

LOCAL HISTORY AS MORAL EDUCATION: THE CASE OF KERINCI WAR (1901-1903)

Uun Lionar¹, Agus Mulyana² & Isrok'atun³

¹Departement of History Education, School of Postgraduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education (UPI)

Awardee of LPDP Scholarship, Indonesia

*^{2,3}Departement of History Education, School of Postgraduate Studies, Indonesia University of Education (UPI),
Bandung, Indonesia*

Received: 18 Apr 2018

Accepted: 24 Apr 2018

Published: 30 Apr 2018

ABSTRACT

Local history occupies a strategic position in developing moral values; this is possible because local history has the peculiarity of national history. Local history lies in the locus of a particular region or region that also belongs to a community. The peculiarity of local history has become the identity of the community and become a shared narrative in the collective memory of a particular locality. On the shared memory, local history taught much about the wisdom and lessons that are valuable to a society. As a local history, the Kerinci War (1901-1903) is still inherent in the collective recollections of the Kerinci community; in Jambi Province (Indonesia). The three-year war has provided many lessons for today's generations, especially with regard to moral values such as nationalism, social solidarity, responsibility, and discipline.

KEYWORDS: *Kerinci War, Local History, Moral Education, History*

INTRODUCTION

Local history includes history at the village level, some villages, as well as regions that are limited below the provincial level. Finberg & Skipp (1973, p. 39) illustrate local history as a history that lies in a concentric circle surrounded by a national and supranational environment. The scope of local history is the whole surrounding environment that can be a territorial unity such as villages, sub-districts, districts, small towns and other unity-sized territories along with elements of social and cultural institutions residing in an environment, such as: family, settlement patterns, population mobility, mutual cooperation, markets, agricultural technology, local government institutions, arts associations, monuments and others (Widja 1991, pp. 14-15).

If the historical principle as a unique one is applied, then it can be said that all history is actually local history (Purwanto, 2007, p. 35). Alfian (1983, p.29) divides two categories of local history, ie: (1) special local history, in the form of internal dynamics occurring in each region; and (2) local level history, ie how a national aspect manifests in the region or interaction between the center and the region. Meanwhile, Finberg & Skipp (1973, pp. 25-44) explain that local historical targets are the origin, growth, development, and fall of the local community so that the main problems in the preparation should be based on local realities.

Observing the local history of each region shows that local history has a special meaning for a community.

The local history belongs to the local community in which it tells the story of the local struggle and the life of the ancestor of a certain locality (Lionar, 2017a, p 297). Therefore, local history is full of moral values and lessons on how a locality survives, preserves existence, and answers the challenges of the times of the past. Through local history, the present generation can understand the story of the past and can take valuable lessons to serve as a living guide in moral education, a collective-oriented education that teaches the values of social life (Durkheim, 1990, p.5).

The Kerinci War (1901-1903) is one of local history, which is loaded with moral education. The three-year war in the highlands of Sumatra Island against the Dutch troops that want to colonize the Kerinci area. It has become an important note for the people of Kerinci until today. Many of the moral values contained in the story, such as nationalism, social solidarity, responsibility, and discipline. And then all of those are the noble values that deserve to be passed on to the generation of the nation.

METHODS

This research uses literature study method and historical method. The data obtained through literature review in the form of a series of activities related to library data collection methods, reading and recording and also processing research materials (Zed, 2017, p.3). The research data is obtained from book and journal sources. Through literature review, researchers examine critically the sources to then be constructed into a comprehensive understanding about the focus of research.

The historical method is used in building the historical narrative of the Kerinci War (1901-1903). The process of historical method consists of (1) hauristics, ie is collecting historical sources from archives, documentation, and interviews; after the data collected and then done(2) source criticism, namely the process of testing the originality and authenticity of data obtained; (3) interpretation, integrating the data obtained into a complete understanding; and (4) historiography, writing history.

DISCUSSIONS

Dutch Knowledge about Kerinci

After the Minangkabau plateau (PadangscheBovenlanden) was conquered by the Dutch in 1837 through the Padri War led by Tuanku Imam Bonjol, followed by the Dutch conquest of the king of Jambi, Sultan ThahaSaifuddin between 1898 until 1904, in 1901 to 1903 the Dutch troops on the west coast of Sumatra include Muko-muko (Bengkulu) and Indrapura (West Sumatra) also attempted to conquer the Kerinci area that located deep in the hinterland of Bukit Barisan Sumatra. The existence of the Dutch on the west coast of Sumatra has been since 1663, with the establishment of a loji by VOC (Vereenigde Oost IndischeCompagnie) in Cingkuak Island in 1663, then followed by Padang loji in 1666 and loji at Air Bangis 1669 (Asnan, 2007, pp. 4-5).

Until the early 20th century, in fact, the Dutch had not yet controlled the whole region of Sumatra. Aceh had just been conquered in 1907 through a very fierce war between uleebalang led by TeungkuCik di Tiro with Dutch troops led by Van Heutsz(Ricklefs, 2016, p. 221). Those facts show strong evidence as stated by G. J. Resink (2012) that Indonesia has never been colonized by the Dutch for 350 years.

According to Klers (1985), Dutch knowledge of Kerinci was minimal, until the late nineteenth century, the Dutch only knew that in the hinterlands of Sumatra there were still many areas which had not been subject to the Dutch. One of them is Kerinci, this area is still sovereign under a traditional federation called DepatiEmpatAlamKerinci, this federation is a set of all customary chiefs in Kerinci. Under the federation Kerinci people live peacefully, the abundant produce such as rice, cinnamon, coffee, and fresh vegetables, Lake Kerinci which extends far enough to meet the needs of the local people's (Andaya, 2016, p. 281; Lionar, 2017b, p. 5; Ramli&Ayu, 2005, p. 6). Marsden (2013, p. 234) an adventurer working for a British trading company in Bengkulu in 1771-1779 reported that Kerinci's geographical location deep in the interior of Sumatra, to get there must cross the forest of the row. Europeans rarely know this area, because of its isolated location in the interior of Sumatra (Cribb & Kahin, 2012, p 238).

The Dutch desire to dominate Kerinci actually began in 1877, with an expedition to Kerinci led by van Hasselt, but the expedition failed to depart after finding out that the inhabitants of Kerinci had survived and prepared the resistance to prevent the Dutch entry into their area (Hasselt & John in Wahyudi, 2017, p. 5). Entering the beginning of the 20th century, the Dutch intention to colonize Kerinci stronger. Through the Resident of Bengkulu, the Dutch had contacts with many Depati in Kerinci. The Dutch intend to forge a partnership under the pretext of "equally beneficial", then sent messengers from Bengkulu namely Imam Mersah and PenghuluSomah, they were sent by KontrolirMuko-muko to deliver a letter addressed to PemangkuDepatiTelago who holds Pemangku DepatiRantau in TigaHelaiKain (PulauSangkar). The contents of the letter in essence the Dutch asked permission to build a road through Kerinci by promising Kerinci leaders "*An egg will not break, a piece of the grass will not wither, one drop water will not murky*" which analogy that the Dutch will not interfere with the sovereignty of the DepatiKerinci (Madjid, 2012, p5.). On the way home the two envoys received resistance from the inhabitants of Kerinci who knew they were Dutch envoys, the dispute between the Dutch envoy and the villagers of LempurKerinci ultimately led to one of the messengers ie Imam Mersah killed on August 5, 1902 (Wahyudi, 2017, p. 7). In another source said that the Dutch envoys were killed because they had made a fake letter that read "*The Kerinci nation was subdued to the Dutch and all Depati have claimed to be devastated to Muko-muko*", on the false letters the people became furious and intended to kill them (Madjid, 2012, p.20).

In October 1902, the Dutch envoys were represented by Inderapura, they headed for the Hamparan Besar Tanah Rawang where the DepatiEmpatAlamKerinci was deliberating there. According to Watson's (1978, p. 139) report that the Sultan of Inderapura initially rejected the Dutch request because he still holds firmly oath of allegiance "*SitinjauLaut*" an agreement between Inderapura, Kerinci, and Jambi to take care of each other "*Tidakbolehmenggungtingdalamlipatan, tidakbolehmenohokkawanseiring*" which means it should not betray the agreement that has been made. However, with the threat of disposal to Ternate granted by the Governor General to the Regent Inderapura and family, with a heavy heart, the Regent must meet the Dutch order to meet all of Kerinci's Depati. The unanimous decision was made by the Depati to the Inderapura envoys that they rejected the entry of the Dutch into Kerinci (Zakaria, 2012, p.6).

In a meeting with the all of Kerinci's Depati, Inderapura delegates led by Sultan Iradat presented the Regent's invitation to the all of Depati to visit Inderapura. Responding to the invitation then some Depati departed ie, SirahMato from Seleman, DepatiTerawangLidah from Rawang, Depati Sungai Penuh from Sungai Penuh, and some hulubalang by bringing some gifts to the Bupati of Inderapura. On the way back it turns the Depati and hulubalang followed by Dutch troops who are ready to fight, then there was war in Bukit Koto Limo Sering which in the end makes Depati and

hulubalang must surrender due to limitations in weaponry. Since then the Dutch slowly entered and controlled northern Kerinci. Then, they try to conquer Siulak and Semurup area through the fierce resistance of the hulubalang of Kerinci. Zakaria (2012, p. 8) notes that at that time there were some famous war heroes, including: Haji A. Rahman and Haji Makmud from Kemantan; Haji SutanTaha Rio Bidi and Imam Berkat from Belui; Mat Syarif as Depati from Sekungkung; Haji M. Yunus; Haji BagindoSutan asDepati fromKebaloSembah; Haji Maninas DepatiNegeri; IjungPajina; dan Haji Muhammad Kari fromSemurup.

Facing the Dutch from Three Directions

The serious Dutch effort to conquer Kerinci is getting stronger, the results of an investigation by the Muko-muko Controller E. F Janesen against witnesses of the murders. Then it is known one of the figures involved pioneered the action of the murder is DepatiParbo from Lolo village. Meanwhile, in Batavia on reports of the death of government envoys, so the murder case was lifted and discussed in the meeting of the Council of Indies with the Governor-General on 12 September 1902. After the Council was informed of the case, the Council ordered the Commander of the army in Resident of Bengkulu to act and drain military force to attack Kerinci. The council also demanded that the murderers surrender, the people should pay a fine for the murder, and if these two things are not met, then the Dutch forces will rule the whole of Kerinci (Madjid, 2012, p.12). In his secret letter dated October 3, 1902, Afdeeling VII, number 1245, as well as the first government secretary's letter dated October 12, 1902 Number 318, Resident of Bengkulu declared Major H.C. Kronour from the General Staff that lead the expedition, preparing for Kerinci's mastery by military means. As a further step, it is also ordered by the Governor of the West Coast of Sumatra to help the Resident of Bengkulu to supply aid (Wahyudi, 2017, pp. 12).

On June 1903, the Dutch decided to launch an integrated attack on Kerinci from three different directions: from the south through the RanahMandjuto, where had prepared troops from Resident of Bengkulu and Muko-muko; from the northwest through Koto LimauSering and Sikungkung, where troops from West Sumatra have been prepared; and from the east of Jambi through Bangko and Tamiai, which brought war troops from Jambi. Meanwhile, the Palembang Resident participated in the request by the Commander of the Army and Chief of Staff of the Dutch East Indies War Department in Batavia to send additional troops. The request was granted by the arrival of the troops of the Battalion Garrisun under the command of the West Sumatra government troops, the Infateri Battalion to IX, the 2nd and 3rd Compagnie from Cimahi West Java, which became the responsibility of the Jambi colonel. The troops who came later specifically dedicated to besieging KerinciHilir, namely the TigaHelaiKain region such as Lolo, Lempur and Pulau Tengah, the execution to this area was led by the Regional Military Commander, van Hoeften (Wahyudi, 2017, p. 13).

From the side of Kerinci, all of Depati formed a deciding war council that each region would be responsible for mobilizing the hulubalang to defend their territory from the Dutch attack (Watson, 1978, pp. 132-135). The war council agreed *"If the enemy comes from the upstream, the upstream people that confront them, if the enemy comes from downstream, the downstream people who parry it, if the enemy is in the middle, equally under siege"*, and this is known the term *"Kincaisehalunsehakselatuhbdei"* which means Kerinci fired the weapons simultaneously. The hulubalang in each region are ready to wait for the arrival of Dutch troops with all the physical powers they have. Some of Kerinci's hulubalang are rumored to have immune science that can withstand sharp objects.

The open war between hulubalang and the people of Kerinci with Dutch troops occurred between June and August 1903, this great war can be said to occur at the same time almost in all hamlets in Kerinci, such as in Hiang occurred on June 12, 1903; BatuHampar from 14 June to 10 July 1903; North Kerinci from 15 to 16 June 1903; SandaranAgung on June 17, 1903; Jujun and Pidung from 17 to 21 June 1903; TanjungBatu on 18 June 1903; Koto Lanang on 19 June 1903; Sungai Penuh on 21 June 1903; TanjungPauh on 1 July 1903; Bukit Kemanten on 1 July 1903; Pengasi on 3 July 3 1903; Benteng Koto Tuwa on 4 July 1903; PulauSangkar from 7 to 17 July 1903; Rawang on 8 July 1903; Sungai Pusaka (Pulau Tengah) from 12 to 13 July 1903; Lempur from 17 to 22 July 1903; Lolo from 14 until 19 July 1903; LempurSumerapon 21 July 1903; BentengBatuPutihon 27 July 1903; andBenteng Bukit on 19 July 1903 (Wahyudi, 2017, pp. 13–14).

The War in Kerinci's Downstream

After the upstream part of Kerinci can be mastered like Semurup, Belui, and Sekungkung, the Dutch focus attention to conquer Kerinci's downstream area especially TigaHelaiKain, such as Lolo, PulauSangkar, Lempur, and Pulau Tengah. The purpose of the conquest was to allow the DepatiParbo, and other fighters to be captured immediately, thus the war would soon fade and end.

Bukit Kemeru is the base for the Dutch troops to perform the consolidation of troops who came later from the direction of Jambi. In daily AH report. Fren Commander BivakKemeru noted that on 25 July 1903 came the southern military commander, van Hoften, health officer, GM. Haltaffel and three officers, Zeni. Their arrival was escorted by troops with a weapon of 51 bayonets. On July 3 1903, came bivouac, from Resident Palembang, Assistant Resident of Jambi, Captain B. Filet. Their arrival is protected with army troops armed with 25 bayonets (Madjid, 2012, p. 24). On the side of the inhabitants of Kerinci have prepared for hulubalang of TigaHelaiKain led by DepatiParbo, they control the battlefield because of the habit of forest entry. The Dutch hate attitude is getting stronger in the body of hulubalang because the spirit of war they are doing is the spirit of jihad, ie jihad against the unbelievers who want to control their area, although later died on the battlefield, they believe will die shaheed. The magnitude of the spirit of Kerincihulubalang in blocking the Dutch troops is proof of their love for the land of their birth "*Not evens an inch of Kerinci land was given to the Dutch*".

The ensuing battle took place at Lolo on July 14-19, 1903, Dutch troops under Command, Captain of Gusdof that got the task of subjugating Lolo which at that time was very difficult to conquer. Dutch troops armed with 21 pieces of the bayonet, which were then greeted by Kerinci's hulubalang. In this battle, the Dutch were also assisted by troops coming from PulauSangkar through the Dusun Pondok road. Lolo is a hulubalang power base area, where this area is the home of the warlord of Kerinci, DepatiParbo. Dutch troops continued to survive the resistance of the hulubalang only armed a perfunctory level, until in the end the battle can be won by the Dutch troops and then they burned the houses of the population. One village woman named Fatimah who became known as DepatiParbo's cousin made a counterattack against the Dutch, this attack was recorded to have killed several Dutch troops. Although in the end, she had to die from Dutch shelling, Fatimah's fight in the battle at Lolo became an important record of Kerinci women's participation in the War of Kerinci period (Watson, 1978, p. 139).

The conquest of the Lempur took place on 17 to 22 July 1903. Through a fierce battle, the Dutch troops were overwhelmed because the strategy of the war of DepatiParbo that made suddenly by building a two-kilometer-long trench

defense. Through the trench, hulubalang can hide waiting for the arrival of Dutch troops, after they arrived, then hulubalang besieged Dutch troops from various directions. However, because of the war equipment which is very limited, Kerinci's hulubalang get a counterattack that makes them have to give up and run into the forest. In mastering the Lempur, Dutch troops are seconded by troops coming from Muko-muko and West Sumatra. Depati Parbo until the end of the war in Lempur, he cannot be conquered by the Dutch.

The Burning Pulau Tengah

The acquisition of Pulau Sangkar, Lempur, and Lolo by the Dutch did not make Kerinci's hulubalang give up. Hulubalang in central Kerinci was still doing resistance, because they still had enough weaponry to face the Dutch troops. In addition to traditional spears and swords, it turns out there are a number of hulubalang that keeps the ancient rifles (muskets) obtained from Jambi and Palembang. Hearing the existence of such weapons, the Dutch immediately sent an order to collect all the weapons possessed by Kerinci's hulubalang.

The area that the Dutch have not conquered is the Pulau Tengah located on the western edge of Lake Kerinci. According to Watson's report (1978, p. 140), this area sends direct messengers to Dutch troops in Rawang to challenge them to war. The strategy of war began to be regulated by hulubalang and religious leaders such as Mat Saleh, Haji Husin, Depati of Gayur, Mat Pekat, Fatimah Jura, Bilal Sengak, and the most important is Haji Ismail known as the war leader, Pulau Tengah. The battle of the Pulau Tengah was the most fierce of the whole war and lasted about six months, from May to November 1903. The attack was launched by the Dutch from the north and south, because the strongholds were so strong so the Dutch can not do anything. The base of the Pulau Tengah's hulubalang defense is located inside the Keramat Mosque, Pulau Tengah, this mosque witnesses how the power of war is driven by the spirit of jihad (Mirdad, 2013, pp. 57). The Dutch then used cannons to attack Pulau Tengah; the cannons were imported from West Sumatra. Several times the cannon were confronted to the area of Pulau Tengah and finally Pulau Tengah defense fortress located on the banks of the river was destroyed. Some of the leaders of the struggle died in this attack, including Bilal Sengak, Mat Saleh, and Fatimah. The episode of war on Pulau Tengah was the most "crazy" episode during the Kerinci War, because the whole of the Pulau Tengah community fought against the Dutch troops, they endured to the death. At the end of the war, Dutch troops burned the area and caused a lot of casualties, it cannot be estimated how many of the victims, and most of them are women and children.



Figure 1

The conquest of Pulau Tengah has not made the Dutch to host Kerinci. Because there are still many Kerinci's

hulubalang that survive in the war. They are ready to return to fight against the Dutch troops. Depati Parbo, until the time of the conquest of Central Island, cannot be conquered by the Dutch. Meanwhile, the area of Kerinci upstream of Siulak is still a battle under the leadership of Haji Umar Prince who came from Jambi and continues the struggle of Sultan Thaha. The battle is expected to end in 1905

Picture: photo KasibgelarDepatiParbo (source: www.harianhaluan.com)

DepatiParbo was finally caught around 1904 through the various threats and tricks of Dutch troops. According to Watson (1978, p. 141) there are many versions of the arrest of DepatiParbo by Dutch troops, including: some say he was caught while performing the prayers at the mosque; others say that he was persuaded to surrender with the threat of Dutch troops was going to kill his family in Lolo; while others said he was tricked into attending a ceasefire meeting with Dutch troops and then arrested.

After the arrest of DepatiParbo, a number of his followers left Kerinci and fled to Kelang (Malaysia), and DepatiParbo himself was sentenced to exile to a place far from his hometown. Likewise with Tuanku Imam Bonjol who was exiled by the Dutch to Menado after the Padri War, DepatiParbo was thus, he was exiled by the Dutch to Ternate, but unlike Tuanku Imam Bonjol who died in exile, DepatiParbo was liable to a sentence of 25 years, in exile DepatiParbo was granted a pardon from the Queen of the Dutch, and was allowed to return to Kerinci. Various sources said DepatiParbo was granted a pardon for his knowledge of kebatinan, he was able to heal the son of a Dutch Resident Assistant, and on the receipt of the Assistant Resident's reply to DepatiParbo, he was released and returned to Kerinci in 1926 (Lionar, 2017b, p. 5). As a form of respect to his struggle against the Dutch colonists, DepatiParbo is pinned as the name of the airport, DepatiParbo Airport in Kerinci by Kerinci's people. In addition, a private university namely Academic Computer Science Management (AMIK) also pinned the name DepatiParbo as the name of the institution. Several times a seminar on DepatiParbo was held in order to carry him as a national hero, but until now he has not become a national hero. DepatiParbo remains a hero to the people of Kerinci, his brave footsteps in the face of Dutch troops is as a proof of the heroism of DepatiParbo.

After the Dutch came to power in Kerinci since 1905, the Kerinci area was incorporated into the Jambi residency by the royal decree of the Dutch on February 1, 1907. At that time Kerinci, Jambi, Bangko, Sarolangun, and MuaroBungo were under the reign of the Resident Assistant based in Bangko. In 1935 the Dutch East Indies government in West Sumatra expanded its territory to the south, so Kerinci was incorporated into the Residency of West Sumatra through *besluit* of Governor-General of the Dutch East Indies. No. 26 September 10, 1935. Kerinci region was given the status of the district administration area, which was further divided into three onderdistrict, namely Kerinci Tengah, Kerinci Ulu, and KerinciHilir. Kerinci district itself is part of *Onderafdeeling* Kerinci-Inderapura under *Afdeeling Zuid Benedenlanden* (Asnan, 2007, p. 237).

Kerinci War as Moral Education

The Kerinci War (1901-1903) was the embodiment of the effort to preserve sovereignty and independence. Many moral values can be taken as an inspiration for moral education for next generation such as nationalism, social solidarity, responsibility, discipline, and so forth. The moral values of nationalism can be found from the resistance of the people of Kerinci who fought in every part of the territory to defend their territory, the nationalism, in essence, is the spirit

of loving the homeland which is realized through the willingness to sacrifice for the homeland, this can be found from warrior of war such as DepatiParbo who did not give up easily against the Dutch troops. The moral value of social solidarity is a manifestation of a strong sense of attachment among the people, this value can be found from the unity of the people who shoulder to shoulder against the Dutch in various regions of Kerinci.

Individual moral responsibility can also be found in the history of the Kerinci War (1901-1903), it can be found in the consciousness of the people with all their might to participate in the war. That awareness is a form of their responsibility as a child of the country that must protect all the people against dangerous threats.

Moral value is no less important is the discipline, from the history of War Kerinci can be found a lot of discipline value, DepatiParbo and other figures have shown that the discipline is the main force in stemming the enemy resistance. The spirit of discipline can be found from how to prepare a strategy of war, a guerrilla war that occurs in three years is a form of strong discipline to keep the people's sovereignty.

CONCLUSIONS

After analyzing the history of the Kerinci War (1901-1903), some conclusions were found:

- The history of the Kerinci War (1901-1903) is loaded with highly relevant moral education to foster the spirit of nationalism, social solidarity, responsibility, and discipline. The value can be found from the events and attitudes of the perpetrators of history, especially the main actors who determine the current history of the Kerinci War.
- There is also the possibility of other moral values that have not been revealed from the history of Kerinci War (1901-1903). Given the limited time in this study so that the authors maximize the ability to find four moral values. For further research can do a more in-depth study with various methods to find other moral values.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author would like to acknowledge and express my greatest gratitude to the Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education (LPDP) for its support of UunLionar's research. UunLionar is LPDP awardee and a master's degree student in History of Education, Indonesia University of Education (UPI) Bandung.

REFERENCES

1. Alfian, I. (1983). *Sejarah Lokal dalam Kurikulum Universitas. Dalam Seminar Sejarah Lokal*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
2. Andaya, B. W. (2016). *Hidup Bersaudara: Sumatra Tenggara pada Abad XVII dan XVIII*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Ombak.
3. Asnan, G. (2007). *Memikir Ulang Regionalisme Sumatera Barat Tahun 1950-an*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
4. Cribb, R., & Kahin, A. (2012). *Kamus Sejarah Indonesia*. (G. Triwira, Penerj.). Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
5. Durkheim, E. (1990). *Pendidikan Moral: Suatu Studi Teori dan Aplikasi Sosiologi Pendidikan*. (L. Ginting, Penerj.). Jakarta: Erlangga.

6. Finberg, H. P. R., & Skipp, V. H. T. (1973). *Local History: Objective and Pursuit*. South Devon House Newton Abbot Devon: David & Charles.
7. Lionar, U. (2017a). Pendekatan Konstruktivistik dan Pembelajaran Sejarah Lokal dalam Kurikulum 2013. Dalam Y. S. Kusumah, A. Permanasari, & Disman (Ed.), *Bunga Rampai: Penelitian Mahasiswa Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia* (hlm. 287–300). Bandung: Sekolah Pascasarjana Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia & Forum Komunikasi Mahasiswa SPS UPI.
8. Lionar, U. (2017b, April 7). *Depati Parbo: Pewaris Perang Paderi dari Kerinci*. Haluan, hlm. 5.
9. Madjid, D. (2012). *Lika Liku Perjuangan Depati Parbo Menghadapi Kolonialisme Belanda di Alam Kerinci*. Makalah, Kerinci.
10. Marsden, W. (2013). *Sejarah Sumatra*. Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
11. Mirdad, J. (2013). *Masjid Sebagai Pusat Perlawanan Terhadap Kolonialisme Belanda (Studi Kasus Masjid Keramat Pulau Tengah Kerinci tahun 1902-1049)* (Tesis). Universitas Islam Negeri Imam Bonjol Padang, Padang.
12. Purwanto, B. (2007). *Sejarah Ekonomi Lokal*. Dalam A. Mulyana & R. Gunawan (Ed.), *Sejarah Lokal Penulisan dan Pembelajaran di Sekolah*. Bandung: Salamina Press.
13. Ramli, T., & Ayu, Y. (2005). *Biografi Mayjen H. A. Thalib (1918-1973) Pejuang dari Bumi Sakti Alam Kerinci*. (A. H. Usman & M. Zed, Ed.). Padang: Yayasan Citra Budaya Indonesia.
14. Resink, G. J. (2012). *Bukan 350 Tahun Indonesia Dijajah*. (Tim Komunitas Bambu, Penerj.). Depok: Komunitas Bambu.
15. Ricklefs, M. C. (2016). *Sejarah Indonesia Modern*. (D. Hardjowidjono, Penerj.). Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
16. Wahyudi, J. (2017). *Perlawanan Depati Parbo di Mata Kolonial Belanda di Kerinci: Suatu Kajian Sejarah Lokal*. *Jurnal Tamaddun*, 5(1), 1–21.
17. Watson, C. W. (1978). *Depati Parbo: A Case Study in Indigenous History*. *Archipel*, 15(1), 123–143. <https://doi.org/10.3406/arch.1978.1385>
18. Widja, I. G. (1991). *Sejarah Lokal Suatu Perspektif dalam Pengajaran Sejarah*. Bandung: Penerbit Angkasa Bandung.
19. Zakaria, I. (2012). *Depati Parbo dari Pejuang Kerinci menuju Pahlawan Nasional*. Makalah, Sungai Penuh, Kerinci.
20. Zed, M. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Pustaka*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

