

The conception of human nature according to Notonagoro and Drijarkara and their implications for the development of the Philosophy of Pancasila

A concepção da natureza humana segundo Notonagoro e Drijarkara e suas implicações para o desenvolvimento da Filosofia de Pancasila

La concepción de la naturaleza humana según Notonagoro y Drijarkara y sus implicaciones para el desarrollo de la Filosofía de Pancasila

Received: 10/26/2020 | Reviewed: 10/30/2020 | Accept: 11/06/2020 | Published: 11/08/2020

Yoseph Umarhadi

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2470-0266>

Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta

E-mail: yoseph.umarhadi@yahoo.com

Lasiyo

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2871-6070>

Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta

E-mail: lasiyo@ugm.ac.id

Heri Santoso

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5365-3708>

Faculty of Philosophy, Gadjah Mada University, Yogyakarta

E-mail: herisantosougmail@gmail.com

Abstract

This article aims to compare the conception of human nature according to Notonagoro and Drijarkara and their implications for the development of the philosophy of Pancasila. For this reason, this study uses a comparison method. With the basic understanding of Pancasila is a philosophical system and human as its ontological basis, the philosophy of Pancasila can be well understood through an understanding of human nature. Therefore, the understanding of Pancasila must begin with understanding of human nature. This study found that Notonagoro and Drijarkara had similarities and differences in formulating human nature as ontological basis of Pancasila. Equally, both see humans not as a single entity. Notonagoro sees humans as monopluralists, while Drijarkara sees humans as singular (*kedwitunggalan*). However, both

have differences in the things emphasized. Notonagoro emphasizes human nature as *monopluralis*, while Drijarkara as *persona*. As *monopluralis*, a good human is one who has pious character, while as *persona*, human perfection is achieved through his relationship with others in love. This difference has implications in developing the philosophy of Pancasila. Notonagoro sees human nature that can be understood in the nature of the precepts of Pancasila, while Drijarkara sees Pancasila as the actualization of an existential human actualization.

Keywords: Human; Notonagoro; Drijarkara; Comparation; Philosophy of Pancasila.

Resumo

Este artigo tem como objetivo comparar a concepção de natureza humana segundo Notonagoro e Drijarkara e suas implicações para o desenvolvimento da filosofia de Pancasila. Por esse motivo, este estudo usa um método de comparação. Com o entendimento básico de Pancasila como um sistema filosófico e humano como sua base ontológica, a filosofia de Pancasila pode ser bem compreendida através de uma compreensão da natureza humana. Portanto, a compreensão de Pancasila deve começar com a compreensão da natureza humana. Este estudo descobriu que Notonagoro e Drijarkara tinham semelhanças e diferenças na formulação da natureza humana como base ontológica de Pancasila. Da mesma forma, ambos veem os humanos não como uma entidade única. Notonagoro vê os humanos como *monopluralistas*, enquanto Drijarkara vê os humanos como *singulares* (*kedwitunggalan*). No entanto, ambos têm diferenças nas coisas enfatizadas. Notonagoro enfatiza a natureza humana como *monopluralis*, enquanto Drijarkara como *persona*. Como *monopluralis*, um bom ser humano é aquele que tem caráter piedoso, enquanto como *persona*, a perfeição humana é alcançada por meio de seu relacionamento com os outros no amor. Essa diferença tem implicações no desenvolvimento da filosofia de Pancasila. Notonagoro vê a natureza humana que pode ser entendida na natureza dos preceitos de Pancasila, enquanto Drijarkara vê Pancasila como a atualização de uma atualização existencial humana.

Palavras-chave: Humano; Notonagoro; Driyarkara; Comparativo; Filosofia da Pancasila.

Resumen

Este artículo tiene como objetivo comparar la concepción de la naturaleza humana según Notonagoro y Drijarkara y sus implicaciones para el desarrollo de la filosofía de Pancasila. Por esta razón, este estudio utiliza un método de comparación. Con la comprensión básica de Pancasila es un sistema filosófico y humano como base ontológica, la filosofía de Pancasila

puede entenderse bien a través de una comprensión de la naturaleza humana. Por lo tanto, la comprensión de Pancasila debe comenzar con la comprensión de la naturaleza humana. Este estudio encontró que Notonagoro y Drijarkara tenían similitudes y diferencias en la formulación de la naturaleza humana como base ontológica de Pancasila. Igualmente, ambos ven a los humanos no como una sola entidad. Notonagoro ve a los humanos como monopluralistas, mientras que Drijarkara ve a los humanos como singulares (kedwitunggalan). Sin embargo, ambos tienen diferencias en las cosas enfatizadas. Notonagoro enfatiza la naturaleza humana como monopluralis, mientras que Drijarkara como persona. Como monopluralis, un buen ser humano es aquel que tiene un carácter piadoso, mientras que como persona, la perfección humana se logra a través de su relación amorosa con los demás. Esta diferencia tiene implicaciones en el desarrollo de la filosofía de Pancasila. Notonagoro ve la naturaleza humana que se puede entender en la naturaleza de los preceptos de Pancasila, mientras que Drijarkara ve a Pancasila como la actualización de una actualización humana existencial.

Palabras-clave: Humano; Notonagoro; Drijarkara; Comparativo; Filosofía de Pancasila.

1. Introduction

As a philosophical system, Pancasila has a different ontological, epistemological, and axiological basis when compared to other philosophical systems such as liberalism, idealism, materialism, communism, and other philosophical systems in the world (Kaelan, 2014). As a philosophical system, Pancasila is a knowledge system. Pancasila is a guideline or basis for the Indonesian nation in looking at the reality of the universe, humans, society, nation and state about the meaning of life and as a human basis in solving every problem they face (Kaelan, 2014).

In Poespowardoyo's view, the epistemological basis of Pancasila cannot be separated from its ontological basis so that the epistemological basis of Pancasila cannot be separated from its basic concept of human nature. Pranarka (1996) states that if humans become the basis for the Pancasila philosophy, the foundation for the Pancasila epistemology building must be placed as human philosophy. Therefore, discussing the Pancasila philosophy must discuss humans as a whole. In a sense, humans are seen not only in one aspect, but in various aspects such as spiritual, physical, freedom, transcendence, sociality, individualism, and others (Sihotang, 2018).

Philosophy itself in a broad sense is basic comparison. That's because when someone faces two or more alternative solutions to any problem, people are comparing them. In this case, Archie Bahm (2003) argues, "Everyone has his own philosophy, if it is the result of choosing among such many alternatives which are related to various problems; it is, in a sense, really a product of comparison."

The philosophical approach of Notonagoro and Drijarkara are not in a completely different time frame, nor are they from different civilizations because both of them are native Indonesians. However, both have different educational experiences and histories. Notonagoro is a professor of law who studies philosophy, while Drijarkara is a professor of philosophy and a Jesuit priest. According to Bahm (2003), a comparative study of the views of philosophers with different backgrounds for the same subject will open the development of ideas about philosophy (Bahm, 2003), which in this case is the philosophy of Pancasila.

This is important because since the beginning Pancasila was not intended as a philosophy even though it contains philosophical thoughts. Pancasila was originally intended to have a practical function compared to a theory (Hadi, 1994), especially as a philosophical system. Pancasila is formulated primarily to find a political basis, even though the political basis has a philosophical view. At least, this political basis is the result of deep reflection (Notonagoro, 1982). The Pancasila which was discovered and formulated by Soekarno (Notonagoro, 1982) is the result of deep reflection and the thoughts of the hearts of the Indonesian people. Contemplation means going through a philosophical process.

In the realm of Pancasila philosophy in Indonesia, Notonagoro and Drijarkara are important figures. As authors, they have big influence in many books that describe or study the philosophy of Pancasila (Prastowo, 2014; Soeprapto, 1995). In addition, many scientific journals have attempted to discuss Notonagoro and Drijarkara's thoughts in various dimensions. Banin Diar Sukmono (Sukmono, 2013), for example, examines Drijarkara ethics in the postmodern context. In his study, Sukmono concluded that Drijarkara ethics is deontological ethics, but which has theological, humanist-naturalist, and axiological dimensions so that Drijarkara ethics can also be said to be teleological ethics. If it is related to the postmodern era, the Drijarkara ethic which is both deontological and at the same time teleological can be used as an alternative basis for morality which is quite solid.

Notonagoro's thoughts have also inspired many philosophical studies published in scientific journals (Hidayatullah, 2006). Soeprapto examines the actualization of Pancasila values based on Notonagoro's thoughts on the nature of mono-pluralist human beings and the

nature of *sholeh*, while Hidayatullah examines Notonagoro's thoughts by emphasizing the religiosity of Pancasila (Soeprapto, 1995).

In addition to studies specifically aimed at Notonagoro and Drijarkara's thoughts, studies of human philosophy (metaphysical anthropology) in the context of Pancasila have also been carried out (Sutono, Lasiyo, & Hardono, 2017). Both studies emphasize the metaphysical dimension of humans in the philosophy of Pancasila. Sutono, Lasiyo, and Hadi looked for metaphysics as a “middle way”. As a middle way, Pancasila is an alternative to the individuality of liberalism and collectivism from communism. Meanwhile, Purwosaputro observed from the essence of “I” in philosophy of Pancasila. In his study, Purwosaputro concluded that I am Pancasila is closer to I am ontological and I am functional (Purwosaputro, 2015).

Based on the research above, it can be concluded that research on the comparison of Notonagoro and Drijarkara's views regarding the human conception and its implications in building the Pancasila philosophy has never been done. In fact, the Pancasila philosophy will be strong if it is sought from its ontological basis, namely humans. Comparative philosophy will lead to new synthetic discoveries (Fleming, 2003). In this study, the main topic to be compared is the views of both philosophies regarding the nature of human nature, and the implications of those views for the development of Pancasila philosophy

2. Methodology

The research material was conducted by library research. This research is qualitative research within the scope of philosophy by using the character concept research model, which describes several sources of literature, research methods and data analysis. This research is library which the, researcher collect the data from related book, previous research results, Journals, articles. The secondary data is in the form of literature such as various journals related to the topic of research of the conception of human nature according to Notonagoro and Drijarkara. The philosophical approach used in this study was comparative philosophy by comparing the thoughts of both philosophers in compiling the philosophy of Pancasila from Notonagoro and Drijarkara.

3. Discussion

3.1 Human Nature

Notonagoro and Drijarkara appreciate the philosophy of Pancasila as a human philosophy first. It means that both philosophers in their efforts to build the Pancasila philosophy are through their understanding of human nature. For Notonagoro, humans are a supporting subject for Pancasila which is essential. This is because, in Notonagoro's view, it is human beings who are godly, just and civilized, united, have a society, and are socially just. Therefore, by looking at this, there is no other way, according to Notonagoro, if we are to understand Pancasila, to seek the essence of Pancasila philosophy, then we must understand the nature of humans.

If Notonagoro puts humans as supporters of Pancasila, then Drijarkara views that Pancasila is inherent in human-as-human existence, apart from certain conditions in the concrete. Therefore, according to Drijarkara, by looking at the *quatalis* human nature (as human being), we will arrive at Pancasila. This statement means that Pancasila is in accordance with human nature. Thus, understanding Pancasila means understanding humans. Thus, the views of these both philosophers regarding human nature will determine the style of the Pancasila philosophy that he builds.

It should be emphasized that in regard to human nature, the human philosophy developed by Notonagoro and Drijarkara has not only differences, but also contains similarities. The differences are mainly in the details, and which one is emphasized more. However, substantially, each idea does not contain differences that contradict or negate one another. There are many similarities though in different ways of articulating them.

In looking at the character of human nature, Notonagoro states that the character of human nature is mono-pluralist, while Drijarkara states that man is a single or single diversity (Drijarkara, 2006). For Notonagoro, human nature must be seen from the composition, nature and position of man. Judging from the structure, humans consist of material goods (body) and spirit (or soul).

Humans exist in physical form, material goods, physical objects that can be seen and touched. However, man is never only in his physical form. In essence, humans are also souls. This body and soul cannot be separated because there is no human being only in his physical form or in his soul alone. One of them is missing so he is no longer human. Man is a unity between soul and body.

According to Notonagoro, humans with spiritual elements have three elements, namely reason, taste, and will. Intellect is the essence of the soul that is related to human potential to gain knowledge, recognize self, and its environment as well as all of God's creation. Taste is a human essence related to its potential in the field of beauty. Its potential is manifested in joy, sorrow and awe. Will, on the other hand, is the essence of the soul which is related to the desire and the ability to deal with life's problems.

Notonagoro stated that, humans with their intellect and have to develop pious character, the details of which are as follows (Notonagoro, 1982). First, caution, which is always acting on the impulse of the will, based on the judgment of reason, in harmony with taste. Second, it is in form of justice, which is always giving to others according to their rights. Third is simplicity, which is always limiting oneself in terms of physical enjoyment. Fourth is persistence, namely always limiting oneself in terms of avoiding suffering. These four pious traits, in Notonagoro's view, are for achieving a common goal, namely mutual happiness.

Human nature is understood as an individual and a social being. As social beings, humans need the presence of other humans. In Notonagoro's view, living together is a demand from human nature as a social being and it is in living together that perfection and happiness are found.

Judging from his position, according to Notonagoro, humans are independent personal beings and at the same time God's creatures. Both as a personal being and a creation of God, humans are in unity. The position is that he is a personal being as well as a creature of God. By looking at human plurality seen from the composition, nature, and position which is always in unity, Notonagoro concludes that humans are mono-pluralist; unity in plurality. Humans are one, but one in the plurality because humans never exist in themselves as composed of one entity. The existence of a soul, for example, is meaningless without a body. Humans are individual creatures, as well as social because no human being lives with himself. He always demands the presence of other people.

While Notonagoro emphasizes the balance of the human conception in terms of nature, structure and nature, Drijarkara states that humans consist of physical and mental elements, and as personal and social beings. Therefore, when Notonagoro states that humans are mono-pluralists, for Drijarkara humans are single diversity, duality, or *dwaita-adwaita*. This diversity is mainly because humans are both physical and spiritual (soul) at the same time. "I am a human being physical and spiritual in unity, because there is no" I "only body

or” I “only spiritual”. However, not unlike Notonagoro, Drijarkara also emphasized the importance of the spiritual or the human soul compared to the body.

Drijarkara said that humans are “what” and “who”. However, what was more important was his who was. What a human being is to be and a human being what is incomprehensible unless seen as whom. Therefore, in order for humans to live well based on nobility, the spirit must be able to suppress the physical will which often creates desires to humiliate humans.

Apart from emphasizing the importance of the spiritual rather than the physical, Drijarkara also emphasizes the dimensions of human sociality in the concept of Persona. First, Persona is never an object. Persona is always the subject so that human relations are always in the form of “I-Thou”, and Persona will be whole, become perfect, when he is with others. Persona always requires the presence of others, and it is in that presence that Persona experiences personation, namely humans who are always in a process towards perfection. It is this dimension that Notonagoro does not seem to emphasize so much.

Although Notonagoro emphasizes the existence of humans as social beings, the conception is not as deep as Drijarkara's presentation in Persona. Not only that, Drijarkara also emphasized that as a human persona is filled with love. “Persona is a subject of love and must be greeted with love. Whoever reduces this is raping the value of the persona”.

Second, humans as Persona in Drijarkara's understanding lead to the conception of human sociality as the basis of their existence. Basically, human existence has a social dimension. Human nature is *homo homini socius* with love. Love is reflected in the subject “I-Thou” where the peak of love is to God, as the Absolute. This dimension received less emphasis from Notonagoro. In understanding human nature, the main part that Notonagoro emphasizes is the mono-pluralist human nature. Notonagoro provides an in-depth explanation of the human structure consisting of the body and the spirit where the spirit has a higher place. This was also emphasized by Drijarkara. However, other parts such as the dimension of human sociality (Notonagoro calls it the mono-dualist nature of humans as individual and social beings) and the relationships between humans get a clearer explanation in Drijarkara's thinking through Persona. With the concept of Persona, Drijarkara explains the relationship between humans and other humans. Here, Drijarkara emphasizes not only that Persona needs other people for its existence, but at the same time emphasizes that human sociality is part of human existence. From this, it seems clear how the differences between both philosophers in developing human nature as the basis of human philosophy. But again, the differences do not appear to be negating each other, but rather complement one another.

3.2 Implications for the Philosophy of Pancasila

Pancasila was born as a need to answer the basis of the state. Pancasila is first formulated as an ideology, the basis of the state to be founded. Therefore, the birth of Pancasila at that time was to answer political needs. Thus, efforts to formulate or in the context of this paper discuss the philosophical views of Pancasila Notonagoro and Drijarkara must answer the essence of Pancasila in life together. In other words, this research is formulating the philosophy of Pancasila as a political philosophy.

As a political philosophy, the Pancasila philosophy cannot be separated from human nature as its ontological basis. This means that the philosophy of Pancasila as a political philosophy must be formulated from human philosophy. So, Notonagoro and Drijarkara's discussion of the Pancasila philosophy in life together will determine the building of the Pancasila philosophy as a political philosophy.

Pancasila is a political philosophy because it is a rational discourse on political life together (Hardiman, 2018). Understanding Pancasila as a political philosophy will have two consequences. First, Pancasila is a worldview (*Weltanschauung*) that is neither religious nor cultural in character. A religious worldview related to salvation in the world and in the hereafter. The path varies according to the teachings of different religions. Meanwhile, a cultural insight, on the other hand, relates to a way to become Javanese, Batak, Flores, and others. On the other hand, a political worldview, according to Hardiman, is concerned with a fair way of managing diversity. All religious and cultural entities in Indonesia can have this political insight without disturbing their religious and cultural identity.

The second consequence, according to Hardiman, is that Pancasila is not a political artificiality, but an articulation of the world of life (*Lebenswelt*) (Hardiman, 2018). Political artificiality is a conceptual construction or engineering designed in such a way as to replace empirical reality. Pancasila philosophy is not the case. As Soekarno put it on June 1, 1945, Pancasila was extracted from the community. In this case Notonagoro has also emphasized that Indonesian society is the ontological basis of Pancasila. It is Indonesian society that is the support as well as the ontological basis.

The question is how both philosophers, Notonagoro and Drijarkara, develop this Pancasila philosophical discourse in state life. Notonagoro takes the path of abstraction by means of language analysis. Therefore, he said that the characteristics of the state must reflect inwardly and be in accordance with God, human, one, people, and just, so that a state that is right in accordance with the concept of mono-pluralist human nature is a state of cultural law.

The constitutional state of culture is a state that overcomes individuals and groups. It is a country that is one with its people. In a state of cultural law, the state does not conspire with a certain class. On the contrary, it maintains a harmonious balance between individual and social life together.

On the other hand, in the context of society or state, Drijarkara argues that the state or society is a way to implement *Liebendes Mit-sein*, being-together-with-love. However, because love has different degrees in a society, there is a great danger in it, namely failure. Therefore, to avoid this danger (to the extent possible because the danger remains), we need a principle that we call Democracy. This principle is not external, but internal. This means, according to Drijarkara, love carried out in a correctional facility, which is in the form of a state, demands that it be carried out in a democratic way. Therefore, democracy is part of an effort to overcome the failure to implement *Liebendes Mit-sein*.

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that the state or being state is a demand from human nature. As emphasized also by Thomas Paine (2000), "There is a natural talent in man, and that talent is greater in society because society has a variety of abilities and resources to adapt to any situation it meets." Therefore, in the social reality, humans will find it much easier and possible to get perfection in life. Then, in order for life in society to achieve its goals, namely the realization of human perfection, community organizing must be based on the five principles of Pancasila.

Only by relying on the five principles in a balanced way, man can realize his life to achieve eminence. By carefully contemplating Notonagoro and Drijarkara's thoughts, it can be concluded that the philosophy of Pancasila is basically a human philosophy as well as a political one. The philosophy of Pancasila is basically a philosophy that becomes a guide or guide in living together (as a state) to realize human life towards perfection which is achieved by basing on the five principles in Pancasila, which is the embodiment of mono-pluralist human nature with love and righteous character.

4. Conclusion

The purpose of this study is to compare Notonagoro and Drijarkara's human conceptions and its implications for the development of the Pancasila philosophy. In general, the two conceptions of human are not completely different. Both see humans as not a single entity, but formed by many (plural) elements. However, both philosophers put emphasis on different dimensions according to their philosophical background and school of thought.

Notonagoro states that human nature is mono-pluralist, which consists of the natural body and soul structure, natural character as an individual and social being, and the position of man as a personal being and God's creation. Drijarkara also said that humans are composed of a duality, body and soul.

In understanding human nature, both philosophers put different emphases. Notonagoro develops pious character from the existence of the human body as body and soul. Soul or spirit in Notonagoro's view consists of reason, taste, and will. From these three things, humans must develop pious character. On the other hand, Drijarkara does not emphasize this dimension, but rather on human sociality as an existence. Man is a persona with love. As a persona, humans can only get perfection when they are with others.

The difference is in the things that are emphasized is because in fact the differences are not substantial leading to the concept of the Pancasila philosophy. In this study, the Pancasila philosophy is seen as a political philosophy building related to life with citizens. Notonagoro's understanding of the nature of the monopluralist human nature brings the conception of a state of cultural law. Notonagoro considers the constitutional state of culture to be a state characteristic in accordance with the nature of mono-pluralist human beings. In a state of cultural law, the state must be in accordance with the characteristics of God, human, one, people, and just. The constitutional state of culture is also a state that maintains harmony between individual and social humans, as well as a state that is one with its people.

In contrast, Drijarkara as it departs from human sociality, the state or state building is a reflection of human sociality as a person. State or social life is the realization of the persona to find perfection. That is, the state is the demand for human sociality as a person who is full of love. So, the arguments of Drijarkara's Pancasila philosophy are basically arguments for his views on this dimension of human sociality.

From the conclusions of the views of both philosophers, it can be indicated that humans are the ontological basis of the philosophy of Pancasila. Understanding the philosophy of Pancasila must be found in human philosophy. In this connection, human existence as a mono-pluralist in character, structure and position is worth defending. This is because that is the human condition.

The reality of man as body and soul, body and soul, as an individual and social being, as well as a person and creature of God is indisputable. It is an absolute reality. However, in its nature, it should be emphasized that sociality is indeed an existential state like Drijarkara's view. In that existence, humans may only find perfection in Drijarkara's view or happiness in Notonagoro's view in life together. Therefore, for human beings to reach perfection and get

happiness, life must always be filled with love. With love, life together will be filled with a spirit of tolerance in worshiping God, humanizing humans, maintaining harmony and community unity, and leading to democracy and justice.

On the other hand, in a life together that is always filled with hatred, there will be no love and cooperation, instead of maintaining unity within its members. However, there was a conflict. As result, perfection and happiness will not be achieved. Therefore, with this understanding of the nature of human beings, living together in the context of the state, the view of the state of cultural law seems difficult to defend.

On the contrary, what is most likely is to continue to develop a common life that is adapted to the circumstances of a common life in accordance with the attributes of God, human, one, people, and just. In preserving such characteristics of the state or of coexistence, love must form the basis of the human relationships that exist in it. This will ultimately reflect on the life of the state because the state is a reflection of humans.

The researcher suggests for the further researcher to analyze comparing the conception of human nature according to the other implications for the development of the philosophy of Pancasila.

References

Bahm, A. J. (2003). *Filsafat Perbandingan: Filsafat Barat, India, Cina dalam Perbandingan* (translatio). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Driyarkara. (2006). *Karya lengkap Driyarkara: Esai-Esai Filsafat Pemikir Yang Trlibat Penuh Dalam Perjuangan Bangsaanya*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Fleming, J. (2003). Comparative Philosophy: Its Aims And Methods. *Journal of Chinese Philosophy*, 30(2), 259–270. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1540-6253.00118>

Hadi, S. (1994). *Statistik dalam Basic Jilid I*. Yogyakarta: Andi Offset.

Hardiman, F. B. (2018). Menggali Pancasila sebagai Filsafat Politik. *Prisma Resource Center*, 37(2), 32–39.

Hidayatullah, S. (2006). Relasi Filsafat dan Agama (Perspektif Islam). *Jurnal Filsafat*, 16(2). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.31271>

Kaelan. (2014). *Pendidikan Pancasila*. Yogyakarta: Paradigma.

Notonagoro. (1982). *Beberapa Hal Mengenai Falsafah Pancasila*. Jakarta: Rajawali Press.

Paine, T. (2000). *Rights of Man (Daulat Manusia)* (Translatio). Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Pranarka. (1996). Epistemologi Pancasila. *Jurnal Filsafat*, 26. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.31637>

Prastowo, T. B. (2014). *Prof. N. Drijarkara: Me-Negara, Meng-Indonesia, Pancasila Dari Sudut Pandang Filsafat Manusia*. Yogyakarta: Pusat Kajian Filsafat Pancasila.

Purwosaputro, S. (2015). "Aku" dalam Pancasila (Refleksi Metafisika Pancasila). *Jurnal Ilmiah CIVIS*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.26877/civis.v5i1/Januari.630>

Sihotang, K. (2018). *Filsafat Manusia: Jendela Menyingkap Humanisme* (revision). Yogyakarta: Kanisius.

Soeprapto, S. (1995). Aktualisasi Nilai-nilai Filsafat Pancasila Notonagoro. *Jurnal Filsafat*.

Sukmono, B. D. (2013). Etika Driyarkara Dan Relevansinya Di Era Postmodern. *Jurnal Filsafat*. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.22146/jf.13220>

Sutono, A., Lasiyo, P., & Hardono, H. (2017). The nature of human Pancasila: A dimension of metaphysical anthropology of individuality and humanity. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science Research*, 3(7), 46–51.

Percentage of Participation of each Author in Manuscript

Yoseph Umarhadi - 40%

Lasiyo - 30%

Heri Siswanto - 30%