

The Influence of Zeitgeist on Historical Content in High School History Textbooks Curriculum 1975-2004Marlina¹**Abstract**

This study explores the relationship between the ruling regime and the hegemonic educational framework by examining the content of history textbooks within this context. The research used historical methods to collect comprehensive data from official and unofficial written historical sources. The findings indicate that the prevailing spirit of the age, as dictated by the authorities in power, significantly influenced the content of history education. Specifically, the study reveals that the educational agenda was strategically utilized to sustain and reinforce Suharto's power through the history curriculum from 1975 to the KBK Curriculum in 2004. The results demonstrate how the regime's interests permeated the educational sphere, shaping the historical narratives presented to students in a way that served to legitimize and perpetuate the ruling authority. This manipulation of historical content within textbooks underscores the broader dynamics of power and control in the educational sector, illustrating the extent to which education can be co-opted to maintain political dominance. Through this detailed analysis, the study contributes to a deeper understanding of the intersection between political authority and educational content, highlighting education's critical role in preserving hegemonic power.

Keywords: *Zeitgeist, Content of History Text, History Textbook, High School Curriculum in 1975.*

Introduction

The rulers' power influences many aspects of life in Indonesia, including aspects of education. The ruler is the party that can affect the dominance of thinking and the condition of society (Perdana, 2013). During the New Order era, the influence/hegemony exercised was dominant because there was no democratic climate (Martono, 2014), even though democracy is perfect for developing people's thinking abilities. Finally, freedom of thought only works with the state's attitude to control mass media and historical narratives (Rohman et al., 2014). From freedom of thought, which could not exist in 1975, freedom of speech and expression of opinion did not exist. As a result, historical truth was monopolized by the Soeharto regime (Haryatmoko, 2010). From this, it is essential to understand the influence of the government and the spirit of the times on the historical content of textbooks. History learning should be understanding the past related to the present (Widodo, 2011). History education and learning should also enable students to be as close to society as possible because the history taught and the values contained in an event are taken from stories that occur in society (Amin, 2011, p.

¹ Prospective Teacher, Universitas Negeri Semarang, marlinamarlinaaa@gmail.com

107). *Zeitgeist* (the spirit of the times) is greatly influenced by the rulers (groups of people). In the dictionary, Hegel's work (Magee, 2010, p. 262) mentions, 'No There is man Can They were leaping through time, to the spirit of its times [der Geist seine Zeit] and its spirit.' So the ruler, the Soeharto regime, seemed to create a cage in social conditions through *Zeitgeist* formation (Nurhajarini & Puewaningsih, 2015; Sufyan, 2014). The formation of a *zeitgeist* in the form of propaganda in all walks of life, including inserting hegemony with the existence of a hidden curriculum (Muhammad, 2017). According to Apple (1982), the hidden curriculum in a way that points to the concept of hegemony. He argues that the idea of hegemony shapes the school in many respects and defines schools as not just distributors but also producers of culture that is vital for the socialization of students. In other words, students encounter various norms and cultures through rules and activities during their school and classroom life that form the social life in the school. Also, in another work, "Ideology and Curriculum," Apple (2001) identifies that the hidden curriculum corresponds to the ideological needs of capital. So that historical subjects are influenced by the era and shaped by it (Hartono, 2017). Realizing this, this research shows that the ruling regime uses history to create the spirit of the times. Based on this, this research uses historical research methods, with the historical sources being high school textbooks from the 1975 curriculum and contemporary supporting data books.

Method

The method employed in this research is the historical method, which involves critically examining and analyzing the editorial content of textbooks and connecting it with the societal conditions prevalent during the implementation of the 1975 curriculum (Wardah, 2014). This approach allows for a comprehensive understanding of how historical narratives in textbooks are influenced by and reflect the socio-political context of the time. By examining these connections, the research aims to uncover the underlying motivations and implications of the curricular content shaped under the ruling regime's influence.

This study's use of historical methods was carried out through four distinct research stages, ensuring a thorough and rigorous analysis. The first stage, *heuristics*, involves collecting materials or sources through an extensive literature study. This was followed by *source criticism*, where the collected data were meticulously selected and evaluated through internal and external criticism to ensure their reliability and validity. The third stage, *interpretation*, entailed analyzing and synthesizing the data to derive meaningful insights and connections between the textbook content and societal conditions. Finally, the process culminated in *historiography*, where the findings were systematically documented and presented, providing

a detailed account of the influence of socio-political dynamics on the educational narratives of the time (Gainau, 2016). This methodological approach not only enhances the credibility of the research but also offers a nuanced understanding of the interplay between education and power.

Results and Discussion

History teachers' understanding of the three conditions that influence the formation of textbooks, namely the conditions of society in the past written in history, the current conditions when history is written, and the conditions expected in the future (Ahmad, 2016; Subekti, 2012). Past conditions written in history create stories like literary works that write stories of the past. Still, this scholarly work is literature based on evidence and research stages with scientific procedures. Current conditions are a space where a history writer writes history. In this writing, the condition of society is considered in writing history—considerations in presenting a story in written form with contemporary considerations. Later, the writing is based on the conditions of the times. Meanwhile, influential future conditions are a hope that the author describes regarding future conditions so that he considers in his writing the hopes or aspirations and even dreams for the future. His writing was used to achieve this dream. All conditions in society reflect the unique spirit of the times. The spirit of the times or *zeitgeist* is the spirit of life humans imbue at a certain period. The spirit of an era shows the dominant elements that an era wants to achieve. There are goals and views about the future. The existence of trends describes the awareness that exists in human minds. As stated in Hegel's Dictionary as follows:

Zeitgeist means 'spirit of the times,' *Zeitgeist* is a term that has come to be associated with Hegel's philosophy of history, although he did not use it. In his *Lectures on the History of Philosophy* (1805, published posthumously), Hegel tells us that 'no man can overleap his own time, for the spirit of his time [*der Geist seiner Zeit*] is also his spirit' (LHP II, 96; Werke 19, 111). Similar statements occur elsewhere in Hegel, the most famous being in the Preface to *The Philosophy of Right*, where Hegel tells us that philosophy transcending its own time is as foolish as the idea that a man can leap over the statue of Rhodes. This is often misunderstood as an assertion of radical historicism (the belief that all claims, even philosophical ones, are valid only for the period they are asserted). Hegel believed that each period and its unique spirit is a stage in developing the World Spirit itself, a particular cultural step in humanity's long struggle to come to consciousness of itself. As this process continues, individuals express their place in history and its limitations. Thus, they can never wholly escape their period to comprehend the world and themselves 'objectively.' However, Hegel believed that he was living when history had reached a kind of consumption when certain necessary cultural and

philosophical forms had run through and completed. The result is that it is now possible, Hegel claimed, to survey the entire course of history, understand its goal as human self-consciousness, and argue that that goal has already been reached. Hegel did not exempt himself from the rule that one may not step outside one's period – but he did claim that his period was unique in that it made possible the achievement of a synoptic view of history and culture. See also 'cunning of reason'; history and Philosophy of History; Objective Spirit; 'owl of Minerva'; 'rose in the cross of the present'; world-historical individuals; World Spirits. (Magee, 2010, p. 262)

If based on politics, the zeitgeist from 1975 to 2006 was a time when certain people or parties-controlled power by forcibly overthrowing and using violent methods of previous power. Hatred becomes the basis for a new spirit of life. In 1975, desoekarnoization was used to perpetuate Suharto's control, and then in 1998, desoehartoization was used to change the reform era. All power is obtained by political and physical anarchy. Abdurrahman Surjomihardjo in Sutjiatiningsih (1995, pp. 93-94) stated that desoekarnoization was being launched in all fields, including education. The New Order government replaced the Pancawardhana curriculum and the 1964 new style curriculum with a new style curriculum that was perfected in 1968. History teaching received special attention because the New Order government needed historical legitimacy. Therefore, the New Order attempted to dominate historical explanations of the political crisis between 1965 and 1968 and continued plans to compile a national history book. For this purpose, the Minister of Education and Culture, Sjarif Thajeb, formed the Committee for Preparing the Indonesian National History Standard Book on April 4, 1970. Prof. Dr. Aloysius Sartono Kartodirdjo, a history professor at the Faculty of Letters, Gajah Mada University, led the committee.

Then, during the New Order era, the zeitgeist strengthened the New Order's power. Syukur (2012) stated that the success of the New Order government in issuing SNI had standardized the Indonesian nation's historical understanding of its past so that it could strengthen national unity and integrity. Its dominance continues today, even though the New Order government ended on May 21, 1998. This proves that there are efforts to strengthen the regime by using history. According to Syukur (2012), there was pressure for the government to reform history teaching materials in the Reformation. Under President BJ Habibie's government, The Ministry of Education responded to this pressure by publishing the 1999 Curriculum Supplement. The teaching material is somewhat different from the previous curricula (1975, 1984, and 1994), especially regarding explaining the 30 September movement coup incident in 1965. The validity period of the Curriculum Supplement 1999 ended after the Ministry of Education in President Megawati Soekarnoputri's government replaced it with the 2004 curriculum. The

history teaching material in the 2004 curriculum is not only slightly different but very different from the three previous curricula. This curriculum wants to eliminate the anti-communist character in the history teaching materials developed by the New Order government. The Ministry of Education stopped this effort in the government of President Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono by implementing the 2006 curriculum and returning history teaching materials to the 1975, 1984, and 1994 curricula. Unfortunately, the 2006 curriculum could not restore the credibility of the history teaching formed during the New Order and was destroyed after the end, only in 1998.

From a political perspective, *Zeitgeist* influences the conditions of many aspects (Pawi, 2009). These aspects then influence and are recorded in history textbooks. Community conditions, including cultural, political, educational, social, and economic conditions, form the content of history textbooks. Because the factor of textbook writers in forming the history content in history textbooks is very dominant, the writer, consciously or unconsciously, cannot be separated from this influence. This is due to the author's filtering of historical data and the existence of standard rules regarding writing subject matter by the applicable national education system. Usually, the author sorts the issues that will be published based on the author's framing analysis. The education system provides material boundaries by the syllabus that applies to a curriculum and the educational principles adhered to by the curriculum.

The country's education state, with minimal facilities and infrastructure as well as teaching staff, means that the development of history learning is not rapid. Moreover, the world of education is increasingly separated from the world of society. History is a subject that only prioritizes cognitive abilities in the form of the ability to memorize (Afrianti, 2018). Memorization is essential in history, but there are certain levels at each level of education. In elementary and middle school, memorization is prioritized, but in high school, there is more emphasis on students' ability to enter the thinking stage through analysis. However, unfortunately, up to the high school level, memorization has still been prioritized from the 1975 curriculum until now.

In 1974, or the year before the implementation of the 1975 curriculum, Indonesia had facilities and infrastructure with an unequal ratio between elementary schools, junior high schools, and senior high schools. For example, the number of elementary schools (SD) is 66,994, junior high schools are 7,587, and senior high schools are 2,841. Moreover, there are 444,241 elementary school teachers, 109,956 junior high schools, and 60,191 high school teachers (BP3K, 1976:11). So it can be understood that in 1974, the condition of education, especially at the Senior Secondary School level, was still lagging because the dominant development was

only starting at the most basic school level, namely Primary School. Not only schools and teachers but also the facilities and infrastructure are limited. Elementary school development is most dominant because in 1971, according to UNESCO statistics, 41% of all Indonesians over 10 were uneducated (meaning they had only studied for one year) and were therefore considered illiterate. However, among the urban population, the illiteracy rate is only 22%. (BP3K, 1976)

The development of facilities and infrastructure in 1980 was quite rapid. At least the increase in the number of schools was only around 57% (4,901) of the number of Senior Secondary Schools (SMTA) in 1974. Physical development until 2004 continued to increase. So, access to education is becoming wider and is still equalizing education. However, the development of education other than non-physical is still not rapid, even though efforts to improve the quality of education are always at the curriculum level, which continues to improve. (BP3K, 1982) .

Indonesian education from 1975 to 2006 was still confined to learning, which was considered a student's effort from not knowing to knowing and not being able to yet, leading to learning, which was an effort from not creating to creating. It is the same when research is still considered to be finding something, not creating something. So, Indonesian education is still stagnant and lagging behind other nations. The relatively high poverty of creativity in Indonesian education means that high school history lessons still revolve around rote memorization and cognitive abilities alone and have not yet reached the stage of critical thinking creativity.

So, it is unsurprising that history textbooks had no significant updates from 1975 to 2006 (31 years). The inclined material composition is the same, with only a different point of view and some improvements in some historical material, especially those related to politics in Indonesia. In high school history textbooks for science majors, social studies majors, or language majors, the material composition is almost the same; the only difference is in the different expansions of the material. For example, the chapter about G30S is in the science and social studies departments, but the history book in the social sciences department explains more about this event. History lessons still cannot support the characteristics of existing majors. For example, the science department discusses politics in Indonesia too much, not the history of science and history expressed using a scientific approach. So if that happens, history has the proper function and not only builds nationalism but also builds the critical power needed by science students (science majors) and language students. New high school history textbooks have been maximally improved when the objectivity in high school history textbooks is visible in the KBK curriculum textbooks (2004). However, learning history is still the same, even though textbooks have changed.

The cultural aspect was felt during the New Order era; critical or democratic culture was still low, so the existing writings did not give rise to polemics, and there were few differences in the historical narrative. Everyone has a preferred patron in writing, namely the book *National History of Indonesia*. This can be seen when almost all high school history textbooks have a bibliography containing *Indonesian National History* in 1994, even in the previous year without a bibliography. The standardization of book writing is not clear. However, there are no protests even though, on the other hand, history books that have transparent sources are prohibited from being circulated, such as the book *Shadows of the PKI* compiled by the ISAI (Information Flow Study Institute) team, which is used as reference material by foreign researchers to create works. Kind. Impossible This book is a reference if you do not have a good source.

In describing the political situation in Indonesia, there are two periods of government with distinctive political terms. These periods are the Old Order and the New Order. In Indonesia, the New Order used the word Old Order to refer to the government system during President Soekarno's rule. The essence of Soekarno's leadership can be understood through his formulation of the Trisakti of the Indonesian Revolution, namely: (1) sovereignty in the political field, (2) independence in the economic sector, and (3) having a national personality in the field of culture. That spirit of independence is the spirit of "Orla" (Setiawan, 2003, pp. 202-203).

Meanwhile, the New Order is a "new" government system implemented in Indonesia on March 11, 1966, and ended as a new government system due to the 1998 elections. With the argument of returning to Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution "purely and consistently," the essence of the Indonesian New Order was to carry out "desukarnoization," which, in the New Order's view, was the Trojan horse of Marxism and the PKI, (Setiawan, 2003, p. 202). These two names from the period of government are significant in the journey of the Indonesian nation regarding political conditions apart from the term reform (post-New Order).

This political situation clearly illustrates that the authorities influence textbooks. Many say that "the rulers write history," which is true. The country's rulers used to be colonialists, so history was written by the colonial version of the colonialists. Then, Indonesia became independent, and Indonesia wrote history. When Indonesia became independent and was ruled by Sukarno, Suharto, the ruler's version, was written; when the ruler became a writer and researcher, history would be written in the author's version.

For example, the centrism of history writing changed from Nenderlandcentric to Indonesiancentric because the country's rulers changed. The influence of the change in power can be seen in the high school history textbooks in the 1975 curriculum, which is still confused

about the centrality of the curriculum. Subsequently, it was revised until the 2004 curriculum depicted Indonesia-centricity. Other evidence that politics influences history textbooks is the wrong assessment of President Soekarno in the 1975 curriculum history textbooks and the superiority of Suharto's role. This can be seen in the history textbook by G. Mujanto entitled *Indonesian History 2B*. In the book, many people give negative labels to Soekarno. For example, these negative labels say that Soekarno is just talking nonsense and has no shame in representing the enemy. Favoring Suharto can be done by highlighting his excellent role in the New Order and showing pictures that include President Suharto.

Opposition to Soekarno was carried out during the New Order era. Sukarno's delegitimization was very high at the beginning of the New Order's development. Darji Darmomiharjo's foreword in Nugroho Notosusanto (1981:8) states that Nugroho Notosusanto carried out several projects that ended in Bung Karno's delegitimization. However, after that, Notosusanto's career progressed as Chancellor of UI and Minister of P and K. Since Nugroho Notosusanto became Minister of P and K, the treatment of history writing towards Bung Karno has remained in the same line. In the 1984 Curriculum, political elements powerfully shaped textbooks. Abdurrachman Surjomiharjo said that before his views on history were clear, the National Struggle History Education (PSPB) subject was launched in a hurry, the textbooks were not ready, and the teaching was open to teachers whose teaching hours were still less than they should be. From the beginning, "the PSPB curriculum developers were given the mission that PSPB was not history" (!), as one writer noted in an excellent theoretical article about history education for 25 years, 1964-1989 (Hasan, 1997). The PSPB's mission remains vulnerable to the decision to write history as long as it still uses the word history, but what power is stated in the GBHN, which we all know is a political product. From the Dutch East Indies era through the Japanese era and in the current era of independence, history education cannot be separated from the dominant political views at a time (Sutjiatiningsih, 1995, p. 95). In 1994, textbooks had a brilliant history of the New Order. The government's achievements are written so that it appears that history textbooks are not just textbooks but books reporting state achievements given to students. This achievement was used to legitimize the New Order's power. Finally, the New Order collapsed, impacting Indonesian history's editorial storyline. The end of the New Order resulted in the introduction of history-teaching supplements in history teaching. Juwono Sudarsono asked MSI (Indonesian Historians Society), in collaboration with the History Directorate of the DEPDIKBUD, to prepare a history teaching supplement that explains controversial issues in Indonesian history. Juwono also hopes that improving history teaching will emphasize that Indonesia is not just Java. Issues considered

controversial by the writing team are the 30 September Movement, Supersemar, the General Attack of 1 March 1949, the birth of Pancasila, the birth of the New Order, and the Integration of East Timor Adam (2007, p. 14).

A critical condition is the condition of information flow due to the rapid development of technology and the openness of information (Hikmawati, 2016). For example, whether a historical figure is good or bad is told freely and spreads quickly, unlike before, when historical figures only revealed their goodness. Previously, the number of high school history textbooks was minimal due to the lack of book procurement, but then photocopying technology emerged. Books have become more accessible, and history textbooks can now be accessed electronically (ebooks). Textbook content is even more exciting and varied because it includes interesting and up-to-date pictures as support materials, and material from authors is increasingly religious. After all, authors can gain access to knowledge quickly in the era of information technology. Economic development also improves the content of history because the quality of what is created will increase by making textbooks with more funds. For example, when economic development is good, the state provides a share of education of 20% of the APBN, and books can be provided for free to students at school.

Conclusion

In the 1975 curriculum, there was a zeitgeist of "desocarnoization" in the world of education; history subjects contributed to and were influenced by the spirit of that era. This usually happens because the Soeharto government authorities can exercise hegemony in the education curriculum through a hidden curriculum. The hidden curriculum includes the Pancasila ideology but inserts an anti-spiritual attitude towards matters related to Soekarno. For the 1984 to 1994 curriculum before the GBPP Supplement, the zeitgeist was to strengthen Suharto's power. The Pancasila ideology is applied to history education with a military-centric system. The historical narrative is based on the military's wishes, and historical truth is monopolized. Then, during the reform period, there was the GBPP Supplement and the 2004 curriculum. The history curriculum with the GBPP Supplement had a reform spirit but contained high levels of anti-Suharto content. It was not until the 2004 curriculum that the spirit of the times moved towards democracy, but the anti-Soeharto spirit persisted.

Reference

Adam, A. W. (2007). *Pelurusan Sejarah Indonesia*. Penerbit Ombak.

- Afrianti, T., Wurdjinem, W., & Kustianti, S. K. (2018). Kemampuan Siswa dalam Memahami Bahan Ajar Sejarah Perjuangan Rakyat Bengkulu pada Aspek Kognitif dan Aspek Afektif pada Mata Pelajaran Muatan Lokal di Kelas V Sekolah Dasar Negeri 49 Kota Bengkulu. *Jurnal PGSD: Jurnal Ilmiah Pendidikan Guru Sekolah Dasar*, 11(1), 8-18.
- Ahmad, T. A. (2016). *Sejarah Kontroversial Di Indonesia: Perspektif Pendidikan*. Yayasan Pustaka Obor Indonesia.
- Amin, S. (2011). Pewarisan Nilai Sejarah Lokal Melalui Pembelajaran Sejarah Jalur Formal dan Informal pada Siswa SMA di Kudus Kulon. *Paramita*. 21(1).
- BP3K. (1976). *Statistik Persekolahan 1974*. Depdikbud.
- BP3K. (1978). *Statistik Persekolahan 1977*. Depdikbud.
- BP3K. (1982). *Statistik Persekolahan 1980/1981*. Depdikbud.
- Gainau, M. B. (2016). *Pengantar metode penelitian*. PT Kanisius.
- Hartono, Y. (2017). Model pembelajaran nilai-nilai karakter bangsa di Indonesia dari masa ke masa. *Agastya: Jurnal Sejarah Dan Pembelajarannya*, 7(01).
- Haryatmoko, J. (2010). *Dominasi penuh muslihat: akar kekerasan dan diskriminasi*. PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Hasan. H. S. (1997). *Kurikulum dan Buku Teks Sejarah dalam Kongres Nasional Sejarah 1996 Jakarta Sub Tema Perkembangan Teori dan Metodologi dan Orientasi Pendidikan Sejarah*. Proyek Inventarisasi dan Dokumentasi Sejarah Nasional Direktorat Jenderal Kebudayaan Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- Hikmawati, F. (2016). *Bimbingan dan konseling*. Rajawali Press.
- Kentli, F. D. (2009). Comparison of Hidden Curriculum Theories. *European Journal of Educational Studies* 1(2), 83-88.
- Magee, G. A. (2010). *The Hegel Dictionary*. New York: Continuum International Publishing Group.
- Martono, N. (2014). Dominasi kekuasaan dalam pendidikan. *Jurnal Interaksi*, 8(1), 28-39.
- Muhammad, G. (2017). *Pada masa intoleransi*. IRCiSoD.

- Nurhajarini, D. R., & Purwaningsih, E. (2015). *Akulturası lintas zaman di lasem: perspektif sejarah dan budaya (kurun niaga-sekarang)*. Fibiona.
- Pawi, A. A. A. (2009). Zeitgeist Di Cakera Nusantara: Zeitgeist In Malay Archipelago. *Jurnal Pengajian Melayu (JOMAS)*, 20(1), 1-25.
- Perdana, D. I. (2013). Kurikulum dan Pendidikan di Indonesia: Proses Mencari Arah Pendidikan yang Ideal di Indonesia atau Hegemoni Kepentingan Penguasa Semata?. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*, 2(1).
- Rohman, A., Muhadjir, N., & Suyata, S. (2014). Dinamika Relasi Politik Antara Otonomi Guru dan Dominasi Kekuasaan. *Jurnal Pembangunan Pendidikan: Fondasi dan Aplikasi*, 2(2).
- Setiawan, H. (2003). *Kamus Gestok*. Galang Press (Anggota IKAPI).
- Subekti, S. (2012). Tinjauan Kritis terhadap Kecenderungan Historiografi Indonesia Masa Kini. *HUMANIKA*, 15(9).
- Sufyan, F. H. (2014). *Sang Penjaga Tauhid: Studi Protes Tirani Kekuasaan 1982-1985*. Deepublish.
- Sutjiantiningsih, S. (1995). *Pengajaran Sejarah Kumpulan Makalah Simposium*. Depeartemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan Direktorat Jendral Pendidikan Tinggi.
- Syukur, A. (2012). Membangun Karakter Bangsa Lewat Sejarah (Refleksi 65 Tahun Pengajaran Sejarah di Indonesia). Diakses <http://nuansapendikar.blogspot.co.id/2012/membangun-karakter-bangsa-lewatsejarah.html> (5 Febuari 2016).
- Wardah, E. S. (2014). Metode penelitian sejarah. *Tsaqofah*, 12(2), 165-175.

