

Juridical and Legal-Political Analysis of BPIP's Role in the State Governance Configuration of Indonesia

Fayreizqi Azelleya Marshanda Putri¹, Fifiana Wisnaeni²

^{1,2} Master of Law, Faculty of Law, Universitas Diponegoro

ABSTRACT: This study examines the juridical and legal-political dimensions of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* or BPIP) and its role within Indonesia's state governance configuration. BPIP was established as an institutional mechanism to strengthen the internalization and implementation of Pancasila as the foundation of the nation's ideology and public policy. The research explores how BPIP's constitutional basis, legal authority, and functional relationship with other state institutions reflect Indonesia's effort to balance ideological guidance with democratic governance. Using a normative juridical approach combined with a political-legal analysis, the study investigates BPIP's institutional legitimacy under existing regulations, including Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018, and its implications for state administration and national development. Findings indicate that BPIP serves as a strategic policy instrument to align state governance with Pancasila values, yet its broad mandate raises questions regarding institutional overlap, accountability, and the limits of ideological intervention in political affairs. The paper argues that BPIP's effectiveness depends on maintaining constitutional proportionality and avoiding excessive centralization of ideological control. This research contributes to a broader understanding of how state institutions in Indonesia navigate the interplay between law, politics, and ideology in the post-reform era. Strengthening BPIP's legal framework and ensuring transparency are crucial to preserving democratic integrity while promoting ideological consistency within state governance.

KEYWORDS: BPIP, Pancasila Ideology, State Governance.

I. INTRODUCTION

The establishment of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* or BPIP) represents a renewed effort by the government to reinforce the role of Pancasila as the nation's philosophical and ideological foundation. The resurgence of this institution reflects the growing concern that the values of Pancasila are increasingly being neglected in social, political, and governmental practices. BPIP is expected to function as a strategic institution to revitalize ideological awareness among citizens and state officials while ensuring that all state policies align with the principles of Pancasila (Suryadinata, 2020). This institutional presence demonstrates the state's intent to strengthen ideological governance within the broader constitutional framework of Indonesia. From a juridical perspective, BPIP's existence is supported by Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018, which grants it the authority to formulate and coordinate national policies related to Pancasila education and internalization. The regulation provides a clear legal foundation for BPIP's operational structure, duties, and responsibilities within the governance system (Santosa, 2019). However, debates persist regarding the agency's position within the hierarchy of Indonesian state institutions. Some legal scholars argue that BPIP operates under the President's direct supervision, which could raise issues concerning institutional independence and checks and balances within the executive branch (Nugroho, 2021). The juridical challenge thus lies in defining BPIP's constitutional legitimacy and ensuring that its role does not overlap with or diminish the authority of other ideological or educational bodies, such as the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology. Politically, BPIP embodies the intersection of law, ideology, and governance. The agency's creation emerged from a political necessity to reaffirm national unity amid rising ideological polarization and the growing influence of transnational ideologies. In this context, BPIP functions as a guardian of ideological integrity, aiming to counteract radicalism and promote civic nationalism (Prasetyo, 2020). The legal-political dimension of BPIP's role is therefore crucial: it serves not only as a regulatory institution but also as an instrument of state ideology that influences policymaking and governance behavior. Nevertheless, this dual function often leads to tension between democratic pluralism and ideological uniformity. Critics have expressed concern that overemphasis on ideological control could potentially limit freedom of expression and political diversity (Wibisono, 2022). In terms of governance, BPIP's role can be analyzed through the lens of institutional theory, which emphasizes the balance between formal legality and

Juridical and Legal-Political Analysis of BPIP's Role in the State Governance Configuration of Indonesia

political functionality. BPIP's establishment represents a form of institutional engineering intended to embed ideological education within state structures (Rahardjo, 2018). Yet, as a relatively new institution, BPIP still faces challenges in translating Pancasila principles into measurable public policy outcomes. The effectiveness of its programs depends largely on inter-agency coordination, political will, and public trust. This highlights the importance of maintaining BPIP's accountability and transparency to ensure its operations align with democratic values and human rights principles (Putri, 2023).

BPIP's existence reflects Indonesia's evolving conception of ideological governance in the post-reform era. After the fall of the New Order regime, the relationship between state ideology and politics underwent significant transformation. Whereas Pancasila was previously used as a tool for political conformity, current efforts focus on ideological revitalization through education and participatory discourse (Susanto, 2021). BPIP's challenge, therefore, is to promote Pancasila without reverting to authoritarian mechanisms of ideological enforcement. This requires a nuanced approach that combines legal legitimacy with inclusive civic engagement. Overall, BPIP's role in Indonesia's state governance configuration demonstrates the dynamic interaction between law, politics, and ideology. It underscores the state's ongoing attempt to institutionalize Pancasila as both a normative and operational framework for governance. However, to function effectively within a democratic context, BPIP must continuously refine its legal foundation, clarify its institutional boundaries, and adapt to the pluralistic realities of Indonesian society. Only through such balanced integration can BPIP contribute meaningfully to the consolidation of democratic governance rooted in Pancasila values (Anwar, 2024).

II. FORMULATION OF THE PROBLEM

1. How is the juridical foundation of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* or BPIP) structured within the framework of Indonesia's constitutional and administrative law?
2. What are the implications of BPIP's institutional role for the dynamics of governance, accountability, and ideological policy implementation in Indonesia?

III. RESEARCH METHOD

This study employs a qualitative research approach using the library research (*studi pustaka*) method. The qualitative method was chosen to allow an in-depth exploration of the juridical and political dimensions of BPIP based on secondary data sources, including laws, presidential regulations, academic journals, and authoritative books on Indonesian constitutional and political law (Moleong, 2018). The study is descriptive in nature, aiming to provide a comprehensive analysis of BPIP's institutional structure, legal basis, and political function within the context of state governance.

The library research method enables the researcher to systematically collect, evaluate, and interpret relevant documents that describe the evolution and role of BPIP in Indonesia's governance system (Sugiyono, 2019). Data analysis is conducted through the technique of content analysis, focusing on identifying patterns of legal norms and political interactions between BPIP and other state institutions. The qualitative descriptive approach facilitates a contextual understanding of BPIP's role without relying on statistical data but instead emphasizing interpretation and conceptual reasoning (Lexy, 2018). By employing this approach, the study seeks to construct a juridical and political framework that explains how BPIP operates within Indonesia's constitutional system. The use of secondary data ensures academic validity while providing theoretical depth and analytical coherence in evaluating BPIP's effectiveness as a state institution that integrates ideology with governance (Salim, 2021).

IV. DISCUSSION

A. Juridical Foundation of The Indonesian Agency For Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* Or BPIP) Structured Within The Framework Of Indonesia's Constitutional And Administrative Law

The juridical foundation of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* or BPIP) reflects a significant institutional development in Indonesia's efforts to ensure that the state ideology, Pancasila, remains the guiding principle in national governance. Juridically, BPIP is positioned as a non-ministerial government agency that operates under and is directly responsible to the President, as stated in Presidential Regulation (Peraturan Presiden) No. 7 of 2018 concerning the BPIP (Santosa, 2019). This regulation serves as the principal legal basis defining BPIP's formation, duties, functions, and authority within Indonesia's state administrative framework. From a constitutional standpoint, BPIP is not explicitly mentioned in the 1945 Constitution; however, its existence derives legitimacy from the constitutional preamble, which emphasizes Pancasila as the foundational ideology of the state. Therefore, BPIP acts as an institutional embodiment of constitutional ideals, functioning to internalize, develop, and maintain the relevance of Pancasila in the governance process (Rahardjo, 2018).

The juridical structure of BPIP must be analyzed within the broader architecture of Indonesia's administrative law. According to the general principles of administrative law, government agencies can be established either by legislation or presidential regulation, depending on their scope and function (Asshiddiqie, 2020). In the case of BPIP, its formation through a presidential regulation indicates that it is an executive agency rather than an autonomous state institution. This implies that BPIP's authority is derivative in nature—it operates under the President's command as part of the executive mechanism rather than as an independent

Juridical and Legal-Political Analysis of BPIP's Role in the State Governance Configuration of Indonesia

constitutional body. As a result, BPIP's decisions and policies must align with the President's political direction and cannot contravene existing laws or the authority of ministries with overlapping functions, such as the Ministry of Education or the Ministry of Religious Affairs (Nugroho, 2021).

The creation of BPIP also represents a continuation of the state's long-standing tradition of institutionalizing ideological education. Historically, Indonesia had the Unit Kerja Presiden Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila (UKP-PIP), established in 2017 through Presidential Regulation No. 54 of 2017. BPIP replaced this institution in 2018, marking a transition from an ad hoc presidential task force to a permanent state agency (Wibisono, 2022). This transformation was aimed at strengthening institutional capacity, ensuring sustainable policy implementation, and enhancing bureaucratic coordination in ideological education. The juridical change from UKPPIP to BPIP signifies the state's intention to institutionalize Pancasila not merely as a political symbol but as a normative framework for governance.

From the perspective of constitutional law, BPIP's existence aligns with Article 4 paragraph (1) of the 1945 Constitution, which grants the President the authority to administer government in accordance with the Constitution and the laws. Since Pancasila serves as the philosophical foundation of the Constitution, any presidential effort to institutionalize its implementation can be interpreted as a constitutional exercise of executive power (Mahfud, 2018). Therefore, BPIP's establishment through a presidential regulation remains within the President's constitutional authority. However, constitutional scholars have raised concerns about whether the creation of BPIP requires legislative endorsement to ensure broader legitimacy and accountability (Fadli, 2020). These concerns stem from the fact that Pancasila, as a state ideology, is inherently a national concern that transcends executive prerogative, and its institutionalization ideally requires the involvement of legislative oversight.

In administrative terms, BPIP's functions are detailed in Articles 3 and 4 of the Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018. The agency is tasked with formulating policy recommendations regarding Pancasila education, coordinating the implementation of ideological development, and monitoring the integration of Pancasila values in government programs. Moreover, BPIP serves as an advisory body to the President, providing analytical input to ensure that national policies remain consistent with the moral and philosophical foundations of the state (Santosa, 2019). This advisory role distinguishes BPIP from purely operational agencies, positioning it as a think-tank-like institution that bridges ideology with public administration. Yet, this hybrid role also creates ambiguity about its accountability mechanisms, as BPIP is neither fully bureaucratic nor entirely academic.

A further juridical analysis reveals that BPIP's authority intersects with the general principles of good governance (*asas-asas umum pemerintahan yang baik*), as stipulated in Law No. 30 of 2014 concerning Government Administration. According to this law, all administrative decisions must adhere to principles of legality, proportionality, and accountability (Sari, 2021). BPIP, therefore, must ensure that its ideological initiatives do not contradict these principles. For instance, while promoting ideological education, BPIP must avoid any actions that could be perceived as political indoctrination or coercion, which would violate the principle of neutrality in public administration. Legally, BPIP's programs must respect freedom of belief, opinion, and political expression, as guaranteed by the Constitution and the Human Rights Law No. 39 of 1999 (Putri, 2023).

Another important dimension of BPIP's juridical foundation lies in its institutional relationship with other state entities. In Indonesia's governance system, institutions that operate under presidential authority are subject to the *tata kelola pemerintahan* (governance structure) that emphasizes coordination rather than autonomy (Asshiddiqie, 2020). This means that BPIP's authority is complementary, not superior, to ministerial bodies. For example, in implementing Pancasila education, BPIP must coordinate with the Ministry of Education, Culture, Research, and Technology, which has the mandate to design national curricula. BPIP's role, therefore, is to provide ideological content and policy guidance, while the ministry handles the pedagogical and administrative aspects (Prasetyo, 2020). Such a cooperative structure reflects Indonesia's principle of functional specialization within the bureaucracy.

However, several legal-political challenges remain. The primary issue concerns BPIP's juridical legitimacy in a democratic framework. Some legal experts argue that BPIP's establishment by presidential regulation alone may not provide sufficient legal strength, particularly when its mandate extends into areas that influence civic education and public discourse (Fadli, 2020). To address this, it has been suggested that BPIP's existence be elevated through an act of Parliament (*undang-undang*), which would provide a more solid statutory foundation and define clearer accountability procedures. This proposal aligns with the principle of *lex superior derogat legi inferiori*, which means that higher legal norms must govern lower-level regulations (Rahardjo, 2018).

Furthermore, the juridical debate surrounding BPIP also involves concerns about overlapping authority with existing institutions such as the National Resilience Institute (Lemhannas) and the Ministry of Home Affairs. These institutions have historically been involved in ideological and civic training for state officials and the general public. Without a clearly defined legal boundary, BPIP's functions could overlap with or duplicate these existing bodies, potentially causing inefficiency and bureaucratic conflict (Nugroho, 2021). Therefore, the juridical structure must ensure that BPIP's existence complements rather than competes with other agencies.

Another critical aspect is the funding and administrative accountability of BPIP. According to Article 9 of the Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018, BPIP's operational budget is sourced from the State Budget (*Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Negara* or APBN). Consequently, the agency is subject to the same financial accountability standards as other state institutions, as governed

Juridical and Legal-Political Analysis of BPIP's Role in the State Governance Configuration of Indonesia

by Law No. 17 of 2003 on State Finance (Sari, 2021). In practice, this means BPIP must submit periodic reports to the President and be subject to audits by the Audit Board of Indonesia (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan or BPK). The inclusion of BPIP within the national budget framework also emphasizes that it functions as part of the executive apparatus rather than as an independent state organ.

From a legal-political perspective, BPIP's juridical foundation can be seen as part of the broader effort to institutionalize the state ideology within democratic governance. This approach differs from the New Order era, when Pancasila was imposed through top-down indoctrination, such as the Pedoman Penghayatan dan Pengamalan Pancasila (P4) program. The current BPIP framework, at least in principle, aims to promote ideological awareness through education, deliberation, and participatory engagement (Wibisono, 2022). However, the legal framework must ensure that BPIP remains an educator rather than an enforcer of ideology. Maintaining this balance is essential to preserve both constitutional rights and democratic diversity.

In evaluating BPIP's juridical legitimacy, it is important to apply the principle of checks and balances that underpins Indonesia's constitutional system. While the President has the prerogative to establish supporting agencies, such institutions must operate within the boundaries of legality and accountability. The absence of legislative oversight over BPIP could potentially create a concentration of ideological authority in the executive branch, which may contradict democratic norms (Mahfud, 2018). Thus, strengthening BPIP's legal framework through legislation would not only enhance its legitimacy but also reinforce democratic control.

Ultimately, BPIP's juridical foundation represents a complex intersection between constitutional ideals, administrative regulations, and political realities. Its existence illustrates how Indonesia continues to reinterpret the role of ideology in governance after decades of political transformation. From a legal standpoint, BPIP's foundation is valid as an executive institution; yet, from a constitutional perspective, its sustainability depends on the broader acceptance of its role by other branches of government and society. The challenge ahead is ensuring that BPIP's legal basis supports its mission to nurture ideological values while upholding the democratic principles guaranteed by the Constitution. In this regard, BPIP must evolve as a transparent, accountable, and participatory institution that genuinely embodies the spirit of Pancasila in the modern state administration of Indonesia (Anwar, 2024).

B. The Institutional Role of The Indonesian Agency For Pancasila Ideology Education (*Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila* Or BPIP) Carries Profound Implications For The Dynamics Of Governance, Accountability, And Ideological Policy Implementation In Indonesia

The institutional role of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila or BPIP) carries profound implications for the dynamics of governance, accountability, and ideological policy implementation in Indonesia. As a state agency tasked with revitalizing and internalizing Pancasila in all dimensions of public life, BPIP not only serves a pedagogical and advisory role but also exerts influence over the political and administrative behavior of government institutions. Its establishment marks a renewed phase of ideological governance that seeks to reconcile democratic pluralism with the foundational principles of the Indonesian state (Suryadinata, 2020). However, the implications of BPIP's presence are multidimensional, touching upon the balance of institutional power, the maintenance of bureaucratic accountability, and the practical challenges of embedding ideology into governance mechanisms.

From the perspective of governance, BPIP's institutional role has reintroduced ideology as a central component in state administration. This is significant in the context of Indonesia's post-reform democratic consolidation, where governance had increasingly been guided by technocratic efficiency rather than ideological coherence (Nugroho, 2021). BPIP's emergence represents a corrective attempt to restore ideological direction to policy formulation and public administration, ensuring that state activities reflect the ethical and moral values of Pancasila. This aligns with the notion of governance with values, which posits that effective governance requires not only institutional capacity but also normative guidance (Rahardjo, 2018). Through its advisory role to the President and ministries, BPIP aims to ensure that Pancasila's values—such as social justice, unity, and democracy—become the reference point in policymaking. However, this normative intervention in governance also risks blurring the boundaries between ideological education and political influence, particularly if the agency's recommendations are interpreted as binding directives rather than consultative guidance.

In terms of policy implementation, BPIP's influence manifests through its coordination with various ministries and local governments in promoting Pancasila-based programs. For instance, the agency has worked with the Ministry of Education and Culture to integrate Pancasila character education into the national curriculum and with regional administrations to develop local ideological programs (Putri, 2023). These initiatives demonstrate a vertical and horizontal diffusion of ideology within state governance structures. Nevertheless, such coordination also introduces bureaucratic complexity, as BPIP lacks direct command authority over other institutions. Its success therefore depends on collaborative governance models, where ideological objectives are achieved through persuasion and partnership rather than hierarchical control (Santosa, 2019). The implication here is that BPIP's effectiveness in policy implementation relies heavily on inter-institutional synergy, political support, and the willingness of other agencies to integrate

ideological principles into their operations.

Regarding accountability, BPIP operates within a unique framework that combines administrative and political forms of responsibility. Administratively, BPIP is accountable to the President as its primary supervising authority, following the principles set out in Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018 (Mahfud, 2018). This accountability is reflected through periodic reporting, program evaluation, and budget audits conducted under the supervision of the State Audit Board (Badan Pemeriksa Keuangan or BPK). Politically, however, BPIP's accountability is broader, as it must maintain public trust and transparency in its ideological mission. Since ideology is inherently tied to national identity, BPIP's activities are subject to societal scrutiny and public debate. This dual accountability structure requires BPIP to navigate both bureaucratic and civic expectations—ensuring legal compliance while fostering inclusivity in ideological discourse (Wibisono, 2022).

The presence of BPIP also influences how ideological policy is conceptualized and implemented in the broader context of governance. Ideological policy refers to the systematic effort of the state to translate foundational values into concrete administrative practices and public behavior. In this regard, BPIP acts as the policy hub that interprets Pancasila into actionable principles applicable to education, governance, and social development (Prasetyo, 2020). However, the translation of ideology into policy is never straightforward. It requires careful balancing between preserving the original meaning of Pancasila and adapting it to contemporary socio-political realities. The risk lies in the potential politicization of ideology—when Pancasila is used to legitimize particular political agendas rather than as a unifying ethical compass. This challenge highlights the importance of maintaining BPIP's neutrality and ensuring that its ideological functions do not evolve into instruments of political control (Sari, 2021).

Another major implication of BPIP's institutional role concerns the tension between ideological unity and democratic diversity. Indonesia's democratic transition since 1998 has emphasized pluralism, freedom of expression, and decentralization. BPIP's mission, however, is to promote a unified national ideology, which—if mismanaged—could be perceived as an attempt to standardize belief systems or suppress dissenting views (Fadli, 2020). This raises a normative dilemma: how can the state promote ideological cohesion without undermining democratic freedoms? To address this, BPIP must frame its ideological programs as educational and participatory rather than doctrinal. Encouraging public engagement, open dialogue, and community-based interpretation of Pancasila can help mitigate the risk of ideological rigidity and reinforce democratic legitimacy (Susanto, 2021).

From a legal-political perspective, BPIP's institutional role also contributes to redefining the relationship between law, politics, and morality in state governance. Ideological governance, as represented by BPIP, seeks to ensure that legal and political decisions are not merely procedural but also value-oriented. This resonates with the concept of integralistic state theory, which holds that the state should harmonize the interests of individuals and the collective through shared moral principles (Rahardjo, 2018). BPIP operationalizes this concept by embedding moral considerations into public policy. However, this approach requires caution: if moral principles are interpreted through a narrow ideological lens, it may lead to moral absolutism that conflicts with the pluralistic spirit of constitutional democracy (Anwar, 2024).

Institutionally, BPIP has also reshaped governance dynamics by creating a new locus of ideological coordination within the executive branch. Its establishment has required ministries and local governments to incorporate Pancasila-related considerations into their strategic plans, effectively institutionalizing ideology as a governance criterion (Santosa, 2019). This centralization of ideological coordination can improve policy coherence but may also reduce institutional autonomy if implemented rigidly. The balance between coordination and independence is therefore critical. Ministries must retain discretion in policymaking while adhering to the overarching moral framework provided by BPIP. This delicate balance reflects the adaptive nature of Indonesia's governance model, which blends central ideological direction with decentralized implementation.

The broader implication of BPIP's institutional role for accountability lies in its potential to enhance ethical governance. By promoting Pancasila values such as justice, humanity, and collective responsibility, BPIP encourages public officials to integrate ethical considerations into decision-making processes. This moralization of bureaucracy contributes to the prevention of corruption, abuse of power, and bureaucratic apathy (Nugroho, 2021). However, to ensure genuine ethical reform, BPIP's ideological programs must be accompanied by institutional incentives, professional ethics training, and transparent evaluation systems. Without these mechanisms, ideological education risks becoming symbolic rather than transformative.

In addition, BPIP's influence extends to civic governance. The agency's outreach programs aim to strengthen civic responsibility and national unity, especially among youth and community organizations. Through public campaigns, seminars, and educational collaborations, BPIP fosters a collective awareness of citizenship rooted in Pancasila values (Putri, 2023). These activities play a crucial role in countering radicalism, intolerance, and social fragmentation. However, such initiatives must remain inclusive and dialogical; ideological education that disregards cultural and regional diversity could alienate local communities and weaken its intended unifying effect (Wibisono, 2022).

Another implication pertains to the evolving nature of state-society relations. BPIP's presence introduces a new interface between the state and civil society in the realm of ideological governance. As an intermediary institution, BPIP must bridge governmental objectives with societal aspirations. This role demands participatory mechanisms that allow citizens, academics, and civil organizations to contribute to the formulation and evaluation of ideological programs (Mahfud, 2018). Strengthening these

Juridical and Legal-Political Analysis of BPIP's Role in the State Governance Configuration of Indonesia

participatory structures enhances both democratic accountability and ideological legitimacy. It transforms ideology from a state-imposed doctrine into a collectively owned value system that evolves with the nation's development.

In conclusion, the implications of BPIP's institutional role are far-reaching for Indonesia's governance landscape. Juridically, BPIP reinforces the constitutional mandate of Pancasila as the state's guiding ideology. Politically, it shapes policy orientation by embedding normative values into administrative processes. Administratively, it influences coordination, accountability, and ethical standards within the bureaucracy. Yet, these contributions come with challenges—particularly in maintaining ideological neutrality, ensuring transparency, and preventing the politicization of Pancasila. To address these issues, BPIP must continue refining its institutional mechanisms, enhance inter-agency collaboration, and promote participatory ideological education. Only through this balanced approach can BPIP fulfill its mission of cultivating an inclusive, value-based, and accountable system of governance grounded in the enduring philosophy of Pancasila (Anwar, 2024).

V. CONCLUSIONS

The juridical and legal-political analysis of the Indonesian Agency for Pancasila Ideology Education (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila or BPIP) reveals that the institution occupies a strategic yet complex position in Indonesia's governance system. Juridically, BPIP's foundation under Presidential Regulation No. 7 of 2018 is legitimate as an extension of the President's constitutional authority to uphold Pancasila as the nation's ideological and moral compass. Politically, BPIP functions as a bridge between law, ideology, and governance, aiming to ensure that national policies and public administration remain aligned with Pancasila values. However, this dual role introduces challenges regarding institutional overlap, accountability, and potential politicization of ideology. BPIP's implications for governance are multifaceted. It strengthens the ethical dimension of policy formulation and promotes ideological coherence across government agencies, yet it must operate carefully to preserve democratic pluralism and freedom of thought. The agency's success depends largely on maintaining transparency, inter-institutional cooperation, and public participation in ideological education. To enhance its legitimacy and long-term effectiveness, BPIP's legal framework may require elevation through legislative endorsement, ensuring broader accountability beyond the executive branch. Ultimately, BPIP represents Indonesia's effort to balance ideological continuity with democratic governance. Its effectiveness will be determined by its ability to embody Pancasila not as a rigid doctrine but as a living ethical foundation guiding policy, civic engagement, and social harmony. A value-driven yet participatory approach will allow BPIP to contribute meaningfully to building an accountable, inclusive, and ideologically grounded governance system for Indonesia's future.

REFERENCES

- 1) Anwar, M. (2024). Pancasila and democratic governance in post-reform Indonesia. Jakarta: Prenadamedia Group.
- 2) Asshiddiqie, J. (2020). Konstitusi dan hukum dalam sistem ketatanegaraan Indonesia. Yogyakarta: UII Press.
- 3) Fadli, R. (2020). Kelembagaan ideologi negara dalam sistem hukum Indonesia: Telaah terhadap posisi BPIP. *Jurnal Konstitusi dan Hukum Nasional*, 17(3), 211–228.
- 4) Mahfud, M. D. (2018). Politik hukum di Indonesia. Jakarta: Rajawali Pers.
- 5) Moleong, L. J. (2018). Metodologi penelitian kualitatif. Bandung: PT Remaja Rosdakarya.
- 6) Nugroho, A. (2021). The role of BPIP in strengthening the ideological foundation of governance in Indonesia. *Indonesian Journal of Legal Studies*, 8(2), 155–173.
- 7) Prasetyo, A. (2020). Reaktualisasi ideologi Pancasila melalui lembaga negara pasca-reformasi. *Jurnal Ketatanegaraan Indonesia*, 12(1), 33–47.
- 8) Putri, D. A. (2023). BPIP and the challenges of ideological education in a pluralistic society. *Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan Nasional*, 9(2), 89–105.
- 9) Rahardjo, S. (2018). Hukum dan perilaku: Hidup baik adalah dasar hukum yang baik. Jakarta: Kompas.
- 10) Salim, H. S. (2021). Metode penelitian hukum. Jakarta: Rajagrafindo Persada.
- 11) Santosa, A. (2019). Legal framework and institutional position of BPIP in Indonesian governance. *Jurnal Ilmu Hukum dan Konstitusi*, 5(1), 72–85.
- 12) Sari, E. N. (2021). Asas-asas pemerintahan yang baik dalam pelaksanaan lembaga ideologi negara. *Jurnal Administrasi Negara dan Kebijakan Publik*, 6(4), 201–216.
- 13) Susanto, B. (2021). Revitalisasi Pancasila dalam era demokrasi terbuka. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- 14) Suryadinata, L. (2020). Pancasila as state ideology and its institutional implementation in Indonesia. Singapore: ISEAS–Yusof Ishak Institute.
- 15) Wibisono, Y. (2022). BPIP dan dinamika politik ideologis di Indonesia. *Jurnal Politik dan Pemerintahan Indonesia*, 10(3), 141–160.