

HISTORICAL SIGNIFICANCE IN INDONESIAN HISTORY: THE POSITION OF THE BATTLE OF SURABAYA 1945 IN INDONESIAN CURRICULUM AND HISTORY TEXTBOOKS

1st Aditya Nugroho Widiadi
Faculty of Social Sciences
Universitas Negeri Malang
line 4: Malang, Indonesia
aditya_widiadi@um.ac.id

Abstract—Indonesia has a long history since the prehistoric period to contemporary history. How do we decide what is important to learn about the past? This article aims to provide arguments about the historical significance of the battle of Surabaya in the Indonesian curriculum and history textbooks. Historical significance varies over time and from group to group, but the results of this study indicate that the position of the battle of Surabaya remains significance in Indonesian history

I. INTRODUCTION

The historical significance of the battle of Surabaya not only reflected on its contribution as a milestone to achieved Indonesian independence but also reflected in its position in Indonesian curriculum and history textbooks. Besides being memorialized in the various form of monuments, this event always sculptured inside the Indonesian curriculum development and carved inside the Indonesian history textbooks. Apart from being commemorated on various remembrance ceremony every year, this battle is a mandatory material to be taught on teaching-learning activities in Indonesian schools. As a “sacred territory” [1], the battle of Surabaya has a significant position in the history education in Indonesia.

This article aims to describe the position of the battle of Surabaya in Indonesia curriculum and history textbooks. There are three questions to explore the position of this event in Indonesian history. First, is there any change in the interpretation of the historical significance of the battle of Surabaya since 1945? Second, whether these changes have been reflected in the history education curriculum development in Indonesia?. Third, whether these changes have been reflected in the history education textbooks in Indonesia?

II. RESULT

A. *The battle for History: Contested Legitimacy*

For the Indonesian as a nation in general and for the Surabaya people in particular, the historical significance of the battle of Surabaya remains the same since the event

occurred in 1945 to the present time. Many historians recognize this heroic battle as a central symbol of Indonesian nationalism ([2]; [3]; [4]; [5]). Moreover, an Australian historian, Frank Palmos, claims that the battle of Surabaya was “Indonesia’s Gallipoli” [6]. Therefore for the Indonesian, the appellation of the city of Surabaya is the City of Heroes (Kota Pahlawan) and the battle of Surabaya in 1945 commemorated as the Heroes Day. This condition indicates that the battle of Surabaya obtains significance position in Indonesia history constantly and got a monumental place in the heart of the Indonesian, without any change from time to time.

The significance position of the battle of Surabaya become the “battlefield” for contested legitimacy. Many parties or individuals fighting for the past and to seize the history. Many historical characters who involved in this event, claim their pivotal role in the battle. While the other historical figures refute that claim and showing different testimony. Many inferior figure and unsung veterans also claim their role in various landmark incident of the battle, while their testimonies can still be considered as doubtful in a certain aspect. The prominent “battle for history” is the contested political legitimacy which utilizes the battle of Surabaya to obtain and maintain political power.

One of the main characters in the battle of Surabaya was Sutomo, which used to be called by his famous nickname Bung Tomo (brother Tomo). He became the symbol of the Pemuda (youth) movement in the battle of Surabaya [7]. His pivotal role in the battle of Surabaya was his ability to agitate the youth fighting spirit trough Radio of Revolt broadcast [8]. Outlines many of Bung Tomo roles as the leader of Barisan Pemberontakan Rakyat Indonesia [9] (BPRI, Forces of the Indonesian People Rebellion). Moreover, Bung Tomo strong impression from the battle still remains until recent days in Indonesian collective memory because his picture always depicted in history textbooks. His photograph while giving oration also many sold in the forms of posters, stickers, and t-shirt in the Indonesian market. The sound of his oration also widely available on YouTube, still leaving the strong vibrations for Indonesian. His voice and picture became the most recognizable symbols of the Indonesian

struggle against colonialism [10]. The culmination of his role on the battle also recognized by the government who awarded him as Indonesian National Hero in 2008.

The great role of Bung Tomo still turns out questionable from some people. From small matters about the authenticity of his famous photograph that was not taken in the battle of Surabaya 10 November 1945—and which is true that the picture was not taken in the battle momentum—until the big matters about his position on the battlefield. For an example, one of the Indonesian newspaper wrote in 2015, “where was the position of Bung Tomo in the Battle of 10 November?” [11]. This article questioned whether Bung Tomo fighting in the front line of the battlefield or he did not fight on the front line. With the reference to the book of Ktut Tantri, *Revolt in Paradise*, the author of the article shows that Bung Tomo was not in Surabaya after 10 November—at the height of the battle. Raises the question of whether he ran away from the battlefield. In fact, he fled to Malang city, about 100 km in the south of Surabaya, to continue his struggle through radio broadcasting from Malang. However, the vital role of Bung Tomo has exhorted the people through radio which can transform belief into action [12] because of his hypnotic radio oratory [13].

Similar to the case of Bung Tomo, there was also a debate about the role of Sumarsono. He was the leader of Pemuda Republik Indonesia (PRI) or the Youth of the Republic of Indonesia [14]. In 2006, Rosihan Anwar, Indonesian senior journalist who attend the battle in Surabaya, accused Sumarsono was not participating in the battle of 10 November 1945 because Rosihan did not meet Sumarsono in the battlefield at all [15]. Meanwhile, [16] describes the Soemarsono experiences in the Battle of Surabaya in the various incident, starting from the flag incident, the killing of Mallaby, and in the battle itself.

The battle for history not only happen to the leaders of the battle but also happen on the inferior figures of the battle. In an attempt to collect the testimony of the witnesses which involved in the battle, Dewan Harian Daerah Angkatan 1945 (Regional Daily Council Force 1945 or a Veteran Council 1945) of the East Java Province got many historical accounts from the veterans in 1970’s. Some of this testimonies are invaluable to reconstruct the battle of Surabaya from the veteran perspective. However many of the testimonies impressed resemble each other and as if trying to declare their presence in various pivotal incidents. Furthermore, many testimonies unable to describe detail chronology of the battle because the event has passed two decades as they testify.

The fierce “battle for history” of the battle of Surabaya also take place within the political elite of the Republic of Indonesia. The first president, Sukarno, who was directly involved in the battle of Surabaya as the truce mediator and gained de facto recognition from the British Allies forces, established the sacred position of the battle in Indonesian history. In the commemoration of the battle of Surabaya on 10 November 1952, he inaugurated the hero obelisk or Tugu Pahlawan [17]. Moreover, in 1957, Sukarno issued a Presidential Decree number 217 the year 1957 about regulation on national independence hero, which also instruct the commemoration of the national hero’s soul every 10 November. By this decree, Sukarno established Suryo—the

first East Java civil Governor and involved in the battle—as national independence hero in 1964. In fact, Sukarno was a skilled manipulator of men and of symbols [18]. By commemorating the battle of Surabaya, it means to indirectly commemorate Sukarno’s role in this event, especially his position as Indonesian president and civilian leader who able to conducted a cease-fire.

In the period of the second president, Suharto, the regime of New Order gave credit in this struggle to the military rather than to civilians such as Sukarno [19]. For Suharto, who has a military background, the Indonesian revolution was primarily a war of Independence from the colonial role. The struggle was won on the battlefield by dedicated soldiers, rather than compromising politicians. In New Order official account, the Pemuda (armed revolutionary youth) who fought the Battle of Surabaya acted with a discipline worthy of the Indonesian armed forces [20]. The official single narrative of Suharto in viewing the revolution was “defending the New Order was the same as defending the Revolution” [21].

On 10 November 1974, Suharto inaugurated “Monument of the Unknown Hero” (Monument Pahlawan Tidak Dikenal) in National Hero Cemetery at Kalibata, Jakarta. The core event of the inauguration was the re-entombment of the remains of anonymous Pemuda fighter who had been killed in the Battle of Surabaya. The body was exhumed in Surabaya and taken under a military guard to Jakarta. The coffin placed on a bier in the parliament building to provide an opportunity for the population to pay their homage and the next day was brought in memorial procession at Kalibata. The monumental memory-site, such as a statue or monument to the dead, owe their meaning to their existence [22]; one could justify relocating them without altering their meaning. Therefore as a centralized government, Suharto move the sacredness of the battle from Surabaya to Jakarta. The actual monument consisted of five concrete rectangular pillars of different height, symbolizing Pancasila’s five principles [23]. The monument of Kalibata symbolizes and celebrates both the state ideology and the Battle of Surabaya. Thereby the Suharto regime appropriates the legitimate power of the ‘Myth of Surabaya’ as the founding myth of independent Indonesia [24].

The battle for history after Suharto regime era was much less controlled by state censors [25]. However, the battle of Surabaya is still a fertile field to harvest political legitimacy in Indonesia. For example, Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono, the 6th president of the Republic of Indonesia who was former Indonesian army general, has established Dr Mustopo in 2007 and Bung Tomo in 2008 as official Indonesian National Heroes. A similar policy was also done by the current Indonesian president, Joko Widodo, who assigned Muhammad Mangundiprojo—a member of Contact Bureau in the battle of Surabaya—as Indonesian National Hero in 2014. On the next following year, Joko Widodo established 22 October as a national “Hari Santri” (Islamic scholars Day) by signing Presidential Decree of The Republic of Indonesia number 22/2015. This presidential decree based on the role of jihad resolution on 22 October 1945 and the role of Islamic students and scholars who participated in Indonesian struggle for independence, especially at the battle of Surabaya. At the surface and official level, the president admitted the role of an Islamic scholar, Kyai Hasyim Asy’ari

as the leader of Nadhatul Ulama, an Islamic organization who declared the jihad resolution in 1945. The actual political background behind this decision was because of the Nahdatul Ulama supports to Joko Widodo in the 2014 presidential election.

Therefore, the historical significance of the battle of Surabaya remains substantial and never changed in the Indonesian history since the battle occurred in 1945 and still prominent hitherto. For Indonesian there is only a single interpretation of the battle of Surabaya; this struggle is a paramount event in Indonesian history. Because of its supreme position, then the battle of Surabaya become the battlefield for history. Many people tried to put their role in the battle or use the battle for their role

B. The Position of the Battle of Surabaya in Indonesian Curriculum Development

The significance position of the Battle of Surabaya is sculptured inside the Indonesian curriculum. From time to time, the battle of Surabaya was never changed or being expelled from the curriculum development. This event is compulsory content in history education or other subjects and always be thought for the young people in Indonesian schools. To explain the position of the battle of Surabaya in Indonesian curriculum, it is necessary in advance to describe the development of curriculum in Indonesia.

Since its independence in 1945, the national curriculum of Indonesia has gone through several changes, namely in 1947, 1952, 1964, 1968, 1975, 1984, 1994, 2004, 2006 and 2013. The first curriculum was called Curriculum of 1947, which had a very simple structure because only consist of the subject names, time allocation, and teaching outline. This curriculum prioritizes character education, state, and society awareness, rather than cognitive education. History was one of sixteen subjects which given since elementary school [26]. The curriculum of 1952 directed to a national education system which has the main characteristic that every lesson plan should pay attention to the content of the subject and should relate to daily life activities [26]. The implementation of Curriculum of 1964 has the pancawardhana program to develop five skills of the students: *Cipta* (create force), *Rasa* (sense), *Karsa* (intention), *Karya* (creation), and *Moral* [26]. The curriculum of 1968 which created by the New Order regime, addressed to develop ideological education based on Pancasila. Learning activities enhance to develop student intelligence, skills, and strong physical health [26]. In the Curriculum of 1968, history subject became a form of citizenship transmission and to develop the potential of the citizen into good citizens [27]. Meanwhile, the Curriculum of 1975 got a lot of criticism because of the strong emphasized on cognitive understanding rather than the formation of attitudes and values [28], as a result of trying too hard “to create Indonesian men of science and technology” [29]. Unfortunately, I could not find any literature or document from all this curriculum from 1947 to 1975, so I could not analyze the curriculum content to describe how was the position of the battle of Surabaya in the curriculum change and development.

In the Curriculum of 1984, the position of history education has an important place in the curriculum. There were two history subject matters, National and World

History as knowledge education and a new subject called “Pendidikan Sejarah Perjuangan Bangsa” (PSPB) or History of the Indonesian Struggle Education as a value education [30]; [31]. According to the Decree of the Peoples Consultative Assembly number II/MPR/1983, the latter subject was established to develop “the spirit and the values of the 1945” in the young generation. These values are a willingness to sacrifice, unity, respect for each other, cooperation, and having pride as Indonesians. The main content of the subject covers the period of Independence from 1945 until recent time. The word “struggle” is a very important part of the subject names, which should inspire students to “struggle”, that is, to act reflecting courage, patriotism, truth and will [32]. The battle of Surabaya position on this curriculum located in the first grade of Junior High School [32] and in the second grade of Senior High School [32]. The battle of Surabaya also taught on the subject of Pendidikan Moral Pancasila (Pancasila Moral Education) in the Senior High School as a moral value education [32].

The Curriculum of 1994 was a refinement of the implementation of the previous curriculum. However, on the aspects of subject content were all almost the same as the Curriculum of 1984 [33]. The exceptional change was the substitution of the semester system to a trimester system to provide opportunities for the student to be able to receive more lessons [26]. In the Curriculum of 1994, the subject of History of the Indonesian Struggle Education dispensed, there is only one subject of Indonesian National History. However, the purpose of learning history is still the same in looking at the importance of the history of the nation’s struggle, in order to transmit and develop the soul, spirit, and values of 1945 to the young generation [33]. The position of the battle of Surabaya was taught on the second grade of Senior High School, along with another battle in Semarang, Ambarawa, Bandung, and Medan.

The Curriculum of 2004 was known as Competency-Based Curriculum which focused on developing student ability to perform certain tasks in accordance with predefined performance standards [26]. However, the implementation of the Curriculum of 2004 became the source of public debate about the content of the historical material, specifically regarding the involvement of Indonesian Communist Party in ‘G-30-S’ coup attempt in 1965 [33]. Finally, the Indonesian government has stopped the implementation of the Curriculum of 2004 for history subject only. Through the Regulation of the National Education Minister number 7/2005, it was decided that the history subject should re-apply Curriculum of 1994 and prohibit the use of every textbook based on the Curriculum of 2004. This prohibition not related to the content of the battle of Surabaya at all, but more related to the conflicting narratives and controversial position of Indonesian Communist Party in a coup attempt in 1948 and 1965 [33]; [34].

The Curriculum of 2006 was known as KTSP or Kurikulum Tingkat Satuan Pendidikan (The School-Based Curriculum). In terms of content and the process to achieve competency, targets were not so much different with the previous curriculum, the most prominent difference was the independence of the teachers to develop learning plan in accordance with the condition of the student and the school [26]. Furthermore, the Curriculum of 2006 has also

emphasized the cultural and character education of the nation [35]. The position of the battle of Surabaya in the Senior High School was taught at the Grade XI for Natural Science students and at the Grade XII for the Social Science student. This battle also taught for Junior High School student at the Grade IX on the subject matter of social studies.

The Curriculum of 2013 is basically an attempt to simplify the previous curriculum [36], especially regarding the arrangement of curriculum content on the Core Competence and Basic Competence. The curriculum introduces core competencies which consist of religious values, social values, knowledge and skills [37]. This curriculum also introduces, and recommends the use of a scientific approach to all learning subject [26], including history. History education on the Curriculum of 2013 emphasizes the importance of nation and character building [33].

Based on the Curriculum of 2013, history is a part of social studies subject matter in the Junior High School. Based on the Regulation of The Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 69 the Year 2013, appendix 10, the position of the battle of Surabaya located on Basic Competence number 3.4 and 4.4. The Basic Competence number 3.4 confirmed that student should have knowledge “to understand the significance of the proclamation of independence, the effort to maintain independence, and the effort to develop a prosperous national life”. The Basic Competence number 4.4 stated that student should have skills “to present a report about the significance of the proclamation of independence, the effort to maintain independence, and the effort to develop a prosperous national life”. The theme of “the effort to maintain independence” containing topic of the battle of Surabaya.

In Senior High School, there are two history subject matter, namely the “History of Indonesia” and the “History”. The History of Indonesia is a compulsory subject matter for all the student from Grade X to XII. Meanwhile, History is a compulsory subject for Social Science student, but an elective subject for Natural Science and Language Science student. The position of the battle of Surabaya located on the subject of “History of Indonesia” for students at Grade XI. While on the subject of “History”, the position of the battle of Surabaya only discussed briefly at Grade XI as a part of the topic “the great revolution of the world”.

In 2016, the Curriculum of 2013 derived minor revision for content improvement of the Core Competence and Basic Competence. Regarding the battle of Surabaya, in the old version of Curriculum of 2013, based on The Regulation of The Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 69 the Year 2013, this battle located on the Basic Competence number 3.11 and 4.11. The Basic Competence number 3.11 stated “to analyze the struggle of Indonesian nation in maintaining independence from the Allies and Dutch threats” and the Basic Competence number 4.11 stated “to process information about the struggle of the Indonesian nation in maintaining independence from the Allies and Dutch threats, and presents it in the form of historical narration (historiography)”. On the latest version of Curriculum of 2013, based on the Regulation of The Minister of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia Number 24 the Year 2016 appendix 46, the battle of

Surabaya located on the Basic Competence number 3.10 and 4.10. The knowledge aspect of the Basic Competence number 3.10 declared that the students have “to analyze the strategies and forms of the Indonesian struggle in maintaining independence from the Allies and Dutch threats”. The skills aspect on the Basic Competence number 4.11 declared that the students have “to process information about the strategy and forms of the Indonesian struggle in maintaining independence from Allies and Dutch threats and present it in the form of historical narration (historiography)”.

The latest version of the Curriculum of 2013 given more emphasis on the ability of the student to analyze the strategies and the forms of the Indonesian struggle. These basic competencies encompass all the events of the Indonesian struggle for independence on the period 1945-1949. Which at that time there was two main forms and strategies of the struggle: diplomatic and confrontation. Meanwhile, the battle of Surabaya categorized as confrontation strategy.

Therefore, the position of the battle of Surabaya in Indonesian curriculum is very prominent because always exist and never changed along with curriculum development. This battle is very important to teach about the value of the struggle as a nation for the young generation. The place of history as subject matter also play important role in Indonesia, especially in “constructing national identity” [38]. History in Indonesia is significant and compulsory subject matter, unlike in New Zealand which is not prominent and offered only as an elective subject [39]. In Indonesia, history main task is not to create patriot per se, because the composition of the latest history curriculum in Indonesia involves complex interactions of declarative and procedural knowledge, both “content” and “skills” [40]. Combined also with values of spiritual and social attitude, as well as “history for nation-building” [41].

C. The Position of the Battle of Surabaya in Indonesian History Textbooks

Indonesia school culture can be described as a “textbook culture” and the content of textbooks faithfully represented state messages about a wide range of “facts”, opinions, and values [42]. For Indonesia as a new nation and as an “imagined communities” [43], school textbooks are needed to use by national government to describe, define, and communicate a national identity [44]. That is why in Indonesian context, the existence of history textbooks are for the benefit of history education and historiography in school textbooks is the reconstruction of historical narratives that serve as a tool in education, which allows a subjective interpretation of history for the benefit of education [45].

During the Dutch East Indies colonialism, Indonesian who opposing the Dutch depicted as villains in school history textbooks. During the Japanese occupation, Sanusi Pane—under Japanese supervision and censorship—turned the history of the Dutch Indies into Indonesian history, the Dutch were shown as evil colonialist and all suffering of Indonesians was attributed to them [44]. After Indonesian independence, the Ministry of Education and Culture tried to issue standardized history textbooks but unsuccessful. The textbooks only transformed the history of the Dutch East

Indies into the history of Indonesia, by simply making it the opposite of what had come before, was bound to cause confusion amongst both students and the general public. Therefore the question arose whether Indonesian history was merely the antithesis of the history of the Dutch Indies [46].

Before the Second National History seminar held in Yogyakarta in August 1970, the Minister of Education and Culture issued a Resolution Number 01731 in April 1970 appointed the Committee for the Compilation of an Indonesian National History Standard Book Based on Pancasila [44]. Six panels were set up to produce six volumes for the six-time periodization of Indonesian history. The book was very popular text during the New Order as a “standard text” and was being used in Indonesian high school [44], and still be must-read textbook for college students in the history department and history education department on various Indonesian universities. This book is titled National History of Indonesia edited by Puspongoro and [47] and went through several editions of revision, 1977 (green cover), 1981-1983 (blue cover), 1984 (grey cover), and the latest revision was published in 2008 (black cover) to accommodate updating version in post New Order. The position of the battle of Surabaya on this book presented on the sixth volume.

Where is the position of the battle of Surabaya in the changing history textbooks? Unfortunately, I could not find any history textbooks from the Curriculum of 1947 to 1975, so that could not be held content analysis to the matter of the battle of Surabaya. In the Curriculum of 1984, the battle of Surabaya much discussed in the subject matter of History of the Indonesian Struggle Independence. In fact, the content of the textbooks contains duplication between the Junior and the Senior High School textbooks [32]. The duplication consist of 23 pages conveys the struggle of the people to defend independence through the struggle and negotiations, including the flag incident and the fight in Surabaya [48]. The battle of Surabaya also mentioned in the elementary school textbooks, including discussed the re-entombment of the remains of the anonymous Pemuda fighter who had been killed in the Battle of Surabaya at the commemoration of the Hero Day on 10 November 1974. This textbooks also instills moral values that “great nation is a nation that respects the services of its heroes” [49].

The position of the battle of Surabaya in history textbook based on the Curriculum of 1994, taught in the second grade of Senior High School. One of the textbooks written by [50] narrates the battle since the flag incidents on 19 September 1945 until the battle broke out in 10 November 1945. The narration consists of five paragraph. The first paragraph describes the flag incident, focused on the cause and the consequence of ripping the flag from red, white, and blue Dutch flag into red and white Indonesian flag. The second paragraph describes the arrival of British Allied Forces which well received by the Indonesians but instead raided the Kalisosok prison. The third paragraph narrates Indonesian counterattacks, the British overwhelmed and bring Sukarno to hold a truce, and the death of Mallaby. The fourth paragraph describes the British ultimatum which was ignored by the Indonesians. The fifth paragraph describes the peak of the battle and the success of the Pemuda to defend the city for a month, so it is remembered as Hero Day.

History textbooks based on the Curriculum of 2004 could not be analyzed, because the books were prohibited for circulating by the Attorney General of the Republic of Indonesia decision in 2007. History textbooks based on the Curriculum of 2006 are still accessible to this day because for the first time the Indonesian government published Buku Sekolah Elektronik (BSE) or electronic school textbooks. So this books is freely accessible for the student and teacher and they do not have to buy expensive printed school textbooks anymore. The Indonesian government bought the copyright of the textbooks and then published it online on <http://www.bse.kemdikbud.go.id>. That is why, in the Curriculum of 2006, there were so many version of textbooks for a single subject matter at a certain grade. For example, history subject matter on the Senior High School, at least available seven different authors for the history textbooks. For Junior High School at least available nine social studies textbooks from different authors. From those textbooks for the Grade IX of Junior High School and for the Grade XI of Senior High School, all of the textbooks review the battle of Surabaya with different depth of discussion.

The following table 1 presents the result of content analysis from nine social studies textbooks for the Grade IX of Junior High School of Curriculum of 2006 which contain the battle of Surabaya.

The table shows that the content of the battle of Surabaya in social studies textbooks for Junior High School always included in. But the depth of discussion of each textbook is different. Some of the textbooks discuss the chronology of the battle in detail, but some are just briefly touched on. Complex historical detail of the battle seems to be ignored to focus on significant milestones and important actors. The same pattern also applied to the history textbooks for Senior High School, despite being found an enhancement of the depth of discussion.

The history textbooks based on the Curriculum of 2013 also available in the form of e-books for free. But the difference with the previous curriculum, there is an only available single version of textbooks. These textbooks consist of two type of books: the first one is “History of Indonesia: Teacher Textbooks” and the other is “History of Indonesia: Student Textbooks”. The teacher textbook is a handbook for the teachers which contains about what and how to teach history for each chapter of the student textbook. Meanwhile, the student textbook is consist of the materials that student should learn.

The position of the battle of Surabaya in the history textbooks from Curriculum 2013 is more comprehensive compared to the textbook from the previous curriculum. This battle located on the textbooks for Grade XI written by Sardiman & Lestariningsih (2014a; 2014b). On the student textbooks, the total number of pages related to the battle of Surabaya is 9 pages. These pages cover the historical background of the battle starting from the effort to seize weaponry from the Japanese hands, taking over Japanese arsenal in Don Bosco, seizing the Kempetai’s headquarter, and the flag incident (page 92). Followed by the discussion about the formation bodies of struggle in Surabaya, such as Angkatan Muda and Pemuda Republik Indonesia by Sumarsono, Sutomo, and Ruslan Wijayasastra (page 105). Then continued by reviewing the historical background of

the arrival of British Allies forces in Indonesia, including the placement of its military division (page 132-132). The essence of the discussion is on pages 138-142, which reviews chronological details of the battle from 25 October 1945 to 28 November 1945. The main weakness of the chronology is the lack of discussion about detail event in the period 10 November to 28 November, just like any other previous textbooks.

second illustration is the photograph of Tugu Pahlawan (hero obelisk) in Surabaya, coupled with a reflective question about the values of the struggle (page 128). The third illustration is the picture of Bung Tomo giving oration (page 138). The last illustration is contained an image of the Mallaby burning car (page 142). The historical character or the actors who involved in the battle also completely mentioned, mainly Bung Tomo and Mallaby.

There are four illustrations related to the battle of Surabaya. The first one is the picture of the flag incident in Oranje/Yamato Hotel on 19 September 1945 (page 92). The

TABLE I. CONTENT ANALYSIS FROM NINE SOCIAL STUDIES TEXTBOOKS

No	Aspects of Content Analysis	Textbooks								
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1	Chronology of the battle:									
	a. Flag incident (19 Sept)	√			√					
	b. The arrival of the battle (25 Oct)		√	√			√	√	√	√
	c. Indonesian first reaction (25 Oct)		√	√				√	√	√
	d. British raid to Kalisosok Prison & another installation (26 Oct)		√	√				√	√	
	e. Hawthorn leaflets drop to ask Indonesian to surrender (27 Oct)			√				√	√	√
	f. Three days battle (28-30 Oct)		√						√	√
	g. The president Sukarno arrival & cease-fire (29-30 Oct)			√				√	√	√
	h. The death of Mallaby (30 Oct)		√	√	√		√	√	√	√
	i. Mansergh ultimatum (9 Nov)	√			√			√	√	√
	j. The battle begin (10 Nov)	√	√	√	√	√	√	√		√
	k. The detail of the battle (10-28 Nov)									
	l. The end of the battle			√						
2	The structure of narration (the amount of paragraph)	3	6	11	5	1	4	7	9	8
3	The illustration/picture/photograph:									
	a. The flag incident	√								
	b. Bung Tomo	√	√	√			√	√	√	√
	c. The situation of the battle					√			√	
	d. The Allies military armament/vehicle				√					√
4	The character mentioned:									
	a. Bung Tomo	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√
	b. Brigadier Mallaby	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√
	c. Suryo (East Java Governor)	√		√			√	√	√	
	d. Mustopo									
	e. President Sukarno		√	√					√	√
	f. Vice President Hatta			√					√	√
	g. Amir Sjarifuddin (minister of information)			√						√
	h. General Mansergh			√	√			√		√
	i. General Sir Philip Christison			√						
	j. Captain Shaw			√	√					
	k. Captain Smith				√					
	l. Captain Laughland				√					
	m. Major Venu Gopal				√					
	n. Colonel Huijer			√	√			√		√
	o. General Iwabe				√					
	p. Sungkono							√	√	
	q. Ktut Tantry								√	
	r. General Hawthorn							√		
5	Why commemorate as Hero Day?		√	√				√	√	√
6	Moral value	√	√	√	√		√	√	√	√

Textbooks Source:

1. Endarto, Suprpto, Haryono, & Rifai (2009)
2. Suprihartoyo, Djuminah, & Wardayati (2009).
3. Yuliati, Khamid, Pawijan, Sutrisna, & Widyastuti (2009)
4. Fertanto, Suwardi, Haryanto, & Waluyo (2009)
5. Wismulyani, Susatya, & Indratna (2009)
6. Fattah, Trimanto, Waskito, & Setyawan (2009).
7. Sutarto, Herjunanto, Purwanto, Sunardi, & Rahmawaty (2009)
8. Bambang & Rukidi (2009)
9. Nurhadi, Saleh, Badri, & Susanti (2009)

Since the early independence, the Ministry of Education and Culture of the Republic of Indonesia faced a dilemma to

bring uniformity into history textbooks and the teaching of Indonesian history. In the first hand, there is the political

problem of trying to define and develop the national character. In the second hand, there is a problem posed by the scientific requirements for the study of history, which might be in conflict with political needs [51]. According to [50], there are two characteristics of school history textbooks in many nations across the world, the first type is overtly nationalistic and the second type is single 'best story' narratives. The current type of history textbooks based on the Curriculum of 2013, seems to be between those two type because try to teach using a scientific approach to promote nationalism. However, the use of history to create a sense of national identity often cause curriculum and textbooks are constantly revised to reflect changing ideas about how a given nation should of think itself [52].

However, the contents of the school textbooks of Curriculum 2013 is actually a simplification of the contents of National History of Indonesia standard textbook in volume VI. According to [53] that in designing textbooks "complex historical factors might be ignored in favour of an emphasis on easy-to-remember events and personages, such as battles and 'founding fathers'". This simplification and adjustment of the history textbook tailored to the level of student ability. To improve student historical thinking skills, they need to be given other learning sources in addition to textbooks, especially primary sources

III. CONCLUSION

Based on the above discussion, it can be drawn some conclusions. First, the battle of Surabaya gained significance position in the Indonesian collective memory. This event still regarded as a major milestone in Indonesian struggle to gain independence. The significance position of the battle of Surabaya never changes for Indonesians, but instead, it becomes a field of battle for history to claims legitimacy. Second, the significance position of the battle of Surabaya is also reflected in its position on the Indonesian curriculum changes and development, this event still always taught for young Indonesian people. Third, the position of the battle of Surabaya also never changes in Indonesian history school textbooks, this event never being expelled from history textbooks.

REFERENCES

- [1] T. A. Ahmad, *Sejarah Kontroversial di Indonesia: Perspektif Pendidikan*, Jakarta: Pustaka Obor Indonesia, 2016. (references)
- [2] M. Ali, "Historiographical problems," in *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Soedjatmoko, Ed., Jakarta: Equinox Publishing Indonesia, 2007, pp.1-23
- [3] B. Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London: Verso, 2006.
- [4] B. R. O'G. Anderson, "The idea of power in Javanese culture," in *Culture and Politics in Indonesia*, C. Holt, Ed., Jakarta: Equinox Publishing, 2007, pp. 1-70
- [5] T. H. Bambang, & Rukidi, *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial Terpadu 3 untuk Kelas IX SMP/MTs*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [6] M. Carretero, M. Rodriguez-Moneo, & M Asensio, "History education and the construction of a national identity". In *History education and the construction of national identities*, M. Carretero, M. Asensio, M. Rodriguez-Moneo, Eds., Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2012, pp. 1-14
- [7] G. R. Clarke, *Social Science in Indonesia: A Curriculum Evaluation*, University of Canberra, 1980, Master Thesis Unpublished.
- [8] M. Conroe, *Generating History: Violence and the Risk of Remembering for Families of Former Political Prisoners in Post-New Order Indonesia*, 2012, Doctoral Dissertation Unpublished.
- [9] Dewan Harian Daerah Angkatan 1945 Provinsi Jawa Timur. *Daftar Riwayat Hidup Singkat Pelaku Pertempuran 10 Nopember 1945*, Unpublished
- [10] Y. M. Djakababa, *The Construction of History under Indonesia's New Order: The Making of the Lubang Buaya official Narrative*, University of Wisconsin, Madison, 1999, Unpublished doctoral dissertation
- [11] D. Endarto, Suprpto, S. Haryono, & N. Rifai, *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial 3 untuk SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [12] K. Ercikan, & P. Seixas, "Issues in designing assessments of historical thinking," in *Theory Into Practice*, Vol. 54 (3), 2015, pp.255-262.
- [13] S. Fattah, J. Trimanto, J. Waskito, & M. T. Setyawan, *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial untuk SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [14] Feryanto, Suwardi, T. Haryanto, & Waluyo, *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial untuk Kelas IX SMP/MTs*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [15] S. Foster, "Re-thinking history textbooks in a globalized world," in *History Education and the Construction of National Identities*, Carretero, Asensio, Rodriguez-Moneo (Eds), Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2012, pp. 49-62
- [16] W. H. Frederick, *Vision and Heat: the making of the Indonesian revolution*. Athens: Ohio University Press, 1989.
- [17] D. Graham, D. "Frank Palmos: from ragamuffins to revolutionaries," in *The Jakarta Post*, November 10, 2011 (online)
- [18] Harsutejo, Sumarsono: *Pemimpin Perlawanan Rakyat Surabaya 1945 yang dilupakan*, Jakarta: Sinar Harapan, 2010
- [19] H. Hasan, "Pendidikan sejarah untuk memperkuat pendidikan karakter," in *Paramita*, Vol 22 (1), 2012, pp. 81-95.
- [20] Idrus, "Surabaya 1945". In *Indonesian Nationalism and Revolution: Six First-Hand Accounts*, Victoria: Monash University, 1971, pp. 18-24.
- [21] G. M. Kahin, *Nationalism and Revolution in Indonesia*. New York: Southeast Asia Program Cornell University, 2003.
- [22] S. Karsono, S. (2013). *Indonesia's New Order, 1966-1988: Its Social and Intellectual Origin*, 2013, Doctoral dissertation unpublished
- [23] P. Kartomihardjo, P. Saptono, & Soekarsono, *Monumen Perjuangan Jawa Timur*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 1986.
- [24] Keputusan Menteri Pendidikan Nasional Nomor 7 Tahun 2005 tentang Penghentian Uji Coba Kurikulum 2004 untuk Mata Pelajaran Sejarah dan Larangan Penggunaan Buku Teks Mata Pelajaran Sejarah yang Disusun Berdasarkan Standar Kompetensi Kurikulum 2004
- [25] Keputusan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 217 Tahun 1957 tentang Pahlawan Kemerdekaan Nasional
- [26] Keputusan Presiden Republik Indonesia Nomor 22 Tahun 2015 tentang Hari Santri
- [27] Ketetapan Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat Republik Indonesia nomor II/MPR/1983 tentang Garis-garis Besar Haluan Negara.
- [28] G. V. Klinken, "The battle for history after Suharto: beyond sacred dates, great men, and legal milestones," In *Critical Asian Studies*, VOL 33 (3), 2001, pp. 323-350.
- [29] Lie, "Religious education and character formation: an Indonesian context," In *Journal of Interdisciplinary Studies*, 2014.
- [30] Mulyana, "Nasionalisme dan militerisme: Ideologisasi historiografi buku teks pelajaran sejarah SMA," In *Paramita*, VOL. 23 (1), 2013, pp. 78-87.
- [31] Nurhadi, B. A. Saleh, D. A., Badri, & P. Susanti, *Jelajah Cakrawala Sosial 3*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [32] F. Palmos, "Surabaya 1945: sacred territory, revolutionary Surabaya as the birthplace of Indonesian independence", Perth, University of Western Australia, 2011, Doctoral thesis unpublished
- [33] L. Parker, "The subjectification of citizenship: Student interpretations of school teaching in Bali," In *Asian Studies Review*, VOL. 26 (1), 2002, pp. 3-37.

- [34] M. D. Poesponegoro & N. Notosusanto, *Sejarah Nasional Indonesia VI*, Jakarta: Balai Pustaka, 2010.
- [35] Reid, *The Indonesian National Revolution 1945-1950*, Hawthorn, Victoria: Longmans, 1974.
- [36] M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia since c.1200*, Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan, 2001.
- [37] M. Sardiman & A.D. Lestariningsih, *Sejarah Indonesia: Buku Siswa Kelas XI Semester II*, Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2014a.
- [38] M. Sardiman & A.D. Lestariningsih, *Sejarah Indonesia: Buku Guru Kelas XI*, Jakarta: Kementerian Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan, 2014b
- [39] Sartono, Djito, & Surono. *Sejarah Nasional dan Umum: Sekolah Menengah Umum 2*, Surakarta: Pabelan, 1995.
- [40] K. H. Schreiner, "'National Ancestor': the ritual construction of nationhood," In *The Potent Dead: Ancestors, Saints, and Heroes in Contemporary Indonesia*, H. Chambert-Loir & A. Reid, Eds., Honolulu: Allen & Unwin and University of Hawai'i Press, 2002, pp. 183-204.
- [41] M. Sheehan, "'Little is taught or learned in schools': Debates over the place of history in New Zealand school curriculum," In *History Wars and the Classroom: Global Perspectives*, T. Taylor & R. Guyver, Eds., Charlotte: Information Age Publishing, 2012, pp. 89-106.
- [42] Soedijono, *40 Tahun Merdeka: Penunjang Pendidikan Sejarah Perjuangan Bangsa*, Klaten: Intan, 1985.
- [43] Suprihartoyo, Djuminah, & E.D. Wardayati, E.D., *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial untuk SMP dan MTs Kelas IX*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [44] Sutarto, N. Herjunanto, B.P. Purwanto, Sunardi, & P. Rahmawaty, *IPS untuk SMP/MTs Kelas*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [45] Tempo, *Dimana posisi Bung Tomo saat pertempuran 10 November?*, November 10, 2015.
- [46] S. M. Thowaf, *The Textbooks of Values Education in Indonesian Secondary Schools: A Content Analysis*, 1990, Doctoral dissertation unpublished
- [47] Triyana, "Sumasono di Surabaya," In *Historia*, November 12, 2010.
- [48] F. Wahyuni, "Kurikulum dari masa ke masa," in *Al-Adabiya*, VOL. 10 (2), 2015, pp. 231-242.
- [49] Wild, "The radio war," In *Born in Fire: The Indonesian Struggle for Independence*, C. Wild & P. Carey, Eds., Athens: Ohio University Press, 1988, pp. 161-167.
- [50] Wismulyani, J. Susatya, & K. Indratna, *IPS untuk SMP dan MTs Kelas IX*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [51] M. Wood, *The Historical Past as a Tool for Nation-Building in New Order Indonesia*, Montreal, Canada: McGill University, Doctoral Thesis Unpublished.
- [52] L. Yuliati, A. Khamid, Pawijan, E. Sutrisna, & Y.P. Widyastuti, Y.P. *Ilmu Pengetahuan Sosial untuk SMP/MTs Kelas IX*, Jakarta: Pusat Perbukuan Departemen Pendidikan Nasional, 2009.
- [53] M. Zuhdi, *Political and Social Influences of Religious School: A Historical Perspective on Indonesian Islamic School Curricula*, Montreal, Canada: McGill University, Doctoral Thesis Unpublished.