

BOOK REVIEW



***Nasionalisme Puitis:
Sastra, Politik, dan Kajian Budaya***

Author: Faruk

Publisher: Pustaka Pelajar

Year of Publication: © 2018

ISBN 978-6022298908

Wiwien Widyawati Rahayu

Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

Email: wiwien.fib@ugm.ac.id

Reading a book called *Nasionalisme Puitis: Sastra, Politik, dan Kajian Budaya* (Poetic Nationalism: Literature, Politics, and Cultural Studies) written by Professor Faruk, feels like entering a large mall, which is marked by neatly lined windows and large glass showcasing goods that highlight each shop individual characteristics. Consumers only need to choose which items they needed; almost everything is available. Furthermore, to see the suitability of the goods needed and their availability we are invited to explore further into “the stores”.

Let us go deeper.

In the conceptual framework as the Introduction Section, the author explained about the idealistic paradigm, which considered the basis of culture is the idea. In this case, culture is understood as an expression of ideas, both individual and collective. In the paradigm of materialistic objects, both natural and artificial are considered as determinants of the formation of other elements. In this case, culture is understood as a tool of human beings individually or collectively to fulfill their material needs through a process called the production process. Both paradigms have similarities in their assumptions about culture as a whole, that culture is a closed system, which is permanent and stable. Cultural change is recognized as a temporary matter and is sometimes understood as something that is negative and which will return to normal, balanced, and permanent. Furthermore, culture is an entity that exists within certain territorial boundaries, which are local or national. This is the basis for the difference between indigenous culture and foreign culture. Intersection between them is possible, but the boundary between the two is maintained.

Furthermore, a new paradigm has emerged, and it is based on assumptions. Culture is understood as a continuous process without goals at one point of balance either temporarily or perpetually. Original and foreign cultural territories are no longer clearly demarcated. The start of recognition of a culture that is both diaspora and hybrid rather than a culture that fully considered authentic. This paradigm does not consider the existence of a permanent relationship between objects (natural or artificial), behavior/activities that are fully physical, as well as ideas/spirit/meaning. Because the relationship between the three depends on the historical context of the community in question, there is what is called discursive practice.

The second part discusses Literature and Politics in Indonesia. Literary politics is basically all activities and the results of activities to conquer the mind, an area of authority that Gramsci calls hegemony, while body politics (legal-formal) can be called domination. In this section, the author wishes to convey that modernity used as an identity. In this practice Indonesian literature does not only carry out a liberation movement, but also acceptance to be conquered. Because modernism in literature is an understanding that leads to literary de-politicization, distancing the literature from political activity that is at least explicit and directed to the state politics, from the beginning Indonesian literature was involved in a fairly strong tug of war between politicization and de-politicization.

Furthermore, through “*Sex dan Politik Dalam Sastra Indonesia*” (Sex and Politics in Indonesian Literature) the author explains about the three patterns of attitudes of Indonesian literature toward sex and

the way through which sex is described by Goenawan Muhammad. Firstly, there are works that try to question sex but do not dare to describe it. Secondly, there are works that question sex and describe it in an “out loud” manner. And thirdly, there are works that deal with sex as a part of normal human life and describe it naturally. It does not stop here, what is questioned here is precisely on how far literature threatens the existence of the potential of individual functions of sex, sexual activity, and its social functions. The threat can be in the form of concealment or even violent criticism on sex and sexual activity.

In the section entitled “*Strategi Pembangunan Karakter Bangsa Indonesia di Era Reformasi*” (Strategies for Developing Indonesian Character in the Reformation Era), the author explains that the role of literary work is basically a communication system that conveys its message not primarily in abstract terms but in the building of images, a concrete imaginary world. Literature primarily invites readers not to understand and to do abstractions, but to engage in stories, entering the world of imaginary life in stories, being directly involved in stories, experiencing them. In other words, a literary work is basically a simulation of life, and not an abstraction from life. As a simulation, literary works invite readers to enter and experience a multidimensional world of life, which does not always lead to certain abstracts and single notions. Literature is a simulation of reader involvement in a total, multidimensional, dialogical, and inspirational life, which provides more challenges and motivation than mere cognitive understanding. This is based on formalist theory which implies that the effect of literary communication is basically reading the reader, especially to the world of direct life experiences, not the world of abstract understanding. This is stated by Umberto Eco, Riffaterre, Roman Ingarden, and Robert Stanton.

The third part is entitled “*Pramoedya Ananta Toer dan Martabat Manusia*” (Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Human Dignity). This part begins with “*Kisah Penjara Etis dan Filosofis: Analisis Lintas Budaya Atas Tembok Tidak Tinggi Karya A. Samad Ismail dan Mereka Yang Dilumpuhkan Karya Pramoedya Ananta Toer*”. The author wish to explain that to gain an understanding about cultural plurality, the direction of comparative methods should be reversed, that is, to find a difference between one local culture and another. Because only with an awareness of the differences between inter-cultural tolerance, the possibility of healthy intercultural relations and the

possibility of mutually enriching relationships and also the synergistic intercultural relationship can be established. The theories proposed to compare the characteristics of the two novels are, for example: the formalist theory that directs the comparative effort to the formal characteristics of the novels in question, structuralist theory which deals with the structural relations of the work, semiotic theory that deals with the building or formation of meaning, and the socio-cultural theory that deals with the comparison of the socio-cultural characteristics of the societies in which the two works lived, developed, and developed.

Subsequently, still in the same section, in the part entitled “*Pramoedya Ananta Toer dan Martabat Manusia*” the author wrote the title with certain reasons. He chose Pram, not only because he is the greatest author in Indonesia, but also because the issue of human dignity seems to be the most fundamental thing in his works. In addition, it can be said that he was a writer who was very sensitive to the issue of human dignity and was very consistent in writing about the issue. Ignorance, poverty, oppression, colonialism, and defeat are the negative sides of the idea of human dignity. On the contrary, struggle, resistance, and war are the positive sides of it. To answer all of the problems, the author uses Lucien Goldmann’s theory of Genetic Structuralism with the post-colonialism of Edward Said and Homi K. Bhaba.

The talk about Pram and his work does not stop here. To provide an example of plural identity and humanism, questioning Pram’s self-authenticity, which is manifested in his tetralogy, and whether it is universal humanism ideology orientation or socialist humanism or neither of both, the writer conducted some initial research to answer that question. The post-structural approach, especially the theory of identity proposed by Madan Sarup, is particularly critical on the idea of Renaissance, like Descartes regarding the autonomy and coherence of the subject. By using Michel Foucault’s view, the author sees the subject as only a construction formed by discursive formations that exist in a certain time and space. In other words, identity is basically contextual and relational. This means that identity does not occur by itself, but is formed from and in a relational process that continues so that identity continues to be a moving process and even has to be negotiated.

In part four the author includes his professorial inaugural address, entitled “*Sastra Dalam Masyarakat (ter)Multimedia(kan): Implikasi Ontologis, Epistemologis, dan Edukasionalnya*” (Literature

in The Multimedia(oriented) Society: Ontological, Epistemological, and Educational Implications). Modern science and literature are actually the products or at least made possible by the “mode of information” mediated by writing, whereas the writing itself, according to its substantive characteristics, is the technological force that forms independent subjects before the universe of objects, a reflective and contemplative subject by taking distance from life to be able to understand, explain, and represent the truth objectively. Postmodern sensibility with multiple mediated modes of information no longer forms independent subjects that are confronted with objects, but form subjects involved in intersubjective relationships with other subjects; therefore, what is prioritized in the acquisition of knowledge is not the result of truth, but the process of the interaction and experience in the process itself. Therefore, with such a sensibility, differences, differentiation, and even the conflict between science and myth and/or superstition are no longer discourses. In and with the similar sensibility, literary works that show new tendencies appeared that, among other things, is referred to as postmodern literature. The condition of the existence of such literary works gives rise to new approaches, new theories in literature that are the approaches and theories that can be said to be contextual and processual. Furthermore, the two points mentioned above provide challenges for literary scholars to shape and develop research and teaching methods that suit them. Considering that in literature there is rarely an exploration, discussion, and formulation of methodological issues, the challenge can be answered perhaps only with extra hard work.

Furthermore, still in the same section, in a work entitled “*Dari Realisme Kultural ke Realisme - Magis*” (From Cultural Realism towards Magical Realism), the author suggests that realism is the most important literary innovation of modern literature, especially the prose. Here the author argues that in the novel of everyday life is displayed and understood as something natural, not as low life or caricature as exemplified in fairy tales, legends, or romances. It can be said to be in the middle between the ideal world and the caricature world. The discussion was started by Fielding, Jakobson, and Ian Watt. From them, in its development, realism was later identified in another way as a bourgeois realism. This is because the psychology of the characters, the particularity of space, and time are the representation of the bourgeois order centered on the individual. With this awareness,

especially what was emerging in the Marxist circles, the history of modern literature was then filled with new understandings, such as critical realism and/or socialist realism, some of which was put forward by Georg Lukacs.

The discussion continues to revolve around Umar Kayam’s realism, which is neither bourgeois realism (tends to approach life psychologically) nor socialist realism (sociologically-politically), but for now it can be called cultural realism (which approaches life anthropologically).

In the work entitled “*Kadar Realisme - Magis Cerpen “Godlob” dan “Adam Ma’rifat” Karya Danarto*” (Magical - Realism Levels in the Short Story of “Godlob” and “Adam Ma’rifat” by Danarto) the author explains that modern literary works emerged as a force that fought for modern culture with a rational-empirical perspective and placed a traditional culture based on irrational, magical, as opposed to others. Both of them are in irreconcilable opposition, like day and night. Literary works of magical realism can be traced back to the 1920s; their popularity and dominant position in the history of world literature were only met in the 1960s through the work of Gabriel Garcia Marques. There are many definitions of this genre; therefore, it is not infrequently even associated and overlapped with fantastic works in which Kafka’s works are included. When sharpened, this genre of literature places itself right in the middle position between realism and traditional works, such as fairy tales, legends, or myths. If the dominant one is only the first one, it will fall under the realism category. If the second one is more dominant, it will fall under the legend category.

Furthermore, “*Sensibilitas Baru Penyair Muda*” (Young Poet’s New Sensibility) is marked by the young poets still being held by the previous hegemony of linguistic and literary order. Most of them display an incoherent mixture of old and new ways of expressing. Or, many also form chaotic expressions in the real sense, in which it is difficult to find the relationships between one another.

What the writer will convey through “*Analisis Wacana Kritis Fairclough: Kasus Wacana Tajuk Rencana Mengenai Bahasa Bali*” (Fairclough’s Critical Discourse Analysis: The Case of the Editorial Discourse on Balinese Language) is that the text is a response to and, at the same time, a representation of the global discourse on mother tongue within the international institution, UNESCO. When viewed from the documents of research conducted by

international institutions themselves, this celebration and appreciation of mother tongue are parts of a larger discourse, namely the discourse on pluralism and tolerance of minorities with their language and culture. The discourse on pluralism itself is an articulation of a larger and more comprehensive discourse, such as localism, globalization, and postmodernism. It is this discourse that drives awareness and all forms of conservation programs, protection, saving local culture, local knowledge, local policies, which as a whole, essentially, weakens the power of state-nations regulation by neoliberal-capitalism.

Furthermore, in *"Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan: Beberapa Masalah Dalam Misi 'Mencerdaskan Kehidupan Bangsa'"* (Education and Culture: Some Problems in the Mission of "Educating the Nation's Life"), a work written for the anniversary speech of Faculty of Cultural Sciences, UGM, the author reminded us to always remember the *sangkan paraning diri* (the origin of oneself). What will we do if we know how vague the message or the duty that become the basis of our existence. How bad is the effect of policies that are not based on knowledge of culture that we have learnt and mastered? This will ultimately make us servants.

In the *"Krisis Nasionalisme: Sebuah Renungan Strategis"* (Crisis of Nationalism: A Strategic Reflection), the efforts to build nationalism and transform it into cultural reality must originate from the existence of a government that is indeed nationalistic, which uses their power for the interests that transcend the interests of their political party or social group, including, the interests of merely winning the next election. Only then will there be a political desire to truly conduct research and arrange strategic possibilities for the development of nationalism as a cultural reality, a willingness to allocate a special budget to implement it.

This fascinating, rich book that is like an "attractive, plump girl" is closed with the realization that every civilization contains its own loopholes which can potentially make the civilization crack. In this third civilization, information and telecommunication technology has succeeded in creating a virtual world that seems real by suppressing, drowning, or actually hiding other technological operations that is the technology related to the way of economic production. The hard facts of economic inequality have disappeared from view due to the virtual world slump, which seems to have been very common and democratic. The people of the third civilization will

have more difficulty finding these hard facts because their sensitivity has been directed only from the signifier to the signifier, not the signified. They have been very fascinated and trapped in the process, while the sensitivity to the results fades away. It is possible that this gap will open and result in enlarging cracks in the above civilization. In this case, attention to social, cultural, and aesthetic symptoms that are outside the mainstream must still be given attention or prioritized (to be more precise).

Professor Faruk has managed to shake our faith to buy this book or, even more, to "buy everything displayed in his shop windows". Congratulations.