



Teaching Controversial History of the 30 September 1965 Movement in the Post- Truth Era (A Critical Discourse Analysis)

Yudi Hartono^{1*}, Khoirul Huda², Sastiya Devy Nur Pratiwi³, Tiswa Aprillia⁴

^{1,2,3,4}Department of History Education, Universitas PGRI Madiun, Madiun, Indonesia,
*yudihartono@unipma.ac.id; khoirulhuda@unipma.ac.id;
sastiyadevy@gmail.com; tiswaaprill@gmail.com

Abstract. This research aimed to qualitatively examine the relationship between the teaching of the controversial history of the 30 September 1965 Movement and Indonesian post-1998 socio-politics changes in the post-truth era. It occurred in Madiun City and Madiun Regency, East Java which experienced an almost similar traumatizing incident by the Indonesian Communist Party in 1948 and 1965. The data were collected using observation, in-depth interviews, and document study and processed and validated through triangulation. Afterwards, they were analyzed using critical discourse analysis. The results showed a relationship between the teaching controversial history of the 30 September 1965 Movement and Indonesian post-1998 society in the post-truth era with traumatizing memories of communism and government policy factor on historical education. The relationship with factors outside represents the transition to the democratization of historical discourse, which is still in progress. The dominant influence of these factors contradicts the main goal of controversial history learning in building the critical awareness of students in the post-truth era.

Keywords : Teaching controversial history, The 30 September 1965 movement, The post-truth era.

1 Introduction

The 30 September 1965 Movement, which was then written as G-30-S, is a controversial history in Indonesia. Controversial history is various interpretations of that incident. Various interpretations have been the cause of the controversy. Each version has a strong foundation according to the author. The writing of history is still in progress, which in the end has led to several different opinions regarding a historical event (1).

Many studies have explored this in detail the G-30-S. In brief, the tragedy of G-30-S was the result of polarization between leftist and rightist groups in Indonesia, which for some decades manifested itself in political competition and political polarization within

society (2). New perspectives have arisen that examine the tragedy not only as a political event *per se* but also as a case of mass human rights violations (3).

The G-30-S became a debatable history material that made difficult roles for teachers. In historical science, controversy is considered fair, but it becomes a difficulty in terms of the learning process. Teachers are faced with various obstacles due to changes in the historiography of Indonesia in the Post-Reformation era. Teachers experience constraints in the learning process of controversial history, namely factors that originate, and in the science of history, namely a change in the historiographic style of Indonesia after the Reformation.

Some experts recommend that the controversial history material not be limited to metanarrative. History should become a historical narration that based on today's condition of students. (4). But in practice, the learning activity about G-30-S material is monotonous and does not attract students' interest (5). There is a tendency for teachers to be afraid of controversial issues (6).

For history teachers in Madiun and Madiun Regency, East Java, teaching the history of G-30-S is not easy, especially among the people who are stigmatized by the event. In Madiun, the incident had a long-lasting impact until today, especially before the 1948 Indonesian Communist Party rebellion occurred. The event has affected the psychological condition of people (7).

The mindset and critical awareness of students are the main goals of controversial history learning (8). Critical awareness is the ability to deeply understand reality and to take a role in improving society (9). Critical awareness is also defined as the ability to think and act at the same time. It is obtained through critical thinking skills as a high-order thinking skill, which is important in controversial history learning.

The controversial history of the G-30-S is a sensitive issue for the Indonesian people. It is important to note that due to a complex political situation, relationships, and hatred that meet most of the main actors together, and the suspicious nature of most of the evidence, the truth will never be revealed. It seems impossible that one mastermind controls the event. Moreover, a single interpretation that attempts to explain the event must be considered carefully.

In the Post-Reformation era, various discourses and narratives of the G-30-S have developed in mass media, including online media, which are different from those in schools. Information and communication technology has resulted in the development of various discourses and narratives on controversial history which are different from those in schools. New counter-narratives challenge official history to appear in new types of media (online media) that have the potential to be emancipatory media (10). It also has an impact on the emergence of the post-truth phenomenon. The term post-truth was introduced by Steve Tesich in 1992 which was taken from the setting of the American Watergate Scandal (1972-1974) or the Gulf War which depicted the condition of society at

that time as being “comfortable” enjoying a life filled with lies. People no longer care about the truth and are free to make life choices (11).

Post-truth means after the truth. Intellect as the basis of truth and observation of facts as a standard of objectivity seems no longer important in influencing opinions, thoughts or behaviour of people who are concerned with sensations and emotions. Humans live a lie and think of it as no big deal. Lies make it difficult for the human mind to see things. There have been various baseless accusations, but are considered factual and viral on social media (12).

History material taught at school is different from what is discussed in various mass media. The teaching of the controversial history of the G-30-S faces challenges in its discourse and practice. This research aims to a relationship between teaching praxis of the controversial history of the G-30-S with the situation of Indonesian society in the Post-Reformation era. The research is expected to be used as a basis for transforming teaching models of the controversial history of the G-30-S, which can better build students’ critical awareness, where the material is actual and relevant to the spirit of the times.

2 Research Method

The research used was an exploratory qualitative method. The research was conducted in the Senior High Schools of Madiun City and Madiun Regency, East Java, Indonesia. Data were collected through in-depth interviews, observation, and documentation study. Data collection was carried out from September to October 2022. The interview was conducted with teachers, students, and the public. Observations were made on classroom learning. Document analysis is carried out by analyzing the curriculum, syllabus, lesson plans, and the contents of history textbooks. Data validation was done through source triangulation. Data analysis used critical discourse analysis by Fairclough (13), which consists of three dimensions, namely text, discourse practice, and social practice. Based on these three dimensions, data were analyzed to find the relationship between teaching praxis with the context outside, namely the context of Indonesian society in the Post-Reformation era.

3 Results

3.1 Construction of Material

In the 2013 curriculum, in history subject in Senior High School, there is a topic about the G-30-S in the material for XII grade. The material began with a statement that the G-30-S still holds controversy, followed by the question, “Who was the mastermind behind the G-30-S?” To answer this question, seven theories about the G-30-S were. These theories are 1) an Army internal issue. The G-30-S was triggered by an internal conflict of the Army; 2) the mastermind of the G-30-S is the United States Intelligence Service (CIA). The United States was worried that Indonesia would be acquired

by communists; 3) the G-30-S is a meeting point between the United Kingdom's desire that Soekarno's confrontational attitude towards Malaysia be ended through a coup and the United States' desire that Indonesia be free from communism; 4) Sukarno was the mastermind of the G-30-S to eliminate the opposition forces from some of the High Army Officers; 5) there is no single role and big scenario but it was a combination of elements (Chaos Theory); 6) Suharto as the mastermind of the G-30-S with a close relationship between Untung as the leader of the G-30-S; and 7) the mastermind of the G-30-S was PKI. PKI leader was responsible for the coup incident by manipulating the Army (7).

Furthermore, Chapter 3 entitled "The System and Structure of Indonesian Politics and Economy for Guided Democracy (1959-1965)" also discusses G-30-S on the material "Map of National Political Strength" which is a sub material of the main material about Political Dynamics of the Guided Democratic Period. This material contains political forces on the national stage, namely the Army, PKI, and Soekarno. Among these political forces, the relationship between the Army and PKI was the worst. Later on, PKI would rebel, and the army crushed it.

The construction of the material is dominated by conflicts between the Army and PKI, which began with the material about the actions of the Indonesian National Army against PKI. After that, the material discusses an issue that blames PKI. PKI replied with various efforts to break the territorial guidance that had been carried out by the Army (7).

In Chapter 4, the material entitled "The Indonesian Political-Economy System and Structure in the New Order Period (1966-1998)" was written the fact that Lieutenant General Soeharto became the president cannot be separated from the incident of the G-30-S or the G-30-S/PKI. The material explicitly mentions the G-30-S/PKI in the history books material for Senior High School students. The word "PKI" written after the words the G-30-S was subsequently written consistently until the end of the book's chapter.

3.2 Teaching Praxis

There are various methods used by teachers in teaching the controversial history of the G-30-S. In the Public Senior High School of Jiwan, Madiun Regency, the methods used are lectures and screening of G-30-S/PKI film. Students watch this films and the teacher explains it through a lecture. After that, the teacher assigns students to analyze the film. According to the results of Imelda's (a student) analysis, the film clearly shows that some Indonesians betrayed and brutally shot the generals to death (Imelda interview, 4 September 2022).

In Taman Bakti Senior High School, Madiun Regency, lecture and film screening methods of G-30-S/PKI are also used. Furthermore, students are given the task of finding out who are the victims of the incident (Indrawan interview, 12 September 2022). Likewise, in the Public Senior High School of Mejayan, Madiun Regency, a learning activity is carried out by screening the PKI rebellion video. The teacher also explains with a real picture in the form of photographs (Linda interview, 11 September 2022).

In Vocational High School, the method used by the teacher is a lecture. The teacher explains the G-30-S material with a lecture accompanied by questions and answers (Ayun interview, 20 September 2022). In the Public Senior High School of Nglames, Madiun Regency, the method used is a lecture using material from the textbook, accompanied by questions and answers. Students are given the task of doing the exercises from the textbook (Deta interview, 27 September 2022). In another class, the method used is lecturing, and watching videos, but there was no assignment from the teacher, only seeing the G-30-S/PKI video (Taufik interview, 20 September 2022).

Some questions were asked by the students. At the Public Senior High School of Nglames, a student asked, "Did economic factors develop well or experience a crisis when the G-30-S happened?" Another student asked about the factors that triggered the movement on 30 September 1965. At the Public Senior High School of Dolopo, a student asked, "Who were the officers who were killed during the G-30-S. At the Public Senior High School of Jiwan, questions arose regarding the background of G-30-S and the deaths.

At the Public Senior High School of Mejayan, students asked, "Is there a possibility that the descendants of PKI members will form a party and will do the same thing again as in the G-30-S?" Likewise, in the Public of Madrasah Aliyah (an Islamic school), Madiun City, teachers also use the story method about their experiences at the time of the G 30 S/PKI, there are questions from students about the possibility that PKI could rise again at this time and how to anticipate it. In the Public Senior High School of Nglames, there were no students who asked questions, even during the explanation, several students fell asleep and some of them were permitted to go to the toilet.

The students have various understandings about the G-30-S. Widiya understands that the G-30-S was a major event that occurred from 30 September to October 1965 when seven Indonesian military officers and several others were killed. Deta revealed that the G-30-S was a movement that took place on 30 September 1965 and was driven by PKI. Taufik revealed that the G-30-S was an event that took place in Indonesia on 30 September 1965 involving a PKI coup, resulting in the deaths of 7 high officers and major Islamic religious leaders who were brutally killed during the coup. According to Vadyla, the G-30-S was an event of the greatest betrayal of the Indonesian people, which occurred in the Madiun area in 1965 to turn Indonesia into a communist and overthrow Sukarno. Imelda also said that the G-30-S was a sadistic event of communists taking place in the Madiun area led by Musso. Furthermore, Hadi stated that the G-30-S was a rebellion carried out in Madiun in 1965.

Based on the data above, it can be said that the teaching methods applied by the teacher are not varied enough. The teachers seem to be very careful in developing more exploratory and innovative methods with a variety of sources. Teaching praxis is dominated by one version with the use of the G-30-S/PKI film media, which affects students' understanding. In general, students' understanding is dominated by one version, some of which are not by the facts of the incident. Students do not explore and criticize the various versions of the G-30-S.

3.3 Reproduction of Knowledge

PKI is a sensitive issue for the Indonesian people, especially in Madiun, which experienced a similar incident in 1948. PKI rebellion in Madiun 1948 and the G-30-S were two events that were not directly related but had their impacts on the Madiun people. The PKI rebellion in Madiun 1948 is often associated with the G-30-S.

The G-30-S was not too spectacular in Madiun, but the impact was strongly recorded that Madiun was identical to the PKI. Despite the Post-Reformation era, people's perceptions, especially the contemporaries', have not shifted as much as in the Pre-Reformation era. One of the examples is the story by MW, who was just about to tell a story when the Army was about to make a documentary film of the PKI Rebellion. The post-G-30-S generation generally knows about the PKI Rebellion from old people's stories and books. In 1948, Madiun became an arena for the PKI rebellion. The main characters were not from Madiun. Musso was from Kediri and Amir Syarifuddin was from West Sumatra. Outside Madiun, Madiun people are often seen as Musso's subordinates (Heri interview, 12 October 2022). Ibu Su'ud when he was studying in Jombang, East Java, was known as Edi PKI (Ibnu interview, 12 October 2022). When Soebi was studying in Semarang, Central Java, his friends once teased him by asking how Muso was (Soebi interview, 15 October 2022).

Juan got a story from his father that the PKI killed many religious leaders (Kiai) and government people. They were people who did not believe in religion (Juan interview, 12 October 2022). Hadi received information from the parents that the leader of the communist party that carried out the rebellion was Muso. PKI people were very cruel and important figures were killed regardless of their social status. He also received information from social media that PKI rebels did not only occur in 1948 but also 1965. PKI controlled various places in the Madiun area and its surroundings, as well as murdered community leaders and various Islamic boarding schools (Hadi interview, 10 October 2022).

Deta also obtained information from social media about the murdered figures and the issue of the rise of PKI, but it is not yet clear. Soeharto was suspected of being the mastermind of the murder of the officers whose bodies were put in a disused well in Lubang Buaya. Vadyla revealed that his parents once told him that the traces of the G-30-S rebels were intentionally eliminated to minimize the trauma of the residents. Vadyla got information of the G-30-S from online media or social media about the background, issues, the involvement of Soeharto, and the victims, as well as the situation after the incident.

The structure of Indonesian society is generally patrimonial with strong oral traditions, which is the same as in Madiun. In the 1960s generation, knowledge of the G-30-S was obtained through the stories of parents, as experienced by Seobi, Juan, Ibnu, and Heri. When the incident happened, they were still young. Parents also reluctantly talk about it, like Emwe, who was only willing to tell a story in 2014. The traumatic social situation experienced by people after the G-30-S causes the knowledge of the incident to be limited to themselves. The public is still taboo about talking about it in public spaces. In schools, they got knowledge from books that showed the government's version of the G-30-S that the PKI was the actor of the incident.

4 Discussion

4.1 Text/Material Analysis

A good textbook must have special sensitivity to know every change that occurs in the curriculum. If it is ignored, the curriculum objectives will be difficult to realize in the learning process (14) The text/material of G-30-S is reflected in the 2013 History Curriculum and history textbooks. Since the Reformation era, there have been changes in historical discourse in Indonesia. Various claims have arisen against the government's version of the history in various media, including the historical controversy of the G-30-S. The controversy occurred in the historical context as teaching material or curriculum as a result of bureaucratic-academic policies. The controversy was not a problem during the New Order government because there was only one version of the government (15).

The controversy of the G-30-S started in December 1965 when General Nasution commissioned a lecturer at the University of Indonesia to compile the book "40 Days of Failure of the G-30-S". The military version was later made into the government version. In 1975, the National History Book of Indonesia edited by Nugroho Notosusanto was used as a reference for high school and junior high school students. The historian, Sartono Kartodirdjo was criticized through his resignation from the writing team for the Indonesian National History (16).

In the 2004 curriculum, the word "PKI" was erased so that the text only says G-30-S. The historical controversy of the G-30-S rolled back when the Attorney General's Office examined books, followed by a ban on history textbooks for junior high and high school students who did not write the word "PKI" after the G-30-S. These books were considered not following the curriculum and had the potential to disrupt public order.

A historian, Aswi Warman Adam, criticized the use of the term G-30-S/PKI. He said that it would be more objective if the incident was referred to as the G-30-S, not the G-30-S/PKI or the Gestapu (Gerakan Tiga Puluh September, an imprecise acronym). The term Gestapu has a negative and frightening connotation because it is associated with the Gestapo (Germany). The addition of the term G-30-S with dash punctuation and the addition of the word "PKI" to become G-30-S/PKI is an interpretation that the PKI was involved or became the mastermind of the incident. This version is still debatable whether it is true that the PKI as a party that was involved and became the actor of the incident (17).

The use of the terms "G-30-S" and "G-30-S/PKI" is still debatable. The 2013 Curriculum for History Subjects used the term "G-30-S/PKI", while history textbooks accommodate various versions using the term "G-30-S", but in the chronology of events, the term "G-30-S/PKI" is used. The inclusion of various versions and the use of the terms "G-30-S" and "G-30-S/PKI" at the same time in material construction represent the situation of Indonesian society after the Reformation. The term "G-30-S" is more neutral, while the term "G-30-S/PKI" refers to one version.

4.2 Discourse Practice Analysis

The dimensions of G-30-S discourse practice can be examined from the production of discourse and practical teaching of G-30-S. There is progress in textbooks issued by the government regarding the G-30-S. Besides containing the government version, the book also includes various other versions. The inclusion of various versions is intended to prevent students from being affected by invalid information. Schools are also allowed to use other historical book sources as material for discussion (18).

In the teaching praxis, some teachers use the G-30-S/PKI film media. This film was produced in 1982 by a state-owned film company and released in 1984. During its initial release in commercial cinemas, students throughout Indonesia were required to buy tickets and attend film screenings during school hours. Furthermore, the film was shown annually on state-owned television stations. All private stations are required to broadcast it on the night of September 30. This film was intended to spread the interpretation of the government's ideology at that time, to emphasize strength and legitimacy (19).

Various analyses carried out by the students about the film showed that the PKI was the actor in the incident. Various versions do not get the attention of the students. They asked more about backgrounds, actors, victims, and predictions about the return of the PKI movement. The G-30-S' controversial history teaching praxis was still dominated by one version, marked by the use of the G-30-S/PKI film media that influenced students' understanding of the G-30-S, which was also dominated by one version. The students do not explore and criticize various versions of the G-30-S. Suparjan's research also showed that the teacher still explained the G-30-S in one version, namely the PKI as the actor of the incident (20).

4.3 Analysis of Social Practices

The social practice dimension relates to the context outside the text, which influences discourse. The Indonesian people in general still have traumatic memories of the G-30-S. PKI is a sensitive issue for the Indonesian people, especially in Madiun and its surroundings, where the people have experienced the events of 1948. The G-30-S incident is an element that specifically represents a collective picture of the past that emerged in contemporary public discourse.

The sensitivity of the PKI issue can be seen, for example, in the reaction of the Indonesian people with the reappearance of the PKI logo, such as in the shopping area in Depok, West Java. A trader selling PKI T-shirts was arrested by the local police. On August 15, 2015, PKI symbols appeared in Pamekasan and Jember, East Java. In Madiun, there was a massive demonstration on Wednesday, September 30, 2015, by several organizations that are members of the Gerakan Bela Negara (GBN) association. In addition to the oration saying that there was no place for communists in the Republic of Indonesia, there were also billboards that mentioned: "PKI No, Pancasila Yes" (Pancasila is Indonesia's national ideology) (20).

Another influential external factor is the government's policy towards historical education, such as the Attorney General's Decree banning history textbooks that do

not contain material on the 1948 PKI rebellion and the G-30-S. Although historical education can be used by the government as an instrument of patriotism and nationalism, too much involvement by the government can have implications for historical education as a means of legitimacy. In the New Order period (1966–1998), the educational system was managed in a centralistic fashion (Budirahayu & Saud, 2021). The New Order regime was successfully deployed to consolidate and maintain its power (22). In historical education, government policies show that history textbooks during the New Order era were dominated by vertical integration and lacked discussions of horizontal integration (23).

In the Post-Reformation era, discussions began to open. Academic openness has increased and general attitudes towards education are no longer dominated by indoctrination (18). However, the socio-political context of Indonesian society, which still keeps traumatic memories of communism, influences the controversial historical discourse of the G-30-S. Communism is a sensitive issue for the Indonesian people. Government policies towards historical education affect the learning praxis. The context outside the text/material has a dominant influence on the discourse and praxis of teaching G-30-S material.

The reproduction of knowledge of the G-30-S is still dominated by government and teacher versions of books through learning in schools. Knowledge about the G-30-S, therefore, also cannot be separated from the general ways of reproduction of this knowledge as a result of traumatic social situations, regardless of validity or illegality issues. This process forms a reality that is considered normal.

The PKI rebellion in Madiun 1948 and the G-30-S, which were two events with no direct relation, were often equated or directly linked. The G-30-S was not too spectacular in Madiun, but its impact was strongly recorded that Madiun was identical to the PKI. Madiun people are stigmatized as PKI. IS when he was studying was nicknamed Edi PKI. When SB was studying, his friends once teased him by asking how Musso was. This further strengthens the picture of the reality faced by Madiun people in that generation regardless of the validity or illegality issues.

The millennial generation, besides obtaining knowledge from their parents, got information from textbooks at school and social media. The knowledge of the parents has not changed relatively that the PKI is the mastermind behind the events. While textbooks gain knowledge of various versions of the G-30-S, they also still get knowledge from the government version of the G-30-S film. From social media, they obtained information about the issue of the rise of the PKI and information about Suharto's involvement.

In the millennial generation, the reproduction of knowledge is no longer dominated by parents, government, and teachers through learning in schools; they also obtain information from social media. This process ultimately also broadens their knowledge of the G-30-S. Their knowledge was no longer dominated by one version of government knowledge, regardless of validity or illegality issues. The social situation has changed in the Post-Reformation era. Millennials were no longer burdened by the traumatic memories the previous generations faced.

As seen in Berger's sociology of knowledge directs its attention to the formation of reality by society, the typification of ways of thinking is an integral element of the

concrete historical socio-cultural world, which is considered normal and has received community approval. The structure of society determines the social distribution of knowledge, its relativity and its relevance to the concrete social environment of a concrete group (Berger & Luckmann, 2012). The reality of the G-30-S, in line with Berger's view, does not depend on the will of each individual; it is on the reciprocal relationship between objective social reality and subjective knowledge. Social reality is the result of human construction and "turns back" to form humans. The relationship between humans and society is dialectical in everyday life.

In the Reformation era, counter-narratives challenging official history appeared in new types of media. Online media has the potential to be emancipatory media voicing the aspirations of those who are stigmatized by the G-30-S (Ikhwan et al., 2019). The Reformation era increasingly demands students' critical awareness in criticizing various discourses and narratives about the controversial history of the G-30-S. The reality of the G-30-S does not depend on the will of each individual but on the reciprocal relationship between objective social reality and subjective knowledge. It is necessary to transform the controversial history teaching of the G-30-S so that students have critical awareness in the post-truth era.

5 Conclusion

The construction of the G-30-S material represents the situation of Indonesian society after the Reformation era, which is marked by the inclusion of various versions and the use of the terms G-30-S and G-30-S/PKI at once. However, the teaching praxis is still dominated by one version that is marked by the use of G-30-S/PKI film media and other sources in the same version. The reproduction of knowledge of the G-30-S is still dominated by government and teacher versions of books through learning in schools. Therefore, also cannot be separated from the general ways of reproducing this knowledge as a result of traumatic social situations, regardless of validity or illegality issues. There is a relationship between the teaching praxis of the controversial history of the G-30-S with the context of the Post-Reformation era in Indonesian society which still has traumatizing memories of communism and government policy factor on historical education. The relations with factors outside represent the reality of Indonesia in the transition to the democratization of historical discourse, which is still in progress. The dominant influence of these external factors does not support the main goal of controversial history learning in building students' critical awareness, which is increasingly important in controversial history learning. It is necessary to transform the controversial historical teaching model of the G-30-S that can better build students' critical awareness, which is actual and relevant to the spirit of the times in the post-truth era.

6 Acknowledgments

This research was funded by the Ministry of Education and Culture, Research and Technology, the Republic of Indonesia for providing financial support through a research contract for the fiscal year 2022.

References

1. Ahmad TA. Implementasi Critical Pedagogy dalam Pembelajaran Sejarah Kontroversial di SMA Negeri Kota Semarang. Master's Thesis at Universitas Sebelas Maret. Tesis Surakarta; 2010.
2. Gerlach C. *Extremely Violent Societies: Mass Violence in the Twentieth Century*. New York: Cambridge University Press.; 2010. 87 p.
3. Wahyuningroem SL. Seducing for Truth and Justice: Civil Society Initiatives for the 1965 Mass Violence in Indonesia. *J Curr Southeast Asian Aff*. 2013;32(3):115–142.
4. Widodo T. Memahami Makna Praksis Pelaksanaan Pembelajaran Sejarah Kontroversial. *Paramita*. 2011;21(2):238–47.
5. Suparjan E. Peristiwa G 30 S sebagai Isu Kontroversial pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di SMA Kota Bima. *J Pendidik Sej*. 2016;5(1):38–48.
6. Misco T. Using Curriculum Deliberation to Address Controversial Issues: Developing Holocaust Education Curriculum for Latvian School. *Int J Educ Policy Leadership*. 2007;2(8).
7. Anderson D. *The Military Aspects of The Madiun Affair*. Dwi Pratom. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Media Pressindo.; 2003.
8. Phillips I. *Reflective Teaching and Learning: A Guide to Professional Issues for Beginning Secondary Teacher*. Los Angeles: Sage Publisher.; 2008.
9. Lestyana P. Presence of Mind in the Process of Learning and Knowing: A Dialogue with Paulo Freire. *Teach Educ Q* [Internet]. 2004;31(1):17–29. Available from: <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ795232>.
10. Ikhwan, H., Yulianto, V.I., & Parahita G. The Contestation of Social Memory in the New Media: A Case Study of the 1965 Killings in Indonesia. *Austrian J South-East Asian Stud*. 2019;12(1):3–16.
11. Suharyanto CE. Analisis Berita Hoaks di Era Post-truth: Sebuah Review. *J Penelit Teknol Inf dan Komun*. 2019;10(2):34–49.
12. Haryatmoko. Ketika Emosi Dominasi Politik [Internet]. *Kompas.Id*. 2017 [cited 2021 Feb 26]. Available from: <https://kompas.id/baca/opini/2017/11/15/ketika-emosi-dominasi-politik/>
13. Fairclough N. *Analysing Discourse: Textual Analysing for Social Research*. London: Routledge.; 2003. 160 p.
14. Sutrimah, Winarni, R., Wardani, N. E. & N. Evaluating the Use of Modern Indonesian Literary History Textbook (Poetry in East Java) in Teaching Literary History Course. *Int J Instr*. 2019;12(3):1–16.
15. Purwanto B. *Sejarah, Kurikulum dan Pembelajaran Kontroversial: Sebuah Catatan Diskusi*. 2009. (Seminar Nasional Pembelajaran Sejarah Kontroversial: Problem dan Solusi, Program Pascasarjana Universitas Sebelas Maret, Surakarta, 28 Mei).
16. Arta KS. Kurikulum dan kontroversi buku teks sejarah dalam KTSP. *Media Komun FIS*. 2011;11(1):154–168.

17. Adam AW. *Kontroversi: Proses dan Implikasi Bagi Pengajaran Sejarah*. 2009. (National Seminar, May 28, 2009 at Sebelas Maret University of Surakarta).
18. Lane M. 50 Years since 30 September 1965: The Gradual Erosion of a Political Taboo. *Perspektive* [Internet]. 2015;2015(66):1–10. Available from: https://www.iseas.edu.sg/wp-content/uploads/pdfs/ISEAS_Perspective_2015_66.pdf
19. Panuju, R., Susilo, D. & H. Cigarette as a tool for representing masculinity in Indonesian left-wing films. *J Komun Indones*. 2018;VII(3):246–57.
20. Suparjan E. Peristiwa G 30 S sebagai Isu Kontroversial pada Mata Pelajaran Sejarah di SMA Kota Bima. *J Pendidik Sej*. 2016;5(1):38–48.
21. Budirahayu, T., Saud M. Proposing an Integrated Multiculturalism Learning System: A Study from Indonesian Schools. *Asia-Pacific Educ Res*. 2021;30:141–152.
22. Djakababa Y. The Initial Purging Policies after the 1965 Incident at Lubang Buaya. *J Curr Southeast Asian Aff*. 2013;32(3):11–36.
23. Purwanta H. Evaluasi Isi Buku Teks Pelajaran Sejarah Pada Masa Orde Baru. *Cakrawala Pendidik*. 2012;XXXI(3):424–40.
24. Berger, P.L., & Luckmann T. *Tafsir Sosial Atas Kenyataan: Risalah Tentang Sosiologi Pengetahuan*. Hasan Basari (Trans), editor. Jakarta: LP3ES.; 2012.

Open Access This chapter is licensed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>), which permits any noncommercial use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original author(s) and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license and indicate if changes were made.

The images or other third party material in this chapter are included in the chapter's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the chapter's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder.

