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ABSTRACT

The study seeks to examine the role and jurisdiction of the People's Assembly of Permusyarawatan (MPR) within the Indonesian statehood system after the modification of UUD 1945. It also intends to identify the efforts made to optimize its functioning and the problems encountered. Normative legal research methods are employed to specifically analyze primary, secondary, and tertiary legal material. The primary legal materials consist of the 1945 Basic Act and its subsequent changes, along with the relevant statutes that regulate the MPR. Secondary legal resources encompass pertinent literature, periodicals, and scientific publications. The research findings indicate that the modifications made to the 1945 UUD have limited the jurisdiction of the MPR, which currently possesses only one primary authority while the others are considered secondary. Constitutional Supremacy establishes the Constitution as the primary framework for governing the state, with the MPR being seen as an autonomous institution alongside the DPR and DPD. While the powers of the MP are restricted, responsibilities like the Socialization of the Four Pillars continue to be essential in maintaining the fundamental foundations of the state. The enhancement of the MPR's authority relies significantly on the agreement among parliament members as stated in the MD3 Act. The primary obstacle it faces is to ensure the MPR remains relevant and effective in a constantly changing statehood environment. The paper suggests implementing strategic initiatives to enhance the role of MPR in the Indonesian statehood system by implementing policy reforms and improving institutional capability.

INTRODUCTION

The Law No. 12 of 2011, often known as UUP3, provides a complete framework...
for the establishment of legislative regulations in Indonesia. UUP3 is the legal framework that establishes and governs the different types of rules and regulations that are acknowledged and enforced within the lives of nations and their citizens. The UUP3 serves as the primary framework that governs the types of rules that can be issued by different state institutions, such as the Act, Government Regulations Replacing the Law (Perppu), Regulations of Government (PP), Presidential Regulations (Perpres), and regulations published by ministries and non-ministerial agencies. Each category of regulation has certain purposes and holds specific places within the national legal system, which is carefully controlled to maintain consistency and certainty in the law.

According Sri Soemantri¹, The presence of many legislative rules of varying forms and levels necessitates a hierarchical structure for regulating legislation. (Soemantri, 1985). In the Indonesian setting, where the rule of law and the hierarchy of legislative norms are followed, this idea becomes essential for maintaining uniformity and order in the national legal system. Sri Soemantri emphasized that the absence of a distinct hierarchy among the several rules of current legislation could lead to ambiguity and discord during their execution. Hence, the hierarchical structure of legislative regulations aims to guarantee that each rule is founded on robust legal principles and aligns with its appropriate level.

The People's Parliamentary Assembly (MPR) is a key entity in the Indonesian statehood system, which is governed by the 1945 Basic Law. Before the changes to the 1945 UUD, the MPR functioned as the supreme institution of the state, exercising the whole sovereignty of the people, with unrestricted authority. Within this particular framework, the UUD 1945 stipulates that "Sovereignty is vested in the populace and is fully executed by the Assembly of the People's Ordinance." As the representative of the entire Indonesian population, the MPR has complete jurisdiction to make decisions and establish the course of the country’s policies. The revision to the UUD 1945 brought about changes in the role and functions of the MPR. However, the fundamental premise that sovereignty lies with the people continues to serve as the primary basis for the Indonesian government structure. Within the constitutional framework, the MPR's role is to ensure that the desires and intentions of the people are carried out through democratic processes and in compliance with relevant legal standards.²

The revision of the 1945 Basic Law has resulted in the establishment of a state institutional framework that aims to ensure equitable power among its components, hence enabling checks and balances. The objective of the system is to establish the primacy of legal principles and fairness while ensuring the safeguarding and preservation of human

¹ Sri Soemantri, Ketetapan MPR (S) Sebagai Salah Satu Sumber Hukum Tata Negara, Bandung, Remadja Karya, 1985, hlm. 14.
² Pasal 1 Ayat (2) Undang-Undang Dasar 1945.
rights. The democratic state and the rule of law are built upon the principles of equality and reciprocal control systems. Within this structure, every state institution possesses equivalent jurisdiction and is obligated to oversee and harmonize with one another to prevent any instances of power misuse. The process of checks and balances is essential for ensuring that all government actions adhere to the law and the constitution, thereby safeguarding the rights of the people and enabling the enforcement of justice.\(^3\)

The Pancasila legal system is the foundation of the national legal system. This system integrates different levels of interest, social values, and the concept of justice into a comprehensive legal framework. It combines numerous positive characteristics to create a holistic and responsive legal system that meets the demands of society. The accepted national legal policy serves as the foundation and framework for all aspects of law formulation, development, and implementation in Indonesia. This legal policy is designed to align with the principles of Pancasila and aims to provide a just and equitable legal system that aligns with the desires of the populace. This strategy aims to ensure that the evolving legal system in Indonesia accurately represents the country's social and cultural diversity, while also being equipped to address contemporary concerns.

Therefore, the modifications made to the 1945 UUD were not merely alterations to legal papers, but rather a substantial advancement towards establishing a democratic, equitable, and socially equitable institutional and legal framework. The ideas of equality, checks and balances, and the rule of law are fundamental foundations that guarantee equitable protection and justice for all citizens under the legal system. Furthermore, it demonstrates Indonesia's dedication to maintaining human rights and establishing a legal and democratic state, in alignment with the fundamental principles of Pancasila that serve as the bedrock of the nation.

There have been four modifications or revisions to the 1945 Basic Law since the period of reform. The first amendment was ratified on 19 October 1999, the second on 18 August 2000, the third on 10 November 2001, and the fourth on 10 August 2002. Each of these modifications contributes to a durable and harmonious cohesion. The amendment procedure is executed by integrating the amendments into the legislative outputs of the People's Assembly (MPR). Each legislative output of this MPR comprises the formulation or composition of articles and sentences that have been altered, without the necessity to restate the wording of sentences or articles that remain unaltered. Therefore, this amendment seeks to modernize and enhance the UUD 1945 in alignment with contemporary progress and the requirements of the Indonesian country.

The initial amendment, enacted on 19 October 1999, served as an initial measure towards constitutional reform, to bolster the democratic system and fortify the

\(^3\) Ika Y. Darmayanti, “Politik Hukum Pemilu Legislatif”, *Jurnal Daulat Hukum, Volume 2 Edisi 2*, Juni, 2019, hlm. 176.
safeguarding of human rights. These modifications encompass the incorporation and alteration of certain substantial sections to accurately embody the essence of reform. The second amendment, enacted on 18 August 2000, furthered the reform process by including additional provisions that aimed to enhance the capabilities and responsibilities of state institutions, while also promoting greater government accountability and transparency. The third amendment, enacted on 10 November 2001, focused on enhancing the statehood system by modifying some provisions that pertain to state institutions and human rights. These modifications are additionally intended to establish a governing framework that is more productive and streamlined. The fourth amendment, enacted on August 10, 2002, marked the final stage in a sequence of amendments implemented after the reforms. The adjustments involve the enhancement of some chapters that require improvement, to bolster the democratic system and harmonize the distribution of power across governmental entities.4

This reform exemplifies the unwavering dedication of the Indonesian populace to consistently revise and refine the Constitution, which serves as the paramount legal basis for the nation's existence. The revisions not only adapt to the evolving circumstances and societal demands but also guarantee that UUD 1945 stays pertinent and capable of addressing future difficulties. The process also reinforces the significance of the MPR's function as the governing body responsible for making constitutional amendments, while upholding the ideals of democracy and fairness.

Following the modification of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia in 1945, the Assembly of the People's Provisions (MPR) experienced a decline in its standing and effectiveness within the state structure. This decline also affected the legal products it generated, such as the MPR Constitution (TAP MPR). The 1945 modification to the UUD greatly restricted the power of the MPR. The provisions of the MPR, formerly a significant legal output generated by MPRs, are no longer explicitly acknowledged in the signed 1945 UUDs. The term TAP MPR originated from the initial sessions of the Provisional People's Assembly (MPRS), established by Article 3 of the 1945 Constitution. Before the change, the MPR possessed complete ability to establish a provision that would be obligatory for the entire entity of the state. These provisions act as the primary principles in the upkeep of government and national existence. Nevertheless, with the amendment, its position diminished in significance.5

The 1945 changes to the UUD, initiated during the period of reform, sought to enhance the foundations of democracy and the supremacy of law. Nevertheless, the MPR experiences a substantial decrease in both its authority and function. The MPR, formerly
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the preeminent governmental organization with boundless jurisdiction, now possesses a more restricted scope of power. This encompasses the issuance of provisions, which once served as a primary tool in political and legal decision-making.

The Assembly of the People's Parliament (MPR) has the power to determine the general course of the country's direction in a comprehensive manner. This jurisdiction grants the MPR the power to establish the primary principles for the trajectory of the state's development and policy in its entirety. The MPR Act, which was later referred to as the MPR legal product, is associated with this authority. During the Temporary People's Assembly (MPRS), the legislation in question was referred to as the TAP Act or MPRS Act.

This mandate plays a crucial role in shaping the trajectory and governance of the nation. It functions as the primary set of principles that must be adhered to by all components of the government and society in fulfilling their obligations and duties. The MPR TAP encompasses a wide range of areas in the realm of national affairs, such as politics, economics, society, and culture, all aimed at attaining national objectives. During the MPRS, the emergence of this TAP was a direct response to the necessity of offering explicit and organized guidance in the governance and development of the nation. This clause ensures that all actions made by the government and other institutions of the country will align with the vision and mission established by the MPR. As a result, it promotes harmony and unity in the pursuit of national objectives.6

The State system encompasses the organizational framework of a state, including the arrangement and roles of state institutions, as well as the jurisdiction, responsibilities, and obligations associated with each of them. Within a state system, each state institution possesses a well-defined function that aligns with the constitution or fundamental laws of the currently effective country. The main objective of the statehood system is to govern the functioning of the state, including the allocation of power among the legislative, executive, and judicial branches. This system establishes both the hierarchy and structure of governmental institutions, while also ensuring a balance of power among them to prevent any misuse of authority. Within this framework, the system of statehood governs the functions and authorities of each institution, such as the parliament or legislative assembly, which is responsible for creating laws, the government or executive, which is responsible for carrying out public policies, and the judicial system or judicial institutions, which handle law enforcement and the resolution of legal disputes.

In Indonesia, the democratic system is founded on the principle that the authority of the people is derived not only from legal regulations but also from the organizational

and operational frameworks of the state and government. Within this framework, the term "people's sovereignty" denotes the principle that ultimate authority within a state rests with its citizens. The people have the entitlement to determine and exert influence over policy formation using selecting their representatives in legislative and executive bodies through general elections.

Furthermore, this principle also encompasses the significance of a proficient and streamlined governmental institutional framework. Parliament, government, and the judiciary must operate with transparency, accountability, and independence. These institutional procedures are created to guarantee that decisions made by governments or other state entities are grounded in the current legal framework and in alignment with democratic norms. A well-defined and strong legal framework is indispensable in this setting. The law should ensure that citizens have a clear understanding of their rights and responsibilities, and that any actions taken by the government can be legally challenged and held responsible. Therefore, an efficient legal system will facilitate the establishment of a robust democracy and uphold stability and fairness in governing the nation.

The notion of popular sovereignty, which encompasses both the legal framework and the organizational structures of state and government institutions, is crucial for the functioning of Indonesia's democratic system. Its objective is to ensure the preservation of the State in alignment with the objectives, functions, and principles of the nation. The notion of popular sovereignty is a key tenet of a democratic society, asserting that ultimate authority in the nation resides with the people. Essentially, significant choices that impact society should originate from and mirror the collective desires and interests of the entire population. In Indonesia, the principle of democratic governance is implemented through the conduct of general elections, when representatives of the people are elected to serve in the legislative and executive branches. Additionally, the public plays an active role in the political process.

Nevertheless, the concept of people's sovereignty extends beyond political matters and encompasses legal and institutional dimensions as well. Consequently, it is imperative that state institutions, including parliaments, administrations, and the legal system, are meticulously structured to operate with efficiency and openness. These institutions must possess unequivocal jurisdiction as stipulated by the constitution or fundamental laws of the nation and must be accountable and impartial in the execution of their responsibilities. Moreover, ensuring legal certainty is a crucial requirement for upholding the authority of the people. The law must be impartial and equitable for every individual, without any exemptions. Consequently, all governmental or state agency decisions must adhere strictly to transparent and justifiable legal frameworks, to prevent any potential misuse of authority.

This article will analyze the role of the MPR in fulfilling its fundamental duties and
functions within the legislative framework and political landscape of Indonesia.

METHODS

The study methodology employed to examine the role and power of the People's Assembly of the Permusyawaratan (MPR) in the Indonesian statehood system following the revision of the UUD 1945 centers on the analysis of primary, secondary, and tertiary legal sources. The primary legal materials consist of the Basic Law of 1945, along with its revisions, as well as the laws and regulations that regulate the MPR. Secondary legislative materials encompass various forms of written content, such as literature, books, journals, and scientific papers, that specifically address the modifications in the functions and powers of the MPR following the 1945 UUD Amendment. Furthermore, tertiary legal resources, such as legal encyclopedias and legal dictionaries, are employed to bolster analysis.

The research commences by identifying the primary issues, specifically the alteration in the role and authority of the MPR following the revision of the UUD 1945, along with the optimization endeavors and hurdles it encounters. Normative analysis involves examining legislative texts and other legal documents to gain a comprehensive understanding of the transformations occurring in the structure and operation of the MPR. The study also examines conditions before and after the amendment to ascertain disparities and ramifications for the Indonesian state structure.

Furthermore, this research approach also entails examining pertinent legal literature to comprehend the principles and perspectives of specialists about the enhancement of MPR authority. The findings of this investigation are subsequently utilized to develop suggestions that might be executed to enhance MPR's position within the Indonesian state system. The highlighted issues encountered in these optimization endeavors are thoroughly examined to offer a detailed overview of the necessary actions to address the current hurdles.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

After the reforms, the Constitutional Decree of the People's Assembly (TAP MPR) was further reinforced with the issuance of MPR Decree No. III/MPR/2000, which established the legal sources and hierarchy of regulations. This section stipulates that the hierarchical arrangement of legislation is the principal criterion for establishing the rule of law in accordance with it. This provision is anticipated to enhance the structure and consistency of the legislative process, ensuring that every rule created have a distinct and robust legal basis. The presence of this explicit hierarchy of laws and regulations is anticipated to enhance the systematic and purposeful nature of the legislative process in Indonesia. Additionally, it guarantees that any law enacted have a robust legal foundation
and does not contradict superior regulations. The MPR Decree No. III/MPR/2000 plays a crucial role in fortifying the national legal system after the reform, aiming to establish an efficient, transparent, and responsible government system.

The implementation of TAP MPR No. III/MPR/2000 brought about a significant alteration in the statehood framework of the Republic of Indonesia, resulting from the approval of the Fourth Amendment to the 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia. This amendment not only modifies the constitution, but also profoundly alters the hierarchy and structure of legislation in Indonesia. An important consequence of this modification is the reorganization of the MPR TAP as a legislative regulatory mechanism in the country. Before the implementation of TAP MPR No. III/MPR/2000, the MPR TAP (and formerly, MPRS TAP) played a significant and influential role in the Indonesian legal system. The MPR TAP frequently issues crucial directives about state policy that encompass diverse facets of national and domestic affairs. Nevertheless, because to the modifications made to the Fourth Amendment of the 1945 NRI, this function has experienced a substantial alteration. MPR No. III/MPR/2000 outlines the prescribed sequence for the enactment of new legislation, which must be adhered to in the development of legal regulations in Indonesia.

Marida Farida argues that the removal of TAP MPR from the legislative regulation’s hierarchy is constitutionally permissible. This is a result of the restrictions placed on the authority of the People's Parliament (MPR) as outlined in the Fourth Amendment of the 1945 NRI Regulation. The revised mandate of the MP is limited to a select few tasks, including modifying and forming the UUD, choosing and removing the President and/or vice president, and selecting a Vice President in the event of a vacancy. More precisely, the 1945 UUD of the NRI, which has been ratified, does not grant the MPR the power to participate in the creation of legislative laws that govern the lives of the general public. This authority highlights particular characteristics that are directly associated with more specific executive and legislative powers. Consequently, the MPR TAP, which previously had a function in offering guidance and instructions for the development of national policies through the regulations it produced, lost its strong constitutional foundation with the amendment of the UUD 1945. As a consequence, TAP MPR lost its hierarchical status in the legislative laws of Indonesia that control the lives of the general population. This perspective highlights the importance of ensuring that any lawful product and regulation is established with explicit authority and in alignment with the hierarchical structure outlined in the UUD 1945. Therefore, the MPR's role and influence in the legislative process and regulation of legislation are precisely governed,

---

in line with amendments that have been made to clarify and restrict the authority of state institutions based on democratic principles and the rule of law.\(^8\)

Hans Kelsen argues that legal standards are organized in a hierarchical system with multiple layers. Essentially, every legal rule that is in effect is derived from a superior rule, and each superior rule also originates and is founded on even more superior rules, and so forth. The highest norm in this hierarchy is referred to as the Grundnorm. According to Kelsen, the Grundnorm is the fundamental norm in a legal system that serves as the underlying principle or basis for all the legal norms within that system.\(^9\)

The legal system is hierarchically and dynamically constructed, meaning that the institutions of authority are responsible for creating and revoking laws. The process of construction and eradication is predicated on higher standards within the hierarchy that validate the existence of lower norms. Put simply, each subordinate rule or law must adhere to a superior rule to possess legitimate legal authority.

This hierarchy establishes a meticulously structured legal framework, wherein each norm is assigned a specific position and function based on its level within the hierarchies. It guarantees that there is a clear and definite understanding of the law and that the legal system is able to properly govern people's lives and handle conflicts and societal changes that arise throughout time. The Constitution is considered the supreme and foundational law in a nation. It derives its status as a source of legitimacy or the foundation of authority for all types of laws or regulations of other laws.\(^10\)

In essence, a constitution is a fundamental pact or agreement between the government and the citizens, outlining the framework of the government, the powers of state institutions, the fundamental rights of individuals, and the mechanisms and processes for making political decisions. The Constitution also confirms the fundamental concepts that regulate the relationships between the government and society, as well as between the different branches of government in a democratic system. Constitutions in certain nations, such as Indonesia, are formed through specific procedures that involve active involvement of the people and are typically ratified or agreed upon through particular processes. The Constitution serves as the fundamental basis for all laws, rules, and governmental policies. It carries legal force and applies to all individuals and organizations inside the state. The constitution holds a superior hierarchical position compared to the norms of other laws, as it is the supreme law. Any law or conduct that goes against the constitution might be deemed invalid or inapplicable due to the authority

---

\(^8\) Maria Farida Indrati Soeprapto, *Ilmu Perundang-Undangan: Jenis, Fungsi, dan Materi Muatan*, Kanisius, Yogyakarta, 2016, hlm. 103.


of competent bodies, such as constitutional courts or other judicial entities.

Moreover, the Constitution functions as a tool to safeguard the basic rights of individuals from possible misuse of authority by the government or other entities. The Constitution often establishes methods to safeguard these rights, as well as procedures for modifying or altering the constitution in response to changing societal or political circumstances inside a country.

The constitution, serving as a legally enforceable foundation, is the product of the supreme governing body within a nation. In Indonesia, the legitimacy of the constitution is derived from the notion of the sovereignty of the people. This means that the Constitution is granted power and validity by the people, who are considered the fundamental source of authority. The basic function of the state is to uphold and enforce the law, ensuring the freedom of its citizens. The Indonesian Constitution, known as the 1945 Basic Law, explicitly declares that the authority and power reside with the citizens. People's sovereignty refers to the principle that ultimate authority and power within a nation resides with the collective body of its citizens, rather than being concentrated in the hands of a select few persons or groups. It embodies the notion that government should originate from and be answerable to the citizens. Within this particular framework, the Constitution functions as a tool for overseeing and restricting the authority of the government, while also safeguarding the fundamental rights of individuals. The Constitution delineates the framework of governance, the allocation of authority among the executive, legislative, and judicial institutions, and the entitlements of persons that must be upheld and safeguarded by the State.

Karl Loewenstein categorizes the constitution into three distinct values: normative values, nominal values, and semantic values. Normative values pertain to circumstances in which the norms outlined in the fundamental law are considered to have legal force and are acknowledged by the individuals who are obligated by the Constitution. Consequently, these criteria are acknowledged and adhered to in practical application. Meanwhile, notional values arise when certain or all aspects of the Constitution are not actively utilized as guiding principles or references in the execution of state actions. The contents of such a constitution have only nominal significance, without substantial effect in the actual functioning of the government.11

According to Loewenstein, semantic values arise when the standards in the constitution are seen merely as symbols or jargon, without being put into practice in the political and legal affairs of the state. According to Karl Loewenstein, the significance of a constitution is determined by its real implementation and adherence in the functioning of government and state law, rather than being solely a formal text or symbolic

---

representation.

The amendments made to the 1945 UUD have substantially modified the power of the People's Assembly of Permusyawaratan (MPR), which previously held the highest position and governed the people's sovereignty as stipulated in the pre-amendment constitution.

Before the modification, the MPR possessed the only jurisdiction to designate and remove the President and the Vice-President. Following the alteration, the selection of the President and Vice President occurred directly through a general election method, rather than involving the MPR.

This transformation signifies the shift towards a more straightforward and inclusive type of democracy, where the authority of the people is reflected more directly through universal elections. The division between the legislative and executive branches is becoming more pronounced due to the diminishing political influence of Members of Parliament (MPs) in the selection of the head of state. This results in the president being elected directly by the people, serving as a representation of direct democracies and deriving their authority directly from the people.

The status of MPR as a state institution is determined by Act No. 2 of 2018 on MD3 and UUD 1945. The MPR is an enduring establishment that possesses its own chambers inside the Indonesian parliamentary system, referred to as the Trikameral. The MPR is considered an autonomous, separate, and coequal entity alongside the DPR and the DPD.\(^\text{12}\)

The powers of the People's Assembly of Representatives (MPR) are distinct and independent, not a fusion of powers from the Council of People's Representatives (DPR) and the Regional Council of Deputies (DPD), as stated in Article 3 of the 1945 Constitution. Furthermore, the MPR possesses the capacity to establish a commission, an ad hoc committee, or a Workers' Body at a designated period, particularly when convening joint sessions that involve multiple members from the DPR and the DPD. It demonstrates that the creation of such equipment is not permanent, but rather occurs just when required to facilitate the completion of specific activities at a particular moment.

CONCLUSION

The State system encompasses the organizational framework of a state, encompassing the structure and hierarchy of state institutions, as well as the power, roles, and responsibilities assigned to each of them. From 1999 to 2002, the 1945 Basic Act received several modifications that are anticipated to propel Indonesia towards a more

advanced state. The responsibilities and jurisdiction of the People's Assembly (MPR) were outlined in both UUD 1945 and the MPR Provisions (TAP MPR) before the alteration.

Before the amendment, the MPR was considered the supreme institution of the state, possessing the sovereignty of the people and extensive powers. The Member of Parliament (MP) have the power to enact the Basic Law, create the National High Line (GBHN), and select, designate, and remove the President and/or Vice-President throughout their tenure. There is no explicit clause specifying the reasons for the removal of the President and/or the Vice-President in the event of dismissal. Following the revision of the 1945 UUD, there was a notable alteration in the framework of Indonesian statehood. The MPR no longer holds the ultimate authority in the state or the primary custodianship of the people's sovereignty. The MPR authority that previously governed the founding of GBHN has been abolished. Furthermore, the MPR no longer possesses the jurisdiction to appoint the President and Vice-Presidents, as the election is now conducted directly by the populace via general elections. This alteration signifies a profound transformation in the Indonesian system of governance, resulting in enhanced democracy and the direct involvement of citizens in the selection of the nation's leader.

The authority of the MPR has been progressively limited due to the revisions made to the 1945 UUD. Currently, the MPR possesses just one primary power, while the others are secondary in nature. The amendment confirms the principle of constitutional supremacy, indicating that the constitution takes precedence as the principal guiding principle in governing the state. The authority of the MPR is essential in the governance of the Indonesian state and is distinct from the authorities of the DPR and the DPD, as stated in Article 3 of UUD 1945. This demonstrates the growing recognition of the importance of MPR and its anticipated ability to make crucial decisions for the preservation of the Indonesian nation. Furthermore, MPR is also responsible for carrying out the Socialization of the Four Pillars, with the objective of ensuring that Indonesia remains grounded in Pancasila. This responsibility upholds the objective of the State to uphold and ensure the freedom of its citizens, albeit this freedom is regulated by law as a manifestation of the people's volition.

The 1945 UUD amendments introduced a revised structure in the Indonesian state system with the aim of establishing a more efficient framework for oversight and accountability. These adjustments are anticipated to uphold the efficacy of the MPR's limited powers and facilitate the stability and advancement of the nation. This transition also underscores the significance of adhering to the ideals of democracy and the rule of law, ensuring that every policy and decision made by the MPR consistently mirrors the desires and volition of the populace.
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