MANTRA
Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Berkelanjutan
Volume 1, No. 1, September 2026: 13-22
e-ISSN: xxxx-xxxx
https://doi.org/10.66031/mantra.vxix.xxx

Pancasila as the Socio-Cultural Consensus of the Indonesian Nation: A Historical Study of the Formulation and Ratification Process

Arditya Prayogi*[1], Riki Nasrullah[2], Novianto Ade Wahyud[3], Luthfia Rosidin[4]
[1,3,4] UIN K.H. Abdurrahman Wahid Pekalongan, Indonesia
[2] Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

Correspondence author e-mail: *arditya.prayogi@uingusdur.ac.id*

Received: 15-08-2026 *Accepted: 03-09-2026* *Published: 05-09-2026*

Abstrak

This article examines Pancasila as the socio-cultural consensus of the Indonesian nation through a historical study of its formulation and ratification. The study is based on the view that Pancasila was not born merely as a formal political decision, but as a crystallization of historical experience, cultural values, and the plural reality of Indonesian society. This research uses a qualitative approach with library research and historical analysis. Data were collected from books, journal articles, historical documents, and academic references related to the formulation of Pancasila, BPUPKI, the Committee of Nine, the Jakarta Charter, and the ratification of the 1945 Constitution. The findings show that the birth of Pancasila was shaped by colonial experience, national awakening, social diversity, deliberation, ideological negotiation, and political compromise among the nation's founders. The change in the first principle on August 18, 1945, reflects an inclusive national decision to maintain unity while preserving the religious character of Indonesian society. This study argues that Pancasila should be understood not only as a constitutional foundation and state ideology, but also as a living consensus that continues to guide unity, democracy, social justice, and the management of diversity in Indonesia today.

Kata Kunci: Pancasila; socio-cultural consensus; Indonesian pluralism; national unity

Prayogi, A., Nasrullah, R., Wahyudi, N. A., & Rosidin, L. (2026). Pancasila as the Socio-Cultural Consensus of the Indonesian Nation: A Historical Study of the Formulation and Ratification Process. *MANTRA: Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Berkelanjutan*, *1*(1), 13-22.

Copyright ©2026 to the Author. Published by CV. Ihsan Cahaya Pustaka
This is an open access article under the CC-BY-SA license

INTRODUCTION

Pancasila is the philosophical and constitutional foundation of the Indonesian state, yet its significance cannot be reduced to a formal political decision made on the eve of independence. The principles embodied in Pancasila emerged from a long interaction between historical experience, cultural practices, religious life, and the plural social reality of the archipelago. Respect for religious values, mutual cooperation, deliberation, recognition of human dignity, and the aspiration for social justice had developed within Indonesian communities long before the establishment of the modern state. Pancasila can therefore be understood as an ideological formulation rooted in the socio-cultural experience of the nation rather than as a concept wholly imported from abroad. This perspective is important because it positions Pancasila as a shared framework through which a diverse society sought to construct a legitimate and durable political community (Nasoha et al., 2024).

Indonesia was formed from a wide diversity of ethnic groups, religions, languages, customs, and local political traditions. This diversity is a source of historical richness, but it can also generate tension when no common framework is available to mediate competing identities and interests. Pancasila gained its national significance precisely in this setting: it functions as a meeting point that recognizes difference while placing it within a common commitment to national unity. The historical process of its formulation shows that the founders of the Republic were concerned not only with establishing a politically independent state, but also with creating a foundation that possessed social and cultural legitimacy across communities. The choice of Pancasila thus reflected an effort to formulate principles that could be accepted by diverse groups without elevating a single identity as the exclusive basis of the state (Indriani et al., 2024).

The colonial experience strongly shaped the national consciousness from which Pancasila developed. Colonial rule produced economic exploitation, social inequality, legal discrimination, and political restrictions, encouraging a collective awareness of the need for independence, human dignity, and justice. During the early twentieth century, nationalist organizations transformed localized resistance into a broader national movement. The Youth Pledge of 1928 became a critical milestone because it articulated a shared commitment to one homeland, one nation, and one language, thereby strengthening the idea that political independence required a unifying national identity (Sibghatullah & Syukur, 2025). These experiences provided an important historical context for the later formulation of unity, humanity, democracy, and social justice as foundational principles.

As independence approached, the need for a clear philosophical and constitutional foundation became increasingly urgent. The first session of the Investigating Committee for Preparatory Work for Indonesian Independence (BPUPKI), held from May 29 to June 1, 1945, provided an institutional forum in which national leaders debated the foundations of the future state. Mohammad Yamin, Soepomo, and Soekarno offered different emphases concerning nationalism, the relationship between the individual and society, religion and the state, democracy, and social welfare. Soekarno's speech of June 1, 1945, was particularly significant because it introduced the term Pancasila as the philosophical basis of an independent Indonesia (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025). However, the formulation process continued beyond this speech through deliberation, negotiation, and compromise.

A decisive stage occurred on June 22, 1945, when the Committee of Nine drafted the Jakarta Charter. The document represented an attempt to accommodate nationalist and Islamic aspirations within a single constitutional framework. Debate over the wording of the first principle demonstrates that Pancasila was not produced through a simple or uncontested process. Its final formulation on August 18, 1945, including the wording "Belief in the One and Only God," reflected a political and socio-cultural accommodation intended to preserve unity while maintaining the religious character of

Indonesian public life (Abdillah, 2020). This episode illustrates the central role of inclusive negotiation in transforming ideological differences into a national consensus.

Previous studies have discussed Pancasila as the state ideology, as a source of national values, and as a product of the historical process surrounding independence. Nevertheless, these strands are often treated separately: historical accounts tend to emphasize chronology, while normative discussions focus on Pancasila's legal or ideological status. This article addresses that gap by reading the stages of formulation and ratification as an integrated process of socio-cultural consensus formation. It examines how colonial experience, national awakening, pluralism, deliberation, ideological negotiation, and constitutional ratification interacted in producing a foundation that could be accepted across social groups. The study therefore aims to explain Pancasila not only as a constitutional text, but also as a living national agreement whose historical formation continues to inform unity, democratic deliberation, social justice, and the management of diversity in contemporary Indonesia.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative design based on library research and historical analysis. The approach was selected because the research focuses on interpreting Pancasila as a socio-cultural consensus through the historical process of its formulation and ratification. Historical analysis is used not merely to reconstruct a sequence of events, but to interpret the social, political, and cultural meanings that accompanied the emergence of Pancasila. The BPUPKI sessions, the formation of the Committee of Nine, the drafting of the Jakarta Charter, and the constitutional ratification of Pancasila on August 18, 1945, are treated as interconnected stages in the formation of a national consensus. This methodological orientation is consistent with a process-based historical reading in which events are analyzed in relation to their broader political and social contexts rather than as isolated episodes (Prayogi & Nasrullah, 2024; Nasrullah & Wahyudi, 2026).

The data consist of written sources relevant to the history of Pancasila, Indonesian nationalism, pluralism, and the socio-cultural foundations of the state. Documentary materials include institutional historical sources, scholarly books, journal articles, and academic discussions concerning the BPUPKI debates, the roles of Mohammad Yamin, Soepomo, and Soekarno, the Committee of Nine, the Jakarta Charter, and the ratification of the 1945 Constitution. Data were collected through documentation techniques involving close reading, note-taking, classification, and comparison of information directly related to the research focus. The materials were organized into thematic categories: colonial experience, national awakening, social pluralism, deliberation, ideological compromise, constitutional ratification, and the continuing meaning of Pancasila as a national meeting point.

Data analysis was conducted descriptively and interpretively. First, relevant sources were identified and grouped according to the historical stages and analytical themes of the study. Second, the evidence was compared across sources to identify convergences, differences in emphasis, and recurring interpretations of the formulation process. Third, the historical material was interpreted through the concept of socio-cultural consensus, particularly in relation to the formulation of divinity, humanity, unity, democracy, and social justice as principles capable of organizing a plural society. Particular attention was given to the negotiation surrounding the first principle because this episode provides a concrete illustration of the relationship between ideological commitment and national integration (Prayogi, 2026; Prayogi et al., 2026). Source comparison was used to reduce dependence on a single historical narrative and to strengthen interpretive consistency. Because the study is based exclusively on publicly available documentary materials and does not involve human participants, no individual participant data or research intervention was involved.

To improve analytical rigor, source selection was guided by direct relevance to the formulation, ratification, and socio-cultural interpretation of Pancasila. Official historical compilations were used to anchor the chronology, while recent scholarly publications were used to interpret nationalism, pluralism, religious accommodation, deliberation, and constitutional meaning. Claims concerning major historical stages were checked across more than one source whenever comparable accounts were available. The analysis did not treat frequency of citation as evidence; instead, interpretive weight was assigned according to the source's proximity to the historical issue and its relevance to the research question. The final synthesis was then reviewed thematically to ensure that each conclusion could be traced to the documentary evidence discussed in the article and that descriptive chronology remained clearly connected to the central concept of socio-cultural consensus.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Historical and Sociological Background of the Birth of Pancasila

The historical foundations of Pancasila predate the formal debates of 1945. Values later expressed through Pancasila were already present in the social practices of communities across the archipelago, including religious devotion, mutual cooperation, deliberation, communal solidarity, and aspirations for justice. These values did not exist in a uniform form, but their recurrence across diverse social settings provided ethical resources from which a common national vocabulary could be constructed. The formulation of Pancasila therefore involved both selection and political articulation: the founders transformed values familiar within social life into principles appropriate for a modern independent state. This helps explain why Pancasila could acquire legitimacy beyond the institutions that formally enacted it (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025; Sari & Najicha, 2022).

Colonialism was another decisive background. Prolonged experiences of exploitation, discrimination, and political exclusion created a shared awareness that independence required more than the transfer of sovereignty. The new state also needed to protect dignity, equality, and collective welfare. Nationalist organizations in the early twentieth century accelerated the transformation of this awareness from regional or communal resistance into a national political project. The Youth Pledge consolidated the language of national unity and demonstrated that Indonesianness could be imagined as a common identity encompassing different ethnic, linguistic, and religious communities (Rasyid et al., 2025). In this sense, the principle of unity was not merely a constitutional formula developed in 1945; it was the political expression of a longer process of nation formation.

Pluralism simultaneously strengthened the need for a shared foundation and limited the possibility of grounding the state exclusively in one social identity. Indonesia's founders confronted the practical problem of designing a state for communities with different religious affiliations, cultural traditions, and political orientations. Pancasila offered a framework in which those differences could be acknowledged without dissolving the commitment to a common political order. This function is consistent with the idea of Pancasila as an open ideology whose principles provide orientation while allowing social development and contextual interpretation (Febriyanto, 2018). Its socio-cultural character can therefore be seen in the way it links unity to diversity rather than treating unity as cultural uniformity.

The cultural dimension of this consensus becomes clearer when the five principles are considered as a connected ethical structure. The value of divinity reflects the central place of religious life in Indonesian society while avoiding the reduction of citizenship to a single religious identity. Humanity directs political life toward the recognition of dignity and civilized relations, whereas unity converts the historical experience of diversity into a commitment to a shared national community. Deliberative democracy draws on practices of consultation and collective decision-making, and social justice expresses the expectation that independence should improve the material and social conditions of the people. Mutual cooperation and community-oriented ethics helped provide a cultural vocabulary through which these values could be understood in everyday life (Sari & Najicha, 2022; Nasoha et al., 2024). The five principles therefore operate not as isolated propositions but as a normative synthesis connecting religion, citizenship, political participation, solidarity, and welfare.

The Japanese occupation intensified the political urgency of these discussions. Although Japanese policy was driven by wartime interests, the later phase of the occupation opened limited institutional space in which Indonesian leaders could prepare for independence. The creation of BPUPKI brought the question of the state's philosophical basis into a formal political forum (Rieski T et al., 2021; Octavionica et al., 2023). By 1945, historical experience, cultural values, and

immediate geopolitical pressure converged. The need for consensus was therefore not abstract: without a broadly acceptable foundation, political independence risked being undermined by ideological and social fragmentation (Zakaria, 2025).

Dynamics of the Formulation of Pancasila

The first BPUPKI session, held from May 29 to June 1, 1945, became the principal arena in which competing ideas about the state were openly articulated. The diversity of the committee's membership meant that the discussion was never a single-voice process. Mohammad Yamin, Soepomo, and Soekarno each proposed different intellectual emphases while addressing a common question: what principles could provide a legitimate foundation for an independent Indonesia? This diversity is analytically important because it shows that Pancasila emerged through the interaction of perspectives rather than through the unilateral imposition of one doctrine (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025).

Yamin's contributions are commonly associated with nationality, humanity, divinity, democracy, and popular welfare. His formulation indicates that elements later associated with Pancasila were already circulating within the constitutional debate before the term itself was formally introduced (Tama et al., 2025). Soepomo, speaking on May 31, emphasized an integral conception of the state, unity, and familial relations within society. His position highlighted the problem of balancing individual interests, social solidarity, and state authority. These interventions reveal that the debate concerned more than terminology; it addressed competing models of political community and the relationship between citizens and the state.

Soepomo's intervention further illustrates the breadth of the constitutional debate. His integralist perspective stressed the state as an organic unity rather than a contractual association of competing individuals and groups. Although later interpretations of integralism have generated debate, its presence in the BPUPKI forum is important because it shows that the founders were considering how institutional design should sustain social cohesion in a society emerging from colonial rule. The discussion therefore moved between philosophical principles and concrete questions about state organization, authority, representation, and the relationship between public power and communal life. This intellectual diversity helps explain why the final Pancasila formulation cannot be attributed to one speaker alone. Soekarno's contribution was decisive in naming and synthesizing the principles, but the eventual consensus was produced through a collective process in which different constitutional and ideological arguments were tested against the practical requirement of creating a state acceptable to a heterogeneous population (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025).

Soekarno's June 1 speech marked a conceptual turning point because he named the proposed five principles "Pancasila" and presented them as the philosophische grondslag, or philosophical

foundation, of the independent state. His formulation connected nationalism, internationalism or humanity, deliberative democracy, social welfare, and belief in God within a single political language (Burlian, 2020). The significance of the speech lies not only in the naming of Pancasila, but also in its attempt to synthesize currents already present in the national movement. Yet the speech was not the end of the process. Differences concerning religion and the state remained unresolved, requiring further negotiation after the first BPUPKI session (Kamdani et al., 2025).

The Committee of Nine subsequently provided a smaller forum for compromise between nationalist and Islamic leaders. On June 22, 1945, it produced the Jakarta Charter, which became a bridge between the debates of the first BPUPKI session and the final constitutional formulation. The wording of the first principle in the Charter reflected an attempt to accommodate Islamic aspirations within the emerging state framework. The importance of this stage lies in the political method through which disagreement was managed: deliberation did not eliminate ideological differences, but translated them into a provisional agreement. The Jakarta Charter therefore demonstrates that consensus in the Indonesian founding process was dynamic and negotiated rather than synonymous with complete uniformity (Octavionica et al., 2023; Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025).

Ratification of Pancasila and Its Significance for the Indonesian Nation

The final constitutional stage occurred on August 18, 1945, one day after the Proclamation of Independence. At its session, the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian Independence (PPKI) ratified the 1945 Constitution and established the institutional foundations of the new Republic. Pancasila was incorporated into the fourth paragraph of the Preamble, giving the principles a constitutional position within the state. The sequence of June 1, June 22, and August 18 should therefore be understood as a connected process: conceptual articulation, political compromise, and constitutional ratification. This layered interpretation is also reflected in the official historical framing of Pancasila's birth and development (Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI, 2025).

The most consequential adjustment concerned the first principle of the Jakarta Charter. On August 18, its earlier formulation was changed to "Belief in the One and Only God." The amendment was not merely editorial. It represented a decision to formulate the religious foundation of the state in language capable of encompassing Indonesia's diverse communities while preserving a strong recognition of religion in public life. Later scholarship interprets this change as evidence of the founders' willingness to prioritize national unity and inclusivity over exclusive group claims (Samekto, 2020; Hamdan & Masyitoh, 2025). In socio-cultural terms, the decision illustrates how consensus was achieved by adjusting constitutional language to the plural composition of the nation.

Constitutional ratification transformed Pancasila from an emerging political idea into the normative foundation of the state. Its position in the Preamble means that divinity, humanity, unity,

deliberative democracy, and social justice function as an interconnected value structure for national life (Permatasari, 2026). These principles also provide an ethical framework for evaluating law, governance, and public policy. At the same time, Pancasila's significance cannot be confined to legal hierarchy. Its durability rests on its capacity to operate as a shared civic reference among communities that retain different religious, cultural, and political identities. This is why interpretations of Pancasila continue to emphasize ethical citizenship, tolerance, deliberation, and public responsibility (Aini & Dewi, 2022).

The ratification also gave Pancasila a dual character that remains important for contemporary interpretation. On the one hand, it functions constitutionally as the value foundation of the state; on the other, it operates sociologically as a shared reference for public life. These dimensions reinforce one another. Constitutional recognition gives the principles institutional continuity, while social acceptance allows them to function beyond formal legal texts. The strength of Pancasila therefore depends not only on its placement in the Preamble but also on the continued willingness of citizens and institutions to translate its principles into inclusive practice. This relationship is especially visible in debates over religious coexistence, democratic participation, social welfare, and equal citizenship. Studies of Pancasila's ethical and constitutional position similarly emphasize that its relevance is maintained when the five principles are interpreted as mutually reinforcing standards rather than as separate slogans (Aini & Dewi, 2022; Permatasari, 2026).

The historical evidence therefore supports reading Pancasila as a national meeting point produced through negotiated pluralism. The founding process did not remove disagreement; instead, it created a political framework within which disagreement could coexist with a shared commitment to the Republic. This distinction is crucial. Consensus here does not mean the absence of difference, but the willingness of different groups to recognize a common constitutional foundation. Contemporary discussions of inclusion and intergroup relations continue to make this dimension relevant, particularly when Indonesian society faces polarization, exclusivism, or unequal access to social participation (Kaharuddin et al., 2024; Naisa et al., 2026).

The continuing relevance of Pancasila follows from this historical character. Challenges to national unity, democratic deliberation, social justice, and respect for human dignity have changed in form, but they remain related to the same problem faced by the founders: how to sustain a common political life in a deeply plural society. Understanding Pancasila as a living socio-cultural consensus shifts attention from memorizing its five principles to examining how those principles are practiced in institutions, public ethics, and everyday relations. Such an interpretation also clarifies the practical implication of the historical study: the legitimacy of Pancasila is strengthened when state institutions and citizens reproduce the inclusive, deliberative, and justice-oriented logic through which the foundational consensus itself was achieved.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Pancasila emerged as a socio-cultural consensus rooted in Indonesia's historical experience and plural social reality. Its formulation was shaped by colonial injustice, the growth of national consciousness, the ethical values embedded in social and religious life, and the practical need to establish a common foundation for an independent state. The BPUPKI debates, Soekarno's June 1 speech, the Jakarta Charter of June 22, and the constitutional ratification of August 18, 1945, form an interconnected process of deliberation, negotiation, and compromise. The revision of the first principle into "Belief in the One and Only God" is particularly important because it demonstrates the founders' attempt to preserve religious meaning while creating a formulation acceptable to a diverse nation. Theoretically, the findings support an understanding of Pancasila not only as a legal foundation or state ideology, but also as a negotiated framework for managing pluralism. Practically, this perspective underscores the importance of inclusive deliberation, public ethics, social justice, and respect for diversity in sustaining national cohesion. The study is limited by its reliance on documentary and secondary sources and therefore does not examine contemporary public interpretations empirically. Future research may combine archival investigation, discourse analysis, or field-based studies to assess how the founding consensus is interpreted and practiced across institutions and communities in contemporary Indonesia.

REFERENCES

Abdillah, M. (2020). Aktualisasi Islam dan keindonesiaan dalam konteks ideologi negara Pancasila. *Himmah, 4*(1), 260–274.

Aini, N. Q., & Dewi, D. A. (2022). Sistem etika Pancasila dalam kehidupan berbangsa dan bernegara. *Jurnal Pendidikan Tambusai, 6*(2), 11120–11125.

Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila RI. (2025). *Naskah sumber arsip dasar negara I: Masa sidang pertama Badan Penyelidik Usaha-Usaha Persiapan Kemerdekaan (BPUPK) 29 Mei s.d. 1 Juni 1945*. Badan Pembinaan Ideologi Pancasila.

Burlian, P. (2020). Pemikiran Soekarno dalam perumusan Pancasila. *Doctrinal, 5*(2), 143–169.

Febriyanto, M. (2018). The role of Pancasila as an open ideology. *J. Sci. Indones., 4*(1), 27–46.

Hamdan, N., & Masyitoh, S. (2025). Ketuhanan dalam era pluralisme: Relevansi sila pertama Pancasila dalam kebijakan negara. *Majelis J. Huk. Indones., 2*(1), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.62383/majelis.v2i1.445

Indriani, J., Aisyah, N., & Trisno, B. (2024). Pancasila sebagai dasar negara Indonesia. *KONSENSUS J. Ilmu Pertahanan, Huk. dan Ilmu Komun., 1*(4), 104–114.

Kaharuddin, Syahuri, T., & Fauzan, M. (2024). Analisis interkonektivitas antara nilai-nilai Pancasila dan indikator SDGs dalam konteks inklusifitas penyandang disabilitas di Indonesia. *PANCASILA J. Keindonesiaan, 4*(2), 163–175. https://doi.org/10.52738/pjk.v4i2.559

Kamdani, Ramayani, D., Siregar, M. R., & Fadiyah, N. (2025). Pancasila dalam konteks perjuangan bangsa Indonesia. *J. Mhs. Kreat., 3*(2), 14–26. https://doi.org/10.59581/jmk-widyakarya.v3i1.4666

Naisa, Z. A., Hikmawati, Y., Musallamah, A. M., Maulidiyah, S., Zahra, S. A., Ma'arif, A. M., & Prayogi, A. (2026). Klenteng dan produksi kerukunan lintas iman di Pekalongan. *Journal of Multidisciplinary in Islam, 2*(2), 13–20.

Nasrullah, R., & Wahyudi, N. A. (2026). Diskursus Politik Kebijakan Pendidikan Dalam Tes Kemampuan Akademik: Antara Kepentingan Stakeholder Dan Rekonfigurasi Akuntabilitas Pendidikan. *Jurnal Ilmiah Cakrawarti*, *9*(2), 31-41.

Nasoha, A. M. M., Atqiya, A. N., Pratiwi, D. I., Putri, S. R., & Naim, S. A. (2024). Pancasila sebagai ideologi bangsa: Perwujudan nilai budaya dan konsensus dalam keberagaman Indonesia. *Majelis J. Huk. Indones., 1*(3), 68–84. https://doi.org/10.62383/majelis.v1i3.321

Octavionica, D., Kadwa, I. I., & Evelyno, M. F. (2023). Sejarah perumusan Pancasila. *Indig. Knowl., 2*(4), 284–289.

Permatasari, A. (2026). Kedudukan Pancasila dalam sistem ketatanegaraan Indonesia. *SATRIA J. Interdiscip. Stud., 1*(1), 105–114.

Prayogi, A. (2026). BAB 2 SEJARAH PERUMUSAN DAN LAHIRNYA PANCASILA. *PENGANTAR PENDIDIKAN PANCASILA*, 19.

Prayogi, A., & Nasrullah, R. (2024). Historical review of Indonesia during the national revolution: A process approach. *Sos. J. Ilmu Sos. Polit. dan Hum., 1*(1), 1–10.

Prayogi, A., Shaleh, A. I., & Said, A. (2026). An Analysis of First-Time Voters' Digital Political Participation and Ideological Polarization in Elections. *Ardi Academic Multidisciplinary Journal*, *1*(1), 39-62.

Rasyid, S., Nurhaolillah, Syahril, & Fahmi, M. (2025). Tiga pelopor bangkitnya nasionalisme di awal pergerakan Indonesia: Budi Utomo, Sarekat Islam, dan Indische Partij. *CARITA J. Sej. dan Budaya, 3*(2), 124–143. https://doi.org/10.35905/carita.v3i2.12871

Rieski T, J., Handayani, S., & Sumardi. (2021). Mobilisasi bangsa Indonesia pada masa pendudukan Jepang untuk kepentingan Perang Asia Timur Raya. *Istor. J. Pendidik. dan Sej., 17*(1), 1–12.

Samekto, F. X. A. (2020). *Pancasila pandu Indonesia dalam taman sari dunia*. Penerbit BPIP RI.

Sari, R., & Najicha, F. U. (2022). Memahami nilai-nilai Pancasila sebagai dasar negara. *Harmony, 7*(1), 53–58.

Sibghatullah, A., & Syukur, S. (2025). Sumpah Pemuda dan Kongres Pemuda: Tonggak sejarah persatuan bangsa Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Multidisipliner, 9*(8), 47–54.

Tama, V. I., Rafni, A., Hasrul, & Kurniawati, E. (2025). Konsep Muhammad Yamin tentang prinsip-prinsip demokrasi di Indonesia pada buku "Muhammad Yamin dan cita-cita persatuan." *Edu Res. J. Penelit. Pendidik., 6*(3), 2160–2171.

Zakaria, M. (2025). Interaksi sosial dan politik dalam dinamika lahirnya Pancasila. *Maliki Interdiscip. J., 3*(November), 306–313.