

DOI: doi.org/10.21009/ISLLAE.05102

Received: 07 September 2022
Revised: 29 November 2022
Accepted: 18 December 2022
Published: 31 January 2023

THE PARADOX OF MORALITY: A DECONSTRUCTIVE READING OF SENO GUMIRA AJIDARMA'S *PRING RE-KE-TEG GUNUNG GAMPING AMBROL*

Nurul Adha Kurniati ^{1,a)}.
Universitas Negeri Jakarta, Indonesia¹⁾
nuruladha@unj.ac.id^{a)}

Abstract

Deconstruction reading looked for ways to obscure, betray, reverse, and overthrow the existence of the text. Seno Gumira Ajidarma's *Pring Re-ke-teg Gamping Ambrol* told a tale about the paradox of morality and how the binary opposition between goodness and badness is unrevealed through the series of contradictory markers. This article used a descriptive analytical method to identify and analyze the meanings of morality presented in the short story. The result showed complex meanings of morality and how the binary opposition contradicts itself in presenting different values within the text. The good and the bad are showcased in various markers that contradict one another and produced a complete new meaning.

Keyword: deconstruction, seno gumira ajidarma, pring re-ke-teg gamping ambrol, literary analysis

Abstrak

Pembacaan dekonstruksi mencari cara untuk mengaburkan, mengkhianati, membalikkan, dan menggulingkan keberadaan teks. *Pring Re-ke-teg Gamping Ambrol* karya Seno Gumira Ajidarma bercerita tentang paradoks moralitas dan bagaimana oposisi biner antara kebaikan dan keburukan tidak terungkap melalui rangkaian penanda yang kontradiktif. Artikel ini menggunakan metode deskriptif analitis untuk mengidentifikasi dan menganalisis makna moralitas yang disajikan dalam cerpen. Hasil penelitian menunjukkan makna moralitas yang kompleks dan bagaimana oposisi biner mengkontradiksi dirinya sendiri dalam menyajikan nilai-nilai yang berbeda di dalam teks. Baik dan buruk ditampilkan dalam berbagai penanda yang saling bertentangan dan menghasilkan makna yang benar-benar baru.

Kata kunci: dekonstruksi, seno gumira ajidarma, pring re-ke-teg gamping ambrol, analisis sastra

INTRODUCTION

A literary work can never be separated from the socio-cultural context that forms the background for the creation of the work. Literary works are often seen as a means of conveying truth and the ultimate medium for upholding justice and defending and illustrating the reality that occurred in a certain period or culture. Literary works are born not only from the ideas or ideas of the author but are also often a reflection of the conditions of the existing social environment. Through literature, a medium,

emancipatory criticism can be born. As Seno Gumira said in Allen (2002 p., 177) that "When journalism is silenced, literature must speak"¹, then the writing of literary works is of course an essential vessel in depicting the reflexivity of a culture.

Seno Gumira is an Indonesian writer who is well-known for his unique writing style in the short stories, poems, and novels he writes. It is difficult to categorize Seno's writing genre because his writing combines themes of realism, fantasy, as well as postmodernism in his depiction of controversial issues that occur in Indonesia (Allen, 2002 pp. 177-178). One of Seno Gumira's works is his short story entitled '*Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*'. This short story was published in Kompas in 2011 and was chosen because of the uniqueness of the theme in the depiction of the irony of a community group in a certain place. The deconstruction method will be applied to this short story to dismantle ideology and reverse the analogy of morality in society.

By looking at Seno's writing style as mentioned above, it can be said that Seno's works fall within the notion of post-structuralism which is known for its theory of omission of grand narratives and the rejection of the domination of structure which results in the reality of binary opposition in a text. The short story '*Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*' tells about the aggression of thousands of people against a village that is believed to have hidden a rapist who had raped a girl in one village. This paper will look at the fusion of binary opposition and the debate between morality and existing structures with the deconstruction method proposed by Jacques Derrida.

RESEARCH METHOD

This research employed a descriptive analytical study in analyzing the data presented in this research. Kutha Ratna (2010, p.53) said a descriptive analytical study is a method used to describe and analyze the facts in order to gain an understanding about the data in a research and it is gained by describing the facts that exist and then followed by the analysis of the theory used. Qualitative research also refers to the process of comprehending the study's subject. To help people comprehend the world in which we live and why things are the way they are, qualitative research develops explanations of social phenomena.

Post-structuralism and Deconstruction

Bertens (2011) argued that post-structuralism is a continuation of structuralism. One method of reading texts in poststructuralism is to use the deconstruction method. Derrida first introduced the term deconstruction in 1966 in his seminar at Johns Hopkins University, United States (Lubis, 2014). Derrida sees that there is an irrelevance of meaning held by structuralists who see that absolute truth is described by geometric truths of science and philosophy (Lubis, 2014). Structuralist thinkers like Saussure see that meaning can be traced through the structures and patterns contained in the text. This structure is the creator of a meaning and vertical power works on this meaning where the meaning only comes from whatever text is created by the author. Barthes argued against the absolute absoluteness of the author in the meaning of the text in the concept of 'The Death of the Author'. This is in line with the upside-down reading that exalts the concept of deconstruction about the dissolution of binary oppositions in the text. Tyson (2006) argues that structuralism sees that every meaning on the surface is a result of the translation of structures and patterns that work within the text. Saussure further put forward the theory of signifiers and signifieds which are fundamental in reading texts. Signifiers and signifieds form correlated meanings and make a text look correct with a binary opposition. Derrida rejects the metaphysics of

¹ Quoted from Pam Allen "Seno Gumira Ajidarma: Conscience of the People" dalam *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 4(2), 177-182

presence by trying to dismantle philosophical and literary texts to be studied by way of upside down reading. Criticism that is quite radical is used as a basis in reading texts to reverse the assumptions, understanding, and beliefs of readers in analyzing a text. Deconstructive reading intends to explore the meaning of 'contradictory, irony and giving roles to marginalized characters' (Ronidin, 2015). Deconstruction is always looking for ways to obscure, betray, reverse, and overthrow the existence of the text itself (Eagleton, 2003). Deconstruction reading cannot be done only once but requires in-depth reading to dismantle the text.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Seno Gumira Ajidarma's '*Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*' tells a story about a plan to attack a village. There's a village consisting of criminals such as thieves, murderers, robbers, and prostitutes, while the surrounding villages consisting of good people. The story begins with a description of the anger of the villagers who feel that their pride has been insulted because a girl from their village has been raped by a criminal from the criminal's village. The people in this village were diggers from the limestone hills and one morning the diggers found Mirah with her torn cloth and kebaya lying on the side of the road outside the village. Pak Lurah or the leader of the village felt that this was an unacceptable act and not only disgraced the girl but also insulted the entire village and himself. Pak Carik, Mirah's father and Mirah herself were still shocked by this incident and were speechless.

Jagabaya, a security guard, was sent by Pak Lurah to convey a message to the criminal village and also to force the criminal village to hand over the rapist to Pak Lurah to be tried. However, the criminal village head's response did not please him, so he decided to attack the criminal village directly. Meanwhile, in the village of criminals, murderers, robbers, thieves, and prostitutes were ready to face attacks from other villagers with all kinds of makeshift preparations. They didn't feel the need to hand over the rapists because there really weren't any rapists among them.

Contradictions in the Dominant Viewpoints

The short story '*Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*' raises the issue of the opposition between good and evil. The concept of good and bad is inherent in the individual as the fundamental basis of behavior. This is also reflected in the concept of society and culture itself. There are two oppositions in this short story, a village consisting of good people and a village consisting of bad people such as murderers, robbers, thieves, and prostitutes. Criminals are often identified as a group of people that shows opposition to the values of truth and criminals are also categorized as troublemakers and they should be punished because the way they live is not in accordance with the ideals or moral values that exist in a particular community or country. The short story '*Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*' presents an endless paradox about what is good and evil. The signifiers and signifieds in text contradict one sentence with another.

This short story is told from a third-person point of view who knows everything.

Ribuan orang baik-baik telah berkumpul di atas bukit, siap menyerbu perkampungan para pencuri, perampok, pembunuh, dan pelacur, yang terletak di tepi sebuah sungai yang mengalir dan berkelok dengan tenang...

...Syahdan, di perkampungan takbernama di tepi sungai yang mengalir dengan tenang dan berkelok yang selama ini dikenal sebagai kampung tempat bermukimnya para pencuri, perampok, pembunuh, dan pelacur, tampak semua orang dengan wajah sungguh-sungguh telah bersiap menyambut penyerbunya. Mereka tidak perlu berteriak-teriak dan hanya dengan saling memandang telah sangat siaga. Jumlah mereka tidak sampai seratus orang, tetapi wajah mereka tidak menunjukkan ketakutan sama sekali...

[Thousands of good people had gathered on the hill, ready to storm the village of thieves, robbers, murderers, and prostitutes, which lay by a river that flowed and meandered quietly...] (Ajidarma, 2011)

[...Syahdan, in an unnamed village on the banks of a river that flows smoothly and winding which has been known as a village where thieves, robbers, murderers and prostitutes live, it seems that everyone with serious faces is preparing to welcome the attacker. They didn't need to shout and just by looking at each other were very alert. There weren't even a hundred of them, but their faces didn't show any fear...] (Ajidarma, 2011)

The third person point of view has a fundamental role in reading this short story. It can be said that the narrator knows everything that happened between the two villages. The emphasis on the description of the emotions of one village is the focus of this analysis. As a narrator who knows everything, it can be seen that the narrator is slightly more in favor of the village of good people, by illustrating details about their work, their attitudes and emotions when they find out that Mirah has been raped, as well as their views on the limestone hill and the village of criminals.

...Senyuman itu juga dipermasalahkan penduduk desa, karena tidak dianggap sebagai senyum keramahan melainkan senyum rayuan.

“Senyum rayuan beracun!”

Kata orang-orang yang merasa wajib menjaga kesucian di setiap desa orang baik-baik...

[...The villagers are also concerned about that smile, because it is not considered a smile of kindness but a smile of seduction.

“Poisonous seduction smile!”

Said the people who feel obligated to maintain the sanctity in every village are good people....] (Ajidarma, 2011)

The narrator wants to explore the way the good people view and treat the criminals in the criminal village. The narrator shows how the village of criminals is described through the emotions (anger) and attitudes (wanting to invade) of the good people. From searching the descriptions of the criminals, it can be seen that the characteristics of good people can be peeled off and dismantled. The characteristics of good people can be peeled off and dismantled by tracing how the criminals are described and presented. This will later become one of the paradoxes and contradictions in the short story. The story begins with a sentence about the raid carried out by good people on the criminal village.

Ribuan orang baik-baik telah berkumpul di atas bukit, siap menyerbu perkampungan para pencuri, perampok, pembunuh, dan pelacur...

[Thousands of good people have gathered on the hill, ready to attack the village of thieves, robbers, murderers and prostitutes...] (Ajidarma, 2011)

Binary opposition was first offered by this sentence where there are some good guys and some bad guys. Budianta, as quoted in Leiliyanti (2016, p. 4) argues that contradiction can be seen from the dismantling of the meaning of the signifier and the signified. The deconstruction method works on the basis of the principle of overturning the meaning of a text (Lubis, 2014, p. 34) which aims to interpret new signifiers and signifieds that will continue to work and interact with each other without any objective boundaries. In the deconstructive reading technique, the validity and truth of the binary opposition are questioned in the markers which contradict one another. Words like 'good people', 'ready to attack', and 'village of thieves, robbers, murderers, and prostitutes...' question each other's true meaning and end up in something very contradictory. It is fitting that those who carry out activities outside of the values of goodness 'ready to attack' are 'bad people' but in this text, 'good people' are those who attack other people.

Ribuan, barangkali lebih dari sepuluh ribu, sebut saja beribu-ribu orang baik-baik telah siap dengan segenap senjata tajam, parang-golok-kelewang, tombak, linggis, pentungan besi, rantai, alu, kayu, maupun badik yang lekuk liku dan geriginya jelas dibuat agar ketika ditusukkan mampu menembus perut dengan mulus, dan ketika ditarik keluar membawa serta seluruh isi perut itu tanpa dapat dibatalkan.

[Thousands, perhaps more than ten thousand, let's say thousands of good people are ready with all the sharp weapons, machetes-machetes-kelewang, spears, crowbars, iron clubs, chains, pestles, wood, as well as badik with its twists and turns. obviously made so that when it is thrust it is able to penetrate smoothly into the stomach, and when it is pulled out it irrevocably takes along all the contents of the stomach.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

Another contradiction depicted in this text is that good people carry various kinds of weapons and the description of the purpose of choosing this weapon as to 'smoothly penetrate the stomach' is in direct contradiction to what good people should carry. This is evidence that the signifier and the signified have gone beyond the boundaries of the association of values and concepts believed by the reader at first. When good people are identified with anything and everything that is good and bad people as the opposition of good people, every individual who does everything that is bad and contrary to the belief in good values, is turned upside down in the text, contradictions, and blurring of the meanings of signifiers and signifieds can occur. Another contradiction can be proved from the following quote,

*“Katakan Mirah, katakan! Supaya aku tidak membunuh sembarang manusia!”
...dan pikiran semua orang memang Mirah itu pasti diculik, diperkosa di tengah jalan itu, lantas dibuang...*

Tepatnya lebih baik begitu, supaya terdapat pihak yang bisa diganyang.

*[“Say Mirah, say! So that I don't kill just any human!”
...and everyone thought that Mirah must have been kidnapped, raped in the middle of the street, then dumped...
Precisely it is better that way, so that there are parties that can be crushed.] (Ajidarma, 2011)*

At first, Pak Lurah was furious when he learned that one of the girls in his village had been raped. He insisted on asking Mirah about who had raped her by saying that 'so I don't kill just anyone' but then in other sentences the narrator represented the voices of Pak Lurah and other villagers who felt that there should be 'a party that can be crushed' whoever it is, the important thing is that he comes from the criminal village.

Memang benar, apabila ada pencurian, perampokan, bahkan pembunuhan, selalu saja kecurigaan terarah ke perkampungan itu. Memang benar pula betapa tiada pernah ada bukti, karena kambing yang lenyap dari kandang tak meninggalkan jejak, begal menyambar dan menghilang pada remang senja bagaikan bayangan, dan mayat korban selalu merupakan buangan dari desa takdikenal yang tidak pernah menunjuk langsung siapa pembunuhnya.

[It is true, when there is theft, robbery, or even murder, suspicion is always directed toward the village. It is also true that there is never any evidence because goats that disappear from the pen leave no trace, muggers snatch and disappear in the twilight like shadows, and the bodies of victims are always exiles from unknown villages who have never directly identified the killers.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

When the belief in the existence of stable values in society often makes the reader associate an event without exploring whether there are other possibilities, as in the quote above, when there is a crime that occurs, it will always be associated with the village of criminals, that any badness and misfortune must originate and be carried out by people in the criminal village. Contradiction and irony occur when the accusation is strengthened by subsequent statements regarding the justification for the absence of evidence which does not undermine their belief in the criminality of the criminal village.

Orang-orang luar, orang-orang yang berbeda, orang-orang yang tidak mungkin sepenuhnya dimengerti, menimbulkan kebencian karena selalu tampak menyanyi dan tertawa-tawa.

[Outsiders, people who are different, people who are impossible to fully understand, generate hatred because they are always seen singing and laughing.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

It is a paradox in reality when the good villagers see bad people, as outsiders they often seem to be singing and laughing and that is what causes hatred for them. When singing and laughing are sometimes identified as markers of happiness, these become the reason to hate.

"Pemerksa? Tidak ada pemerksa di kampung ini! Mungkin kami memang sebangsa candala, tetapi kami sama sekali tidak perlu memperksa siapapun di luar kampung ini untuk mendapatkan cinta, karena di kampung ini cinta macam apapun setelah dibagi rata masih selalu bersisa.

["Rapist? There are no rapists in this village! Maybe we are a nation of candalas, but we don't need to rape anyone outside this village to get love, because in this village, love of any kind after it's divided equally, there's always some left.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

When Jagabaya came to bring news to Pak Lurah about what the criminal villagers had said, Pak Lurah responded very angrily. This is in line with the reason why good people hate criminal villagers. On the other hand, these criminals, even though they are called criminals, they never feel a lack of love. They feel that love is always enough in their village. Contrary to what has been associated with criminals in general, that they are people who are far from happiness itself. The complex concepts of pleasure and happiness contradict each other and are reversed in this text.

Identity Demolition

As mentioned earlier regarding how there is a tendency in taking sides of good people's point of view, compared to residents in the criminal village, this point of view also plays a role in forming a new understanding of who the criminal character in this text really is. When the narrator talks about emotions and how bad people are portrayed by good people, the narrator also "skins" and uncovers the identities of these good people.

Dengan datangnya truk-truk pengangkut bongkahan batu kapur, sedikit demi sedikit datang pula orang-orang dari luar desa, yang jika tidak ikut menggali atau membuka warung makan bagi para pekerja, di antaranya ada pula yang menjadi perantara pembelian bongkahan batu-batu, membuka kios rokok dan sampo untuk membersihkan rambut dari serbuk-serbuk kapur, dan sejumlah pekerjaan yang tidak begitu dipahami penduduk desa. Di antara pekerjaan itu antara lain menyewakan pengeras suara dan televisi untuk menyanyi-nyanyi. Adapun mereka yang menyewa pengeras suara dan televisi itu dilayani perempuan pekerja yang menyediakan minuman, ikut menyanyi, dan hampir selalu tersenyum dengan amat sangat manis sekali.

[With the arrival of the trucks carrying the boulders, little by little people from outside the village also came, who, if they were not involved in digging or opening food stalls for the workers, some of them became intermediaries for buying the boulders, opened kiosks, cigarettes and shampoo to rid the hair of lime powder, and a number of jobs the villagers didn't quite understand. Among the jobs include renting out loudspeakers and televisions for singing. Those who rent loudspeakers and televisions are served by working women who serve drinks, sing along, and almost always smile very, very sweetly.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

The narrator said that after the construction of asphalt roads around the limestone mountains, the arrival of outsiders increased and some of them opened stalls or shops around the limestone quarry. Here it can be seen that the outsiders who lived and opened the stalls were the people they called the criminal villagers. Good people question why there was a job renting out loudspeakers for singing and why there

were so many smiling women serving them. It was not clear enough for the reader why these people were called thieves, robbers, or murderers because in fact those described in the text were people who helped to stabilize the economy and they worked in the shops they set up there. If things like 'thieves' and 'robbers' were associated with 'people outside the limestone mountains who came and worked' as the fact that the limestone mountains had been 'stolen' and used as livelihood projects, another contradiction would emerge when the other villagers also got jobs from the 'limestone hill theft'. When the residents got jobs from the asphalt road construction and the limestone mountain projects, these "good" residents at the same time also hate the people who lived in the criminal village.

"Senyum rayuan beracun!"

Kata orang-orang yang merasa wajib menjaga kesucian di setiap desa orang baik-baik. Sebetulnya hanya para penggali kapur dari luar desa sajalah yang dalam kesepian dan keterasingan alam pegunungan kapur datang ke sana untuk melewatkan waktu. Namun pemandangan orang menyanyi dan tertawa-tawa rupanya memberikan perasaan tidak menyenangkan bagi orang-orang yang merasa dirinya suci.

["Poisonous seduction smile!"

Said the people who feel obliged to maintain the sanctity in every village are good people. Actually, only lime diggers from outside the village who, in the loneliness and isolation of the natural limestone mountains, come there to pass the time. But the sight of people singing and laughing seems to give an unpleasant feeling to those who think they are holy.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

The text quote above offers another binary opposition that supports the evidence that the identity demolition and characteristics of good people can be demonstrated through the depiction of the identity of criminals. These good people really didn't like the smiles that were given by the women in the village of criminals. They thought that 'only' lime diggers 'from outside the village' came there to entertain themselves and only the good people who got bothered from the singing and laughing of the people in the bad guy's village. The two binary oppositions of the outsider and the insider were also holy and impure. These binary oppositions fought each other to form new clues such as why only outsiders came there, whether good people were happy enough with their lives that they didn't feel the need to come to the village of criminals to entertain themselves. But then in the next text it was identified that those who were considered as good people were also people who felt they were holy, but they also felt uncomfortable with the sound of laughter from other people's happiness.

"Lagipula, siapa bilang penduduk desa suatu hari tidak akan pernah tergoda?"

Tentu saja senyum yang manis adalah senyum yang manis. Apalagi jika itu senyuman yang manis sekali. Manusia yang bermata dan berhati tidak akan terlalu keberatan, jika suatu ketika secara suka rela merasa lebih baik tergoda sahaja.

["After all, who said that the villagers would one day never be tempted?"

Of course a sweet smile is a sweet smile. Especially if it's a very sweet smile. A man with eyes and a heart would not mind too much, if one day he voluntarily felt it would be better to be tempted.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

This narrative described an ambiguity about the identity of people who thought they were holy really was. It was described as the possibility that these good people eventually fell entangled in the 'smiles' of the women in the village of criminals. The identity of good people would be rejected because of this exfoliation of their thoughts and feelings. At the end of the story it was revealed that the perpetrator of the rape was the son of Pak Lurah himself and that the sentence "dan berusaha—ya, masih

berusaha—memaksakan suatu kehendak yang tidak dipahaminya” [and trying—yes, still trying—to impose a will that he does not understand] (Ajidarma, 2011) proves that the rape never actually happened. But as mentioned above, no matter what happened, and without any evidence, everything must still be blamed on the village of criminals.

Who is the Real Villain? A Paradox

A question that arose in reading this text which was taken from a third person's perspective was finding out who the real criminal was, and the essence and definition of crime in this text. The lack of description and emphasis on certain people's points of view increased the ambiguity and paradox in this short story. Citing what madness was from the view of a famous philosopher, Michel Foucault, about madmen and criminals, that it is a futile thing to punish madmen and criminals for their actions because basically, they cannot see what is right or what is wrong. Normal people who punish these crazies will look cruel because they have punished people who do not have good and right thoughts in a fully conscious state².

Nyaris tidak ada seorangpun yang memegang senjata karena apapun yang dipegangnya bisa menjadi senjata yang sangat berguna. Ada yang memegang batang kayu, ada yang memegang gagang sapu, dan ada pula yang cukup memegang sebatang lidi. Para pelacur yang senyumnya manis, begitu manis, bagaikan tiada lagi yang lebih manis, ada yang tampak mengebutkan selendang dan ada pula yang menggenggam ratusan jarum.

[Almost no one is holding a gun because whatever it is holding can be a very useful weapon. Some hold a log, some hold a broom handle, and some simply hold a stick. The prostitutes whose smiles are so sweet, so sweet, it's as if nothing could be cuter, some seem to be speeding on shawls and some are holding hundreds of needles.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

The bad guys were fully prepared for the good guys to destroy them with everything they could find without even using a gun. They were ready for whatever would happen because in the previous narrative they were 'people who are not afraid of death' and they were ready to 'take responsibility' for whatever they had done. But at the same time there was a mystery about these criminals which could be seen in the following narrative excerpts,

Tidakkah segenap orang baik-baik itu menyadari, betapa tindakan mereka itu seperti bunuh diri sahaja? Tidakkah mereka sadari, betapa para candala, jika memang candala, dan tiada lain selain candala, yang selalu terpinggirkan dari zaman ke zaman, tentulah jauh lebih siap menghadapi pertempuran terbuka daripada mereka, meskipun dikeroyok orang baik-baik begitu banyaknya? Tidakkah telah sering mereka bicarakan juga, meskipun tak pernah dan tiada akan pernah dengan bukti nyata, betapa para candala sebagai manusia memang digjaya dengan segala mantra sirep, tenung, teluh, kebal tubuh, dan setelah merapal ilmu halimunan bila perlu dapat menghilangkan bersama senja?

Tidakkah ribuan orang baik-baik yang menyerbu bagaikan air bah ke bawah menuju perkampungan candela di pegunungan kapur itu taksadar, setaksadartaksadarnya, betapa batang kayu, gagang sapu, dan sebatang lidi itu sekali digerakkan, sembari melenting-lenting di atas kepala, akan memakan korban jiwa, setidaknya ratusan dari mereka dalam seketika? Begitulah, ribuan orang baik-baik yang sedang berteriak-teriak sambil berlari-lari itu, betapapun tidaklah pernah membayangkan, bagaimana selendang yang halus dan wangi itu akan dapat memecahkan kepala, dan betapa ratusan jarum dalam genggam akan melesat seketika bagaikan bermata untuk mencabut ratusan nyawa.

[Don't all these good people realize how their actions are like suicide? Don't they realize how the candalas, if they really are the candalas, and none other than the candalas, who have always been sidelined from time to time, are certainly far more prepared to face open combat than they are,

² This quotation is from a lecture 'Teori Kritis tentang 'Foucault, *Madness and Civilization*' by Dr. Saraswati Putri on 2 December 2016 at FIB UI Depok.

even though they are surrounded by so many good people? Haven't they also often talked about, even though there has never been and there will never be any concrete evidence, how the candalas as human beings really excel with all the spells of syrup, sorcery, teluh, invulnerability, and after chanting witchcraft if necessary they can disappear with the dusk?

Weren't the thousands of good people who rushed like a flood down towards the village of candela in the limestone mountains, not realizing how a log, a broom handle and a stick once moved, while bouncing overhead, will take lives? , at least hundreds of them in an instant? That's it, thousands of good people who were screaming while running, however never imagined, how that soft and fragrant shawl would be able to break heads, and how hundreds of needles in a hand would shoot instantly like eyes to take hundreds of lives.] (Ajidarma, 2011)

There was a self-awareness within these criminals that they were criminals who could do anything beyond the reasoning of these good people. These criminals with the slightest weapon could actually retaliate and counterattack the attacks of these good people. When in the analysis above there were contradictions proving that good people may not be 'as good' as stated in the social and cultural context, the text in the last stanzas explains a paradox about this bad guy and good people. That maybe these criminals were real criminals because of their confidence that they could 'cripple' good people with just a scarf or a needle.

CONCLUSION

Reading a text like this requires more than sympathy for one party because the understanding and truth of morality were questioned and turned upside down through a game of signifiers and signifieds that contradicted one another. It had been proven in this text that good and evil had complex meanings and could not be seen using binary oppositions alone. Truth was constructed by social and cultural context, as well as the categorization of 'criminals'. But this short story also criticized more or less hidden crimes, as well as 'criminals' who hide under the guise of goodness and could escape trial and punishment because of the concept of 'scapegoat' itself.

REFERENCES

- Ajidarma, S. G. (2011). *Pring Re-ke-teg Gunung Gamping Ambrol*. Taken from <https://cerpenkompas.wordpress.com/2011/06/05/pring-re-ke-teg-gunung-gamping-ambrol/> accessed 19 December 2020.
- Allen, P. M. (2002). Seno Gumira Ajidarma: Conscience of the People. *New Zealand Journal of Asian Studies*, 4(2), 177-182.
- Barthes, R. (2001). The death of the author. *Contributions in Philosophy*, 83, 3-8.
- Bertens, H. (2001). *Literary theory: The basics*. New York: Routledge.
- Eagleton, T. (2003). *Literary theory an introduction*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Foucault, M. (1982). The subject and power. *Critical inquiry*, 8(4), 777-795.
- Leiliyanti, E. (2016). Pembongkaran Eksistensi Tokoh Utama dalam Peeling Karya Peter Carey (Deconstructing the Existence of Main Characters in Peter Carey's Peeling). *ATAVISME*, 19(1), 1-14.
- Lubis, A. Y. (2014). *Postmodernisme: Teori dan metode*. Jakarta: PT RajaGrafindo Persada.
- Putri, LG Saraswati. (2016). Foucault, Kegilaan dan Peradaban. Teori Kritis. Lecture given at FIB UI Depok on 2 December 2016.
- Ratna, Nyoman Kutha. 2010. *Metodologi Penelitian: Kajian Budaya dan Ilmu Sosial Humaniora Pada Umumnya*. Pustaka Pelajar : Yogyakarta
- Ronidin, R. (2015). Pembacaan Dekonstruksi Cerpen " Zina" Karya Putu Wijaya. *Jurnal Puitika*, 11(1).

Tyson, L. (2006). *Critical theory today: a user-friendly guide*. 2nd edition. New York: Routledge.

