



Bringing Memory Studies Into the Classroom: A Case of Misremembering Towards The Tumpak Rinjing Battle

Azril Azifambayunasti^{1*}, Ardeti Jeni Abdilla², Annisaa Khansa Labibah³, Epifania Puspo Diati Ernawan⁴, Ery Widhiastuti⁵, Shendy Dyah Pramesti⁶

^{1,2,3,4,5,6}Universitas Negeri Malang, Malang, Indonesia
*azril.azifambayunasti.fis@um.ac.id

Abstract. This study aims to explain the potential of integrating discourse about memory studies in history learning. In this case, the memory studies, especially a collective memory that will be brought into the classroom is regarding the Tumpak Rinjing Battle in Pacitan Regency. As it widely acknowledged, the Tumpak Rinjing battle, an affair behind the construction of Palagan Tumpak Rinjing monument, is often misremembered by the people because the monument was built with the big statue of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi. It also leads to omission of the commoner's role in that 1949's battle. This study uses a conceptual research method to explore the history of Tumpak Rinjing Battle, construction of the monument, a collective misremembering, all of them in the frame of memory studies and oral history. It will also explore its potential to be brought in history learning to counter and deconstruct a collective misremembering. As the result, we see that this effort to align the misremembering is an important move to carry on a critical history learning, so the students would not only learn about an affair in the past, but also understand that something in the past could be manipulated according to who held the power.

Keywords: Memory studies, history learning, documentary, Tumpak Rinjing, oral history

1 Introduction

The Battle of Tumpak Rinjing is generally not very familiar to the people of Pacitan Regency. This is different when the discussion is directed to the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, one of the monuments depicting Sudirman in Pacitan Regency, East Java. Unlike the General Sudirman Monument, which is located in Pakisaji Village near the guerrilla headquarters during the second aggression, this monument stands on the edge of the inter-provincial road. The monument depicts Sudirman standing and shaking hands with Slamet Riyadi, a military figure who played a role in the revolutionary period. Uniquely, the inscription beneath the statues of the two figures explains the narrative that the monument was built to commemorate the struggle of the local community fighting the Dutch troops in 1949. The presence of these two figures as icons of the monument has given rise to misinterpretations, even misremembering of the true history that underlies the monument's construction.

This phenomenon aligns with the statement that history is tied to events, but memory is tied to space [1], where those spaces can be adapted to what should be known and remembered. Monument is one such space with objects that cannot be viewed neutrally, as they are closely tied to the selection process of what should be remembered and forgotten [2]. The same perspective is also used in interpreting the existence of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument. In various online portals, discussion regarding the historical narrative behind the construction of the monument is also very minimal. Several articles focus more on the monument as a legacy of Sudirman's guerrilla warfare in Pacitan [3], [4]. Research conducted in 2021 also stated that some local residents remember the monument more as a marker of guerrilla routes or places where Sudirman once visited. The local school's curricula also never conveys a historical narrative about the monument [5].

Based on these things, it can be concluded that public memory is more shaped by the figure depicted on the monument. Not only that, public memory is also influenced by the commemoration which is again related to Sudirman. This commemoration is held every two years on Heroes' Day through the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing "walk retracing" activity [6]. This kind of thing is in line with what Kammen alluded in his review to Erika Doss's writing, that history cannot be manipulated, except by misremembering [7]. Misremembering or errors in remembering, especially regarding historical events, is not simply a failure of society to remember the past, but rather the result of socio-political processes [8]. Once again, memory is often adapted to suit needs, distorting actual events and replacing them with filtered memories, commanding and powerful [1], so that misremembering is an effect that often appears in society. Space or objects also play an important role in shaping what should be remembered [9], even though memories are passed down between generations, memories are also vulnerable to manipulation [10], through the construction of spaces or objects intended to organize memories related to certain events or things.

The construction and inauguration of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument which took place in 1980 [11] also raised the question of why a monument was built in that year, when in fact, its construction was intended to commemorate the struggle of the local people during the second aggression in 1949. Various narrative ambiguities then lead people to collective misremembering. The collective misremembering then also inherited into the history learning. It showed through the survey's result of 13 high school students in Pacitan on June 20 2026, where 76,9 % of the respondents said that they have no clue about the monument. The rest said that the monument is closely related to Sudirman, the great general. Their history class also never mentioned the monument, when in fact, history learning should be an important arena in forming historical awareness [12], even deconstructing narratives [13], [14]. Thus, history learning really needs to give more space regarding the memory studies.

For students, collective memory is something tied and closely related to their surroundings and people around them. Therefore, this study will discuss the urgency of bringing memory studies into history learning, with specific case regarding the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument. This integration also needs a precise learning model and media, so this study will also explore the potential of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument as something that constructs a collective memory, to be discussed

in the history class through a documentary film as a learning media and learning model that is based on real problems.

2 Method

This research uses a conceptual research method. Conceptual research is a non-empirical research method aimed at generating new knowledge through the analysis, synthesis, adaptation, categorization, or modeling of existing concepts and theories rather than through primary empirical data collection. In conceptual studies, theories and concepts serve as the primary sources of evidence that are systematically examined to address a research problem. Consequently, conceptual research requires a clear research design consisting of: (1) identifying a phenomenon or conceptual problem that has not been adequately explained; (2) selecting and justifying relevant theories and concepts; (3) defining the role of each theory as either a domain theory or a method theory; (4) analyzing and integrating concepts to develop coherent arguments; and (5) producing a conceptual contribution in the form of theory synthesis, theory adaptation, typology, or a conceptual model. The rigor of conceptual research therefore depends on the appropriateness of theory selection, the strength of the argumentation, and the transparency of the logical chain connecting theoretical foundations to research conclusions [15].

In this study examining the potential of integrating memory studies into history education through the case of collective misremembering of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing event, the conceptual research approach can begin with the empirical phenomenon of a mismatch between the historical event being commemorated and the representation displayed by the monument. The first stage is identifying the conceptual problem, how the presence of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi's statue at the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument may contribute to the formation of collective memories that differ from the actual historical account of local community resistance against the Dutch in 1949. The second stage involves selecting relevant theories, such as collective memory theory, misremembering, *lieux de mémoire* (sites of memory), and history education theory. Collective memory and misremembering theories may function as method theories for analyzing public memory formation, while history education theory serves as the domain theory to which the conceptual contribution is directed. The next stage is synthesizing and integrating these theoretical perspectives to explain how memory distortion generated through monumental representation can be transformed into educational resources that foster historical literacy, critical thinking, and historiographical awareness among students. The final outcome would be a conceptual discussion regarding memory construction, misremembering, and their pedagogical potential for history learning [15].

3 Result and Discussion

3.1 Collective Memory, Monument, and Oral History

Talking about memory will lead us to distinguish between individual memory and collective memory. Individual memory is a person's personal memory, while

collective memory is a collection of past that is determined and formed to be remembered by one group of people. The study of collective memory will always raise questions such as: which memory? Does the memory correspond to reality? Or how can people still have those memories? This cannot be separated from the fact that the formation of memory is strongly related to power and authority, as well as cultural norms and social interactions. In relation to history, memory is often a history that is remembered, designed, and even made up. [16]. Therefore, memory is not always exactly what happened in the past, as memory can be formed or distorted over time. This also makes memory very necessary to be corrected, which requires the help of historical science. In this case, the historical science allows for criticism, so that bias and distortions in memory can be minimized [17].

One of the needs for criticism of memory arises because memory is often used as a political instrument. As Halbwachs says, collective memory is more of a social construct, so it's very likely that it will be different from what actually happened. This can be caused by two things, the first is the conscious manipulation by the elites or rulers, and the second is due to the distortion of the internalization process that is unconsciously passed by the community [18]. The complex problems and political agenda behind this practice provide compelling reason to respond to collective memory with skepticism [17]. Therefore, while collective memory can be an alternative narrative for some marginalized groups whose history is recorded with bias, it is also worth noting that collective memory can also be a mirror of societal memories formed by misremembering, or elite manipulation for political gain.

The close relationship between collective memory and politics then leads us to the discussion of the politics of memory. The strong influence of politics on the formation of collective memory is often seen in the selection of what and who should be remembered or forgotten. Referring to Verovšek, the elite often highlight certain events or figures and at the same time omit others. This is not a fabrication, but rather a selection of emphasized focus or unbalanced storytelling. In his writings, Verovšek gives an overview of how in Italian history, what is highlighted is the suffering of the people and at the same time does not mention the violence perpetrated by the Nazis [18]. This kind of selection is also very common in Indonesian history, such as the 1965 reinterpretation of the events carried out by the New Order regime, or the Timor Leste conflict which is very minimally discussed using the perspective of the local community in Indonesian history textbooks [19].

Selection in the formation of collective memory then leads to misremembering. Misremembering is a state in which individuals or communities collectively remember and are aware of an event that has occurred, but are wrong in remembering some details of the event [20]. Errors in remembering generally occur due to errors in the source of attribution that are accepted and imagined, and in this case, the visual is an element that plays a very important role [21]. The occurrence of errors in memory is also an act of forgetting. Referring to Assmann, that in order to remember something, there is something that must be forgotten [22], so that when a group of people experiences misremembering towards an event that has happened, then indirectly there is one thing that they forget. This can then become a gap for political interests to provide legitimacy for certain things.

When visuals become a crucial element in causing misremembering, they can appear in various forms, usually memorial buildings. Some of them are museums,

dioramas, and monuments. Those who built these memorials were rulers with political interests. According to Bellentani and Panico, rulers often build monuments to promote historical narratives that focus on specific events or figures that support their political agenda, while at the same time burying other narratives. Monuments themselves can be defined as objects built to remind people of important events or figures. However, the question is, who are these events and figures most important for? [23]

Monument, as one of the elements in forming collective memory—even can give rise to the phenomenon of misremembering—, monuments actually have several functions. Its cognitive function aims at the transmission of knowledge. It also has an axiological and emotional function, where monuments can have an influence on how audiences appreciate the events, ideas, and individuals represented or displayed in monuments. Third, monuments also have a pragmatic function as objects or buildings that are used simply as infrastructure for the surrounding community [23]. However, politics in the construction of monuments cannot be ignored. In Indonesia, some monuments are explicitly built as instruments of legitimacy. Almost the majority of these monuments were built when Suharto came to power with his New Order regime. In her book, Kate McGregor explains that the New Order regime seriously built various memorials such as the Pancasila Sakti Monument and the Lubang Buaya Museum as the legitimacy of the rulers in exterminating the communists who were then framed as national enemies [24]. Not only that, the New Order government also built many memorials to commemorate the period 1948-1949 when there was military aggression by the Dutch, with the aim of legitimizing the role of the military in defending independence. Some examples are the *Serangan Umum 1 Maret* Monument and the *Jogja Kembali* Monument. In addition, monuments have also appeared featuring prominent figures in the Indonesian military such as Sudirman, a great general who led the guerrillas in 1949.

Building monuments certainly allows the elite or anyone with political interests to define figures as official heroes and determine which historical events can become the identity of the country. Viewed from this point of view, monuments have become a weapon in the political battle to win the hearts and minds of the people [25]. The strong politics of the construction of monuments have led some experts to argue that in the era of democratic dominance and widespread literacy, monuments should only be relics of the old system that is obsolete [26]. However, the reality is that in some cases, monuments claimed to commemorate historical events still influence the collective memory of society to this day.

In addition to monuments, the role of politics in the formation of collective memory and misremembering also appears in various “commemoration” practices. Referring to Savage, in terms, it is defined as the act of remembering one or a group of people or events through a ceremony or other activity. The most important thing about this commemoration is that it aims to shape and evoke collective memory [26]. This kind of practice is also widely found in Indonesia, generally accompanying the existence of monuments. Monuments and commemorative practices are still a common thing in society, even appreciated and adored as an effort to form a national identity. How these phenomena, including how they shape people's collective memory and cause misremembering, can be further explored through oral history.

Oral history is often used to voice the identity of a community who are marginalized or eliminated from the larger narrative. Oral history is also a means of negotiating the past that is considered traumatic [27]. The study of collective memory will be closely related to oral history, because collective memory itself, according to Nora, will always evolve, open to the dialectic of remembering and forgetting [1]. The collaboration between the two will allow for an alternative narrative in addition to the official historical narrative. It will also give rise to a more ambivalent dialogue, because in some cases, memories that are usually conveyed orally about certain events or characters have difference with the written narratives [28]. Through oral history, we will get a narrative about collective memory through interviews with people who are witnesses or actors of history [29]. Oral history in this case will help us to explore the collective memory and compare it to the official narratives.

3.2 Case of Tumpak Rinjing Battle

When we discuss collective memory that is often shaped by the existence of public objects such as monuments and commemorative practices, we will find the same case in the Tumpak Rinjing battle or *palagan* that once occurred in Dadapan Village, Pringkuku District, Pacitan. The story of this battle is not very familiar to the people when compared to the monument that stands on the side of the Pacitan-Solo highway, a road that connects the province of East Java and Central Java. The monument is called Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, which if seen from the inscription on its building, was erected to commemorate the struggle of the local people in fighting against the Dutch troops on June 7, 1949. Why is the event of the battle unfamiliar to the public, even though there is a monument erected to commemorate it? This is because the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument was built with statues featuring General Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi, military figures when the Republic of Indonesia defended its independence from Dutch military aggression in 1948-1949.

The existence of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi as statues at the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, whether politically deliberate or not, has in fact shaped the collective memory of the people that in the place where the monument was erected, there was a historical event that directly involved the two figures. According to the sample of local people (personal communication, Jul. 1 2026), the monument is even misunderstood as part of Sudirman's guerrilla route, although some them have also wondered why the monument is located so far from the guerrilla headquarters in Nawangan District. In fact, if you want to read the information under the statues of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi, the monument was clearly built as a commemoration of the local people who died in the battle against the Dutch troops. However, in reality, the people around never even actually went inside the monument complex and read the information that existed. In this case, the visual of the statues is very influential in shaping the collective perception and memory of the event behind the monument.



Fig. 1. The Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument

In this case, the narrative behind the construction of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument is divided into several groups: the collective memory of the people and the popular narrative that leads to misremembering, the official narrative from those in power (politicians and the military), and the memory of those who are related to events and different from official and popular narratives. Interviews conducted with several students and people in Pacitan showed that they remembered the monument as a mark to commemorate Sudirman's struggle. The struggle in this case can be in the form of battles or guerrilla routes. Some of the samples who participated in this interview were those who had participated in a commemoration called *Gerak Jalan Palagan Tumpak Rinjing*. This activity is held every odd year in conjunction with the commemoration of Heroes' Day in November, with the activity of walking along 40-45 kilometers through the west area of Pacitan and passing the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument.

Those who participated in the commemoration, both those held in the 1980s and the last one in 2019, never received information about the history of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument (personal communication, Jul. 1 2026). This is also one of the reasons why the public is more familiar with the *Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument* than the battle itself. Likewise, some high school students admitted that they never actually visited the monument and found out its history. They are only familiar with the monument because it is located on the side of the road that they often pass. The history lessons they have received so far have also never talked about

the history of monument (personal communication, Jul. 1 2026). This fact has become evidence of the misremembering in society, a mistake in remembering caused by the visual of monuments.

The Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument with the statues of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi makes them more memorable than ordinary people who were directly involved in the events of the battle, although there is a written narrative stating the involvement of the people with the republican army in it. Referring to a book written by several local academics in collaboration with the *Dewan Harian Cabang (DHC)* 45, the battle in Dadapan Village, was one of a series of events in the early period of 1949, where Dutch troops intensively patrolled to arrest Sudirman who was headquartered in Nawangan District [30].

On January 12, 1949, the Dutch troops were seen trying to enter Pacitan Bay. The military forces in Pacitan then went on standby, until on February 11, the Dutch troops began to successfully enter and attack several villages that were considered to be passed through or became Sudirman's hiding place. In June, the Republican army and the people prepared in Dadapan Village, precisely in Gesingan to block the Dutch troops who were expected to pass the Pacitan-Solo highway. The Republic army is said to have prepared four infantry sections which since June 6 have surveyed the place and installed bombs on roads that are considered strategic. On June 7, 1949, a group of Dutch troops in four trucks accompanied by two pantser-wagens passed through the Pacitan-Solo highway. A truck passed the bomb that had been installed and entered the ravine, until a shootout broke out between the Dutch and the Republican troops. The battle ended with dozens of Dutch soldiers killed and evacuated to Surabaya using Catalina aircraft. In that book, it is also stated that the attack in Gesingan was very influential in lowering the morale of the Dutch troops who were still left in Pacitan [30].

In the *Suara Karya* newspaper, it was stated that on May 20, 1980, the Minister of Information, Ali Murtopo inaugurated a monument called *Monumen Perjuangan 45* in Bukit Tumpak Rinjing, Pringkuku, Pacitan. The inauguration coincided with the commemoration of the Indonesian National Awakening Day (*Hari Kebangkitan Nasional*) which was centered in Pacitan as the guerrilla area of General Sudirman. It also stated that the construction of the monument began in 1979, chaired by Ranuwijaya, and was constrained before receiving support from Ali Murtopo. The statue of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi was then made by Saptoto, a sculptor with bronze techniques assisted by artists from ASRI Yogyakarta. This monument was built to commemorate the event where Sudirman sent Slamet Riyadi to disrupt the Dutch troops who were going to arrest Sudirman. Finally, there was a battle at Tumpak Rinjing Hill which killed five soldiers – referred to as Sudirman's men – named Kusno (Second Lieutenant), Imam Asro (Sergeant Major), Sarponen (Sergeant Major), Jupri (Corporal), and Sahid (Corporal). There were also three local residents who died named Katidjo, Kasan Mukmin – a *Kamituwa* – and one unidentified person [31].

The narrative regarding the involvement of local people and the army in that battle without direct contact with Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi is very limited to the public if historical research is not really carried out. The thing that is most easily internalized into the collective memory will remain the visual monument. However, in addition to the official narrative and the collective memory that reflects

misremembering, there is one memory that voices a different narrative. This narrative emerged from two figures in Gesingan. They are brothers, namely the late Misno, the former Head of Dadapan Village and his younger brother Jarman, who also served as the Head of Gesingan Hamlet. From an interview conducted with Jarman, he recalled the events that led to the construction of the Tumpak Rinjing Monument as an event when people tried to block the way of the Dutch troops by throwing stones and using makeshift weapons. When the Dutch troops felt attacked, they resisted so that many local people died (personal communication, Jul. 1 2026).

On the other hand, the memories conveyed by the late Misno was more detailed. Based on his father's story, he said that physical contact with Dutch troops at Tumpak Rinjing Hill was triggered by a person named Sahid. The person was a stranger to the people of Gesingan, said to have come from Yogyakarta and invited the people to fight the Dutch, but the majority ignored him. Sahid took the risk of assembling the weapons himself, then blocking and shooting the truck driver who was carrying a convoy of Dutch troops. Although one truck fell into the ravine, the other truck then attacked Sahid with a firearm until he was killed [5]. From here, we are faced with various narratives about the events that became the background for the construction of the Tumpak Rinjing Monument. Then, which history is true? Individual memories that are close to historical actors but not written, or written narratives that emerge from those who have access to power?

Actually, there is one similarity from that various narratives. It is the fact that Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi were not really directly involved in the battle. However, because the construction of the monument places the two figures as icon on the statue, it causes collective misremembering for the people and the youth today. A big question is also left behind, is the decision to display the statues of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi politically deliberate to legitimize the role of the military in defending independence? Or is it just a decision without special intentions and long projections about public perception? But what is certain is that the monument in this case remains a political object that plays a huge role in shaping collective memory.

This case is very important to bring into the classroom, into the history learning at the high school level. Students need to be introduced to the study of memory, especially collective memory, and how oral history can bridge it with history. By departing from the closest cases around, such as misremembering the events of the battle of Tumpak Rinjing, they will be able to be invited to think and realize that many things happened because of political moves. They will also understand that history is very complex and multidimensional, so it cannot be absolutely said to be right or wrong.

3.3 Memory Studies and Oral History in the Classroom

The people's memory of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument proves how an object of memory can produce misremembering. This phenomenon has previously been studied by Nora through the concept of *lieux de mémoire*. According to Nora, *lieux de mémoire* was emerged because of the loss of *milieux de mémoire*, which is a memory environment that lives naturally and spontaneously in the midst of society [1]. The memory of an event cannot occur spontaneously, so modern society often uses artificial sites, such as archives, museums, monuments, to resist the oblivion of an event. The Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument can be read as a *lieu de mémoire*.

This monument is material because it is in the form of statues and inscriptions. It also functional because it is an important point in the commemoration of the *Gerak Jalan Palagan Tumpak Rinjing*, as well as symbolic because of Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi statues which are intended to arouse respect for the struggle to defend independence. However, the *lieu de mémoire* has a big possibility to the reconstruction of meaning and re-reading, so that it allows for distortion of meaning, as happened to the Tumpak Rinjing Monument where the public does not remember much about the event of the struggle to defend independence by the people of Pacitan on June 7, 1949 and turned into a reminder of a national figure who is much more widely known.

The people's memory of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument is in line with Halbwachs' view of space and collective memory. According to Halbwachs, every collective memory is always based on a spatial framework, because space is stable and able to survive beyond changes in community members and time. A group believes in continuity and identity precisely because the physical space around it appears to be unchanged, even though what actually happens in that space is much more complex [9]. This principle explains why the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument is so effective in shaping the collective perception of the people in Pacitan. With its presence on the side of the Pacitan-Solo main road, it convince people that the space is part of Sudirman's guerilla route, without the need to verify the written narrative behind it. In other words, space becomes the authority of memory itself, and the visual of sculpture replaces the need to re-read the actual historical narrative which is much more complicated.

The meeting point between Nora and Halbwachs' theories and the reality of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument is the basis for the argument that memory studies needs to be brought to the history classroom. Research in the field of history education shows that collective memory plays an important role in shaping students' moral judgments of historical actors, including how they categorize parties in an event into specific moral roles [32]. What happened to the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument was that when the monument raised Sudirman and Slamet Riyadi as the most memorable parties, students were unconsciously also directed to a moral assessment of who was the most meritorious in the history of independence, while the people of Pacitan itself –who died– escaped the recognition. Other studies affirm that history learning should develop historical reasoning competencies, namely the ability to identify historical significance, understand continuity and change, and analyze various causes and effects through perspective-taking and historical consciousness [33], [34]. The case of misremembering of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument provides concrete material to train the three competencies at once, because students are exposed to one event that is represented differently by the official narrative, popular collective memory, and personal memory of historical witnesses.

This kind of learning is in line with the view that schools are not just channels of mainstream historical narratives, but a democratic space that allows small narratives to be brought to life to develop local historical awareness as well as historical empathy for students [35], [36]. As found in the interview data with several students in Pacitan, history learning in high school in Pacitan has not touched on the history behind the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, so it is possible that indirectly the school also perpetuates the misremembering that has been formed in the community. This is in line with the findings of Elmersjö's research that history

teachers often pass on historical cultural narratives that are broader than their own personal memories, so that without critical awareness, teachers have the potential to reproduce the same misremembering instead of discussing it in the history classroom [37].

Based on these considerations, the integration of memory studies into the history of the Tumpak Rinjing case needs to be supported by a problem-based learning model, where students are positioned as investigators who compare the official narrative in the monument inscription and the *Suara Karya* newspaper in 1980 with the personal memory recordings of historical witnesses, like the testimony from Misno and Jarman. This kind of approach is in line with the concept of educational memorial cultures, which integrates memory studies with pedagogy through eyewitness testimony and emotional involvement in teaching historical traumatic events, so that learning becomes balanced between the emotional and cognitive dimensions [38]. In addition, documentary film media is the most relevant means to realize this approach, as research shows that learning interventions that combine emotional engagement with historical reasoning, such as sourcing and structural analysis of sources, significantly improve students' understanding and attitudes towards historical memory compared to conventional history learning [39], [40]. Documentaries allow these two elements to be present simultaneously through recorded oral history interviews that present emotional engagement through the voices and faces of historical witnesses, while their integration with official narratives trains students to source as well as critically analyze the inconsistencies between the two types of sources.

This approach is also in line with findings on the effectiveness of visits to memory sites in history learning. For example, González-Vázquez's research examines how students' visits to sites such as the Exile Memorial Museum (MUME) have been proven to be able to evoke emotional connectedness and a participatory framework in learning about historical injustices, as well as fostering empathy, solidarity, and democratic competence of students [41]. The same study is very possible to be applied to the case of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, so that the meaning of the monument can be transferred from just being a selfie background for visitors or a marker for commemoration Gerak Jalan Palagan Tumpak Rinjing, to an authentic local history learning resource, where students are invited to visit the monument as well as watch, or even participate in producing a documentary film based on interviews with residents around. By presenting memory studies and opposing official narratives and personal memories through documentaries, history learning no longer stops at the channeling of historical facts, but invites students to better understand that history and memory are two different things as emphasized by Nora, and that spaces such as monuments always have the potential to be politicized for certain interests as explained by Halbwachs. Through the case of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, high school students in Pacitan are expected not only to be aware of the distortion in their own memories of the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument, but also to be trained to critically question other *lieu de mémoire* around them, so that the historical awareness formed among students is not just the memorization of facts, but a reflective awareness of how the past is constructed, selected, contested, and disputed in meaning.

4 Conclusion

This study demonstrates the potential of integrating memory studies into history learning through the case of collective misremembering surrounding the Palagan Tumpak Rinjing Monument. The discussion shows that the monument's representation, commemorative practices, and limited historical narratives have contributed to a public memory that tends to associate the Tumpak Rinjing Battle primarily with military figures, while overlooking the role of local communities in the 1949 struggle. Oral history provides an important means of recovering these marginalized memories and placing them in dialogue with official historical narratives.

Bringing this case into history learning can therefore help students understand the distinction between history and memory, while critically examining how the past is selected, represented, remembered, and sometimes distorted. The use of a documentary as a learning medium, combined with problem-based and inquiry-oriented activities, offers a potential approach for developing students' historical reasoning, empathy, and historiographical awareness. Thus, integrating memory studies into history education is not merely an effort to correct misremembering, but also a means of developing critical historical consciousness by encouraging students to question dominant narratives and recognize the role of power in the construction of collective memory.

Acknowledgments. This study was funded by an internal funding of Universitas Negeri Malang with decentralization scheme for Faculty of Social Science (*Desentralisasi Peneleitian – Dosen FIS Nasional*), under the agreement letter numbered 20.4.71/UN32.7.2/LT/2026.

Disclosure of Interests. The authors have no competing interests to declare that are relevant to the content of this article.

References

1. P. Nora, "Between Memory and History: Les Lieux de Mémoire," *Representations*, no. 26, pp. 7–24, 1989.
2. S. Macdonald, *Memorylands: Heritage and Identity in Europe Today*. London: Routledge, 2013.
3. P. Sumodiharjo, "Palagan Tumpak Rinjing, Monumen Pertempuran Pejuang Pacitan Lawan Belanda," <https://news.detik.com/berita-jawa-timur/d-5249671/palagan-tumpak-rinjing-monumen-pe-rtempuran-pejuang-pacitan-lawan-belanda>.
4. Y. Arifai, R. Wicaksono, and R. Dani, "Kisah Monumen Palagan Tumpak Rinjing di Kabupaten Pacitan yang Mangkrak Tak Terawat," https://timesindonesia.co.id/peristiwa-daerah/442709/kisah-monumen-palagan-tumpak-rin-jing-di-kabupaten-pacitan-yang-mangkrak-tak-terawat#google_vignette.
5. A. Azifambayunasti and S. Ediyono, "Monumen Palagan Tumpak Rinjing dan Ingatan Masyarakat Kabupaten Pacitan Atas Revolusi Fisik 1949," *Sejarah dan Budaya*, vol. 15, no. 2, 2021.

6. A. Azifambayunasti, "Sudirman Monuments in Pacitan: Something Behind The Silent," pp. 101–111, 2024.
7. M. Kammen, "'You Can't Change History'—Unless by Misremembering," *Rev Am Hist*, vol. 39, no. 4, pp. 673–677, 2011.
8. P. Connerton, "Seven types of forgetting," *Mem Stud*, vol. 1, no. 1, pp. 59–71, 2008.
9. M. Halbwachs, *The Collective Memory*. Harper & Row, 1950.
10. Ronggosaputro, *Mengenal Daerah Pacitan Dan Perkembangannya*. Surabaya: Suradipa, 1980.
11. P. J. Lee, "Putting Principles into Practice: Understanding History," in *How Students Learn: History, Mathematics, and Science in the Classroom*, J. D. Bransford and M. S. Donovan, Eds., National Academies Press, pp. vii–x, 2005.
12. T. Epstein, "The relationship between narrative construction and identity in History Education: implications for teaching and learning," *Educar em Revista*, no. 60, pp. 161–170, Jun. 2016.
13. Djono, H. Joebagio, and N. F. Abidin, "Pembelajaran Sejarah Naratif-Dekonstruktif: Suatu Kajian Konseptual Awal," vol. 20, p. 19, 2020.
14. Jaakkola, E. "Designing conceptual articles: four approaches". *AMS Rev* 10, 18–26, 2020.
15. B. Zelizer. "Reading the Past against the Grain: The Shape of Memory Studies," *Critical Studies in Mass Communication*, 12(2), p214-39, 1995.
16. R. Poole. "Memory, history and the claims of the past," *Memory Studies*, 1(2), 2008.
17. P. J. Verovšek. "Collective memory, politics, and the influence of the past: the politics of memory as a research paradigm". *Politics Groups and Identities*, 4 (3). pp. 529-543, 2016.
18. A. Azifambayunasti., dkk. "Bias atau Realita: Analisis Wacana Konflik Timor Timur dalam Buku Teks Sejarah Indonesia Pasca Orde Baru". *Jurnal Humanitas: Katalisator Perubahan dan Inovator Pendidikan*. 11. 745-762, 2025.
19. A. Sant'Anna. "Unsuccessful Remembering: A Challenge for the Relational View of Memory". *Erkenn* 87, 1539–1562, 2022.
20. S. J. Frenda, E. D. Knowles, W. Saletan, & E. F. Loftus. "False memories of fabricated political events. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*", 49(2), 280–286, 2013.
21. K. Errera, & S. M. DeIulius. "Public Memory: The Politics of Remembering and Forgetting". *Southern Communication Journal*, 88(1), 53–66, 2023.
22. F. Bellentani, & M. Panico. "The Meanings of Monuments and Memorials: Toward a Semiotic Approach". *Punctum. International Journal of Semiotics*, 2, 28-46, 2016.
23. K. E. McGregor, "Ketika Sejarah Berseragam: Membongkar Ideologi Militer dalam Menyusun Sejarah Indonesia". Yogyakarta, Indonesia: Syarikat, 2008.
24. Forest and J. Johnson, "The Politics of Public Space: What Can Political Science Contribute to the Study of Monuments?," presented at the Annual Conference of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), Montreal, QC, Canada, Jun. 2010.
25. K. Savage, "History, Memory, and Monuments: An Overview of the Scholarly Literature on Commemoration," National Park Service, Washington, D.O., Theme Study Draft, 2008.
26. Price, Jay. "Oral History and Public Memories edited by Paula Hamilton and Linda Shopes." *Public History Review*. 16. 117-180, 1970.
27. Stephens, Julie. "Our remembered selves: oral history and feminist memory. *Oral History*," 38 (1). pp. 81-90, 2010.
28. F. Steijlen, "Sejarah Lisan", <https://sejarahlisan.um.ac.id/>, 2025.
29. Fashihullisan, dkk., "Pacitan Berjuang Pacitan Dilupakan: Sejarah Perjuangan Pacitan Tahun 1945-1949". LPPM Press STKIP PGRI Pacitan, 2013.
30. "Menpen Resmikan Monumen Perjuangan '45 di Pacitan, Rakyat desa itu menyambut hangat salam Presidennya", *Suara Karya*, May 23 1980. Accessed on July 2026 [Online]. Available: <https://mpn.komdigi.go.id/arsip/storage/resize/2df8632393be95253483e1531ed987211b8d9a64.jpg>

31. Barreiro, A., & Perez-Manjarrez, E. "Collective memory, moral judgements, and history education". *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 66, 102113, 2025.
32. Luis, R., & Rapanta, C. "Towards (Re-)Defining historical reasoning competence: A review of theoretical and empirical research". *Educational Research Review*, 31, 100336, 2020.
33. Smets, W., & Savenije, G. "A structural and functional differentiation of knowledge for the history curriculum". *Journal of Curriculum Studies*, 57(4), 495–506, 2025.
34. Kello, K. "Sensitive and controversial issues in the classroom: Teaching history in a divided society". *Teachers and Teaching: Theory and Practice*, 22(1), 35–53. 2016.
35. Perrotta, K., Hochuli, C., Hickson, J., & Williams, R. "They Were Here: A Study on High School Students' Engagement in Historical Empathy With a Local History Research Project". *Journal of Social Studies Research*, 48(1), 3–16. 2024.
36. Elmersjö, H. Å., & Thorp, R. "The Cold War, Historical Culture and History Education: Swedish Teachers' Entangled Narratives of History and Memory". *Acta Didactica Norden*, 14(1 SE-Artikkel), 2020.
37. Hondius, D. "Learning from eyewitnesses: Examining the history and future of personal encounters with holocaust survivors and resistance fighters". In *As the Witnesses Fall Silent: 21st Century Holocaust Education in Curriculum, Policy and Practice* (pp. 81–94). 2015.
38. Endacott, J. L. Reconsidering affective engagement in historical empathy. *Theory and Research in Social Education*, 38(1), 6–47, 2010.
39. Na'im, M., & Triyanto, J. R. The Effect of Visual Narrative-Based Pear Deck Media on Students' Historical Empathy in History Learning: A Quasi-Experimental Study. *Journal of Social Studies Education Research*, 17(1), 163–191. 2026.
40. González-Vázquez, D., Feliu-Torruella, M., & Íñiguez-Gracia, D. The teaching of historical memory as a tool for achieving sdg 16 and teachers' views on the exile memorial museum (Mume) routes. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 13(24). 2021.

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.

