

Critical Study on The Manipulation of The History of Pancasila's Birth in The New Order Version

Ganjar Razuni

Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Nasional

*Correspondence Email: ganjar.razuni@civitas.unas.ac.id

Received: 5 January 2024; Revised: 18 May 2024; Accepted: 5 June 2024

Abstract: *The writing of the historical birth of Pancasila during the New Order was biased, starting with the stage of historical sources (heuristics). In this stage, the New Order did not use the main source or historical facts, namely, in this case, the original archive of the Minutes of the BPUPKI and PPKI sessions. Pancasila history writing during the New Order only used the 1945 Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution book edited by Mr. Muhammad Yamin. However, the book is only a copy of the minutes of the BPUPK and PPKI sessions, not the original archive. Based on this source error, the writing of the history (historiography) of the birth of Pancasila was born, which places Mr. Yaminof as well as Mr. Soepomo as figures who participated in the creation of Pancasila, apart from Bung Karno. During the New Order, this historical construction was used to erase the commemoration of Pancasila Day every June 1. Currently, the alignment of the history of the birth of Pancasila has been carried out by Presidential Decree No. 24 of 2016 concerning the birth of Pancasila. However, the academic straightening of history needs to be done more seriously and deeply.*

Keywords: *pancasila; history; manipulation; new order*

How to Cite:

Razuni, G. (2024). Critical Study on The Manipulation of The History of Pancasila's Birth in The New Order Version. *Journal of Governance*, 9(2), 238–251.
<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.31506/jog.v9i2.25402>



This work is licensed under a [Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/).

Introduction

History writing in the New Order era was very close to the interests of power. This can be seen especially in the writing of the history of the state foundation, which is known as Pancasila. In this regard, the writing of the history of Pancasila that occurred during the New Order era was carried out by ignoring the rules (methods) of historiography that are academically valid. This happened because historians were involved in government and power practices, so their studies were biased. Although the writing of history has been revised after the New Order, the main problems in the writing have not been thoroughly and fundamentally resolved until now.

The historiography of Pancasila that occurred during the New Order era centered on the history of the birth of Pancasila. The historian who did the writing was Prof. Nugroho Notosusanto from the University of Indonesia, who also serves as Chairman of the Center for Historical Research of the Armed Forces of the Republic of Indonesia (ABRI). Thus, Nugroho's historiography cannot be separated from his position as part of ABRI.

The main works of literature written by Nugroho in this regard are: (1) *The Authentic Manuscript of Proclamation and the Authentic Formulation of Pancasila*, published in 1979; and (2) *The Formulation Process of Pancasila, the State Constitution*, published in 1981. In *The Authentic Manuscript of the Proclamation*, Nugroho builds a historical construction of the birth of Pancasila that refers to four phases, such as: First Phase, the initial formulation by Mr. Muhammad Yamin on May 29, 1945, in front of the First Plenary Session of the Agency for

Investigating Preparatory Efforts for Independence (BPUPK); Second Phase, the second formulation by Sukarno on June 1, 1945, in front of the First Plenary Session of BPUPK; Third, the formulation of the Jakarta Charter by the Committee of Nine on June 22, 1945; and Fourth Phase, the final-legal formulation by the Preparatory Committee for Indonesian Independence (PPKI) on August 18, 1945. According to Nugroho, the three initial formulations, which include Mr. Yamin's formulation, Bung Karno's formulation, and the Jakarta Charter formulation, are not authentic Pancasila formulations. In other words, these formulations are embryonic, which is different from the authentic formulation, which is contained in the Fourth Paragraph of the Preamble of the 1945 Constitution. In this historiography, for the first time, Mr. Muhammad Yamin's name was included in the List of Pancasila Formulators, even the Early Formulators, ahead of Sukarno (Notosusanto, 1979: 18–24).

Meanwhile, in *The Formulation Process of Pancasila*, Nugroho emphasizes the historical construction he wrote in the Manuscript of the Proclamation. The assertion refers to the historical construction of the birth of Pancasila, which not only refers to Bung Karno's speech on June 1 concerning Pancasila but also refers to Mr. Yamin's speech on May 29, 1945. The conclusion Nugroho wants to draw is that Bung Karno was not the only one who invented the Pancasila. There was an earlier Mr. Yamin, three days before his June 1 speech (May 29, 1945), who had proposed five precepts very similar to the five precepts proposed by Sukarno on June 1, 1945. From here, five precepts Nugroho then recommended a policy to abolish the commemoration of

Pancasila Birth Day on June 1, which had taken place from 1964 to 1968 (Notosusanto, 1981: 51–56). Based on Nugroho Notosusanto's "academic paper" on the history of the birth of Pancasila (*Hari Lahirnya Pancasila*), the commemoration of Pancasila Day on June 1 was abolished, replaced by the commemoration of Pancasila Miracle Day (*Hari Kesaktian Pancasila*) every October 1.

Conceptual Framework

The problem is that Nugroho's method of writing is problematic, starting with the heuristic process (Madjid, 2014: 219). In the heuristic process, Nugroho used the only historical source at the time, the Preparatory Manuscript of the 1945 Constitution compiled by Mr. Yamin, published in 1959. The book was a copy of the archive of the minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI sessions. It means that what Mr. Yamin published was a copy, not the original archive of the minutes of the BPUPKI and PPKI sessions. The original archive itself was declared lost by Mr. Yamin, even though he had borrowed it from the Deputy Head of Administration of BPUPKI, Mr. AG Pringgogidgo. Finally, Nugroho has claimed that the only source for the birth of Pancasila is the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution, in which Mr. Yamin gave a speech on the five precepts of Pancasila on May 29, 1945.

However, Nugroho's use of the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution has fundamental flaws. First, he only uses the first volume of the book, ignoring the other two volumes. Because the book of the Constitution Preparatory Manuscript, edited by Mr. Yamin, consists of three volumes, In this context, Nugroho does not use the second and third volumes, even though they contain some of Mr.

Yamin's speeches in the 1950s, which confirm that Pancasila was born on June 1, 1945, through Bung Karno's speech (Yamin, 1959: 71). Not through the speech he gave in the first volume of the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution. This means that Nugroho draws conclusions about Yamin's role without referring to Yamin's own testimony on the matter. This is very problematic because historical sources are not only texts but also the testimonies of the historical actors themselves. By using only the text of Mr. Yamin's speeches in the first volume and ignoring Mr. Yamin's testimonial speeches in the second and third volumes, Nugroho seems to be hiding historical facts.

Second, Nugroho did not use the testimonies of other historical actors, such as Bung Hatta, Achmad Soebardjo, AA Maramis, and AG Pringgogidgo, who, together with Sunario, formed the Committee of Five. In fact, in 1977, the Committee of Five, who were the former drafters of Pancasila (the Committee of Nine), rejected the authenticity of the text of Mr. Yamin's speech in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution. This makes Nugroho's historiography problematic, starting with the heuristic method, because it does not use the testimonies of historical actors as historical sources. The problem of the historiography of the birth of Pancasila written during the New Order era is the object of this study. The focus of the study is the historiography of the birth of Pancasila that was blurred by Nugroho Notosusanto, a historian who was close to the power of the New Order era.

Method

Before criticizing the historiography of Pancasila in the New Order era, it is better to understand

historical methodology and historiography. Historical methodology consists of two words: methodology and history. Methodology comes from the Greek *metodos*, consisting of two syllables: *metha*, which means through or through, and *hodos*, which means way or way. So methodology is a science or study that discusses frameworks about concepts, methods, or procedures, which means to analyze the principles or procedures that will guide and direct the investigation and preparation of a field of science. Thus, methodology is the science of methods, or the science that talks about methods.

Meanwhile, *sejarah* in English is called history. Etymologically, this word comes from the Greek *historia*, which means science, inquiry, interview, or interrogation of a witness. According to the general definition, the word history means the past of mankind. In German, history, called *geschichte*, comes from the word *geschehen*, which means to happen. *Geschichte* is something that has happened.

In this context, the historical method is the process of examining and analyzing historical testimonies to find authentic and reliable data, as well as attempting to synthesize such data into a reliable historical story. Therefore, the historical method is the implementation and technical guidance on materials, criticism, interpretation, and presentation of history. In the historical method, various types of historical writing, units of study, theories, concepts, and historical sources are described.

As a science of methods, historical methodology means a science that talks about methods, that is, ways to find out events that occurred in the past. For example, a historian who wants to know the history of the birth of Pancasila will

systematically carry out investigative procedures using techniques for collecting historical materials so as to capture as much complete information as possible. However, it is not enough to use these methods. He must also complement it with methodological or theoretical knowledge, even philosophy. This means that historians must know how to use the "science of method" in its proper place.

In historical methodology, a historian is required to master the methods used to find out past events. For this reason, research is carried out in the form of investigative procedures using historical data collection techniques, both in the form of archives and interviews with living figures, in connection with historical events. Studying historical methodology means also describing historical research methods, historical sources, and historical writing.

Before conducting historical research, we must understand the methods of historical research. Historical research methods are methods or methods used as guidelines in conducting research on historical events and problems. In other words, historical research methods are instruments for reconstructing historical events (history as past actuality) into history as a story (history as written). In the scope of historical science, the research method is called the historical method. The historical method is used as a research method to answer six questions, "5 W and 1 H," which are the basic elements of historical writing, such as: what, when, where, who, why, and how. The questions are: What (what events) happened? When did it happen? Where did it happen? Who was involved in the event? Why did it happen? How did the event happen?

Meanwhile, internal criticism aims to reveal the credibility or validity of

historical sources. Internal criticism intends to use the content of the source, which means wanting to know "what" and "how" the content of the source. In detail, this internal criticism aims to reveal the credibility and truth (validity) of the contents of the source writing and dive into the author's mind and mental state, or intellectual honesty (Sulasman, 2014: 94-104).

Interpretation is the next stage in the historical method after source criticism. At this stage, there is an interpretation of the historical facts obtained from source criticism. In this regard, there are two meanings of interpretation as an effort to interpret historical facts in the framework of reconstructing the reality of the past:

First, interpretation in an effort to reconstruct past history means giving back the relationship between facts. Facts as evidence that have occurred in the past are interpreted by looking for and proving the relationship between each other so as to form a series of factual and logical meanings of the past life of a group, society, or nation;

Second, interpretation is more associated with historical explanation. Basically, an interpretation refers more to arguments that answer causal questions. Thus, there are two relations, which include the causal relation and the value relation. Historical interpretation has two methods, namely, analysis and synthesis. Analysis means to decipher, while synthesis means to combine. Both are seen as the main methods of interpretation. Interpretation is also divided into five types: verbal interpretation, technical interpretation, logical interpretation, psychological interpretation, and factual interpretation.

Interpretation or historical interpretation also has three important aspects, which include: first, analytical-critical, which analyzes the internal structure, patterns of relationships between facts, dynamic movements in history, and so on; Second, historical-substantive, which presents a processual description with sufficient factual support as an illustration of a development. Third, socio-cultural, which pays attention to human manifestations in socio-cultural interactions and interrelations.

Historiography is the last stage in the historical method. Historiography is a way of writing, presenting, or reporting the results of historical research that has been carried out. In historiography, there are several important things that the author needs to pay attention to, such as:

- a. Selection is done based on facts and descriptions of historical facts based on two criteria: the relevance of the event and its feasibility.
- b. Imagination: using imagination in writing history means trying to obtain links and ties that connect separate events, then comparing them with experiences stored in memory or past events that have been written and accepted by people;
- c. Chronology, in contrast to other social sciences, describes changes by systematizing economic changes, societal changes, political changes, and cultural changes. In history, these social changes will be sorted based on their chronology.

Furthermore, the author divides historical research into these research

steps into three discussions: research preparation, research implementation, and research reports (Andryana, 2016: 13–15).

Result and Discussion

Manipulation of Pancasila History

The various methods in historiography methodology will be used as an analytical knife to criticize the historiography of Pancasila in the New Order era.

Although historically, the birth and founding of Pancasila have been affirmed by the founding fathers, since the New Order, this fact has been blurred. The blurring was done through the coronation of Mr. Muhammad Yamin as the originator of Pancasila before Sukarno. Interestingly, this coronation was contrary to the views of Yamin himself, who was a Sukarنوist from the beginning. As a close person to Sukarno, Yamin repeatedly stated that the birth of Pancasila occurred on June 1, 1945, through Bung Karno's speech in front of the First Plenary Session of the Agency for Investigating Preparatory Efforts for Independence (BPUPK).

Not only Mr. Yamin, but another speaker at the First Plenary Session of the BPUP, namely Mr. Soepomo, was also asked to be the originator of Pancasila (Darmodihardjo, 1991: 102), so that until now, there is still information, even an understanding, that states that Pancasila has three formulations. First, the formulation of Muhammad Yamin's version, which was delivered on May 29, 1945, at the first day of the Plenary Session of the BPUPK, Second, Soepomo's version, which was delivered on the third day of the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK on May 31, 1945; third, Sukarno's version on June 1, 1945, on the fourth day of the First Plenary Session of the BPUPK. All three are said to have proposed five similar

precepts. Sukarno's contribution was only to name that proposal Pancasila. From this kind of historiography, June 1 would not be called the Birth Day of Pancasila because the precepts were said to have been proposed by Yamin and Soepomo before the date of Sukarno's speech.

Despite the enactment of Presidential Decree No. 24/2016 concerning the Birth of Pancasila, which affirms June 1 as the birth of Pancasila, the historiography that includes Yamin and Soepomo as the originators of Pancasila is still being written. For example, there is a historiography model in the Pancasila and Civics Education materials at the secondary education level. In the 2018 Teacher's Book 'Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan' for Junior High Schools (SMP) and Madrasah Tsanawiyah (MTs), published by the Ministry of Education and Culture, such history is written. The book explains that the history of the birth of Pancasila experienced three phases of proposals: the first phase by Mr. Yamin on May 29, the second phase by Mr. Soepomo on May 31, and the third phase by Sukarno on June 1, 1945. Such historical writing is certainly invalid and contradicts the affirmation of Presidential Decree No. 24/2016. Thus, the Presidential Decree on the Birth of Pancasila has not been used as a guideline for writing Pancasila education materials within the Ministry of Education and Culture. In fact, the ministry should be in line with the president's policy.

According to the book, Mr. Yamin was informed that he had proposed five precepts similar to Pancasila in two different ways. First, an oral speech on May 29, 1945. Second, in a written proposal in the Preamble Draft of the Constitution (Kemendikbud, 2018: 57). Both proposals were invalid since they were fabricated by Mr. Yamin. This will be explained further in this chapter.

Similarly, Mr. Soepomo did not propose the five precepts numerically the way Sukarno proposed the five precepts of Pancasila numerically (using numbers) and systematically. The invalid historiography of the birth of Pancasila proves that the alignment of the history of the birth of Pancasila has not occurred academically, although juridically, the alignment has been carried out by President Joko Widodo's Presidential Decree No. 24 of 2016.

In the context of rectifying the academic history of the birth of Pancasila, this chapter will delve into various facts concealed by such disinformation. Firstly, the author examines various facts and manipulations regarding Muhammad Yamin's speech.

The appointment of Muhammad Yamin as the originator of Pancasila before Sukarno was done by the New Order era historian, Prof. Nugroho Notosusanto (late). This was done in two main books. First, the authentic proclamation manuscript and the authentic formulation of Pancasila (1971). Second, the Process of Formulating the Basic Because these two figures spoke before Sukarno, who delivered his speech on June 1, 1945, Nugroho argued that June 1 was not the birth of Pancasila, so it did not need to be commemorated as Pancasila Birth Day. Through these two works, Nugroho Notosusanto asserted that Sukarno was not the only proposer of Pancasila. There were two other figures who proposed five precepts similar to Pancasila, namely Yamin, who delivered a speech on May 29, 1945, and Soepomo, who delivered a speech on May 31, 1945. Because these two figures spoke before Sukarno, who delivered his speech on June 1, 1945, Nugroho argued that June 1 was not the birth of Pancasila, so it did not need to be commemorated as Pancasila Birth Day.

As described in the historiography in the above Civics Teacher's Book, Nugroho also explained that Yamin had proposed the five precepts of Pancasila using two methods. First, at the beginning of his speech, in a systematic presentation, Yamin wrote values similar to those of Pancasila, namely: (1) nationalism; (2) humanity; (3) divinity; (4) people's sovereignty, which includes three principles (deliberation, representation, and wisdom); and (5) people's welfare (social justice). Interestingly, the writing of these five values was done by Yamin as an introduction to his explanation of these five values. It is assumed that the writing of these five values serves as an introduction to his spoken speech. The question is, how can a spoken speech without a text have an introduction like a written speech? This inconsistency is often criticized by critics of Yamin's speech text.

Yamin's oral proposal on the five precepts similar to Pancasila was included in the book "*Naskah Persiapan UUD 1945*" (Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution), compiled by Mr. Yamin and published in 1959. The proposal was included on pages 87-103, totaling 21 pages (Yamin, 1959: 87-103).

Non-Authentic Speech Text

Unfortunately, despite the questionable authenticity of the speech text, the State Secretariat of the Republic of Indonesia still includes it in the book "*Risalah Sidang BPUPKI dan PPKI*," which has been published since 1992 and revised in 1995 and continues to be widely circulated to this day. The book, which is a reissue of the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution, does not revise Mr. Yamin's speech text, even though the compilers of the Proceedings have provided footnotes indicating that the text

of Yamin's speech proposing five precepts similar to Pancasila was not found, either in the "Koleksi Mr. Yamin" or the "Arsip Pringgogigdo" currently housed in the National Archives of the Republic of Indonesia (ANRI) (Setneg, 1995: 11-12). Thus, to this day, the state still includes non-authentic historical sources, despite being aware that these sources are not found in official archives.

The inclusion of Mr. Yamin's speech text in the book of *Risalah Sidang BPUPKI-PPKI* by the State Secretariat (1995: 11-31).

Therefore, Yamin proceeded to write the aforementioned Preamble Draft, incorporating the five precepts of Pancasila as proposed by Sukarno on June 1st. These principles are: *peri-kebangsaan, peri-kemanusiaan, peri-ketuhanan, peri-kerakyatan, dan kesejahteraan rakyat*. These five precepts are 100% identical to the five precepts of Pancasila proposed by Sukarno on June 1st, namely: *kebangsaan Indonesia, internasionalisme (perikemanusiaan), mufakat (demokrasi), kesejahteraan sosial, dan Ketuhanan Yang Maha Esa*. However, Yamin proceeded to reposition the principle of belief in one supreme God from the fifth position in Sukarno's proposal to the third position in his writing.

Therefore, the understanding that Yamin had proposed five precepts similar to Pancasila should be based on knowledge of the background of his writing. The background is Sukarno's instruction to Yamin to draft the Preamble of the Constitution, where Sukarno asked Yamin to include the five precepts he proposed on June 1, 1945. Thus, instead of Yamin proposing the five precepts similar to Pancasila long before Sukarno's speech on June 1, 1945, the reality is that Yamin's writing about these five precepts was done at Sukarno's instruction just before the

Nine Committees meeting, not during the First Plenary Session of the BPUPKI on May 29, 1945. This fact proves that it wasn't Sukarno plagiarizing Yamin's speech. Instead, Yamin wrote the five precepts of Pancasila as per Sukarno's instruction.

According to Bung Hatta's testimony, the Preamble Draft of the Constitution written by Yamin was rejected by the Nine Committees because it was too lengthy. Together with Yamin, the Nine Committees then rewrote the shorter version of the Constitution's Preamble, which is now known as the Jakarta Charter. Bung Hatta revealed that Yamin still retained this Preamble Draft of the Constitution and included it in the book "Preparatory Manuscript of the 1945 Constitution," replacing the original transcript of Yamin's speech on May 29, 1945, which significantly differed from the Preamble Draft of the Constitution. From this, we understand that the speech text by Yamin proposing the five precepts of Pancasila was not a transcript of his speech on May 29, 1945, but rather the Preamble Draft of the Constitution written during the Nine Committees meeting on June 22, 1945. This means that Yamin wrote the Preamble Draft after his speech on May 29 and after Sukarno's speech on June 1, 1945.

Such testimony was also conveyed by Bung Hatta during the meeting of the Committee of Five in 1975. The Committee of Five was formed by President Soeharto to formulate the official interpretation of Pancasila according to its framers. It consisted of former members of the Nine Committees, including Bung Hatta, Achmad Soebardjo, and AA Maramis, as well as AG Pringgogigdo (the minutes keeper of the BPUPKI session) and Sunario (a nationalist activist). Unfortunately, the

Committee of Five affirmed that only Sukarno proposed Pancasila, and this proposal was the only one adopted by the BPUPK as the primary basis for formulating the state's foundation by the Small Committee (Nine Committees) (Panitia Lima, Hatta, 1977).

In the minutes of the Committee of Five meeting, a dialogue occurred between Sunario and Bung Hatta, where Sunario raised a question regarding the book "Preparatory Manuscript of the 1945 Constitution," in which Yamin wrote five precepts similar to Pancasila. Sunario expressed concern that the existence of Yamin's text had created confusion about the true history of the birth of Pancasila. Responding to Sunario's question, Bung Hatta then stated:

"That's not accurate. Bung Yamin was quite clever. The truth is, the speech was delivered during the session of the Small Committee. Bung Karno was the only one who firmly proposed the philosophical foundation for the state to be established, namely, the five precepts known as Pancasila, with only the sequence where the principle of belief in One Supreme God is placed below." (Panitia Lima, Hatta, 1977: 59-60).

Secondly, RM AB Kusuma, in his work "*Lahirnya UUD 1945, Memuat Salinan Dokumen Otentik BPUPK*" (2016), also refutes Muhammad Yamin's claim. Through a comparison with the authentic minutes of the BPUPK meetings originating from the Pringgogidgo Archive (the minutes archive of the BPUPKI sessions owned by Abdul Karim Pringgogidgo), this archive was originally stored in the Algemeen Rijksarchief (ARA), The Hague, Netherlands, and has been returned to the National Archives of Jakarta since 1989. In this archive, different minutes were found compared to

the text contained in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution.

Original minutes by Mr. Yamin

The controversy surrounding Yamin's speech text is indeed related to the dynamics of archiving the minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings. If Yamin's speech text contained in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution is part of the minutes archive of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings belonging to Abdul Ghaffar (AG) Pringgogidgo, then the original minutes of Yamin, which recorded his original speech on May 29, 1945, are included in the minutes archive of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings owned by Abdul Karim (AK) Pringgogidgo, the brother of AG Pringgogidgo.

Understanding these two archives is key to the controversy surrounding Yamin's speech text. Initially, the official archive belonging to the state was AG Pringgogidgo's archive because AGP was the Deputy Head of Administration of the BPUPK and the Keeper of the Minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings. Whereas the archive belonging to AKP was the archive of the Japanese government because AKP was a Japanese government official tasked with taking the minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings. In the 1950s, this archive was in Indonesia but was seized by the Dutch army and then stored in a Dutch archive museum. However, in 1989, the archive was returned to the National Archives of Indonesia (ANRI), where it is now. In this archive, the original minutes of Mr. Yamin's speech on May 29, 1945, are still preserved, which are entirely different from the text of Yamin's speech contained in the Preparatory Manuscript of the 1945 Constitution. The original minutes of Yamin's speech in AKP's archive consist of only two pages in the form of pointers, not a systematic written

narrative like the one in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution, which consists of 21 pages.

Meanwhile, AGP's archive from the 1950s was borrowed by Mr. Yamin with the intention of publishing the archive. However, until Yamin's death, the archive was not returned. In 1959, Yamin then published a copy of the archive titled "Naskah Persiapan UUD 1945." In this book, Yamin included a lengthy speech text containing five values similar to Pancasila and attached a draft of the Constitution, which also included a formulation of Pancasila very similar to the official Pancasila. In 1992, AGP's archive was discovered by archive officials in Central Java in the library of Puri Mangkunegaran, Solo. It turned out that after Mr. Yamin's death, his son-in-law, Ki Bagus, took all of Mr. Yamin's book collections to Solo. In 1992, AGP's archive was returned to the National Archives of Indonesia (ANRI) in Jakarta and is now stored at ANRI under the name "Koleksi Mr. Yamin." Unfortunately, in this archive, the minutes of Yamin's speech on May 29, 1945, are missing. This fact is confirmed by the authors of the book "Risalah Sidang BPUPKI-PPKI," published by the State Secretariat, stating that Yamin's speech text proposing five precepts was not found, neither in the collection of Mr. Yamin nor in the collection of AK Pringgodigdo.

If we pay attention to the original minutes, Mr. Yamin talks about three kinds of fundamentals. First, the basis of independence includes two principles: internal sovereignty and external sovereignty. Internal sovereignty means protection and supervision by the state over its citizens. External sovereignty refers to international relations. Second, the basis of humanity (internationalism) and the basis of popular sovereignty or

state sovereignty. He includes these two bases in the principles of the goal of independence. In this context, the basis of humanity and the basis of popular sovereignty actually mean the same as the two previous bases, namely external sovereignty and internal sovereignty. However, Yamin places the basis of humanity and the basis of popular sovereignty within the goal of independence (Arif, 2021: 56). At this point, Yamin talks about the basis and goal of independence, not the basis of the state. This means that both internal sovereignty, popular sovereignty, external sovereignty, and the basis of humanity are not intended as the basis of the state but rather as the basis and goal of independence.

Thirdly, the three fundamentals, which include deliberation, representation, and wisdom, He bases deliberation on the teachings of the Qur'an, representation on custom, and wisdom on rationalism. If we try to understand what is meant as the basis of the state, maybe these three fundamentals.

Thus, although mentioning three kinds of fundamentals (basis of independence, goal of independence, and the three fundamentals), Yamin did not propose five precepts similar to Pancasila as in the speech text in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution. Because in that book, Yamin's proposal is in the form of five values written systematically, similar to the way Bung Karno delivered it. Whereas in the original minutes, Yamin did not propose five precepts, namely nationalism, humanitarianism, religiosity, democracy, and people's welfare. In the speech text in the Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution, Yamin then included his proposal about the three fundamentals as a sub-chapter of the democracy principle. Therefore, Yamin's proposal regarding the three fundamentals actually

only represents one value, namely democracy. In the minutes, Yamin also mentions the value of religiosity. However, religiosity is not placed as part of the basis of the state but rather as the basis of Indonesian civilization.

The third response to Mr. Yamin's speech controversy is delivered by Yudi Latif in "Negara Paripurna, Historisitas, Rasionalitas, and Aktualitas Pancasila" (Perfect State, Historicity, Rationality, and Actualization of Pancasila). According to him, Yamin is not consistent in placing the values he mentioned as the basis of the state. In his categorization, deliberation, representation, and wisdom (rationalism) are called the basis (the third basis). Whereas nationalism, humanitarianism, and welfare are called principles.

In another section, representation is classified as an ideology. Meanwhile, the divine blessing is not clearly categorized. Even what Yamin meant as the basis of the state also includes state defense, the morality of the state, state regions, the population and sons of the state, and the government structure, including land rights. The multitude of things included as the basis of the state is what made the Vice Chairman of BPUPK, Raden Pandji Soeroso, repeatedly interrupt Yamin. This interruption prompted Yamin to object, questioning, "Why from the beginning of the session did the leadership not decide which things fall into the category of the basis of the state?" (Latif, 2011: 11).

Based on various responses, several conclusions can be drawn. First, Mr. Yamin's speech text proposing five precepts similar to Pancasila does not constitute the minutes of his speech on May 29, 1945, at the First Plenary Session of BPUPK. The speech text is a document he wrote after the First Plenary Session of BPUPK (May 29–June 1) concluded, and it was prepared for the meeting of the Nine

Committees on June 22, 1945. This means that Yamin wrote the speech text proposing five precepts after he finished speaking on May 29, even after Bung Karno delivered his speech on June 1, 1945.

Secondly, the writing of the speech text was Yamin's effort in drafting the preamble of the Constitution under Sukarno's instructions as the Chairman of the Nine Committees. This means that the text was initially not a speech but a preamble draft of the Constitution. Sukarno asked Yamin to write that draft, including the five precepts of Pancasila proposed by Sukarno on June 1, as the task of the Nine Committees was to reformulate Sukarno's five Pancasila precepts into the basis of the state. The formulation of Pancasila proposed by Sukarno on June 1 as the basis of the state was done by incorporating Pancasila precepts into the preamble of the Constitution. Therefore, it is not surprising that Yamin included the five Pancasila precepts in the draft of the Constitution's preamble. So, the five Pancasila principles written by Yamin in that draft are Sukarno's Pancasila precepts, not Yamin's ideas. However, because Yamin's draft was too long (21 pages), the Nine Committees rejected it. Alongside Yamin, the Nine Committees, led by Bung Karno, rewrote the Constitution's preamble into a shorter text, which we now know as the Jakarta Charter. These two conclusions are facts about Yamin's speech text, which proposes five precepts similar to Pancasila.

Thirdly, in addition to the speech text or draft of the Constitution's preamble, Yamin actually had the original speech minutes on May 29, 1945. These minutes were originally contained in AG Pringgogigdo's archive, which Yamin borrowed in the 1950s but never returned

until his death. Until the minutes were accidentally found by the archive museum staff in Central Java in 1992 and returned to the National Archives of Indonesia in Jakarta, the Original Speech Minutes of Yamin were missing. Who removed these minutes?

Fourthly, because the Original Speech Minutes of Yamin in AG Pringgogidgo's archive were missing since 1959, we have only been presented with Yamin's speech text proposing five Pancasila precepts, which was not actually his speech on May 29, 1945. This text was initially included in the book "Drafts of the 1945 Constitution," published in 1959, and then republished by the State Secretariat in the book "Minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI Meetings," published in 1992, and reprinted in 1995. Until now, Yamin's non-authentic speech text is still included in the Minutes of the BPUPKI-PPKI, which is the official source of state information on the history of the birth of Pancasila. Therefore, it is not surprising that in Pancasila education materials, the history of the birth of Pancasila still places Yamin as proposing Pancasila earlier than Sukarno.

Fifth, due to the inclusion of Yamin's non-authentic speech text in the book "Naskah Persiapan UUD," during the New Order era, Yamin was credited as one of the proposers of Pancasila. This was initially done by historian Nugroho Notosusanto, both in the books *Teks Proklamasi yang Otentik dan Rumusan Pancasila yang Otentik* (1971) and *Proses Perumusan Pancasila Dasar Negara* (1981). Based on Yamin's speech text, Nugroho asserted that Sukarno was not the sole proposer of Pancasila, as Yamin and Soepomo had proposed five precepts similar to Pancasila a few days before Sukarno's speech on June 1, 1945. Despite numerous criticisms of Nugroho's

conclusions, including the rejection by the Committee of Five regarding the authenticity of Yamin's speech text, Nugroho insisted that Yamin's speech text proposing five Pancasila precepts was the only authentic historical source.

Therefore, the inclusion of Yamin's non-authentic speech text in the "Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution," as well as Nugroho Notosusanto's affirmation that Yamin was one of the architects of Pancasila, represent a process of engineering Yamin's speech and portrayal as an architect of Pancasila.

Lastly, in addition to the missing authentic speech minutes of Yamin in AG Pringgogidgo's archive, there are also authentic speech minutes of Yamin on May 29, 1945, still contained in AK Pringgogidgo's archive. Unlike the non-authentic speech text of Yamin, which consists of 21 pages, the original minutes only consist of two pages, written in the form of pointers, not a lengthy narrative like the non-authentic text. In those original minutes, Yamin only proposed the "three fundamentals," namely, deliberation, representation, and wisdom, which were then made into a sub-section under the principle of democracy in the speech text of the "Preparatory Manuscript of the Constitution." Thus, the three fundamentals actually only represent one precept, namely democracy. Therefore, unlike the fabrication, whether by Yamin himself or by Nugroho Notosusanto portraying Yamin proposing five Pancasila precepts, Yamin actually only proposed one precept, which is democracy.

Conclusion

Thus, the investigation into the historiography of the birth of Pancasila during the New Order era concludes. This

historiography was political in nature, as it was part of the "desukarnoisasi" agenda developed by the New Order regime. This political agenda was implemented through the academic writing of history, which unfortunately did not adhere to the proper rules of historical writing.

Therefore, criticism of "desukarnoisasi Pancasila" needs to be carried out through methodological criticism in the academic realm, so that the effort to rectify the writing of the history of Pancasila's birth is not political but scientific. Its importance lies not in power but in truth.

In this regard, the urgent agenda that needs to be undertaken is the revision of the book "Risalah Sidang BPUPKI-PPKI," published by the State Secretariat from 1992 to 1998, which is still widely circulated today. This book needs to be revised because it still contains the inauthentic speech of Mr. Yamin. By replacing it with the original minutes of Mr. Yamin's speech found in the archives of AK Pringgogidgo, if this is not done, the "bending" of the history of Pancasila cannot be corrected academically, even though it has been corrected juridically based on Presidential Decree No. 24/2016 regarding the birth of Pancasila.

Acknowledgment

The author extends heartfelt gratitude to colleagues involved throughout the research process. The researcher thanks the Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Nasional, for providing the necessary data. Appreciation is also extended to the readers and all parties for their support during the writing of this article.

References

Arif, Syaiful, 2021. Benarkah Muhammad Yamin dan Soepomo Mengusulkan

Pancasila? *Majalah Silapedia*, Edisi I/April/2021.

Basri, 2006, *Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah, Pendekatan, Teori dan Praktik*, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Restu Agung, Jakarta.

Darmodihardjo, Dardji (ed.), 1991, *Santiaji Pancasila*, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Usaha Nasional, Suarabaya.

Deppen RI, 1967. *Peringatan Hari Kesaktian Pancasila*, Jakarta: Departemen Penerangan RI

Hatta, Mohammad, 1979, *Memoir*, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Tintamas Indonesia, Jakarta.

Kemendikbud, 2018, *Buku Guru Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, Cetakan Pertama, Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta.

Kusuma, AB, 2017, *Menggugat Arsip Nasional*, Cetakan Pertama, Badan Penerbit Fakultas Hukum Universitas Indonesia, Kota Depok.

Latif, Yudi, 2011, *Negara Paripurna, Historisitas, Rasionalitas dan Aktualitas Pancasila*, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama, Jakarta.

M. Dien Madjid, Johan Wahyudhi, 2014, *Ilmu Sejarah, Sebuah Pengantar*, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Prenadamedia Group, Kota Depok.

Menjadi Warga Negara Pancasila, 1979, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Balai Pustaka, Jakarta.

Naskah Persiapan UUD 1945 Jilid II, 1959, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Siguntang Djakarta, Djakarta.

Naskah Proklamasi yang Otentik dan Rumusan Pancasila yang Otentik,

- Cetakan Pertama, 1979, Penerbit PN Balai Pustaka, Jakarta.
- Notosusanto, Nugroho, 1981, Proses Perumusan Dasar Negara, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit PN Balai Pustaka, Jakarta.
- Orientasi Singkat Pancasila, 1974, Cetakan pertama, Humas Universitas Brawijaya, Malang.
- Pancasila dalam Pemikiran dan Pemasarakatannya, 1983, Cetakan Pertama, Laboratorium Pancasila IKIP Malang, Malang.
- Panitia Lima, Moh. Hatta, 1977, Uraian Pancasila, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Mutiara Offset, Jakarta.
- Pengertian Pancasila, 1977. Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit CV Haji Masagung Yayasan Idayu Press, Jakarta.
- Pokok-pokok Demokrasi Pancasila (Suatu Uraian Singkat, 1979. Cetakan Pertama, Lembaga Penerbitan Universitas Brawijaya, Malang.
- Pusat, Yapeta, 1995, Sejarah Lahirnya Pancasila, Cetakan Pertama, Yapeta Pusat, Jakarta.
- Pranarka, AMW, 1985, Sejarah Pemikiran tentang Pancasila, Cetakan Pertama, CSIS, Jakarta.
- Redi Andryana, Redi, 2016, Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Unoversitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung.
- Sulasman, 2014, Metodologi Penelitian Sejarah, Teori, Metode, Contoh Aplikasi, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Pustaka Setia, Bandung.
- Yamin, Muhammad (ed.), 1959, Naskah Persiapan UUD 1945, Cetakan Pertama, Penerbit Siguntang Djakarta, Djakarta.