Reading the New Direction of the Peristiwa 1965 Narrative Representation in Indonesian Novels

Muh. Fatoni Rohman, Djoko Saryono, Moch. Syahri, Roekhan

muh.fatoni.2002119@students.um.ac.id 0000-0001-9497-5404

djoko.saryono.fs@um.ac.id 0000-0003-0604-2060

moch.syahri.fs@um.ac.id 0000-0001-8273-5622

HOW TO CITE:

Muh. Fatoni Rohman, Djoko Saryono, Moch. Syahri, Roekhan (2026). Reading the New Direction of the Peristiwa 1965 Narrative Representation in Indonesian Novels. International Journal of Special Education, 41(5s), 681-691.

COPYRIGHT STATEMENT:

Copyright: © 2026 Authors. Open access publication underthe terms and conditions of the Creative CommonsAttribution (CC BY) license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/).

ABSTRACT:

The 1965 Incident is considered as a major historical moment for the Indonesian nation. The historical moment still leaves sociopolitical traumatic complexities. The 1965 Incident marked a change in Indonesia's national leadership from President Soekarno to President Soeharto. This change was preceded by the tragedy that occurred on September 30, 1965 with political coup, kidnapping, and murder issues. The 1965 Incident was responded with numerous narratives. Hegemonic and dominant narratives were formed to exhibit the power of certain parties by ignoring the marginalized voices. Literature as a medium of reconciliation is present to reveal "other" narratives that may be "excluded" in the formal hegemonic narrative. The transformation of the Indonesian novel corpus before and after 1998 portrays a shift in literary expression, from a controlled space to a critical and democratic space. The new direction of the 1965 Incident's narrative in Indonesian Novels signifies the evolution of a more complex, critical, and humane literary awareness in interpreting traumatic events in the nation's history.

Keywords: Narrative construction, Peristiwa 1965, mimetics, reconciliation, conflict resolution

Background of Study

When taking up the tragedy of 1965 Incident in Indonesia, people's collective memories will focus on the dark events involving kidnappings, killings, and the issue of a political coup. The 1965 Incident is a complex historical moment in the journey of the Indonesian nation, which has profound implications on various aspects of social, political, and cultural life. The narrative of the event has undergone a significant transformation in the context of contemporary Indonesian literature. The process of reconstructing collective memory through the medium of novels has become an essential space to explore traumatic experiences that have been repressed all this time. Critical studies on the 1965 incident's representation in literary works have become increasingly vital to study the socio-historical dynamics surrounding them. Consequently, it is necessary to analyze the new direction of the 1965 Incident's narrative in Indonesian novels as a form of the official discourse deconstruction that has been dominant or hegemonic all this time.

This hegemonic narrative often appears in historical events that are still "gray" or lead to diverse perspectives. One of the Indonesian historical events that is still in this "gray" area is the 1965 Incident. The 1965 Incident was a tragedy that became one of the causes of the change of Indonesia's national leadership from President Soekarno to President Soeharto. There are

numerous versions regarding who and what was behind the occurrence of this incident. The incident which was begun with the kidnapping and murder of six generals and one Army Officer of the Indonesian Armed Forces, ended with a total purge of members or sympathizers of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) and its underbow organizations. The incident that took place in September 1965 still give rise to a non-singular narrative dialectic. In this context, the history expression written with the pen of the victor becomes strongly relevant. Semantically, the expression lays certain institutions or individuals the freedom to shew a dominant narrative, for certain purposes and interests.

Dominant narratives often reflect the interests of certain powerful parties, thus ignoring other perspectives that are more humane and complex. According to Eriyanto (2017), narrative analysis can help revealing the hidden meanings and ideologies underlying a text, including in literature. The 1965 Incident was not excluded from the observation of writers, who then enacted this conflict as the basic idea for the creating literary works. This is inevitable because writers are part of the society and literary works are how writers respond to what happens in their surroundings. The statement about the relationship between author and nature or the surrounding environment has long existed. The term commonly used to picture this relationship is mimetic. Mimetic was used by Plato and Aristotle to explain the relationship between works of art and reality (Teeuw, 1988:219; Luxemburg, 1989:15). There are diverse opinions and narratives emerged regarding the 1965 incident in Indonesian literature.

The position of the 1965 Incident's narrative in Indonesian literature today is still very complex. Numerous literary works that address this theme portray a shift in the way this incident is viewed. Novels published after 1998 tend to give voice to the marginalized parties, including the victims and their families who were not highlighted in the official narrative before 1998. Denzin and Lincoln (2009) reveal that narrative research can discover certain themes and patterns in the society, including in sensitive historical contexts. The 1998 era became quite crucial when the big currents of reform and the transfer of the government from President Soeharto who had led for 32 years after the 1965 Incident. New currents and directions in the disclosure of the 1965 Incident from various perspectives emerge more and more.

Based on statistical data on Indonesian novel corpus data for the 2000-2020 period, there are 215 novel literary works that exhibit multi-perspectives related to the 1965 Incident. A total of 37 published novels have attempted to present alternative perspectives that differ from the official government narrative. The percentage of novels with critical perspectives reached 17.2% with a tendency to increase every decade. The findings from the corpus data imply that there are differences in the narratives of the 1965 Incident, which mentions differences in the treatment of figures who are "considered" to be involved in the 1965 Incident. In addition, there is also a tendency of bias of figure as the author's manifestation and the emergence of a conflict resolution construction of the 1965 Incident.

The 1965 Incident is one of the conflicts that still leaves problems to this day. The conflict which began with political interests, then developed into a multidimensional conflict. Conflicts that were initially based on politics turned into religious, economic, and artistic and literary conflicts (Herlambang, 2013; Moeljanto and Ismail, 1995). The 1965 Incident not only leave trauma due to the vast number of victims, but also leave traces of horizontal conflict that are still felt today.

Some novels including *Mencoba Tidak Menyerah* by Yudhistira ANM Massardi (1996), *Kubah* by Ahmad Tohari (1982; 1986; 2003), *Para Priyayi* by Umar Kayam (1992); *Amba* by Laksmi Pamuntjak (2002), *Pulang* by Laela S Chudlori (2012), and *Buku Harian Keluarga Kiri* by Dhianita Pertiwi (2021) try to present the theme of the 1965 Incident from multiple perspectives. There is a finding in these novels, namely that there are differences in the treatment of 'those' who are considered to be involved in the 1965 Incident.

This raises several questions, including why the figures involved in the 1965 Incident could "return" to the community, what were the socio-cultural conditions of the community that "were willing" to accept the perpetrators of the 1965 Incident, how was the process of change in the perpetrators of the 1965 Incident so as to make the opposing party a "lost brother who returned home" after the 1965 Incident, and how was the process of community acceptance of the perpetrators of the 1965 Incident.

All of those questions lead to the mouth of question 'how does the author view and create a narrative of the 1965 Incident?'. In this context, factually, studies related to the 1965 Incident have mostly focused on the causes, perpetrators, and political impacts. Weirenga (2000), Crouch (1986), Anderson and McAvey (2017) discuss the aspects of the 1965 Incident. Even, Tahler (2012) examines the impunity towards the perpetrators of the 1965 massacre, making similar events repeated in the East Timor incident. Meanwhile, the study of the 1965 Incident from a post-conflict perspective was carried out by Laksana (2022), which was oriented towards the position of women in the chaotic conflict. Simultaneously, Yen Leong (2021) tried to capture two different narratives from the two parties who conflicted. The narratives are perceived from the biographical works of people closest to the perpetrators of the 1965 Incident such as Nani Nurrachman Sutojo, I Wayan Wilyana, Ribka Tjiptaning Proletariatry, and Oka Putu Sukanta. Yen Leong (2021) reveals the impact of the hegemonic narratives of the 1965 Incident that was echoed massively by the New Order on those who were considered directly and indirectly involved.

By focusing on Indonesian literary works, this study aims to understand how authors portray the incident and how these representations reflect social and political changes in Indonesia. In the post-reform context, where freedom of expression is increasingly open, it is essential to examine how narratives about 1965 Incident develop and change. As the result, the purpose of this study is to analyze the new direction of the 1965 Incident's narratives through Indonesian novels published before and after 1998. The year 1998 became the midpoint of change as Soeharto's reign came to an end.

Through this study, it is hoped that new patterns can be found in the narratives depicting the 1965 Incident, as well as how literary works can function as a medium to reflect and reconstruct the society's collective memory. Thus, this research not only contributes to the understanding of Indonesian literature, but also to the study of history and social memory.

Methods

This research employed a qualitative method with a focus on the analysis of novel texts depicting the 1965 Incident. The primary data used were quotations and narratives from novels published before and after 1998. This research is classified as qualitative research because it involves a broader and deeper context analysis, and aims to describe the construction of narratives in literary works. According to Darmono (2002), literature can be considered as a reflection of the social and economic processes that occur in society, so the analysis of literary texts can provide insight regarding the social conditions that underlie them.

Data collection was carried out by reading and analyzing relevant novels, then coding quotations that contain narratives about the 1965 Incident. Based on the initial review of novel references raising the theme of the 1965 Incident, approximately 17 novel titles were found. The novels are as follows.

Table 1. The list of Novel Titles

NO	TITLE	AUTHOR	YEAR
1	Sri Sumarah	Umar Kayam	Pustaka Jaya (1975)
2	Kubah	Ahmad Tohari	Pustka Jaya (1981)
3	Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk	Ahmad Tohari	Gramedia (1982)
4	Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI	Arswendo Atmowiloto	Pustaka Sinar Harapan (1986)
5	Para Priyayi	Umar kayam	Grafiti (1991)

6	Mencoba Tidak Menyerah	Yudhistira A.N.M. Massardi	Bentang Budaya (1977/1996)
7	Jalan Menikung	Umar Kayam	Grafiti (1999)
8	Saman	Ayu Utami	KPG (2001)
9	September	Noorca M Massardi	Tiga Serangkai (2006)
10	Blues Merbabu	Gitanyali	KPG (2011)
11	1965	Gitanyali	KPG (2011)
12	Amba	LAksmi Pamuntjak	Gramedia (2012)
13	Kumara	S Djai	DKJT (2013)
14	Pulang	Laela S Chudlori	Gramedia (2013)
15	Buku Harian Keluarga Kiri	Dhianita Kusuma Pertiwi	Pelangi Sastra (2019)
16	Dari Dalam Kubur	Soe Tjen Marching	Marjin kiri (2020)
17	1965	Kopong Bunga Lawamurwan	Penerbit JBS (2023)

The obtained data were then selected, classified, and interpreted to spot the emerging themes and patterns. Those patterns were classified based on the analysis of theme, diachronic, and narrative representation. This technique is in line with the narrative analysis approach proposed by Eriyanto (2017), where analysis is carried out inductively to find categories and themes related to the existing narrative.

The use of narrative and sociological perspectives in this research aims to understand how literary texts reflect broader social phenomena. Thus, this research focuses not only on the aesthetic aspects of literature, but also on how the narrative functions in a social and political context. This is in line with Endraswara's (2011) view that literary texts can be utilized to elaborate the structure of society and the existing social dynamics.

Discussion

a. The 1965 Incident in Three Narrative Domains: Government and ABRI, Cornell Paper, Nahdlatul Ulama

The 1965 Incident was an event which became a milestone in the changing socio-political conditions in Indonesia. There are diverse versions of who and what was behind the occurrence of this incident. The Indonesian government and ABRI call this incident as the Thirty September Movement/Indonesian Communist Party (G.30.S/PKI). The official government narrative stated that PKI was the perpetrator of the assassination of Generals and Army Officers of the Indonesian Armed Forces and that they would rebel against the legitimate government (*cou'p d'ectat*) (Notosusanto and Saleh 1989; SETNEG RI 1994; MABES ABRI 1994). The G.30.S/PKI term is a hegemonic term that is strongly recorded in the collective memory of the Indonesian people. President Soekarno referred the 1965 Incident as GESTOK on the pretext that this movement occurred on October 1, 1965 (not September 30, 1965) and was considered as a "ripple" that usually occurs in revolutions (Sulistyo, 2000:3). Another version stated that this incident was an internal conflict between the Pro-Soekarno Army and PKI vs Anti-PKI Army (Lane, 2010:10). There were also statements that this tragedy was an event used to overthrow President Soekarno by means of a creeping coup (Adam, 2009:105; Crouch, 1986:141; Sulistyo, 2000:58).

Anderson and Mc Vey (2017) proclaimed that the 1965 Incident was an internal army conflict, led by officers of the Diponegoro Division. This was caused by disappointment regarding several policies established by the general and military staff of Jakarta. The disappointment gradually increased when rumors spread about the General Council who planned to execute a coup against President Soekarno. Anderson, Ruth Mc Vey, and Frederick Brunell conducted a study on press production in the last three months of 1965. The results of those activities were presented in several informal seminars at Cornell University. Anderson (2017: xx) considers the results of the initial analysis that had been disseminated to a limited audience as "secret" information, which then a copy of the document was reproduced and distributed in Indonesia without their knowledge.

The copy of the document was later referred to as the "Cornell Papper".

The perspective on the 1965 Incident was also conveyed by the Executive Council of Nahdlatul Ulama (*Pengurus Besar Nahdlatul Ulama*) by publishing a book entitled "NU-PKI Clash 1948-1965" in 2013. According to NU's point of view, the 1965 Incident is an event with a long background. The 1965 Incident cannot be separated from the PKI rebellion in 1926 and the Madiun incident in 1948 (Mun'im, 2013:7). This Nahdliyin perspective considers that the 1965 Incident was a civil war where there was no single perpetrator and victim (Mun'im, 2013:vi). NU, in the book, also professed that there was an inflated number of victims of the 1965 Incident. Eventhough there was difference in determining who was behind the incident, several opinions above agreed that this incident began with the abduction and murder of 7 (seven) generals and army officers (AD) which then developed into a horizontal conflict between "those considered as" supporters of communism and anti-communist supporters.

Directly proportional to the increasing escalation of the 1965 Incident, the victims of this horizontal conflict were also vast. The lowest reference stated that the victims of the 1965 Incident were 70,000 people and the highest was 2 million people in a duration of 2 years (Mun'im, 2013:14; Sulistyo, 2000:43-46; Lane, 2010:3; Torqouis, 2011:3). The primary thing to note here was that both PKI "sympathizers" and PKI opponents (armed forces, mass organizations, and ordinary people) were the real victims of this incident.

The 1965 Incident did not escape from the observation of writers, who then brought this conflict as the basic idea for the creation of literary works. This is inevitable because writers are the part of society and literary works are how writers respond to what happens in their surroundings. The statement about the relationship between the writers and nature or the surrounding environment has long appeared. The term commonly used to explain this relationship is mimetic. Mimetic was used by Plato and Aristotle to describe the relationship between works of art and reality (Teeuw, 1988:219; Luxemburg, 1989:15).

Mimetic is a term that embodies the notion that literature is an imitation of natural facts. Apart from being an imitation of nature, the basic literary sociology discourse also brings up the conception that literature is a means to express narratives that are not contained in factual or official narratives. Literature can be used as a medium to express "other" narratives that may be "ignored" in formal hegemonic narratives. The position of literary works interpretation that is based on the concept of *licentia poetica* makes literature in the realm of "liberated" to reveal reality and even build an independent reality, namely imagined reality (Kleden, 2004:431).

Two sociological views related to literature as an imitation of reality (reflection) and literature as a medium for revealing other things (refraction), also colored the narrative of the 1965 Incident in Indonesian literature. There are diverse thoughts and narratives that emerge regarding the 1965 Incident in Indonesian literature. Here are some authors who have used the 1965 Incident as an idea for their works;

Given the historical intersections mentioned above, the use of terms commonly used for the tragedy, G.30.S/PKI, will be avoided in this article. Likewise, perspectives that omit the label "PKI" as an antithesis to the mention of the incident will also be avoided. This is done because the mention or omission of "PKI" has the tendency to reveal the perpetrators of the incident. Therefore, henceforth, the G.30.S incident will be referred to as "The 1965 Incident" to avoid unwanted debates, as well as to place and see the incident in a neutral and proportional manner. The use of the term "The 1965 Incident" is also to "encompass" the series of events that began with the abduction and murder of the Army generals until today, as depicted in the novels used as sources of research data and to analyze how the narrative perspective of the 1965 Incident is expressed by these authors.

b. Diachronic Review by the Year of Publication

There are crucial differences in the narratives of the 1965 Incident reflected in novels published before and after 1998. The novels published before 1998 generally tend to comply the official narrative dominated by the government and military perspectives. For example, in the novel "*Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI*" written by Arswendo Atmowiloto, the incident is depicted with an emphasis on the betrayal and atrocities of the PKI, creating a negative image of the party. This was in line with the New Order government's efforts to discredit the PKI and legitimize their power. The followings are the novel literary works and the year of publication:

Figure 1. The Novels and The Year of Publication

The diachronic reading above directly portrays the great enthusiasm regarding the 1965 Incident in Indonesian novels. The table above clearly indicates that after 1998 (reform), the publication of novels with the theme of the 1965 Incident escalated. Note that this article limits the study data to only novels. This cannot be separated from the Indonesian government's post-1998 policy on freedom of expression.

The year 1998 was a milestone in the transition of political power in Indonesia marked by the stepping down of President Soeharto from the highest leadership helm of Indonesia. The end of the New Order government era tended to repress the emergence of hegemonic counter-narratives. This can be understood, because the beginning of the New Order government was marked by the destruction and extermination of the communist movement in Indonesia. By the end of the repressive rule of the New Order in 1998, the freedom of speech narratives emerged. This discourse of freedom supported the writing and publishing of novels with new perspectives on the 1965 Incident.

On the contrary, novels published after 1998 display a tendency to give voice to victims and perspectives that were previously marginalized. The 1965 Incident is presented in a more humane manner, depicting individual suffering and the psychological impact of the incident. This portrays changes in freedom of expression and the recognition of multiple perspectives in Indonesian history.

Statistics show that after the 1998 reforms, the number of publications raising the theme of the 1965 Incident increased. This indicates that there is a need for people to explore and reflect on events that have long been buried in the official narrative.

The change in this narrative can also be viewed in the way the authors depict the characters involved in the incident. In previous novels, the characters involved in the PKI were often portrayed as antagonists without human dimension. In recent works, however, they are often given more complex backgrounds, suggesting that they are victims of a bigger situation. This is an important step towards

reconciliation and a deeper understanding of Indonesian history.

c. New Directions and Narrative Representations of the 1965 Incident

This indicator is based on the authors' narrative articulation related to the narrative of the 1965 Incident. The sorting of this narrative articulation will produce novels with comparative narratives or in line with hegemonic narratives and novels with comparative narratives against hegemonic narratives.

There are 6 (six) novels with comparative articulation of hegemonic narratives, namely as follows:

Table 2. Data of Novels with Comparative Narrative

NO	TITLE	AUTHOR	YEAR
1	Sri Sumarah	Umar Kayam	Pustaka Jaya (1975)
2	Kubah	Ahmad Tohari	Pustka Jaya (1981)
3	Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk	Ahmad Tohari	Gramedia (1982)
4	Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI	Arswendo Atmowiloto	Pustaka Sinar Harapan (1986)
5	Para Priyayi	Umar kayam	Grafiti (1991)
6	Jalan Menikung	Umar Kayam	Grafiti (1999)

The novels listed in Table 2 emphasize the point of view in line with the government's narrative, with the PKI as the antagonist in the characterization of the story. Table 4 also implied that the novels were published before 1998, except for Umar Kayam's "Jalan Menikung", which was published in 1999. Even though it was published after the reformation and change of power events, the novel "Jalan Menikung" still uses the same point of view as the hegemonic narrative.

The most powerful example of this situation is the novel "Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI" written by Arswendo Atmowiloto. This novel is an adaptation product of a movie with the same title directed by Arifin C Noer in 1981. The content of the novel "Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI" has great similarities with the content of the movie with the same title. Even, the illustrations in the novel include pieces of scenes from the movie "Pengkhianatan G30S/PKI". There are 10 (ten) novels with hegemonic narrative comparative articulations, namely as follows:

Table 3. Data of Novels with Comparative Narrative with Hegemonic Narrative

NO	**TITLE**	**AUTHOR**	**YEAR**
1	Mencoba Tidak Menyerah	Yudhistira A.N.M. Massardi	Bentang Budaya (1977/1996)
2	Saman	Ayu Utami	KPG (2001)
3	September	Noorca M Massardi	Tiga Serangkai (2006)
4	Blues Merbabu	Gitanyali	KPG (2011)
5	1965	Gitanyali	KPG (2011)
6	Amba	LAksmi Pamuntjak	Gramedia (2012)
7	Kumara	S Djai	DKJT (2013)
8	Pulang	Laela S Chudlori	Gramedia (2013)
9	Buku Harian Keluarga Kiri	Dhianita Kusuma Pertiwi	Pelangi Sastra (2019)
10	Dari Dalam Kubur	Soe Tjen Marching	Marjin kiri (2020)
11	1965	Kopong Bunga Lawamurwam	Penerbit JBS (2023)

The novels in Table 3 provide a comparative or opposing viewpoint to the government's narrative. Those novels attempt to see the 1965 Incident from the perspective of the "accused" PKI victims. This perspective views the 1965 Incident from the perspective of members or sympathizers of the Communist Party, who are accused of being the main perpetrators of the 1965 Incident. The characters in the novels may be direct or indirect victims of the Incident. The point of view is also expressed by the direct perpetrators or their descendants.

The novel "*Mencoba Tidak Menyerah*" is a unique datum. Even though it was published before 1998, the novel raises a distinctive narrative of the 1965 Incident. The narrative in the novel is expressed by the narrator/character who searches for the whereabouts of his father who disappeared in between 1965-1966. As mentioned before regarding the relationship between the events of 1965 and 1998, it implies that the 1998 reformation event did not only affect the quantity of novels published related to the 1965 Incident. The incident also opened up the opportunities for the emergence of 1965 novels with new perspectives. Novels that raised the theme of the 1965 Incident before 1998 tended to profess a point of view that was in accordance with the formal historical narrative of the government, by making the PKI, underbow organizations, and their sympathizers the antagonists of the incident.

Meanwhile, the interesting part about the data from the table above is the placement of the murder narrative at the beginning of the novel. The author deliberately placed this part to describe the situation experienced by the victims or perpetrators of the 1965 Incident, in the peaceful masses after the incident subsided. The placement of the murder narrative at the beginning and then detailed at the end of the novel seems to indicate that the narrative development framework of the 1965 novels is a mixed induction-deduction framework. This is the opposite of the other novel data, which make the 1965 Incident with all its excesses as the narrative culmination that the presence must be saved.

In addition to the position of the 1965 Incident in the plot, the difference between the 1965 novel and the other three novel data is that the 1965 novel narrates the 1965 Incident outside Java. This novel takes the setting of place in the Witihama area of East Flores. The outside Java's perspective needs to be presented in order to see the narrative of the 1965 Incident which is far from the conflict epicentrum. After introducing the character *Kopong* in 1970 as the beginning of the plot of 1965 novel, the author flashes back to the early 1950s to strengthen the main character. The strengthening is done by portraying the image of *Kopong*, as the main character, which is begun with the character's contact with education world.

As seen from the table related to the data of novels that make the 1965 Incident as a theme above, it can be observed that there are several authors who raise the theme of the 1965 Incident in several of their novels. These authors are: 1) Ahmad Tohari who raised the 1965 Incident in the novels "*Kubah*" (1981) and "*Ronggeng Dukuh Paruh*" (1982); 2) Umar Kayam in the novelettes "*Sri Sumarah*" (1975), "*Para Priyayi*" (1991), and "*Jalan Menikung*" (1999); 3) Gitanyali in "*Blues Merbabu*" (2011) and "1965" (2011). An interesting note on this indicator is the emergence of the Massardi brothers (Noorca and Yudhistira) who raised the 1965 Incident in their novels.

This indicator is also used to get the proportion of data sources that can represent writers cum actors and writers cum readers. The distinction in paradigm and context of the incident will be able to decide the basic concept of the narrative displayed in a writing. This indicator will bring up writers who were in the same era of the 1965 Incident such as: Ahmad Tohari, Umar Kayam, Yudistira ANM Masardi, Noorca M Masardi, and Arswendo Atmowiloto. In addition to present writers who lived contemporaneously with the 1965 Incident, this indicator also drives writers who were born after the 1965 Incident such as: Laksmi Pamuntjak, Dhianita Pertiwi, Soe Tjen Martrjing, and S Djai. These distinctions can be seen in the table below.

This sorting of actors and readers shews interesting data, namely ithe biography of Laela S Chudhori who was born in 1962. Laela was 3 years old when the 1965 Incident occurred. This makes her in the liminal or within area in the data source table. Another interesting thing that emerges is the author's personal background named Gitanyali. It is likely that Gitanyali's name is the pen name of someone who has a connection with the 1965 Incident.

Furthermore, based on the results of reading the novels above, there are interesting findings that can be used as a common thread of study. Those findings are as follows: There are crucial narrative differences between novels

published before 1998 and novels published after 1998. The year 1998 also marks the year of the increase in the publication of novels with the 1965 theme.

Table 4. Narrative Representation Before and After 1998

No.	Aspect	Narrative	Character	Representation
1.	Before 1998	Dominated by government and military perspectives	Specialized on antagonist characters	Official narrative and propaganda
2.	After 1998	Diverse, giving voice to victims	Complex characters with backgrounds	Humane and reflective narrative

Novel writers who also experienced this incident directly (writers and actors), tend to have similar narrative point of view as the hegemonic narrative. Meanwhile, novel writers who do not experience the incident directly (writers and readers) have comparative point of view from the hegemonic narrative. Although the government's hegemonic narrative that makes officials, members, or sympathizers of the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) as perpetrators is still strong, comparative narratives of the 1965 Incident that are expressed through literary works have begun to emerge.

Based on the reading results of the novels above, there are interesting findings that can be used as a common thread of study. Those findings are as follows: There are crucial narrative differences between novels published before 1998 and novels published after 1998. The year 1998 also marked an increase in the publication of novels with the 1965 theme. The new direction of novel writing related to the 1965 Incident highlights several things, namely opening space for critical dialogue, deconstructing single narrative, providing space for voices that have been silenced, and encouraging the reconciliation process through the medium of literature.

The findings based on the initial reading of the novels above raise various questions and provisional statements related to the 1965 Incident. The questions arise mainly related to the relationship between the authors and the authorship process, the relationship between text and events, the author's ideological building, etc. Those questions then brought out provisional statements that became the background of this research, namely "literature is a medium for revealing comparable discourses related to the 1965 Incident" and "The narrative construction of the 1965 Incident is strongly influenced by the authors' ideology and the authors' ideology is shaped by the construction of events occurring around them".

Conclusion

In this study, it can be concluded that the narrative of the 1965 Incident in Indonesian novels has undergone a significant transformation since the 1998 reformation. The novels published after this period indicate a tendency to bestow space for more diverse perspectives, especially from those who became the victims of the incident. Through narrative analysis, it is clear that literary works do not only function as entertainment, but also as an important medium to reflect and discuss complex history.

The transformation of the Indonesian novel corpus after 1998 era portrays a significant shift in literary expression, from a controlled space to a critical and democratic space. The "New Direction" of the 1965 Incident's narratives in Indonesian Novels signifies the evolution of a more complex, critical, and humane literary awareness in interpreting traumatic events in the nation's history.

This change of narrative reflects the social and political dynamics occuring in Indonesia, where people are getting more open to discuss and explore their collective memories. As such, this research is expected to contribute to a better understanding of how literature can serve as a reflection of the nation's social and historical realities.

References

Adam, Asvi Warman. 2009. *1965 Orang-Orang di Balik Tragedi.* Yogyakarta: Galang Press

Anderson, Benedict R O'G dan Ruth T Mcvey. 2017. *Kudeta 1 Oktober 1965 Sebuah Analisis Awal.*Yogyakarta:Gading

Crouch, Harold. 1986. *Militer dan Politik di Indonesia* (terjemahan. Th. Sumarthana). Jakarta: Sinar Harapan

Damono, Sapardi Djoko. 1979. *Sosiologi Sastra: Sebuah Pengantar Ringkas*. Jakarta: Pusat Pembinaan dan Pengembangan Bahasa Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.

Damono, Sapardi Djoko. 2002. *Pedoman Penelitian Sosiologi Sastra*. Jakarta: Depdiknas.

Endraswara, Suwardi. 2011. *Metodologi Penelitian Sosiologi Sastra*. Jakarta: Buku Seru.

Eriyanto. 2017. *Analisis Narasi Dasar-Dasar dan Penerapannya dalam Analisis Teks Berita Media.* Jakarta: Penerbit Kencana

Herlambang, Wijaya. 2013. *Kekerasan Budaya Pasca 1965*. Serpong: Margin Kiri

Kayam, Umar. 1986. *Sri Sumarah dan Bawuk*. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya

Kayam, Umar. 1992. *Para Priyayi*. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Utama Grafiti

Kayam, Umar. 2010. *Jalan Menikung*. Jakarta: PT Pustaka Utama Grafriti

Khudlori, Laela S. 2012. "*Pulang*". Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka

Kleden, Ignas. 2004. *Sastra Indonesia dalam Enam Pertanyaan Esao-Esai Sastra dan Budaya*.Jakarta: PT Pustaka Utama Grafiti

Lane, Max. 2010. *Malapetaka di Indonesia* (Terjemahan Chandra Utama). Penerbit Djamanbaroe

Laksana, Grace, at all. (2022). *Exploring Women's Narratives on Conflict and Violent Histories*. In book: Proceedings of the 2nd International Conference on Social Knowledge Sciences and Education (ICSKSE 2022).PDF.

Luxemburg, Jan van, dkk. 1989. *Pengantar Ilmu Sastra* (Terjemahan Dick Hartoko). Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

MABES ABRI. 1994. *Bahaya Laten Komunisme di Indonesia (I-V)*. Pusat Sejarah dan Tradisi ABRI

Mun'im DZ, H. Abdul. 2013. *Benturan NU-PKI 1948-1965*. Depok: Langgar Swadaya

Notosusanto, Nugroho dan Ismail Saleh. 1989. *Tragedi Nasional Percobaan KUP G/30/S/PKI di Indonesia*. Jakarta: PT. Intermasa.

Pamuntjak, Laksmi. 2012. *Amba*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama

SETNEG RI. 1994. *Gerakan 30 September Pemberontakan Partai Komunis Indonesia Latar Belakang, Aksi, dan Penumpasanya*

Soewarsono. 2019. *Historiografi 1965/66: Menimbang Lagi Sejumlah Pandangan*. Yogyakarta: Gading Publishing.

Sulami. 1999. *Perempuan-Kebenaran dan Penjara.* Jakarta: Cipta Lestari.

Sulastomo. 2000. *Hari-hari yang Panjang 1963-1966.* Jakarta: Kompas

Sulistyo, Hermawan. 2000. *Palu Arit di Ladang Tebu*. Jakarta: KPG

Suryawan, I Ngurah. 2007. *Ladang Hitam di Pulau Dewa Pembantaian Massal di Bali 1965.* Yogyakarta: Galang Press

Tahler, Kai. 2012. *Foreshadowing Future Slaughter From the Indonesian Killing of 1965-1966 to Genocide in East Timor.* PDF.

Teeuw, A. 1988. *Sastra dan Ilmu Sast*ra. Jakarta: Pustaka Jaya

Toer, Pramoedya Ananta. 2000. *Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu (Jilid 1 dan 2)*. Jakarta: Hasta Mitra.

Tohari, Ahmad. 1995. *Kubah*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Tohari, Ahmad. 2009. *Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk*. Jakarta: Gramedia Pustaka Utama

Yen Leong, Kar. 2021. *Speaking a Cross The Line 1965, The Family, and Recontiliation in Indonesia.* https://ajol.ateneo.edu/kk. Diakses 7 Maret 2023.