood as complex and interconnected, education fosters critical, reflective, and integrative thinking. Learners are thus guided not only to acquire information but to grasp its meaning in relation to life.

From a philosophical and legal perspective, ontology shapes how knowledge is institutionalized within a national education system. Assumptions about reality influence legal norms governing classification, transmission, and assessment. If reality is viewed as discrete and measurable, education law tends to emphasize procedure and technical compliance. If reality is seen as relational and value-laden, legal regulation must incorporate ethical purpose and normative reflection. Ontology therefore serves as the underlying foundation of education law.

In legal philosophy, this link between ontology and normativity is decisive. Law reflects particular conceptions of the human person and social reality. That legal norms presuppose ideas of rationality, responsibility, and moral agency. The ontology of knowledge adopted in education thus determines whether learners are treated as technical objects of regulation or as moral subjects entitled to dignity and development. This distinction shapes the legitimacy and direction of education law.

In Indonesia, the lack of an explicit ontological framework in education governance has created normative ambiguity. Although legislation formally invokes Pancasila, it rarely explains how scientific ontology should align with its values. Education policy therefore often reflects positivist assumptions, while references to Pancasila remain declarative. This gap underscores the need to articulate ontology explicitly within national education law and policy rather than leaving it implicit.

2. The Ontological Paradigm Shift: From Mechanistic to Holistic Approaches

The history of intellectual development shows a continuous shift in how humans explain reality. Early mystical stage, where natural phenomena were understood through myth and supernatural forces.¹² This was followed by an ontological stage marked by rational inquiry, as seen in ancient Greek philosophy, and later by a functional stage, where knowledge served practical needs. These shifts continued into the Enlightenment, when the mechanistic worldview of Newtonian physics became dominant. Nature was understood as a machine reducible to its parts, an outlook that shaped education by emphasizing specialization and factual transmission. With the rise of systems theory, complexity theory, and critical social sciences, this paradigm has gradually given way to a holistic and interconnected view of reality. Education must therefore move beyond reductionism and cultivate the ability to understand interdisciplinary relationships and complex humanitarian, social, and environmental challenges.

The mechanistic paradigm has influenced not only science but also legal and educational institutions. By treating reality as closed and predictable, it fragments knowledge into

¹⁰ Kantaprawira, R. (2009). *Filsafat ilmu*. Alumni, 17–30.

¹¹ Burhanuddin. (2020). *Ontologi dan filsafat ilmu*. Prenadamedia, 25–45.

¹² Setio, J., dkk. (2024). *Ontologi dan ilmu pengetahuan*. Pustaka Pelajar, 15–35.

specialized fields and defines learning in terms of technical efficiency. In education policy, this orientation promotes standardization, quantification, and regulatory control. As a result, education law risks becoming an administrative tool detached from ethical and humanistic purpose.

The emergence of holistic and complexity-based paradigms represents a fundamental ontological transformation. That reality is dynamic and interdependent, integrating knowledge, values, and consequences. This shift requires education law to move beyond reductionist regulation toward normative integration. Legal frameworks must recognize learners as complex human subjects whose intellectual development is inseparable from moral, social, and cultural dimensions.

From a legal standpoint, this transition requires rethinking regulatory rationality. Mechanistic legal models emphasize predictability and control, while holistic paradigms require flexibility and ethical interpretation. That law should be understood as a principled interpretive practice rather than a rigid rule system. Applied to education, this view requires legal frameworks that integrate ethical principles into the governance of knowledge.

Failure to adapt to this ontological shift risks creating a mismatch between contemporary science and outdated legal regulation. Education systems grounded in mechanistic assumptions struggle to address technological disruption, ecological crisis, and social inequality. The ontological transformation of science therefore provides a normative basis for reforming education law and policy.

3. Pancasila Ethics as an Axiological Framework

In Indonesia, the ontology of science is inseparable from the value framework of Pancasila. Pancasila as the *causa materialis* of the Indonesian nation, meaning that science and education must be grounded in its values. Its second principle, Just and Civilized Humanity, affirms that science must serve human dignity rather than narrow pragmatic interests. This view aligns with concept of critical consciousness, which holds that education should develop awareness and resist dehumanization. Science and education must therefore pursue emancipatory, not merely technical, goals. Empirical studies show that integrating Pancasila into curricula often remains procedural and formal, without transforming learning substantively.¹³ Value integration must instead shape the epistemic core of knowledge, aligning education with justice, unity, and humanity.¹⁴ That integrating scientific and humanistic values is essential for an education system that is both intellectually and morally grounded.¹⁵

As an axiological framework, Pancasila provides the ethical orientation for scientific development within national education. It links moral principles with constitutional objectives, placing humanity, justice, and collective responsibility at the center of education policy. Pancasila thus functions not only as an ethical ideal but as a normative standard guiding the formulation and interpretation of education law.

From a legal philosophy perspective, axiological foundations are essential to legal legitimacy. That law must maintain moral coherence to preserve its authority. Education law that adopts scientific paradigms without ethical grounding risks becoming formalistic and detached from its human purpose. Pancasila provides a value system capable of aligning scientific rationality with ethical responsibility.

Integrating Pancasila into the ontology of knowledge also ensures that scientific progress respects human dignity. Its second principle affirms that knowledge must serve humanistic and

¹³ Komalasari, K., & Saripudin, D. (2018). The Influence of Contextual Learning-Based Civic Education Interactive Study Model on Civic Literacy of Students in Junior High School. *International Journal of Instruction*, 11(1), 131–146

¹⁴ Priyatna, M. (2020). Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Nilai-Nilai Pancasila. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 9(1), 1–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v9i01.695>

¹⁵ Abdullah, M. A. (2021). Integrasi keilmuan dan nilai kemanusiaan dalam pendidikan Islam: Perspektif filsafat ilmu. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2021.10101>

emancipatory ends. This view parallels critiques of instrumental rationality against reducing reason to technical efficiency. Embedding Pancasila within education law enables scientific advancement while preserving accountability to humanity and social justice.

Positioning Pancasila as an axiological foundation ultimately transforms education from a technical function into a moral and constitutional project. Education law becomes a means of cultivating ethical agency and civic responsibility, not merely technical competence. This integration is essential to ensure that scientific development strengthens national integrity and constitutional values.

4. Paradigmatic Tensions in National Education

Although Pancasila has long served as Indonesia's ideological foundation, educational practice often separates science from values. Scientific knowledge is taught through a value-neutral framework emphasizing objectivity, while Pancasila-based character education remains ancillary. This division creates a dichotomy between rationality and morality, producing graduates who are cognitively capable but socially disengaged. That curriculum reforms are frequently treated as technical adjustments rather than philosophical shifts recognizing learners as human subjects within a humanistic framework.¹⁶ This condition reflects a philosophical inconsistency that weakens the education system's ability to address complex global challenges.

This tension is structural rather than incidental. Indonesia's education system operates within a dual framework: scientific rationality is governed by instrumental logic, while Pancasila values function as external moral additions. This dualism disconnects knowledge production from ethical purpose. Education policy becomes fragmented, prioritizing measurable competence while reducing moral and civic development to symbolic discourse. This condition as the dominance of instrumental rationality over normative reasoning within modern institutions.

The implications extend into legal governance. When science is treated as value-neutral and policy prioritizes efficiency and measurability, education law assumes an administrative and technocratic form. This limits its capacity to articulate ethical responsibility and human dignity. Legal regulations governing curriculum, assessment, and institutional accountability often lack coherence with the constitutional mandate to develop humane and civilized citizens.

From a constitutional perspective, this tension raises a problem of state responsibility. Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution defines education as a constitutional mechanism for realizing national values. When education policy rests on contradictory paradigms, the state risks failing to fulfill its obligation to ensure holistic human development. The conflict between mechanistic scientific paradigms and Pancasila ethics therefore constitutes a constitutional issue affecting the legitimacy of education governance.

This tension also reveals a deeper ontological problem within education law. Kuhn (1970) explains that paradigms shape not only scientific inquiry but also institutional and regulatory structures. Without reconstructing the ontological foundations of education policy, reforms remain superficial. Resolving this tension requires not only curriculum change but a fundamental reorientation of the philosophical and legal basis of national education.

5. National Education as Legal Policy: A Normative Legal Analysis Based on Pancasila

Within Indonesia's constitutional framework, national education is not merely a pedagogical activity or sectoral policy. Legally, it constitutes state legal policy, a deliberate normative choice aimed at achieving constitutional objectives. As part of public law, education

¹⁶ Umar, M., Basri, M., & Subandi, A. (2022). Paradigma Kurikulum Merdeka bagi Guru di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, 6(3), 4376–4383. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2982>

functions as an instrument of social engineering that shapes citizens' intellectual, moral, and civic character.

Its constitutional status is grounded in Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution, which defines education as both a fundamental right and a state obligation. This provision imposes binding duties on the state to design and implement an education system consistent with the aims set out in the Preamble. Curriculum design, competency standards, assessment, and institutional governance are therefore normative expressions of state policy rather than neutral technical measures.

At the statutory level, Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System affirms that education is rooted in Pancasila. The core legal problem, however, is not the absence of such references but the lack of ontological clarity about the conception of knowledge underlying education law. In practice, regulations adopt a technocratic and ostensibly value-neutral scientific paradigm, while Pancasila remains a formal symbol external to the epistemic structure of knowledge. This separation creates tension between constitutional ideals and regulatory practice.

From a legal philosophy perspective, this condition raises concerns about normative coherence. That law contains an internal morality requiring alignment between its aims and mechanisms. When education law aspires to form holistic and dignified individuals yet relies on reductionist assumptions about knowledge, a structural inconsistency arises. This weakens its moral authority and its role in constitutional governance. Legal validity depends not only on formal legality but also on moral correctness. Education, as a policy shaping citizens, occupies a sensitive normative domain. If the scientific ontology guiding education ignores ethical responsibility and human dignity, legal norms may remain formally valid while becoming substantively flawed.

The shift in science from mechanistic determinism to holistic and complex paradigms carries direct implications for education law. Mechanistic ontology promotes efficiency, standardization, and measurable outcomes. Holistic ontology requires recognition of learners as socially and morally embedded subjects. Law as a principled interpretive practice rather than a technical rule system. Education law must therefore reflect moral principles consistent with foundational legal values. In Indonesia, Pancasila serves as the philosophical foundation and primary source of legal values. The ontological and axiological basis of the legal order, requiring all norms, including education law, to embody its humanistic orientation. Pancasila must function as an axiological compass within the conception of knowledge underlying education policy. Reconstructing the national education paradigm is thus a legal necessity. Education policy must align scientific ontology, Pancasila ethics, and constitutional objectives. Without such coherence, education law risks becoming formalistic, fulfilling procedural legality while failing to realize its mandate to cultivate humane and ethical citizens.

6. Legal-Philosophical Implications of Ontological Paradigm Shifts in National Education Law

Ontological assumptions about knowledge play a decisive role in shaping education law. Law does not arise in a philosophical vacuum but reflects underlying conceptions of reality, humanity, and social purpose. Legal systems embody the worldview of their historical context. In national education, the dominance of mechanistic and reductionist scientific ontology has strongly influenced regulatory frameworks, standards, and institutional practices.

Within this paradigm, knowledge is treated as fragmented, measurable, and value-neutral. Education law therefore prioritizes efficiency, standardization, and technical competence. Curriculum standards focus on quantifiable outcomes, while ethical and humanistic dimensions remain marginal. This is the colonization of normative domains by instrumental rationality. As

a result, education law risks becoming an administrative mechanism rather than a normative framework for human development.

This condition raises concerns about legal coherence and legitimacy. Law requires consistency between its moral aims and regulatory structure. When education law formally adopts Pancasila yet applies value-neutral scientific assumptions, a normative inconsistency emerges. This weakens its ethical authority and undermines its constitutional role in advancing a just and civilized society.

The ontological shift toward holistic and complex scientific paradigms requires a corresponding transformation in legal reasoning. Contemporary philosophy of science emphasizes interdependence, uncertainty, and ethical responsibility as intrinsic to knowledge. In legal terms, this shift requires education law to move beyond procedural regulation toward substantive ethical orientation. Legal norms must regulate institutional structures while also defining the moral purposes of knowledge production and transmission. In Indonesia, this transformation is grounded in Pancasila as the philosophical foundation of the legal system. Pancasila as the ontological and axiological basis of Indonesian law, requiring all legal norms to reflect its humanistic and moral orientation. Integrating holistic scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics is therefore not merely a policy choice but a constitutional obligation.

Failure to incorporate this ontological shift carries serious legal consequences. Education policies rooted in reductionist paradigms produce legal frameworks that prioritize technical compliance over ethical substance. Such frameworks may achieve formal validity while lacking substantive justice. Legal validity must be accompanied by moral correctness. Without ontological and axiological coherence, education law risks losing normative legitimacy and its capacity to uphold human dignity and social justice. Recognizing these implications is essential for reconstructing the national education paradigm. Grounding education law in a holistic conception of knowledge and embedding Pancasila as an axiological compass ensures alignment with constitutional objectives. This philosophical and legal realignment provides a foundation for education policies that are both legally valid and ethically grounded.

7. Reconstruction of the National Education Paradigm and the Right to Education as a Human Right

To resolve this tension, the national education paradigm must be reconstructed by integrating contemporary scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics. Rahmawati & Nurdin (2022) argue that such reconstruction can shift education from a technocratic model to a humanistic praxis. This transformation involves several key steps.¹⁷

1. A New Ontological Foundation

Science must be understood as complex, dynamic, and interconnected. This requires integrative, interdisciplinary, and non-reductionist learning approaches. Education should develop learners' capacity to understand relationships across disciplines and real-world contexts.

2. Pancasila as an Axiological Compass

Education must aim not only to produce skilled workers but to form humane, just, and civilized individuals. Pancasila values must shape the substance of knowledge itself, not function as external moral additions. This ensures ethical coherence between knowledge and national value.

3. Curriculum Integration

4. All subjects should incorporate ethical reflection. Science education, for example, should teach physical laws alongside responsibility toward environmental and social

¹⁷ Rahmawati, S., & Nurdin, I. (2022). Rekonstruksi paradigma pendidikan nasional berbasis etika Pancasila. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, 5(4), 211–226. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31227/jip.v5i4.2187>

consequences. A humanistic education framework enables learners to develop intellectual competence alongside empathy and ethical awareness.¹⁸

5. The Role of Teachers and Academics

Teachers must act not only as transmitters of knowledge but as facilitators of critical consciousness. Education should cultivate critical awareness and human agency. This requires educators to integrate ontological understanding and ethical reflection into the learning process.

Through this model, a generation is expected to emerge that is not only scientifically competent but also deeply committed to humanistic and national values.

The reconstruction of the national education paradigm must be understood not merely as a philosophical refinement, but as a normative imperative grounded in the right to education as a fundamental human right. From the perspective of international human rights law, education is not a discretionary state policy, but a legally binding obligation derived from universal norms. Therefore, any educational reconstruction in Indonesia must be explicitly linked to both international and national legal frameworks governing this right.

At the international level, the right to education is firmly established in the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (ICESCR), particularly Article 13, which recognizes education as essential to the full development of human dignity. The Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights further clarifies that education must meet the “4A framework”: availability, accessibility, acceptability, and adaptability. This framework rejects reductionist paradigms, as education limited to fragmented technical knowledge cannot fulfill its human rights function of fostering dignity, critical awareness, and social responsibility. Indonesia’s ratification of the ICESCR through Law No. 11 of 2005 therefore creates a constitutional obligation to align its education system with these principles.

At the national level, the right to education is guaranteed by Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution, which affirms education as both a fundamental right and a core state obligation. Constitutionally, education serves to realize human dignity and social justice, not merely economic productivity. When education is governed by a value-neutral, mechanistic paradigm, its constitutional promise risks being reduced to formal access without substantive humanistic content. Thus, reconstructing the national education paradigm toward a holistic and value-based ontology is essential to ensure that the right to education is fulfilled both procedurally and substantively.

This constitutional mandate is further reinforced by Law No. 39 of 1999 on Human Rights, which explicitly recognizes education as a human right and obliges the state to respect, protect, and fulfill it. Article 12 affirms that every person has the right to education for the development of personality, intelligence, and moral awareness. This provision aligns with the axiological foundations of Pancasila, particularly the principle of Just and Civilized Humanity. Accordingly, education law and policy must aim to form moral subjects with dignity, not merely skilled objects of technocratic governance.

From a legal-philosophical perspective, the reconstruction of the education paradigm reflects the inseparability of ontology, axiology, and normativity. Legal norms derive legitimacy not only from formal validity but also from moral correctness. Education policies grounded in reductionist ontological assumptions while claiming to fulfill human rights obligations suffer from normative inconsistency. By contrast, a holistic paradigm rooted in Pancasila ethics enables education law to function as an authentic instrument for realizing the right to education.

In this sense, reconstructing the national education paradigm constitutes a human rights-based approach to education governance. It aligns Indonesia’s education system with

¹⁸ Azhirakeisha, S. M., Afriannisa, A., & Ruslan, A. (2024). Filsafat Pendidikan Humanisme dalam Pengembangan Karakter Peserta Didik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(3), 44573–44578. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v8i3.21041>

international human rights standards, constitutional guarantees, and national human rights law, while preserving the ethical identity of Pancasila. This integration ensures that education fulfills its dual role as a constitutional right and a moral project to cultivate humane, critical, and socially responsible citizens. Without this human rights foundation, educational reform risks remaining technocratic and philosophically fragmented, failing to meet both constitutional and international obligations.

This new paradigm carries several practical implications. First, curriculum design must be integrative, combining scientific knowledge with ethical reflection grounded in Pancasila. Hidayat dan Kurniawan stress that Pancasila-based humanistic education cultivates ethical awareness and social virtue. Second, educational policy should treat values as the spirit of education, not as administrative formalities. Third, teachers must be able to connect subject matter with its underlying value dimensions. As Sauri explains, education must be philosophically grounded to sustain its orientation toward truth, goodness, and beauty.

From a legal and governance perspective, reconstructing the national education paradigm requires moving beyond fragmented regulation toward a coherent normative framework that integrates scientific development with ethical responsibility. Education must be understood not merely as an administrative sector, but as a constitutional instrument for shaping moral agency and civic responsibility. Regulatory coherence is essential to align educational objectives with constitutional values and institutional practice.

Curriculum policy, therefore, should be viewed as a legal instrument rather than a purely technical document. As an expression of state authority, it embodies normative choices about the knowledge, values, and competencies prioritized in national development. Excessive standardization and outcome-based regulation risk reinforcing reductionist paradigms and weakening education's ethical dimension. A holistic approach instead requires curriculum regulation to incorporate reflective and ethical considerations consistent with Pancasila, especially humanity, social justice, and collective responsibility.

The reconstructed paradigm also reshapes the role of the state. The state must act not only as a procedural regulator but as an ethical guarantor of education. Failure to substantively integrate Pancasila values into policy reflects a normative deficiency in fulfilling constitutional obligations. Accordingly, education policy should be assessed not only by efficiency or performance metrics, but by its capacity to advance human dignity, social cohesion, and moral development.

Aligning educational reform with broader legal and constitutional frameworks is essential. Without a clear normative orientation grounded in Pancasila and informed by contemporary scientific ontology, reforms risk reproducing existing contradictions. A legally and philosophically integrated approach enables national education to address global challenges while remaining faithful to Indonesia's constitutional identity and moral foundations.

C. Conclusion

This article critically examines the philosophical and legal necessity of reconstructing Indonesia's national education paradigm by integrating contemporary scientific ontology with the axiological foundations of Pancasila. Education cannot be reduced to a technical or administrative sector; it is a constitutional and legal instrument reflecting the state's commitments to human dignity, justice, and civilized humanity. The persistence of mechanistic, reductionist, and value-neutral paradigms in educational governance has created a structural inconsistency between scientific rationality and the ethical mandates of Pancasila.

From the philosophy of science perspective, the shift from mechanistic–deterministic models toward holistic and relational understandings of reality has major implications for education law. Ontological assumptions about knowledge shape how education is regulated and evaluated. When grounded in reductionist ontologies, education law prioritizes efficiency,

standardization, and measurable outputs at the expense of moral reflection and human development. This risks reducing education to an instrumental enterprise and undermining its constitutional purpose.

Within Indonesia's legal framework, this issue is especially significant because Pancasila serves as the state's philosophical foundation. It is not merely symbolic, but an ontological and axiological source of legal values that must guide all policies, including education. This article argues that Pancasila should function as an internal ethical compass within the conception of knowledge itself, rather than as an external moral supplement. The separation of science and values in education governance reflects a paradigmatic tension that weakens the coherence and legitimacy of national education law.

The study demonstrates that this paradigmatic tension is not only pedagogical but also constitutional and legal. Education, as guaranteed by Article 31 of the 1945 Constitution, is the means through which the state fulfills its obligation to develop intellectually capable, morally responsible, and socially conscious citizens. When education policy is shaped by contradictory paradigms, the state risks failing its constitutional duty. Thus, reconstructing the national education paradigm is a normative legal necessity, not merely a philosophical option.

By integrating holistic scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics, this article proposes a reconstructed paradigm that aligns scientific advancement with ethical responsibility. Knowledge is understood as inherently value-laden, and learners are recognized as moral subjects rather than regulatory objects. This enables education law to function as a coherent normative framework guiding both institutional structures and the ethical orientation of knowledge production and transmission. Ultimately, this article contributes to legal and philosophical discourse by offering a framework that bridges philosophy of science, legal philosophy, and constitutional theory. It affirms that national education must evolve with epistemological transformation while remaining grounded in Pancasila's ethical foundations. Through this alignment, education can fulfill its constitutional role in cultivating humane, ethical, and civilized citizens capable of navigating global complexity without losing their national identity.

D. Suggestion

This article argues that Indonesia's national education paradigm reflects a structural inconsistency between contemporary scientific ontology and the ethical–constitutional mandate of Pancasila. Education governance has adopted mechanistic, reductionist, and value-neutral paradigms focused on efficiency, standardization, and measurable outcomes, while Pancasila remains largely symbolic rather than operative. This gap creates tension between constitutional ideals and educational practice. The shift from mechanistic–deterministic science toward holistic and relational paradigms calls for a reconstruction of education law and policy. Ontological assumptions shape regulation, conceptions of learners, and educational goals. When grounded in reductionism, education law risks producing technically skilled but morally fragmented graduates, undermining the constitutional aim of developing whole and dignified persons.

Given Pancasila's status as the philosophical foundation of the state, it must function not as an external ethical reference but as an axiological compass embedded in the very conception of knowledge. Separating science from values is therefore not only pedagogically flawed but constitutionally problematic, weakening the coherence and legitimacy of education law. This article proposes integrating contemporary scientific ontology with Pancasila ethics, recognizing knowledge as value-laden and education as a legal instrument oriented toward dignity, justice, and civilized humanity. Such reconstruction is not merely philosophical but a constitutional necessity, enabling education to cultivate intellectually capable, morally responsible, and

socially conscious citizens while preserving Indonesia's foundational values amid global change.

Acknowledgements

Sincere gratitude is expressed to all parties who provided support during the preparation of this article. Appreciation is extended to previous researchers and scholars whose works served as essential foundations for this study. Valuable insights and constructive feedback, which significantly contributed to the refinement of the analysis, are gratefully acknowledged as having been provided by colleagues and academic supervisors. Gratitude is also conveyed to those who assisted in reference collection, manuscript editing, and the completion of publication-related administrative processes. All of these forms of support are sincerely acknowledged as instrumental in the successful completion of this article.

Grants

This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or non-profit sectors.

References

- Abdullah, M. A. (2021). Integrasi keilmuan dan nilai kemanusiaan dalam pendidikan Islam: Perspektif filsafat ilmu. *Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, 10(1), 1–15. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.14421/jpi.2021.10101>
- Alexy, R. (2002). *A theory of constitutional rights*. Oxford University Press.
- Azhirakeisha, S. M., Afriannisa, A., & Ruslan, A. (2024). Filsafat Pendidikan Humanisme dalam Pengembangan Karakter Peserta Didik. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai*, 8(3), 44573–44578. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/jptam.v8i3.21041>
- Burhanuddin. (2020). *Ontologi dan filsafat ilmu*. Prenadamedia.
- Committee on Economic, S. and C. R. (1999). *General Comment No. 13: The Right to Education*. United Nations. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/documents/general-comments-and-recommendations/general-comment-no-13-right-education>
- Dworkin, R. (1986). *Law's empire*. Harvard University Press.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Fuller, L. L. (1969). *The morality of law (Rev. ed.)*. Yale University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1984). *The theory of communicative action: Reason and the rationalization of society (Vol. 1)*. Beacon Press.
- Hidayat, R., & Kurniawan, D. (2023). Pendidikan humanis dalam bingkai nilai Pancasila: Kajian aksiologis. *Jurnal Filsafat Dan Pendidikan*, 14(2), 87–102. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.21831/jfp.v14i2.53241>
- Indonesia, R. (1999). *Undang-Undang Nomor 39 Tahun 1999 tentang Hak Asasi Manusia*. <https://www.mkri.id/index.php?page=web.UUD1945>

- Indonesia, R. of. (1945). *The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*.
- Indonesia, R. of. (2003). *Law Number 20 of 2003 on the National Education System*.
- Kantaprawira, R. (2009). *Filsafat ilmu*. Alumni.
- Komalasari, K., & Saripudin, D. (2018). The Influence of Contextual Learning-Based Civic Education Interactive Study Model on Civic Literacy of Students in Junior High School. *International Journal of Instruction*, *11(1)*, 131–146. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.12973/iji.2018.11110a>
- Kuhn, T. S. (1970). *The structure of scientific revolutions (2nd ed.)*. University of Chicago Press.
- Latif, Y. (2011). *Negara Paripurna: Historisitas, rasionalitas, dan aktualisasi Pancasila*. Gramedia.
- Morin, E. (1999). *Seven complex lessons in education for the future*. UNESCO.
- Nations, U. (1966). *International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights*. <https://www.ohchr.org/en/instruments-mechanisms/instruments/international-covenant-economic-social-and-cultural-rights>
- Notonagoro. (1959). *Beberapa hal mengenai falsafah Pancasila*. Pantjuran Tujuh.
- Priyatna, M. (2020). Pendidikan Karakter Berbasis Nilai-Nilai Pancasila. *Edukasi Islami: Jurnal Pendidikan Islam*, *9(1)*, 1–22. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.30868/ei.v9i01.695>
- Rahmawati, S., & Nurdin, I. (2022). Rekonstruksi paradigma pendidikan nasional berbasis etika Pancasila. *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan*, *5(4)*, 211–226. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31227/jip.v5i4.2187>
- Sauri, S. (2010). *Filsafat pendidikan Islam*. UPI Press.
- Setio, J., dkk. (2024). *Ontologi dan ilmu pengetahuan*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Umar, M., Basri, M., & Subandi, A. (2022). Paradigma Kurikulum Merdeka bagi Guru di Sekolah Dasar. *Jurnal Basicedu*, *6(3)*, 4376–4383. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.31004/basicedu.v6i3.2982>