

Ideological Fantasy of an Indonesian Absurdist in Danarto's Short Story *Godlob*

Asep Anugrah

Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Abstract

Reasoning about ideological criticism through literary work can be seen from how the literary work represents the ideology of the author as a critical form of social dominated ideology. The matter is when the criticism exactly shows paradox with what the author delivered, so the type of ideological criticism has been described by the author with real literary work which uses language as a medium. Therefore, the author's subjectivity of literary work is just symbolization which forms as post-ideology and it is termed by Žižek as cynicism which only appears on the level of ideological fantasy. This matter is applied by the researcher to analyze Danarto's short story *Godlob*. This research focuses on Danarto's ideology which is offered as radical acts by the characters. This research method leads to textual and objective analysis to detect radical action in *Godlob* Short Story. The result of the textual analysis is presented with the subjectivity of the author, which produces harmony as well as the paradox of radical action. This is what described in the discourse of Danarto's short story *Godlob* about; (1) how the radical actions of the characters are depicted in the *Godlob* short story, and (2) how ideological fantasies are generated through the encounter of both literary subjects in the *Godlob* short story. The goal is to see that ideological criticism through literary works is not only through the phenomenon but also through the reality itself. In other words, by analyzing radical action textually and then confronted with the author's subjectivity, the paradox of ideological criticism can be embedded in the discourse of this study. Based on the analysis, literary works as a criticism shows how ideological fantasy comes as a result of the cynicism of the author. Danarto seemed to be immersed in an ideology that he criticized in his work.

Keywords: *Ideological Fantasy; Radical Act; Absurdism; Short Story; Godlob*



This is an open access article under the CC-BY-NC license.

INTRODUCTION

Ideology as the crucial foundation of magnificent works becomes one of the reasons why literary work presents in the academic world for being analyzed. Presence of some problems in this study, the writer begins the introduction by focusing on historical-psychoanalysis theory of Slavoj Žižek as its scalpel. Žižek understands ideology as something that no longer dwells on the symptomatic region, but has entered the realm of fantasy. Marx talks about "They do not know, but they still do it" (Žižek, 2009:24) has shifted toward "They already know, but still do it anyway." Such an ideology, in the literary context, can be contrasted by the authorship process, which shows that the author pursues the text as a critique of ideology with the author's own ideology. In other words, bringing ideology to ideology implies nothing that is beyond ideology or just an illusion. Ironically, if an author creates a literary work as a criticism of artificiality, but he still holds such falsehood then the problem will arrive at the level of consistency of the author's actual reality of his work. That is where the ideological criticism not only stems from the symptomatic domain or false consciousness but also rather the fantasy or presence of reality itself which is mashed in the process so that even if the subject knows its falseness, they will do it anyway.

The problem of ideological fantasy is recorded in Danarto's *Godlob* short story, which seems to present a resistance to a dominant ideology. Starting from this, it builds a question about the reason why an author criticizes a social reality, and the answer is certainly very varied, which is hanging on resistance, metaphorical defense, and others that hide the truth. Moreover, as a comprehensive background, the selection of ideological fantasy topics is based on the facts that described from this short story and also the social background of Danarto as the Indonesian absurdism. Both of the alleged or contradictory assumptions show the author's legitimacy and resistance pattern to the dominant ideology.

This narrative device briefly is framed alternately by the father's figure, who tries to fight the state ideology. From the narrative, father had four children whom three of them have died as a victim in the civil war, and he was looking for his fourth son in the battlefield, who was one of the soldiers. The father finally found his son in the middle of corpses, and luckily, his son was still alive. On their way to home, the father discussed many things with his son, but the child who was injured not so interested in the words of his father. The narrative culminated when the father decided to kill his son.

Danarto in *Godlob* takes the military theme as an integral part of the state ideology that he will criticize. The issue of militaristic ideology will lead to the discussion of the time when the short story is published; on the dark history of the Indonesian nation under the New Order government. We can assume that Danarto in this short story seemed to want to criticize the ideology of heroism that in the new order era incessantly implanted to the people of Indonesia as a legitimate effort against the existence of the army. It can be reconciled with the object of this research as an attempt to dismantle the author's efforts to establish legitimacy through his criticism. It cannot be denied that literary works, as cultural products, cannot be separated from the effect, even in some roles of literary works have become the medium of intervention over the authoritarian stance of the government.

The problem is when Danarto has already known that writing short stories is part of life with offering nothing and meaningless, but why Danarto still writes and works. In addition, what Danarto has undertaken exhibits the ideology of absurdism and also has shown that the ideology is only a small part of what Danarto's criticisms, as long as absurdism is indicated by symbolization (language). In the short story *Godlob*, it seems as if the figure wanted to reject the symbolic system and to resist the social order that was born by the ideology.

This research will describe the life of the imaginary figure in *Godlob* and Danarto as two different subjects in order to find the area without ideology in reality. Then the researcher will trace to where the representation of absurd thought can be lived by the figure in *Godlob*. If the figure is incapable of continuously representing absurdity, there also appears cynicism as a result of the symbolic order. In addition, this research will also search for an ideology that Danarto offers in the short story *Godlob*, where it has been authentic through Danarto's subjectivity to imaginary figures. Therefore, the issues raised in this research are (1) how absurdity is represented as a radical act in the short story *Godlob*, then (2) how ideological fantasies are generated through the encounter of both literary subjects in the *Godlob* short story.

LITERATURE REVIEW

A comprehensive study must have a solid foundation as a grip. In this section, the researcher emphasizes and describes some of the theories, especially, that is Žižekian historical psychoanalytic theory to describe how ideological fantasy operations work in the *Godlob* short story. In addition, the inevitable part of this paper is the exposure of some opinions related to the problems in this study.

Subjectivity in Žižek's Perspective

The Žižek subject idea is the result of his reading of Hegel's, Marx's, and Lacan's concept. Žižek takes Hegel's perspective on dialectics discourse (substantial) and social subject, while Marx is associated with ideological issues and the concept of Lacan is used Žižek as the formula of subject concepts. In Hegel's opinion, to create an absolute and ideal state, subjects must sacrifice their substance to the social to be accepted. A substance is something that will reduce the emptiness of subjects that are in an empty form through the process of self-relating negativity (dialectics) to create reconciliation in a hierarchical position of the absolute.

Žižek criticized that in the process of exchange, always never balanced (Žižek, 1993: 20). He exemplifies it in the case of noble-consciousness where the people are subject, and The State is substance; the subject alienates itself to the substantial exchange (such as energy, loyalty, matter, etc.) with The State. Instead, the subject gets a replacement of what he sacrifices, such as honor, nobility, and so forth. This stage marks the first process of subjectivity, that to change the State where reality cannot be reached, then it abstractly contradicts with the wealth of subject through the substance. On the other hand, the substance (The State) is not only subordinated to the subjectivity consciousness through its transformation into "rank and honor" because, in this subordination exchange, the matter obtained by a substance is the impersonal form of the state being replaced by the absolute power of the monarchy. It can be concluded that the exchange of the substance does not offer anything because the subject just traverses the empty space, alienating itself into an abstract negation that does not offer a positive and determinant content (Setiawan, 2017:50).

According to Žižek, the subject is not always a subject of necessity and eroded circumstances, but there is a moment when the subject is aware of his absence, so it encourages him to internalize his subjectivity impulse until he finds the most essential essence. Subject emptiness can actually blow the 'equivalent exchange' and present the real subject - not as an absolute freedom but as 'the spirit certain of itself' (Žižek, 1993: 22). In conclusion, the subject does not have to make an exchange because basically, the subject does not get anything from it. By that way, the subject can be separated from the social or symbolic order, as Žižek's reading of Hegel and Lacan then led to the ideological discourse of Marxism.

Karl Marx mentions the ideology as false or counterfeit consciousness because subject's awareness does not reach the true reality, where the society does not know that what they have done and it appears as same as an illusion to obscure the behind reality. But, almost all of the social elements in this era are cynical, they have known the fact of reality, and they precisely cover up the knowledge toward the reality by still commit it. So, ideological implementation tends to show that existing reality behind it goes to the surface, and ironically, subject acts as like as unknowing but actually they are aware of it (Setiawan, 2015: 40). Žižek notices how ideologies work in cynicism, in which as if unknown power becomes an object in order to subject keep abiding and obeying on illusion. It is the crucial part to see and to find "sublime object of ideology" that is surely nothing but still haunts the subject.

The reading and understanding of Žižek toward Lacan can be investigated by how he explains about subject's obedience upon veneration object. The idea about unity between consciousness, and this matter is outstanding in Lacan's expression "Unconsciousness is structured as similar as language (Lacan, 1997: 149). Unconsciousness is human's desire zone, and secondly, because desire is always others desire, which is internalized into our discourse, advice, satire, and expectation, briefly through language. That is why Lacan reveals that desire "must be formulated as others desire (*désir de l'Autre*)

because it originally is a desire which is from what is desired by The Other (*désir de son désir*) (Lacan, 1966: 163).

Lacan's psychoanalysis concept is known as the Trinity: The Imaginary, The Symbolic, and The Real, with Graph of Desire. Imaginary phase can be associated with the mirror phase, which indicates the subject has not identified between himself and The Other. The next is a symbolic phase that the process is becoming subject in this position when 'self' is negotiating with the signifying chain (language). The symbolic phase explains how language binds subject by point de caption (morality). The subject then is cursed become split subject, empty, and always lacks because the symbolic exists before and bent the subject. Finally, it correlates with Althusser's ideological interpellation process, which mentioned by Lacan as part of castration (Žižek, 2009: 112).

Radical Act

Radical actions in Žižek's view can be understood as a form of self-rejection to attach possesses objects of loves, so the subject gets free space for radical action. It can be interpreted as an act of not knowing himself because 'self' is an ideological construction. Radical action is also concerned with momentum, not a process involving plans, goals, intentions, and so on. This action is an explosion of the subject's disgust for symbolic things. Momentum is an unexpected ex-nihilo explosion, but it does not mean straying without direction, and therefore Žižek sees this action as a goalless direction (Žižek, 1993: 72).

An act can be categorized radical if the contingencies that stimulate the act goes beyond the symbolic, the social order, the 'ideological' order, etc., so it is like breaking away from any constructive morality and therefore this action is more correlative with ethics. Žižek then refers to Kantian to explain the contingencies of an action. For Žižek, Kant separates the action into two priorities, (1) Act inappropriately with duty; an action based on a corporation with another entity, (2) act from duty; an act done on the basis of the act itself, 'a purposeless act', essentially a by-product of itself (Freidrich, 1949: 147). The correlation between 'act from duty' and radical action lies in the basic kernel power of a subject which has no intent that implies that the subject is in a moment of emptiness without influence and no purpose. This emptiness is the state of ex nihilo subject, there is no ideology behind it.

Ideological Fantasy

In the previous section, it has been asserted that the Big Other is present through point de caption explaining how the process toward The Real will always be avoided and the subject always finds the answer to failure to meet the Big Other that they really desire. In other words, the current ideological problem is about a subject that knows reality but does not care, and it actually describes the way the ideological fantasy makes the subject can answer '*Che Vuoi?*' Today's society has actually realized the reality, but they have been mystified it as if 'the real ones' are the elusive one.

Ideological fantasy may save the subject from social trauma (Žižek, 2009: 29). Fantasy ultimately creates and constitutes desire in response to the Big Other, which is also a real closure of real or 'realistic'. Fantasies teach the subject how to desire because whatever they pursue will only end up in a void. From that point on, the author as a subject constituted his desire as an attempt to reject the ideology and also as an attempt to expose reality and to present the 'real' that was symbolized through his work. The more reality is opened, the deeper the real is buried to be extracted. Thus, making the subject more suspicious to dig it, which, of course, ends on the pleasure (Setiawan, 2015: 61). If viewed from a more positive perspective, the symbolism is actually showing how the passage of fantasy can

describe the meaning that looks just disrupt the order of meaning so that it explains that: the text is clean, while, at another level, it bombards the spectator with the superego injunction, 'enjoy! Give way to your dirty imagination' (Žižek, 2000: 10).

METHODOLOGY

This section explains how to determine and obtain data for research and how to classify so that data can be analyzed and presented. For information, the material object used in this study is the *Godlob* short story published in 1974. This short story is Danarto's first short story published in one book along with eight other short stories. The source of data in this study is a short story text that describes the radical action. The data source on the subjectivity of the author is taken through short stories, newspapers, interviews, and various other sources. The data sources of ideological fantasy are drawn from short stories and related social fact texts.

After collected and classified, then the data are analyzed textually. The theory in this research is Historical-psychoanalysis by Slavoj Žižek with qualitative research as its method. Qualitative method is a method that utilizes interpretation by presenting descriptive research results, prioritizing the depth of interpretation of the narrative and interaction between the concepts studied (Ratna, 2006: 46). This study uses a pragmatic approach in which this approach gives a major concern to the interpretation of the reader (Ratna, 2006: 71).

The analytical had been done by doing a textual analysis of the characters in the short story. It is possible to associate with other related text to support the offered argument. Furthermore, the analysis of the subject of the author through the characters reflecting himself primarily through the character of the Father will be seen through the Ideological Fantasy concept which explains how the author created himself through literary works.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Absurdity as A Radical Act

Understanding the essence of the emptiness moment will ultimately lead us to a skeptical question about whether the moment of emptiness must exist as a navigation of the radical action presence. The main problem is that being radical is not really a matter of radical action itself, but rather a constellation of a moment that is in an empty dimension. The moment of emptiness is not presented but presents itself as a shocking explosion, a disgusted to the falsehood that obscures reality, or an action out of consciousness that is devoid of a plan and without purpose. It also begins to explain how a particular subject is capable of doing something that cannot be understood as fairness by the general public. Even radical acts always have negative connotations because they go out the norm and morality that apply exactly like what the figure of Father in *Godlob* short story that killed his beloved son.

In the *Godlob* narrative, we can realize the absurdity offered by Danarto is free from the bonds and norms of society. The matter needs to be emphasized in this short story that is the father figure who killed his son. The question that arises will certainly dwell on the reasons or motives behind the murder, which is surprising, ironic, paradoxical and absurd. The killings at once broke the normative relationship between father and son. The relationship was eventually destroyed just as the father pierced his son's heart.

What the figure of Father did is a disgusting form of shackles to his country's ideology. Being in post-war, where the corpses of warriors laid and eaten by ravens, has finally opened the veil of the father's consciousness of the futility as long as he has been living. Ideology works by obscuring reality,

hiding it, and providing only illusions. To get out of that situation, the father thinks and his consciousness breaks off, opening up all the illusive veils. This is clear in the following quotation:

"Anakku..." katanya sambil memapah anak muda itu.

"Kau lihat. Kau lihat. Baru sekarang aku takjub atas pemandangan ini. Kau lihat"
(Godlob, 1974:2)

["My son ..." he said as he held up the young man.

"You see. You see. Now I'm amazed at this scene. You see"
(Godlob, 1974: 2)]

The father's amazement can be interpreted as a sign of the emergence of an awareness of the reality that he witnessed. The fact of how miserable the post-war situation had uprooted his father from the symbolic space, while he had been living for. The reality of war was not as beautiful as what the leaders of the country echoed, about dedication and a sacrifice. As explained by Setiawan (2016: 37) that ideology falsifies reality and thereby distorts the distance between the illusion and the real. War discourse as a form of loyalty and devotion of the people to the state was not as beautiful as the reality in the field full of corpses that witnessed directly by the father. The narrative continues when the father seems to invite his son to speak. But the truth is that the father is talking to himself. He does not demand the child's reply. He just kept saying no matter what his son was listening or not. This can be seen in the following quotation:

"Kau masih ingat sajak 'Sang Politikus'?" tanya orang tua itu. Tapi karena kata-kata itu seolah-olah ditunjukkan kepada dirinya sendiri, maka anak muda itu tidak menjawab. Orang tua itu lalu berdiri, tangannya merentang dan memandang sekeliling:

Oh, bunga penyebar bangkai

Di sana, di sana pahlawanku tumbuh mewangi.

Ia berhenti deklamasi, sejenak ia termangu, sedang tangannya masih tetap terentang, lalu meledaklah tawanya dan bubarlah gerombolan gagak di kanan kirinya. (Godlob, 1974: 2)

["Do you remember the poem 'The Politician'? " Asked the old man. But because the words were as if shown to himself, the young man did not answer. The old man then stood up, his arms outstretched and looked around:

Oh, the flower spreading carcass

There, there my hero grew up.

He stopped declamation, momentarily stunned, whereas his hands still stretched, then burst his laughter and broke up the crows on his right. (Godlob, 1974: 2)]

Through the poem, the father wanted to reveal something that he could not really express. In this case, the poem, which the father reads, is a willingness that demands a pure will. That Poem is not the vibration or desire of the subject that targets any object. Moreover, the voice does not say anything in its meaning. The sound accurately shows that the language has taken over the position of pure meaning, and behind the sound remains pure negativity that hides the true meaning. The voice becomes pure voice freedom from the language aspect, which can never be expressed. In the end, the father's laughter exploded, marking a revival of the totality of ideological falsehood. If explored thoroughly, it can be clarified that there is a sense of idealism in the subject of emptiness, and the question that can be alluded

to is a subject that is in emptiness but not always passive. The void is then shown by metaphor story that he told to his son:

"Kalau ada seorang yang menderita luka datang kepada seorang politikus, maka dipukullah luka itu, hingga orang yang punya luka itu akan berteriak kesakitan dari lari tunggang langgang. Sedangkan kalau ia datang pada seorang penyair, luka itu akan di elus-elusnya hingga ia merasa seolah-olah lukanya telah tiada. Sehingga tidak seorangpun dari kedua macam orang itu berusaha mengobati dan menyembuhkan luka itu. Bagaimana pendapatmu, Anakku?" (Godlob, 1974:4)

[*"If a man with a wound comes to a politician, then the wound is struck so that the person with the wound will scream in agony from running. Whereas when he comes to a poet, the wound will be in cared or loved until he feels as though his wound has gone. Till no one of the two kinds of people is trying to cure and heal the wound. What is your opinion, my son? "*'] (Godlob, 1974: 4)

The father's story is an ideological picture of how he views the world. In the father's perspective, the reality of life does not offer anything. Either politicians or poets, no one really offers to heal for "wounds". The father's story can also be seen as a form of real manifestation which is described earlier and not fluid, by a dimension beyond language. However, what should be underlined here is when the reality is present in the presence of subject, automatically subject will be banged on two choices, and those are chosen to remain in the symbolic order by nullifying the real which he witnessed, or vice versa, break away from the existing order and taking radical action. It can be seen that at that stage, when the father tells his story, his father is still trapped in a symbolic space.

The representation of father and son relationships in Godlob really deconstructs the ideal relationship that has been understood by common people. Through the character of the father, the identity of a hero has been deconstructed all-out by Danarto. The relationship between the Father and the Son entangled in a symbolic order, especially his son was a soldier, so it appears as pride for parents at the symbolic level. The relation between father and son forms a substantially symbolic order and indicates an absolute space of an order that is more appropriate (Setiawan 2016: 103).

Subjectivity is formed appropriately in situations where the most important is abrogated, in the sense of killing the 'self' which is a symbolic interpellation. The subject (indirectly) cuts his freedom from the precious object whose possession precisely makes the opponent repeatedly, so the subject gets a room for free action (Žižek 2000: 150-151). It is depicted in a father figure who has freed himself from all that he loves (his beloved son), while the state is the most radical representation of the social world lived by the father. The father, who had been patient, lets the lives of his four children die in the war, but finally realized what he did was a lie. So, dumping his identity with all the good symbols surround him, his father finally acted radically and released all the symbolic surrounded him.

Orang tua itu bangkit dan seandainya ada cahaya yang menerangi wajahnya, akan tampak betapa tegang urat-uratnya dan menyerengai merah. Lalu ia berkata keras-keras,

"Anakku, maafkan ayahmu. Kau harus kubunuh!" (Godlob, 1974:6)

[The old man stood up and if there was a light that illuminated his face, it would appear how tense his veins and altered red. Then he said aloud,"

My son, forgive your father. I should kill you!"] (Godlob, 1974: 6)

The point which is emphasized here is that the radical action of the subject presents as an act of momentum rather than process because the process involves a plan, intent, intention, tendency, deliberate, and so forth. Momentum can be viewed as an explosion that occurs shortly after the subject is in its moment of emptiness. The action of the Father in *Godlob* is categorized as a radical act because the contingencies that stimulate the action are beyond the symbolic, social order, ideological order, and so on. Thus, it is like breaking away from any constructive morality, and this action is more correlative with ethics. Danarto's realization as the author really manifested through Son's character, and that is called fate by the child, which is constructive in its symbolic order. As the author, Danarto feels rightly partisanship of Father who sees the world full of falsehood that deceived his consciousness.

Danarto's Subjectivity in *Godlob*

Since the 19th century, literature has met its most realistic form of embodying the problems of industrial society. The realist view is present with strong reason when reviewing the purpose of authors who want to criticize dominance in the social, political, cultural, and so forth. Therefore, the authors record the reality of society to be wrapped in their thinking. In other words, authors and literary works have power in their own universe. But the interesting point is when literature tries to expose an unconscious reality, to open taboos of the illusion of consciousness, and to spread the corruption of power against the people, it actually becomes a cynicism. The true attitude is still subjected to an ideological order, which is believed by the subject. Meanwhile, the ideology itself is the failure of the subject to find a shortcut to get to 'The Real' that is behind the system. It certainly attacks the inevitability of the author's works.

The noticeable side of cynicism is that in the aftermath of the father's radical action by killing his son and the assumption that man never goes far from his symbolic space becomes the basic reason of father after killing his son, in which he was caught in a symbolic space again. However, the symbolic space that his father lived has changed, although not space he previously occupied. The desires of the father who had lost four children in the past because the war had shaped the father's consciousness that the war is believed to be a form of defense against the state, the embodiment of the love of the homeland, and it turns nonsense that does not offer anything in its substantial exchange, that even the father feels he has lost everything. So, in order not to lose too much, the father kills his youngest son, who is a soldier so he can be known as the father of a hero.

"Belum cukup! Aku harus memutuskan sesuatu yang hebat, biar aku tidak dirugikan habis-habisan! Lihatlah, Anakku! Lihatlah! Gelap gulita dan pekat. Saking gelapnya hampir hampir aku tak bisa melihat tubuhku sendiri. Tidak ada setitik cahaya pun." (Godlob, 2016: 7)

["That's not enough. I have to do something great so that I will not be harmed all of a sudden! Look, my son! Look! Dark and dense, I cannot see my body. There is not a speck of light."] (Godlob, 2016: 7)

After killing his son, the father then gets caught in another symbolic space, becoming the father of a hero. Then it can be seen that the father's radical act is the bridge between the old symbolic orders to the new symbolic order. In this new symbolic order, cynicism is present from the existing social, moral, or symbolic circumstances, and it also explains how the Lacanian theory of the symbolic order or what Hegel conceptualized about the absolute. The problem of cynicism will be attributed to the author because the author represents the authority of his work as a resistance. In this case, Danarto is the author

of *Godlob*. It is necessary to re-emphasize the basic assumptions that support this study. Danarto as the author has subjectivated himself to the Father figure in *Godlob*, so the point of view of the short story Danarto stands outside the story and acts as God in his work or in a literary symbolic order known to the third person all-knowing.

Though Danarto placed himself outside of his work, in this case, Danarto's partisanship toward my father's character can be felt entirely when reading *Godlob*. Danarto tends to highlight the father figure in each of his narratives and it is evidenced by several things. Father gets a much larger portion of the narrative than any other characters and the thing expressed is more emphasizing his father's view of the futility he is going through that is about the irreplaceable loss. Although 'as if' was inviting her son to talk, the father in impressed was talking to himself.

The ideology of the absurdism that Danarto tried to offer was completely melted in my father's character. Furthermore, the thing that can convince Danarto's alignment with Father's figure is when the child's character is turned off as a symbolic representation by the father. It can be said that Danarto has deconstructed the meaning of the hero in the most absurd way. Meanwhile, at the end of the story the father was killed by his wife, it appears Danarto wants to assert that the subject is not really dead in the process of subjectivity in the world, but present in his rejection of the symbolic social order that ensnares the subject.

Ideological Fantasy in *Godlob*

Godlob is one of the short stories of Danarto published in 1987 by the Pustaka Grafiti Utama (first published in 1974) together with other nine short stories. This book has been translated into several languages, including English, which is translated by Harry with the title *abracadabra*. In Burton Raffel's essay in "The Asian Wall Street Journal" 28 February 1980 states that the most interesting is the experimentalist Danarto, in which Danarto's works are also valued beyond the literary works that exist in Europe and USA.

It has received many acclaims from both critics and writers at the time. Danarto's writing style, which is considered new terms of theme and structure is able to attract people's attention. In one of his essays, Korrie Layun Rampan once said, Danarto is a reformer in the treasury of Indonesian literature, who named as a conscious reformer, not because of the raw and ridiculous experimentation. Danarto's asset as a reformer is not a slogan because his short stories show a unique newness that is different from the short stories ever. The novelty can be seen from the aspect of presentation and the load aspect in the short stories. From the presentation aspect, it appears the features of poetry, music and painting elements that are so capable of providing poetic, musical, and artistic-decorative effects, to the point of the tragic killing, becomes so beautiful, such how the blood splatter becomes so sweet. On the other side, from the load aspect, it appears to be a moral tendency of pantheism, a doctrine that believes all things to be the embodiment of God (Sriwidodo, 1983: 147-150). Predicate as a reformer seems also agreed by Umar Kayam stating that in Indonesia there is no short story writer which very consciously creates an alternative world in his stories, except Danarto.

Dami N. Toda argues in his essays published in *Hamba-hamba Kebudayaan* (1980) calls Danarto, Iwan Simatupang, Putu Wijaya, Arifin C. Noer as the author with a new awareness of where reality really is not real; senselessness and sensuous consciousness. Man, there seems alienated, because the reality he faces is purely-absurd. Could it be a statement of Toda, also so in the short story of *Godlob*?

Directly or indirectly, these opinions then pave the way for Danarto as the author is known for his absurdity in his work. Although Danarto himself did not directly say his works as a form of absurd

consciousness, the readers of Danarto already pinned the title as a symbolization of Danarto's work. By banal reading, Danarto in the short story *Godlob* tries to reject the symbolic system. The appearance of an imaginary figure, as if Danarto with absurdity gives a subjective picture of the ideology that he offers, which is starting from the pattern of resistance to the symbolic, social order to the real meaning of life (according to Danarto himself). Based on these opinions, none has seen Danarto's narrative either in *Godlob* or Danarto's other short story in terms of subjectivity, so that research is expected to fill the void and become a renewal in the view of Danarto's works.

In this context, Danarto as the author is assumed to be still bound in the symbolic realm that ensnares the subject as a marker of identity. Borrowing Bourdieu's understanding, legitimacy is a form of the attainment of an author in his arena, so we should assume that by working through the absurd genre, Danarto has a goal to be legitimate in the Indonesian literary arena. Furthermore, in the 1970s, absurdity was famous to the public, when literary works of the time still use the telling techniques that refer to the conflicting realities of everyday life - if not to say the genre of colonial inheritance.

As a representation or reflection of existing social reality, cumulative literary works have a reference or directional reflection that is always dependent on the author, as the author's life experience is the most crucial in shaping the author's worldview (in Gramsci's discourse) and then represented in his work. Thus, it can be concluded that the literary work is the media subjectivity of the author, while the tool of legitimacy into a landscape that is actually pursued by the author based on recognition of other writers, national and international awards, which potentially can divert the original purpose of the author. This characteristic, when viewed psychologically, primarily through the Lacanian perspective, would be confirmed by an assumption that the subject's desire is the Other or social desires so that legitimacy would only be non-existence without recognition from others. Hence, a literary work can be a paradox between textuality and the myth of authorship, between ideas (author's critique of social reality) and the psychological side of the author to achieve personal legitimacy or even both.

If the Father in *Godlob* is an unlucky figure who has lost his children in battle, then Father is the subject who sees his world (in *Godlob*) as a place that does not offer happiness, is futile to live it. Father's figure is seen as Danarto (a subjectivity), Father figure becomes a utopian figure, who made Danarto as the trigger of his criticism of the state ideology. However, looking at Danarto's background, what underlies Danarto criticizing the militaristic problem while he is not the Army, this is not a complex issue to contend with, but if it is seen from the most sentimental point, it will target the ideological utopian image of an author. Especially if Danarto has a contradictory historical side to the imaginary figure (Father) -united by the grounds of criticism of the heroic discourse-that feels victimized by political identity in *Godlob*. The question is whether Danarto will still write if the reader does not exist? Appreciation is the key, and it explains the dilemma of the subject's psychological side-what he always hides (symptomatic) and what he shows but dodge it (fantasy). Thus, the question of the father figure as the subject of imaginary in *Godlob* and Danarto as the subject of the author are two different things - not just about two contradictory things - but parallels as well. In other words, the subject is placed by the author simultaneously, and both will be reconciled.

CONCLUSION

As an author, Danarto certainly had the understanding, though, and ideology that he wished to embody in his imaginary figures. He is trying to conceive an ideology of absurdism. There is nothing substantial in this life, and everything is a construction that leads to the stitching of the subject in a symbolic tagging system. It becomes paradox and visible from the process of creating a literary work. An

author will always be involved in a symbolic order, always be involved in ideological matters, such as absurdism. In other words, he presents as a radical action, which is a form of criticism of something symbolic has brought the real into a symbolic. In other word, criticizing the ideology in literary work is not a radical act, but it is merely a cynicism that is clad in concrete, unauthentic action as described by Žižek.

Danarto was too aware of the existence of a symbolic external space, which a space that was out of language so that it could never be spoken; something real without ideology. However, the consciousness is accomplished in work, and the result is the translation of the real into the language, into the symbolic. Danarto with his absurdism is only a point of a symbol in the middle of the ocean of symbols that sweep the subject away from the real.

Acknowledgment

This research was supported by The Indonesia Endowment Fund for Education or Lembaga Pengelola Dana Pendidikan (LPDP) that has funded the researcher finishing this paper.

REFERENCES

- Akmal, Ramayda. (2012). *Melawan Takdir:Subjektivitas Pramoedya Ananta Toer dengan Novel Perburuan: Pendekatan Psikoanalisis-Historis Slavoj Žižek*. 2018. Yogyakarta: Octopus.
- Danarto. (1987). *Godlob*. Jakarta: Pustaka Graffiti
- Lacan, Jaques. (1979). *The Four Fundamental Concepts of Psycho-Analysis*. New York: Norton.
- Hegel, Georg Wilhelm Friedrich. (2001). *The Philosophy of History* (Trans. J. Sibree). Batoche Books: Kitchener
- Ratna, Nyoman Kutha. (2006). *Teori, Metode, dan Teknik Penelitian Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.
- Robet, Robertus. (2010). *Manusia Politik: Subjek Radikal dan Politik Emansipasi di Era Kapitalisme Global menurut Slavoj Žižek*. Tangerang: Marjin Kiri.
- Setiawan, Rahmat. (2015). *Fantasi Ideologis dalam novel The White Tiger karya Aravind Adiga: Perjumpaan Subjek-subjek Sastra melalui prespektif Slavoj Žižek*. Tesis tidak diterbitkan. Yogyakarta: Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2001). *Enjoy Your Symptom! Jaques Lacan in Hollywood and Out*. London: Verso
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2002). *For They Know Not What They Do: Enjoyment as Political Factor*. London: Verso
- Žižek, Slavoj. (1994). *Mapping Ideology*. London: Verso.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2006). *The Parallax View*. Massachusetts: MIT Press.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2008). *The Plague of Fantasies*. London: Verso.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (2008). *The Sublime Object of Ideology*.Cetakan London & New York: Verso.
- Žižek, Slavoj. (1999). *The Ticklish Subject: The Absent Centre of Political Ontology*. London: Verso.