

**THE 1965 INDONESIAN KILLING DISCOURSE
BY GENERATION 2000 WRITERS**
Wacana Pembunuhan Indonesia Tahun 1965 oleh Penulis Generasi 2000

Diah Ariani Arimbi

Departemen Sastra Inggris, Fakultas Ilmu Budaya, Universitas Airlangga,
Kampus B, Jalan Dharmawangsa Dalam 2A Surabaya 60286, Tlp.031-5035676,
Pos-el: diaharimbi@yahoo.com

(Makalah diterima tanggal 31 Desember 2010—Disetujui tanggal 4 Mei 2011)

Abstrak: Jatuhnya kekuasaan Soeharto pada tahun 1998 berdampak pada berbagai sisi kehidupan di Indonesia: politik, sosial, dan budaya. Pergeseran dari pemerintahan yang dulunya otoritatif menjadi pemerintahan yang sarat dengan "reformasi" dan "demokratisasi" telah memaksa negara untuk mendefinisikan kembali wewenangnya kepada para anggotanya. Makalah ini bertujuan untuk melihat respons publik yang diceritakan dalam fiksi Indonesia kontemporer. Walaupun fiksi dapat dipandang sebagai produk imajinatif, ideologi diskursif dapat dilihat dengan jelas. Dengan memeriksa tema-tema yang secara signifikan dimunculkan dari narasi tentang G30S/PKI dan tragedi pembunuhan sesudahnya dalam tulisan-tulisan sastra yang diterbitkan pasca tahun 1998 oleh penulis Indonesia kontemporer, yang dikenal sebagai penulis Generasi 2000 (penulis yang kebanyakan lahir di tahun 1970-an—setidaknya 5 tahun setelah 1965 kejadian: juga dikenal sebagai millenials), makalah ini berusaha menjawab apakah generasi baru mengalami pergeseran dalam memahami tragedi tahun 1965. Apakah mereka telah menciptakan sendiri arti peristiwa sejarah tersebut lewat karya mereka ataukah mereka mengukuhkan makna yang sudah ada adalah pertanyaan yang berusaha dijawab dalam makalah ini.

Kata-Kata Kunci: ideologi, diskursus, tragedi tahun 1965, milenial

Abstract: The fall of Soeharto's authority in 1998 has indeed impacted numerous sides of Indonesian life: political, social and cultural. The shifting of authoritative government to the state of "reformation" and "democratization" has forced the nation to redefine its authority to its members. This paper aims to look at these public responses which are narrated in contemporary Indonesian fiction. Although fiction may be seen as imaginative production, discursive ideologies can be examined clearly. By examining thematic significant of the narratives about G30S/PKI and the killings—aftermath in the literary writings published in post 1998 by contemporary Indonesia writers, who are known as the Generation 2000 writers (who were mostly born in 1970s—at least five years after the 1965 incident: also known as the millennials), this paper will attempt to answer whether or not this generation presents shift and creates its own notions of the incident.

Key Words: ideology, discourse, the 1965 Indonesian killings, millennials

INTRODUCTION

"History is simply not in her side," one of the contemporary Indonesian writers wrote.¹ The very sentence seems to capture one of the emotions of the country regarding one of the darkest

episodes in Indonesian history: the 1965 G30S/PKI and the killings aftermath. That single sentence implies the very essence of how public was made to understand, even to believe of that tragedy. As a victim of the killings after

the G30S/PKI occurrence, the woman in the story is pitied (she becomes the victim because she is simply in the wrong time, in the wrong place), but the actor of the victimization has never been mentioned. This actor could easily get away without even being demanded to be put on trial. This is perhaps one public reception because of the long silence imposed on when it comes to this 1965 episode. After 1965, to the 1970s until the late 1990s, discussions, circulations or publications of the “leftist” books² were restricted: perhaps because of more than thirty years of Soeharto’s monolithic definition of this 1965 tragedy. Thus, writings or public discussions about that 1965 tragedy during his reign came under strict limitation and surveillance. The prohibition proved to be effective; discussion was silenced became invisible in public discourse.

The fall of Soeharto in 1998 and his death in 2008 after a long illness really opened up a door of opportunity of public exposure of the 1965 G30S/PKI and the killings aftermath. Not only about this 1965 tragedy, many have guessed, discourses about communism and leftist perspectives have also been publicly accessible. Although Wahid’s proposal to withdraw TAP MPRS/XXV/1966 that banned the distribution of Marxism, Leninism, Communism teachings resulted in failure,³ “leftist books” are widely available for public. Since 1998, many new independent and small publishers have eagerly published a number of “leftist” books in original Indonesian language or translation. To name a few, books by Tan Malaka, Pramoedya Ananta Toer that were used to be banned by Soeharto’s authority, or Marx’s *Das Kapital*, Geoffrey Robinson’s *Kudeta Angkatan Darat*, *Revolusi Rakyat Che Guevara* are now available easily in book stores, bought and read by

university students and young professionals.⁴ Furthermore, in Indonesia today, *buku putih* or testimonials of those who were witnessing the tragedy, either by military generals or elite politicians are abundant in book stores⁵.

Taken for granted, even after forty-four years after the occurrence, at most time by most people, the public reception on such tragedy, we now recognize, has never been simple or unitary, one size fits all, for all diverse generations. There are many factors contributing to such still controversial receptions while also helping to define a continuum of various sentiments. Now, that rather many books about G30S/PKI are available, we currently know more that historical, political, economical, educational or social institutions have become forces that influence the creation of rather diverse receptions. The time when we wanted to know but we were not allowed to have has passed. With many controversies arose after the 1998 reformation, we are perhaps coming to understand the difference that various values can play in the formation and maintenance of public understand and reception of the 1965 tragedy.

Literature, of course, can always get here first. Despite then restriction, writers, some of themselves have been victimized by this tragedy in any kind of level, have been sensitive to the felt complexity from time immemorial, some more consciously than others. Writers like Pramoedya Ananta Toer (1925—2006), Umar Kayam (1932—2002) have found ways to explore what it meant to think, feel and suffer across various social dividing lines. Pram’s works *Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu* (1999) or Kayam’s *Sri Sumarah dan Bawuk* (1975) have explored the various victimization processes for those who are accused to be participating in G30S/PKI and their struggles in coping such atrocities. Other works by other writers like Mochtar

Lubis (1922—2004) and Ahmad Tohari (1948) show almost similar case. Lubis' *Senja di Jakarta* (1970) and Tohari's *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk* (1982) tell narratives of those who suffer and are socially abandoned by their own society because they, in some ways, are relatives of those labeled as "participants or sympathizers of PKI" (simply known as PKI) without their knowing it or even being aware of it. When those narratives touch the life of women, these women who are left and abandoned by their husbands because of imprisonment or death, then work mostly as prostitutes to support their life and family. In these narratives, the families of those accused as PKIs suffer most; the mother and daughters turned into prostitution and the sons are too ashamed to be socially labeled as *anak PKI* (PKI's children) dropped out of school and worked as *preman* (street thugs) or had low life jobs. As much as those stories are written as the unavoidable dreadful effects that the families of the PKI have to suffer, it is noted that these families or their members have hardly been portrayed of having descent life or jobs. This may function as two sides of the same coin. On one hand, those tales reflect public reaction of how discriminative and disgraceful life would be for the families of those accused to be related with PKI (whether this accusation is true or not does not matter). On the other hand, they also imply that anything related or associated with PKI directly or indirectly is necessarily bad. Nothing good comes out of PKI and any association to it. This seems to be the most popular public sentiment within the discourses of G30S/PKI and the killings aftermath in Indonesian fiction during the 1970s to 1990s. The binary opposition saying that PKI is bad and anti-PKI is good works dominantly in those years.

As mentioned previously, after 1998 liberation began to operate considerably. One significant departure discourse offered by writers after 1998 or often called as the Generation 2000 is that various discourses about the 1965 tragedy are taken into account, focusing to what Asvi Warman Adam calls a *sejarah korban* (the victims' history as opposed to the authority's history much reflected in the binary opposition model).⁶ Testimonies of the victims and the ways the younger generations especially writers of Generation 2000⁷ wrote about this incident are interesting to note. As these people are more or less generations without mature memories of communism while their parents or grandparents often grew up with a strong memory and monolithic New Order's definition of the G30S/PKI discourse, this generational gap conditions considerable social changes and intergenerational difficulties as the young may reject many of their parents/grand parents' perspectives. This generation too experiences, different from their precedents, modern western amenities on a wide scale due to the liberalization of their economies. It is therefore crucial to examine their perspectives portrayed in their literary works.

THEORY

Literary works are commonly charged as a microcosm where contesting views on which the conflicts of the larger society exist in macrocosm domain. Thus writing often becomes "a space for struggle and contestation about reality itself."⁸ To have a political reading of the literary works by Generation 2000 writers about the discourses of G30S/PKI and the killings aftermath means to see how much things have changed and how past views are received by the younger ones. As a political reading in literature means to

accept that literature is political,⁹ this kind of reading will then inform us of the operating views within. Literary analysis takes the role of the structures of ideology that lie within the literature. Ideology does not appear as mere ideology, but, rather, as subtle network representing “the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence.”¹⁰ In this respect, literature is ideological in its nature, “[i]n imaginative works a moving ideology can be fixed and brought to consciousness and its contradictions can be made visible.”¹¹ Perhaps, it may be added that in literary works, the structures of ideology are not only thematic but disperse in every element of the work. The inclusion of analysis of ideology in literary analysis is therefore crucial:

Criticism using the notion of ideology focuses both on what is stressed as intentional and what appears subliminal, discordant and unintentional. With the notion, we can read against the grain, not aiming to uncover a truth but investigating how a transcendental concept of truth was formed at all. Literature inevitably colludes with ideology, which is in turn inscribed in literary forms, style, conventions, genres and institution of literary production. But it does not simply affirm, and it can expose and criticize as well as repeat.¹²

Although political readings offered in the above discussion are by and large applied in feminist literary criticism, it is not to say that such readings cannot be applied in other literary analysis. Any ideological and discursive political reading of literary works enacts a complex politics. It is not just an exercise in recapturing the past, but a future oriented project that seeks to establish more understandings, sentiments and receptions about the darkest episodes of a society's history.

METHOD

In this paper, I will attempt to explore the ways in which discourses of G30S/PKI of the 1965 and the subsequent bloodshed are represented in the literary works of contemporary Indonesian writers; writers who belong to Generation 2000 and consequently whose works were published post-1998. As part of an on going, still evolving project, only four works are examined as these texts are readily available and accessible. To different degree, these texts: Ayu Utami's *Larung* (2001), Rachmat H. Cahyono's *Luweng* (an anthology of short stories, 2005), *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965* (an anthology of short stories, 2006). Each narrative sets up various discourses not only thematically, but also in the reflexive construction of the narratives themselves. Of those three, *Undangan Menari* is based on testimonies. *Undangan Menari* is a collection of short stories based on women's testimonies who were victims of the 1965 tragedy, retold and rewritten in the form of fictional stories by millennial authors. These stories are real testimonies made fictional in order to give new and fresh interpretations of these younger authors, this genre transformation also aims to show the younger generation's sympathy to the suffer of the older generation.¹³ The presence of editors or retellers in *Undangan Menari* who testify that they have rewritten the stories faithfully as they came from the mouths of the objects indeed have a significant contribution. These editors or narrators, though confess to make slight changes of the testimonies, it is them who have opened the narrators' hearts and minds, recognizing the narratives' horrific details as representative of the evils of the G30S/PKI discourses. Consequently, how the testimonies are then retold and

presented to the readers embody strong presence of their perspectives on the same discourse. Although I have these three texts together in a single essay, my intention is not to gloss over their significant differences, but rather to explore the ways in which each story engages in new perspectives, new discourses that challenge the already-existing authoritative definition.

As these three works belong to literary genre, discursive ideological analysis is used in scrutinizing these texts. How and in what ways discourse of the 1965 Indonesian killing incident presented by the millennial writers is the focus of this paper. Discursive analysis is the method accounted in this paper therefore by its definition, discursive analysis will look for modes of organizing ideas rooted in these millennials' stories. Thematic significances are glossed within such analytical approach in order to show how these writers attempt to link themselves with that 1965 occurrence, particularly how they make meaning of it and what it means to them: opinions channeled through their literary writings.

ANALYSIS AND RESULT

History of the Victims

Adam proposes that Generation 2000 have welcomed the history of the victims, and this generation's narratives, be it fictional or testimonial, show the parallel. Their narratives exhibit a striking likeness, namely, the agony, the suffering and the humiliation these victims have to undergone: during and long after the tragedy. In the stories, women are largely victimized. Their victimization goes during and after the imprisonment. While in detention, being raped by the prison guards (i.e. the army) or beaten and humiliated are common; sexual violence is inevitable for female prisoners in these life stories. All *eks-tapols* women in the stories were raped.

No single story in these *eks-tapol* (*eks-tahanan politik*, ex-political prisoner) narratives contains no sexual violence, particularly rape. Rape is perhaps one of the most common forms of violence against women in prisons. A woman's body becomes the site of oppression and the signifier of male possession and power. The politics of the body, represented in the rape, dramatically exposes the intimate relationship between the female personal body and the theme of body politics in the women's stories. A woman's body functions simultaneously as a personal and political, psychological and ideological boundary of meaning, a contested border of self-possession and of transgression through which her subjectivity is subdued. The rape in the stories signals a gigantic colonization of women's subjectivity with the purpose to slowly exterminate them. After the detention, labeled as *eks-tapol*, these women were still humiliated and hated by the society, making it difficult for them to have any descent job to feed their family—many of them turned to be prostitutes.¹⁴ Moreover, these women's stories unfold an interwoven, complex female history going forward under the harsh conditions in prisons or private houses (after their release) where they were treated like slaves who were forbidden to react continuously to the subtle, varying, infinite pressures from a manipulative and abusive male control.¹⁵

Quite frankly the same victimization was also raised by authors during the New Order's period. Nevertheless, there is a strong difference: then and now. Then, the victims never spoke for themselves. Now, though through a mediator or a reteller, these women speak for themselves. With regard to the role of these millennials as retellers or writers is the discursive relationship between these retellers/writers Emma Rahmawati, G Dimas Agung, Novi

Astuti Wulandari, M Rifki Gunara, Citra Orwella, D Fardan, Nurul Hidayah, Ferry Edwin Sirait and Taufan Sukma of *Undangan Menari* remain the authors of the books—the major collectors, shapers, writers, the ones who speak in the third person, to an outside audience. They too are the ones having power to include and exclude in the writings' of these women stories. The power of words to shape reality is a direct extension of these young people's stories. They have translated memory into spoken words and spoken words into the written text that serve to insure its continuing existence. For me, these writers' works are a creative project that translate and write women's voices into writing, into a recognizable and political subject. As writing is sometimes an act of empowerment. An act of transcribing one's life from oral story into writing becomes an act of transforming one's life, theorizing and establishing one's identity. Thus, it is indeed necessary to collect, recollect and rewrite the stories of the *eks-tapol* women as what have been done by these editors and retellers. Smith believes that writing is a political act, an empowering creative act with a system ready to impose its definition.¹⁶ When their stories are put into writing, as testimonies or fictions, through the eyes of other people (i.e. retellers or writers), they have made their stories full of imaginative impacts of combined images, of seeing the familiar in new way. These retellers and writers are the cooks who need to know what ingredient they have before executing the cooking. Therefore, as Nadia puts it, these women's stories could serve as the centre of historical interpretation¹⁷ that, if I may add, with suitable handling could multiply the monolithic definition of a historical incident.

For these women, the threat of interpellation is ever-present because they have been defined, both historically

and socially. The word *eks-tapol* that is embedded in them becomes latently derogatory and embodies a ghostly appearance in them, just like how communism is considered to be a ghost that forever haunts Indonesian memory. In Althusserian words, these *eks-tapol* women are interpellated not only because of their relation to PKI but because of their external relations; their husbands or relatives accused to be PKIs or related to PKI, with or without evidence. For most of them, their crime is not of what they have done, but of what others have done and in some ways, indirectly, they are related to. These women are interpellated due to the political baggage imposed on them: of the obligation to report to the nearby police station on regular basis after their release from the detention, of having written *eks-tapol* in their ID cards and of many other obligations.¹⁸

Two parties are speaking in these narratives of victimization: the women who experienced the suffering and the retellers/writers who retell/write these women's experiences. The millennial writers are the connectors of these women's memory and the readers. As the intermediary, these young writers reconnect with these women and allow these women's own voices to speak. The silencing has been broken, done by the older generation and the younger one. The reconnection also signifies a different action: it is also an act of sympathy, of an attempt to feel the same pain and these women feel. Your pain is my pain too, these writers articulate. Victimization is not only experienced by these *eks-tapol* women but also their retellers/writers from much younger generation too. This truly cooperative narrative telling marks a discursive relationship between generations, generating other major parallels in the body of works that make up the tradition of the history of the victim narratives.

Authoring and editing are both taking place, but the functions are not clearly separable, and both roles seem to be ascribed to both generations, consistent with these retellers/editors' effort, to make room for these women's voices and views. The stories become a final mix of memory, imagination, feeling and fact that steps beyond the conventional prescriptions of the testimonies and the insistence of the retellers'/writers') intermediaries on the unvarnished truth, signaling the mix sources and vital complexity of the stories.

The rewritten of oral history of these victimized women, in the light of political reading, makes a point of explaining the writing process and relating this to the issue of the books' truthfulness. Because of their different relations to the stories, often these retellers/writers reveal their awareness of their inclination to invent and appropriate the victims' stories in the form of oral history narratives as an alternative way to reinterpret history. In part, the re-writings and re-telling of the *eks-tapol* stories may be read as a reaction against a historically specific act of marginalization that resulted in the extermination of a whole generation. Ultimately however, such texts represent the resurgence of the new and fresh interests and investment in the history of the victimized and marginalized people (men, women and children), reclaimed, partly, through the medium of life story writings that give voice to a group of people long-silenced.

History is not only history of the oppressor but also the oppressed, these contemporary writers are proposing. Nadia believes that the writing of these women's stories is an attempt to create a "ruang sejarah" (a room for history – or a room for *herstory* in this regard) to reconstruct the unjust past. This writing of the oral history into stories (i.e. literary stories), she insists, will make

the victims as the center of history, and in the end, this will revise history¹⁹ and will stop this "othering" that has demonized these women (the New Order's myth has defined these women as ruthless women who, while dancing, slivered the army generals' genital organs).²⁰

These women's stories become the primary medium to rediscover a more just past. In this way, these women' oral stories have a historical dimension to it that pertains to the collective memory of the Indonesian people. It is a social history, not only of individuals, but also of a community. History, memory and social reality can never be separated and taken for granted. They can become a way to combat the loss of the past and the social amnesia.

The Inter-Generational Bondage

In line with the connection between the retellers/writers (the millenials) and the authors (the people whose life stories or experiences as the victims of the 1965 killings were put into stories), within the stories too, the need to have an inter-generation connection seems very strong. The millennials, who are in the stories, are the grandchildren of the men and women who were detained because of being accused to be PKIs (whether it is true or just wrong accusation) desire to have a deeper understanding of the unclear past when the tragedy took place. These young people are eager to open up the door to the past to search for the truth. In the story "Luweng" (metaphorically named as "*luweng tikus*", the rat hole) two young people traveled in a remote village to find out what had happened to their grandfather who was said to be murdered in a big hole in that village. Kinanti, one of these young people questioned:

Cerita macam apa yang akan dia peroleh dari penduduk dusun itu? Siapa yang tahu waktu yang tepat untuk

memasuki buku tragedi masa silam yang akan coba dibuka kembali halaman demi halaman? Sekaranglah saatnya? Rasa letihnya karena berjalan cukup jauh seolah hilang oleh sebetuk perasaan bergemuruh dihatinya. Rasa ingin tahunya membuncah ingin segera tumpah dan menemukan jawaban.²¹

Kinanti's concern virtually reflects the sentiment of the people of her generation. She and Taufan are on their way to find out about Kinanti's grandfather. In the same story elsewhere, Cahyono shows the divergent opinions between the Kinanti's and Taufan's generation, the millennials, and the *warung* owner where they asked direction to the *luweng*. The *warung* owner who was portrayed as a middle age man, a representation of an older generation, warned them not to dig up the past for the shake of national stability.²² These two young people in their twenties refused to succumb to his warning and headed to the *luweng* to find out whether Kinanti's grandfather was actually murdered there. The story ends when Zubaidi, the guard of the *luweng*, spoke nothing of Kinanti's grandfather, though he was the executioner who murdered Kinanti's grandfather, not because of choice but because of force. He had to murder those people accused to be PKIs or else he would be murdered himself.

The presence of the old man's warning in Cahyono's "Luweng" represents his recognition of the need to still respect the old generation's perspectives of the incident. Toward the warning, Taufan did not immediately set up a confrontation signaling the war of the generations, rather he simply mentioned that his reason to visit the *luweng tikus* was to get a prophecy of a lottery number when meditated next to the hole.²³ Taufan's decision of non-frontal confrontation shares an understanding of the distinct often dichotomized ideological positioning

amongst the generations in contemporary Indonesia about the G30S/PKI discourses. Yet, the two young people's determination to find the answer holds in common a commitment to renew, not simply negate the ideological legacies of the older generation so that differences are recognized and explored.

The discrepancy between the millennials and older generation, in addition, show two things. One is that younger generation has demanded to have their right in truth searching of the tragedy as Zurbunchen wrote.²⁴ Second, the truth-searching attempt of the young generations actually set up bondage across generations: the grandparents and the grandchildren.

The young people who have a little exposure to the intense tragedy often misunderstand of the parents/grandparents' silence in matters related to the 1965 incident. They see this as an act of fear to the still latent danger of communism. In some stories, however, this misperception about such act of fear is finally understood when these young people know of the horror and agony these parents/grandparents have experienced. In Rahmawati's story, the grand daughter, Sri could finally accept the awkward personality of her grandmother because she was one of the many women survived against the torture she received while imprisoned.²⁵ "Mainan Masa Kecil," retold by Rifki Gunara, shows similarity. In the beginning of the story, Darmo refused see his mother after she was released from the prison. The school taught him that all PKIs were evil; kidnappers and murderers. After learning that this was just a propaganda not based on truth, he could finally accept his mother's coming home.²⁶ The New Order's discourse demonizing everything related to PKI results in failure for these young people who have been aware of the New

Order's discursive falsehood. Ayu Utami in *Larung* captures this awareness succinctly. Ketut Alit Kertapati alias Wayan Togog, a friend of Larung, the protagonist, said to himself:

Kemudian hari ia mendengar bahwa visum atas para jenderal yang dibunuh di Lubang Buaya tak pernah menyatakan bahwa mereka dianiaya sebagaimana dalam monument dan diorama. Kulit mereka tidak disayat, penis mereka utuh, mata mereka tidak ditusuk. Mereka *hanya* dibunuh, katanya pada diri sendiri. *Sebagaimana dalam sebuah perang*. Ia merasa telah diperdaya. Itu cukup bagi dia untuk menarik kesimpulan. Jika sebuah rezim memalsukan sejarah secara kecil, maka ia memalsukan sejarah secara besar pula.²⁷

Through the voice of Wayan Togog, Utami has put a strong criticism to the New Order authority. Utami's use of words such as: regime, *diperdaya* (being manipulated) and *memalsukan* (to falsify) signals that the millennials do not easily receive without criticism the New Order's discourse of the G30S/PKI. What these young people know in fact does not make them turning away from their past and the people who were labeled as PKIs. Quite on reverse, the millennials embrace the *eks-tapol*s, believing that they are victims rather than perpetrators. Utami is not the only one raising this fabrication of history. Saskia Wieringa's works, among others, have argued the same thing.²⁸ With this knowledge as a start, the millennial are no longer shrouded in a mystery they cannot penetrate. On one hand, they understand that their parents/grandparents, because of the fear, refuse to speak up, on the other hand, they are willing to and eager to dismantle this unknown.

This millennial's truth searching across generations prefigures a bridge to the dark past with the hope of

dismantling this mystery to gain a more understanding attitude of the older generation's silence. These young people's acceptance of such silencing is not simply meant that they will be silenced like their predecessors. In fact, through them, they will gain more truth of the dark history. They are establishing themselves as speaking subjects of the parents/grandparents' stories, not a silenced and silent object. Their effort is not a dramatic flight that will distance themselves from their predecessors but rather it will be a glue: a bondage crossing age differences and generational gaps.

The Reconciliation

After having an opening to the dark mystery, the question that remains will be: what's next? The reconciliation and rehabilitation might be one alternative sentiment as suggested by some scholars.²⁹ Cahyono speaks about this reconciliation in his story "Alia Terlahir Kembali" (Alia is reborn). Alia's father was an *eks-tapol* and Alia blamed him for all the sufferings and humiliations she and her family had to go through. And now thirty years after, his father came back to her life asking for forgiveness. To be able to move forward to a better future, Alia must make peace with her past, with her father's mistakes and with her shame and hurt, and this, she finally understands.³⁰ When the bridge between generations has already been built, and the wounds have been reopened and understood, the reconciliation seems perfect. Alia was not the only victim, her father and million others have shared the same feeling and trauma, her husband reminded her.³¹ Alia finds that she can reconcile herself to the pain of remembering when she reconnects herself to others. Her husband mentions and encounters that all of her hatred can be overcome through the magnanimity

of those who suffer as much as her. What is then more appealing and self-soothing than reconciliation and rehabilitation? When all societal elements reconcile and seek through forgiveness upon the past abuses and rehabilitate those who have suffered physically and mentally, the nation will find a cure and can use such cure to face new challenges. The stories of those victims of the 1965 tragedy can be described not only as simple stories, but stories that intertwine the memories and the experiences of an entire people in order to demonstrate the importance of the past on the formation of the future. These stories become a way of remembering a nation's pain and agony that can finally be worked to uncover and afterward redefine the mystery of the past.

CONCLUSION

The contemporary narratives of the Indonesian contemporary literary writers have shown a somewhat theme of universal textuality over the textures of individual experiences. Some of these writings, with the best intentions, deconstruct the notion of experiences to the extent that they disregard or delegitimize the way textual constructs may be experienced as very intimate, very personal, very real – which is why testimony and fiction are simulacra to each other. The writings of these contemporary writers modify and situate themselves at the intersection between testimony, experience, and fiction. What is at first personal stories are then turned into a highly political strain that functions as a collective memory and societal history. There are many forms and characterizations of these writers' works that are loaded with much thematic significance. These millennial writers have shown new meanings of the 1965 incidents through their stories. They offer new and fresh notions of

what this incident may mean for them. They have created opportunities that allow the people who are victimized by the incident to speak. Also through their narratives, they have exchanged what commonly known as *the history of the perpetrators* into *the history of the victims*. Creating stories based on real life experiences of those who suffered, humiliated, and victimized have indeed opened up a room that discloses the gap between generations, producing inter generational bondage in attempt to understand each other. These writers put their selves in the shoes of these *ekstapols*. They understand them and even desire for reconciliation that perhaps is essential to do if we ever want to erase the painful scar in our historical memory. What I have attempted to discuss in this paper is just a few of them. Ideological re-examination and re-reading from fresh eyes are necessary to grasp further messages sent by these writers in their works. Still, these millennial writers have remade themselves through their writings and rewritings of the old stories into free men and women speaking their voices. Therefore, not only that their writings have revised the old model of history, the falsification of the truth but also have redesigned the dark past, to make it usable today.

¹ Emma Rachmawati. 2006. "Perempuan Yang Gampang Terkejut," in Puthut E.A. (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat, pp. 8—9.

² "Leftist books" is the popular translation of in Bahasa Indonesia, *buku-buku kiri*: books about Marxism, Communism, Leninism, etc, in general, these are books, all books about leftist ideologies.

³ Kasiyanto Kasemin, 2004, *Mendamaikan Sejarah Analisis Wacana Pencabutan TAP MPRS/XXV/1966*, Yogyakarta: LkiS.

⁴ Sabtu, 15 April 2000, "Buku-buku Kiri Menyerbu Pasar", <http://www.kompas.com/kompas-cetak/0004/15/nasional/buku07.htm>. access date 27 April 2009.

- ⁵ See for *examples*: Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia, 1992, *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia Latar Belakang, Aksi dan Penumpasannya*, Jakarta; Moerdion, 1994, *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Ghalia Indonesia; Mayjen. (Purn). Samsudin, 2005, *Mengapa G30S/PKI Gagal? (Suatu Analisis)*, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia; Surya Lesmana (Ed.), 2006, *Saksi dan Pelaku Gestapu Pengakuan Para Saksi dan Pelaku Sejarah Gerakan 30 September 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Media Pressindo.
- ⁶ Asvi Warman Adam. 2009. "Mencipta Beragam Narasi Tragedi 1965" in *Membongkar Manipulasi Sejarah Kontroversi Pelaku dan Peristiwa*. Jakarta: Kompas.
- ⁷ Indonesian literary world is commonly divided into episodes, from Balai Pustaka Generation to the youngest Generation 2000. Writers whose works were published pre 1998 are usually placed within Generation 1966 or 1970s, while during and post 1998 are within Generation 2000 who are (either who are members of Generation X, were born between 1965—1980) and Generation Y (popularly labeled as the millennials who were born between 1980—1995). For more detailed explanation of millennial generation, see *Millennial Rising: The Next Great Generation*, Neil Howe and William Strauss, Vintage Books, New York, 2000.
- ⁸ Chandra Talpade Mohanty, 1991, "Introduction Cartographies of Struggle Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism," p. 34 in *Third World Women and The Politics of Feminism*, Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (eds), Bloomington,: Indiana University Press, pp. 1—47.
- ⁹ Judith Fetterley. 1978. "Introduction on the Politics of Literature," in *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press, p. xiii.
- ¹⁰ Louis Althusser, 2001, "From Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigations) From *On the Reproduction of the Conditions of Production*," *Norton Anthology Theory and Criticism*, Vincent B. Leitch, William E. Cain, Laurie Finke, and Barbara Johnson (eds), New York: W.W. Norton & Company, p. 1498 (pp. 1491—1509).
- ¹¹ Janet Todd, 1988, *Feminist Literary History: A Defence*, Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press, p. 86.
- ¹² *Ibid.*, p. 86.
- ¹³ Pengantar Penerbit, 2006, *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*, Puthut E.A (Ed.), Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat, p. vi.
- ¹⁴ The rape and prostitution seem going in parallel. In the narratives of *eks-tapol* in *Undangan Menari*, they all were raped and forced to work as prostitutes to support their life. Many of them were not even paid for their service, they were simply given food to survive.
- ¹⁵ Novi Astuti Wulandari, "Dengung di Telinga," pp. 27—40; Citra Orwellia, "Di Dalam Sebuah Jip," pp. 52—66, D Fardan, "Perangkap Gelap," pp. 67—78, Ferry Edwin Sirait, "Rahasia Cincin." pp. 89—103, Taufan Sukma, "Undangan Menari," pp 104—121, in *Undangan Menari*.
- ¹⁶ Paul Smith, 1988, *Discerning the Subject*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press, p. 111.
- ¹⁷ Nadia, p. 28.
- ¹⁸ Yanti, "Membangun Kekuasaan di Atas Perkoasaan," *Suara Perempuan*, p. 81—82.
- ¹⁹ Ita F. Nadia, 2007, "Prakata Penulis Pengalaman Perempuan Sebagai Pusat Penafsiran Sejarah," in Ita F. Nadia (Ed.), *Suara Perempuan Korban Tragedi '65*, Yogyakarta: Galang Press. p. 29.
- ²⁰ Budiawan, "Kata Pengantar Perempuan Dalam Tragedi 1965: Narasi Sejarah Yang "Hyper-Real", *Undangan Menari*," p. xi.
- ²¹ Rachmat H. Cahyono, 2005, "Luweng" in *Luweng A Collection of Short Stories*, Jakarta: PT. RajaGrafindo Persada, p. 83.
- ²² Cahyono, p. 81.
- ²³ *Ibid.*, p. 81—82.
- ²⁴ Mary S Zurbunchen, 2004, "History, memory and the "1965" incident in Indonesia," *Asian Survey*, July/August, Vol. 42, 4, pp. 564—581.
- ²⁵ Rachmawati, "Perempuan Yang Gampang Terkejut," p. 12.
- ²⁶ M. Rifki Gunara, "Mainan Masa Kecil, *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*, pp. 41—51.
- ²⁷ Ayu Utami, *Larung*, KPG, Jakarta, 2001, 208—209.
- ²⁸ Saskia E., Wieringa. Spring 2003, "The Birth of the New Order State in Indonesia: Sexual Politics and Nationalism," in *Journal of Women History*, Vol.15, issue 1, pp. 70—93 and "Kata Pengantar Sejarah Telah Membersihkanmu," *Suara Perempuan*, pp. 7—27.
- ²⁹ Jimly Asshiddiqie, 2005, "Rekonstruksi Sejarah Suatu Catatan Pengantar, *Mengapa G30S/PKI Gagal? (Suatu Analisis)*, pp. xxiii—xxv. See also Priyambudi Sulistiyanto, Feb 2007, "Politics of Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Soeharto Indonesia," *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire: Vol. 37, 1, pp. 27—95. Although Sulistiyanto

uses the similar alternative as Asshiddiqie focusing on the Tanjung Priok killings, he also mentions that reconciliation and rehabilitation could also be applied in dealing with the trauma of the 1965 tragedy.

³⁰ Cahyono, "Alia Terlahir Kembali," *Luweng*, pp. 17—27.

³¹ *Ibid.*, p. 23.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Adam, Asvi Warman. 2009. "Mencipta Beragam Narasi Tragedi 1965." *Membongkar Manipulasi Sejarah Kontroversi Pelaku dan Peristiwa*. Jakarta: Kompas.

Althusser, Louis. 2001. "From Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses (Notes towards an Investigations) From *On the Reproduction of the Conditions of Production*." In Vincent B. Leitch, William E. Cain, Laurie Finke, and Barbara Johnson (Eds). *Norton Anthology Theory and Criticism*, New York: W.W. Norton & Company.

Asshiddiqie, Jimly. 2005. "Rekonstruksi Sejarah Suatu Catatan Pengantar." In Mayjen. (Purn). Samsudin, *Mengapa G30S/PKI Gagal? (Suatu Analisis)*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia..

Budiawan, 2006. "Kata Pengantar Perempuan Dalam Tragedi 1965: Narasi Sejarah Yang "Hyper-Real", In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.

Buku-buku Kiri Menyerbu Pasar", <http://www.kompas.com/kompas-cetak/0004/15/nasional/buku07.htm>, Sabtu, 15 April 2000, Accessed 27 April 2009.

Cahyono, Rachmat H. 2005. "Alia Terlahir Kembali." *Luweng Koleksi Cerita Pendek*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Cahyono, Rachmat H. 2005. "Luweng." *Luweng Koleksi Cerita Pendek*. Jakarta: PT. Raja Grafindo Persada.

Fardan, D. 2006. "Perangkap Gelap." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.

Fetterley, Judith. 1978. "Introduction on the Politics of Literature." In *The Resisting Reader: A Feminist Approach to American Fiction*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Gunara, M. Rifki. 2006. "Mainan Masa Kecil." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.

Howe, William and William Strauss. 2000. *Millennial Rising: The Next Great Generation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Kasemin, Kasiyanto. 2004. *Mendamaikan Sejarah Analisis Wacana Pencabutan TAP MPRS/XXV/1966*, Yogyakarta: LkiS.

Lesmana, Surya (Ed.). 2006. *Saksi dan Pelaku Gestapu Pengakuan Para Saksi dan Pelaku Sejarah Gerakan 30 September 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Media Pressindo.

Moerdiono. 1994. *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Ghalia Indonesia, Jakarta.

Mohanty, Chandra Talpade. 1991. "Introduction Cartographies of Struggle Third World Women and the Politics of Feminism." In Chandra Talpade Mohanty, Ann Russo and Lourdes Torres (Eds.) *Third World Women and The Politics of Feminism*, Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Nadia, Ita F. 2007. "Prakata Penulis Pengalaman Perempuan Sebagai Pusat Penafsiran Sejarah," In Ita F. Nadia (Ed.). *Suara Perempuan Korban*

- Tragedi '65*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
- Orwellia, Citra. 2006. "Di Dalam Sebuah Jip." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat, Yogyakarta.
- "Pengantar Penerbit" 2006. In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat,
- Rachmawati, Emma. 2006 "Perempuan Yang Gampang Terkejut." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.
- Saksi dan Pelaku Gestapu Pengakuan Para Saksi dan Pelaku Sejarah Gerakan 30 September 1965*. 2005. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Media Pressindo.
- Samsudin, Mayjen (Purn). 2005. *Mengapa G30S/PKI Gagal? (Suatu Analisis)*, Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- Sekretariat Negara Republik Indonesia. 1992. *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia Latar Belakang, Aksi dan Penumpasannya*. Jakarta.
- Sirait, Ferry Edwin. "Rahasia Cincin." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.
- Smith, Paul. 1988. *Discerning the Subject*, Minneapolis: U of Minnesota Press.
- Sukma, Taufan. "Undangan Menari." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.
- Sulistiyanto, Priyambudi. Feb 2007. "Politics of Justice and Reconciliation in Post-Soeharto Indonesia." In *Journal of Contemporary Asia*. Abingdon, Oxfordshire. Vol. 37, 1.
- Todd, Janet. 1988. *Feminist Literary History: A Defence*. Cambridge and Oxford: Polity Press.
- Utami, Ayu. 2001. *Larung*. Jakarta: KPG.
- Wieringa, Saskia E. 2007. "Kata Pengantar Sejarah Telah Membersihkanmu." In Ita F. Nadia (Ed.). *Suara Perempuan Korban Tragedi '65*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
- Wieringa, Saskia E. Spring 2003. "The Birth of the New Order State in Indonesia: Sexual Politics and Nationalism." *Journal of Women History*. Vol.15, issue 1, pp. 70—93.
- Wulandari, Novi Astuti. 2006. "Dengung di Telinga." In Puthut E.A (Ed.). *Undangan Menari Cerita Seputar Para Perempuan dan Tragedi 1965*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Syarikat.
- Yanti. "Membangun Kekuasaan di Atas Perkosaan." In Ita F. Nadia (Ed.). *Suara Perempuan Korban Tragedi '65*. Yogyakarta: Galang Press.
- Zurbunchen, Mary S. July/August 2002. "History, Memory and the "1965" incident in Indonesia," *Asian Survey*, Vol. 42, 4.

