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ABSTRACT

Revolutionary goals of Indigenous movements against colonial oppression during historic periods of insurgency are complicated by the fact that Indigenous women continue to suffer at the hands of those who claim to be the oppressed. Rukiah S. Kertapati describes Indonesia’s movement for independence from Dutch rule in *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, while contemporary literature, such as Eden Robinson’s “Queen of the North” examines the oppression of Indigenous peoples of Canada. Women’s interests in intervening in the momentum of revolutionary violence may be interpreted in different ways – from subversive, to reactionary, to dissenting. However, women’s literary voices resist the impact of colonial oppression by illuminating the need for social change that emerges with awareness, combines emotion with intelligence, and recognizes the political relevance of personal experience.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

In this thesis, I will compare two literary works by women authors who respond to colonization and Indigenous revolutionary movements. S. Rukiah Kertapati’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* was published during the period that Indonesia transitioned from colonial rule to national independence. The revolutionary spirit of Indigenous nationalism in Indonesia offered women the opportunity to break with oppressive gendered traditions, but also promised suffering and separation for love relationships endangered by the revolutionary cause. Eden Robinson’s “Queen of the North” creates a contemporary portrayal of an Indigenous Canadian woman who resists the soul-devastation of generational abuse that originated with colonial oppression. Like Rukiah, Robinson portrays a woman’s ambivalence to sentiments of retribution that shatter a love relationship.

While these two selected works were written at different historical junctures in Indonesia and in Canada, both the authors and main characters are Indigenous women. Both Rukiah and Robinson are Indigenous women authors, and portray Indigenous communities that struggle against the impact of colonial oppression, as well as against internal conflicts derived from the internalization of colonial oppression in the form of gender inequality. Both works are written from the perspective of similar subject-positions located within a field of race, gender, and class-based power relations. (The mother in Rukiah’s story pressures her daughter to marry because, as she explains “There are things we really need right now” [“An Affair” 56] [“sedang kebutuhan kita jang nyata, kebutuhan kebendaan jang terus terang”; *Kedjatuhan* 141], implying a precariousness of the family's undefined class positioning. This is re-confirmed when Susi discovers that, according to her mother, her father’s job “doesn’t pay enough to cover all the expenses” [“An Affair” 87] [“Tapi uang dari pekerjaannya, tak cukup buat membeli obat”]
keperluanku”; *Kedjatuhan* 183], and that her ill mother relies on community support [“An Affair” 88]. In an interview with Helen Hoy, Robinson says of her characters that “I just assumed they were really young and really poor” [154], positioning the Indigenous characters in her narratives within a class framework.) Further, both works emphasize the emotional impact of disrupting relationship and community integrity in order to engage in what are superficially perceived as actions of resistance, while also representing a form of internal resistance that signals the potential for change. A significant difference between the two works is in the context of resistance. Rukiah examines the emergence of a nationalist movement that unifies the causes of diverse Indigenous communities. Robinson, on the other hand, specifies that it is an Indigenous Canadian Haisla tribe being represented, and highlights the personal context of resistance. While post-Indonesian independence women’s voices were not acknowledged adequately enough in the new constitution (Struers) to alter the trajectory that enabled the perpetuation of gender inequality in Indonesian decades later, allegorically reflected in Rukiah’s work, Robinson’s work advocates a contemporary discussion of strategies for restoring Indigenous Canadian women’s positions of equality for the benefit of future generations in Indigenous communities in Canada. In this Introduction, I will provide a review of the critical literature about both the works that I will discuss, as well as provide political context and background information on the position of women for both the post-revolutionary Indonesian and contemporary Indigenous Canadian contexts.

In Chapter 2, I will draw from the works of postcolonial and identity theorists in my comparison of Rukiah and Robinson, including Jonathan Friedman’s discussion of Indigeneity within the global context, and Franz Fanon’s approach to decolonization. I will also enlist Gayatri Spivak’s subaltern theory, along with the works of other postcolonial theorists, in my
treatment of Indigenous women’s positionality. I will engage with Stuart Hall’s discussions of identity and articulation, as well as Douglas Kellner’s approach to deconstructive analysis of politicized representations of identity, combined with Fredric Jameson’s strategies for integrating contextual politics with textual analysis. I will also discuss works by Tineke Hellwig, an analyst of women’s writing in Indonesia, and by Lee Maracle, an Indigenous Canadian writer and critic who explores women’s distinct position of resistance in Indigenous Canadian communities—among other postcolonial, and Indigenous feminist theorists. An important component of my discussion will be in providing background into the ways that Indigeneity is defined, and how this is integral to the form that resistance to colonial oppression takes. I will then discuss the unique position of Indigenous women in decolonization and resistance movements, with specific attention to the dual oppressions of race and gender within the context of colonization.

In Chapter 3, I will discuss S. Rukiah Kertapati’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, an Indonesian novella published in 1950 (Frederick, Introduction 3). Rukiah tells the story of Susi, an Indonesian woman who has no emotional interest in the pragmatism of arranged marriage, though this was a common practice in Indonesia during the colonial period that was intended to uphold a woman’s status position and preserve her material future. *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* compares the stories of three sisters, one who marries in order to please her mother and learns to love her husband, one who leaves the community after realizing that her own wishes will never be fulfilled if she adheres to the traditional expectations imposed upon her, and the main character, Susi, who follows her heart and explores her sense of self and identity. Susi falls in love, though she has steeled her heart in order to contribute tirelessly to a communist cause for Indonesian independence. She is heartbroken when her lover, Luk, leaves her to embark on a dangerous mission that will likely result in his imprisonment, making their relationship
impossible. Susi returns to her home community and marries a suitable husband before anyone finds out that she is pregnant with Luk’s child. When Luk returns to visit Susi, she refuses to have anything to do with him, and demands with emotion that he leave her. Susi succumbs to the traditional gendered expectations that are imposed upon her by her home community in her decisions around family, relationships, and livelihood, yet this is after her experience of supporting the communist cause that promises gender equality teaches her to be critical of adhering to a political ideology that, in practice, contradicts her emotional reality. Rukiah’s portrayal of the revolution presents false promise and hypocrisy in terms of practicing gender equality, and exposes the subsumation of Indigenous women’s voices within their own communities, despite common resistance to a colonial oppressor. Rukiah emphasizes the significance of emotional connection at the personal and communal level, implying that Indigenous women’s critical voices hold the potential to sustain social harmony in revolutionary progress.

In Chapter 4, I will examine Eden Robinson’s short story “Queen of the North.” Eden Robinson is an Indigenous Canadian Haisla author who tells the story of Adelaine, a young Indigenous woman from a reserve community in British Columbia, Canada who is sexually abused from early childhood, and grows up with a lifestyle of violence and substance abuse. Adelaine falls in love with Jimmy, who is “practically a Boy Scout” (Robinson, “Queen” 193), and the two are an unlikely match. At the same time, Adelaine discovers that the uncle who routinely abuses her was himself abused by a residential school priest. Adelaine makes a pointed verbal reference to her uncle’s history of childhood abuse, and is surprised to discover that her uncle responds by leaving Adelaine’s bedroom without raping her. Adelaine carries this strategy further, by leaving a package with a pointed message for her uncle. She compares him to the
priest and herself to her uncle as a child, and then implies that she has aborted a child that was conceived during one of his sexual assaults on her. By chance, Jimmy finds the package, and responds with shock. Without telling Adelaine, he arranges an opportunity to go on a fishing excursion with Adelaine’s uncle, where it is implied that a confrontation will ensue. Upon discovering Jimmy’s plans, Adelaine immediately regresses into a familiar pattern of violence, fighting with her peers and being badly beaten. Adelaine’s frustrations communicate the futility of Jimmy’s attempt at retribution, despite the fact that, through his actions, Jimmy will confront the spectre of colonialism that takes possession of members of the Indigenous community. With Jimmy’s decision to leave on Adelaine’s uncle’s boat, *Queen of the North*, Adelaine loses her anchor to a healthy relationship that had initially empowered her to confront her oppressor. In this way, Robinson represents the shattered community through her portrayal of disintegrated personal relationships, and shows that the outward-facing actions of confrontation and resistance to the ideologies of subjugation imposed by the colonial oppressor must be considered in ways that allow for sustaining the life-affirming relationships that empower resistance.

In Chapter 5, I will discuss Indigenous women’s different political situations in relation to the various circumstances of colonization in both works, as well as Susi and Adelaine’s parallel ambivalence for anti-colonial revolution and retribution due to continued tensions caused by women’s inequality within Indigenous communities, and their personal experiences of articulative awareness and insight. I will consider the literary representation of Indigenous women’s emotional voices that challenge unconditional loyalty to resistance movements by revealing the ‘shattered hearts’ that have resulted from fractured communities and separations. Finally, I will posit the idea that the literary representation of women’s ambivalence to revolution can be read as critical articulations of Indigenous identity with the potential to refine
and sustain the momentum of decolonization processes in ways that positively benefit love relationships, family, and the community. I draw evidence from the fact that Indigenous women’s emotional expressions of dissent in these representations culminate in soul-searching that holds the potential to generate critical and personal transformations that may lead to greater insight into the situation of systematic inequality.

Position and Ethics

Indigenous women are particularly subject to the detrimental effects of colonization, and at the same time, have the least opportunity to express this in ways that will be heard. I will argue that Indigenous women’s critical response to traditional oppressions, colonial injustice, and resistance and revolution compose the articulations of identity that hold the potential to effect social change. My thesis will be that Indigenous women’s literary emphasis on the emotional bonds formed in personal relationships is indicative of Indigenous women’s careful assessment of the dynamics that reveal the disharmony of internalization of oppression, or generate solidarity in movements for resistance.

I adopt my position on this subject with an awareness of my own reflexive position in relation to the knowledge presented, and the significance of my representation of the subaltern through my interpretation. I accept the assumption that my decision to position the subaltern through interpretive analysis directly and actively engages the reality of social inequality, and therefore, I attempt to best address the needs of the subaltern as I understand them from my unique social vantage. I conduct this analysis within a context of ethical consideration of the interests of the subaltern subject, limiting information or topics that I perceive as dangerousely undermining the empowerment of vulnerable peoples while acknowledging that my current
knowledge of the subaltern within various contexts is finite. This is in keeping with the subaltern concept of immediacy, where the intention is to allow the voice of subaltern to elucidate experiential knowledge of subaltern position in a way that is free of the hegemonic constraints imposed upon representations of subaltern identity (Guha; Ireland).

Of note, I invoke the term ‘soul’ in this thesis in its ‘poetic’ sense. By ‘poetic,’ I refer to the literary quality with which I define the term. By ‘soul,’ I imply metaphoric allusion to a deeply meaningful quality that is often considered an essential component of the self for living a happy, fulfilling life. Therefore I should mention that, in doing so, I do not imply a conceptual association with any religious institution or set of religious beliefs. I do, on the other hand, compose this thesis with a specific principle derived from traditional Indigenous worldviews as an ethical foundation. This principle is that of consideration of future generations when examining the implications of my position and approach. This concept is described by the Aboriginal Women’s Council of Saskatchewan (AWCS) with the following words: “These guiding principles will reflect the natural laws that will govern us to ensure the future home of our children” (Ouellette 58-9). In this way, approaches, methodologies and guiding principles that form the vision for AWCS’s practices are composed in the interest of future generations. This concept is also described in various but similar terms by other Indigenous groups and organizations, and is one that forms an underlying ethical principle for the writing of this thesis.

Literature Review: Rukiah

S. Rukiah Kertapati’s 1950 novella, Kedjatuhan dan Hati (An Affair of the Heart), has been extensively analyzed within the field of Indonesian literary scholarship. Rukiah, an ethnic Sundanese author from Java (Chambert-Loir 269), wrote until the persecution of communists in
Indonesia in 1965 prevented her from publishing (Shackford-Bradley 39). Toeti Heraty lists Rukiah among the many Indonesian authors of note whose works form the canon of contemporary Indonesian literature (121). Likewise, Jacob Sumardjo considers Rukiah’s novella to be an important contribution to the works of Indonesian women authors writing on family and relations during the post-independence period (47-6). Sumardjo compares Rukiah to renowned author Nh. Dini, whose writings include powerful representations of women who transcend the gendered norms that they are expected to adhere to (46).

Tineke Hellwig writes an in-depth analysis of *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* in her book, *In the Shadow of Change*, arguing that Rukiah’s portrayal of a woman whose decisions are constrained by societal expectations is consistent with other works by Indonesian women authors during the same period (64-7). Hellwig shows that Rukiah’s novella is representative of narratives that demonstrate the limitations of women’s options, and their struggles to resolve the actualities of gendered societal expectations with the ideologies of gender equality advocated during the revolution (65). She writes that in post-independence works, women “form their self-identity by means of connections with others and reinforcement from others” (65), implying both social dialogue and community pressure in the decisions around how to represent women’s realities. I will expand upon Hellwig’s position by emphasizing the depth of the self-identity formation that takes place during the post-independence period, and the subaltern articulation of this through communicating emotions in dialogue, and through textual elucidation of political insight. I will look closely at this dynamic as it applies to *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, and will consider how Susi “lets her last chance slide by to follow her heart and realize her ideals and conforms to the patriarchal rules of society” (56) as a reflection of her subaltern status.
Barbara Hatley discusses *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* in her article, “Nation, ‘Tradition,’ and Constructions of the Feminine in Modern Indonesian Literature.” Hatley acknowledges that, “She [Susi] laments the fact that Lukman’s beliefs prevent them from leading a normal life; rather than taking responsibility for their love in a marriage witnessed by her family, he has to flee to avoid capture by the authorities” (109). I will examine *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* for the way that Susi criticizes Luk’s values as derived from an ideological position that advocates action for the benefit of society, but that conflict with the emotional needs of his personal relationship with her, as alluded to by Hatley.

Julie Shackford-Bradley includes a chapter on Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* in her doctoral thesis, *Autobiographical Fictions: Indonesian Women’s Writing from the Nationalist Period*. Shackford-Bradley argues that Susi’s self-constructed identity occurs within a chaotic restructuring of Indonesian society, and therefore, develops in ways that do not facilitate her integration into mainstream Indonesian society. Shackford-Bradley explains that for Susi:

> this epiphany [of self-realization] centers around the notion of the self as a collection of fragments and ideas from various beliefs, ideologies, and philosophies, drawn together by worldly experience and an understanding of human nature. She will refer to these fragments as “unregulated sentences” and describe herself in like terms, part of the larger collective, yet refusing to conform to its regulations. (248)

Shackford-Bradley illuminates an important aspect of Susi’s character, as well as providing extensive background information on Rukiah as an author. Shackford-Bradley’s analysis focuses on the dynamics of personal and group interactions, and on the way that these impact individual development. My analysis differs, in that it is specifically concerned with the significance of Susi’s developing awareness of her political positioning and appeal to emotion as transformative subaltern articulation.
My argument contrasts with, or perhaps reworks French literary critic, Henri Chambert-Loir’s position in his 1977 article “Les Femmes et L’Écriture: La Littérature Feminine Indonésienne,” published in *Archipel*. Chambert-Loir contrasts Rukiah’s intellectualism with the sentimentality of other Indonesian women writers of her time (278). I intend to show that Rukiah’s representation of Susi as an intellectually-engaged woman emphasizes the political significance of women’s communication of their emotional experiences.

Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* was originally published in the Indonesian magazine, *Pudjangga Baru* in 1950, and was included in a book of short fiction in 1952. The translation that I will work with is by John H. McGlynn, and was published in *Reflections on Rebellion: Stories from the Indonesian Upheavals of 1948 and 1965*, a 1983 collection of post-independence short stories from Indonesia, edited by William H. Frederick and John H. McGlynn. Rukiah is included in the collection alongside renowned Indonesian authors, Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Umar Kayam, who wrote challenging and critical works during historic periods of “crisis” (Frederick, Introduction 5). While both Pramoedya Ananta Toer and Umar Kayam have been published in English, S. Rukiah Kertapati is less well known to English readers, and deservedly recognized by Frederick and McGlynn in this volume, where her work is described as “outstanding” (3) and credible (4).

**Political Background: Indonesia in Revolution**

The period leading to, and following, Indonesian independence was a time of intense turmoil. Indonesia gained national independence from occupying Japan in 1945, and resisted foreign intervention from the both the British and the Dutch – with the Dutch withdrawing from Indonesia four years later (Chalmers 19). At the same time, Islamic factions in West Java and
South Sulawesi vied for power with communists and nationalists (Winet 47). By 1948, various nationalist troops had been mobilized to resist impending attacks by the Dutch; but this also resulted in skirmishes and conflicts between competing communist, nationalist, Islamic and other political groups (Cribb and Brown 25-6). Conflicts emerged between nationalist Siliwangi military and Islamic groups in West Java (Cribb and Brown 29; Sundhaussen 37-9), and resistance to a nationalist agreement with the Dutch gave rise to the 1948 PKI-led Madiun revolt (Cribb and Brown 31; Swift 1-3). By 1950, the nationalist and military powers had worked to overturn the communist leaders, or laskar / lashkar-rakyat ‘non-aligned groups’ (Shackford-Bradley 233). PKI (Parti Kommunis Indonesia) leaders, D.N. Aidit and M. H. Lukman, subsequently reorganized the communist party, hoping to gain ground by destabilizing the deadlock between competing political powers: Sukarno nationalists and military (Cribb and Brown 55; McVey 109-10). Rukiah describes this period in Indonesia’s history, shown when Dr. Mansur explains that, “Our unit’s been ordered to disband. There’s a good possibility those of us they call the ‘ringleaders’ will be taken in” (“An Affair” 79). In Rukiah’s novella, the nationalist military that captures Dr. Mansur’s band of communists are subsequently attacked by remaining Dutch troops, who in turn, free the rebel communists (95). As a result of the various political agendas and violent conflicts, the period of Indonesian independence was characterized by a chaotic restructuring of Indonesian society (Chalmers 20).

During the period following Indonesian independence, women’s roles in society were still defined by traditional values, though some changes had begun to occur. Jacob Sumardjo discusses the main themes of pre-independence literature as focussed on the frustrations of traditional society, colonial governance, and arranged marriages in particular (42-3, 47). These realities are documented, with one representative example being the complex social and legal
dynamics of illegal marriages between Indonesian women and Dutch men (Hellwig, *Adjustment* 31-9). Raden Adjeng Kartini, as a Western-educated aristocratic Indonesian woman, wrote in detail about her life between the years 1900-1904 (Shackford Bradley 55, 55n8). Her writings include descriptions of her aversion to being subjected to the rite of *pingitan*, where she was to be isolated from the community from puberty until marriage, and also her unwillingness to marry (56). Sumardjo explains that the adoption of Western ideas by educated writers contributed to their criticism of traditional practices, reflecting actual realities of women’s interests. He writes, “Did not women, who as a group were completely controlled by ‘the parents’, voice their own protest in the form of the novel?” (Sumardjo 43), and notes that women writers, including Hamidah and Selasih, express increasingly ‘modern’ ideas in terms of women’s equality, in the period prior to independence (43).

By the time of Indonesian independence, ideas about women’s roles in society were being actively questioned, though challenges to equality remained. The Indonesian 1945 constitution guaranteed women full social equality, but the state downplayed the significance of women’s independence, authority, or voice, in favour of *ibusim*, a national ideal that defined women’s roles and the value of women’s labour based on their contributions to the domestic sphere (Hellwig, *In the Shadow* 200). Rukiah’s works represent women’s involvement with the revolutionary movement, and their efforts to have their participation in social affairs outside the home validated. Ati, in Rukiah’s “Antara Dua Gambaran,” is portrayed as a ‘free-thinking’ woman whose lover “was not a TNI (Nationalist Army) officer and I wasn’t a PMI (Red Cross) girl who followed him courageously to the front” (Shackford-Bradley 254), as stated by the character. Ati says this in a way that creates a generalized portrait of women who advocate for nationalist ideals in their relationships through involvement with the independence struggle by
association with the Red Cross or other service-providing organizations, and by working alongside their partners (267). Ati’s statement shows that the scenario of politically-invested relationships was common at that time. Women who were active in the independence movement but who were critical of the nationalist agenda were often affiliated with Gerwani, the women’s organization that supported the communist party, the PKI, and advocated for the abolition of religious traditional practices that perpetuated women’s inequality. Gerwani’s campaigns were not necessarily supported by local communities (McVey 104).

The discrepancy between revolutionary ideals and the continued limitation of women’s social roles is evident when Sumardjo reveals the revolutionary assumption that “Women had the same freedom as men; the revolution had wiped out differences of social strata” (45). This is despite the fact that, as Barbara Hatley notes, during the period surrounding Indonesian independence the majority of Indonesian women worked to maintain their households, concentrating their activities on the domestic sphere. While women are represented in film and literature as involved in the revolutionary efforts, they are most often portrayed in “background roles as dependents and as victims” (96). Women’s writing continued to represent the domestic sphere and intimate relationships as a literary focus (“as depicted by women writers, a woman’s life revolves only around love” [Sumardjo 46]), though female characters are represented in revolutionary works as equal in the Marxist sense (46). This shows the persistence of conflict over gender roles and expectations of women during this period of social change in Indonesia.

Rukiah’s short career as an author and her powerful and progressive woman’s literary voice was abruptly interrupted by the New Order persecution of communists beginning in 1965. While her husband, an active revolutionary, fled Indonesia, Rukiah was jailed and her six children were left with relatives (Shackford-Bradley 42). In the years that followed, Rukiah was
unable to work because of her *ex-tapol* ‘political prisoner’ status (42), and feared to continue to publish her writing: “her name and contribution was erased from Indonesian literary history, she apparently kept a promise to refrain from writing to ensure her children’s safety” (42). Rukiah suffered sickness, poverty, and dependence upon her family’s support from the 1960s until the 1990s. Shackford-Bradley argues that when Rukiah’s writes in a letter to her husband, “Wasn’t this what we planned for, ever since we married? Did we not know we would have to accept this as our fate (*menerima nasib ini*)?” (43), this indicates Rukiah’s strong sense of integrity and commitment to her ideals despite the suffering she endures (43). Shackford-Bradley adds that “By forcing entire families to suffer for the supposed crimes of their parents and relatives, the government forced people to be silent in order to protect, not themselves, but their kin” (45), exposing the hypocrisy of the Indonesian constitution’s promise of gender equality. Not only were revolutionary and critical women’s political opinions formally and informally censored as Indonesian independence gave way to the advent of the repressive New Order regime, but also, the *ibu*’s (mother’s) home and family were targeted as a means to crush dissent, and to reinforce popular submission in the form of silence.

**Women’s Roles in the Indonesian Revolution for Independence**

Women’s roles were drastically re-evaluated in the period of transition from Dutch colonization to Indonesian independence. The movement for independence from Dutch colonization in Indonesia is characteristic of Indigenous independence movements of colonized countries, where the resistance to colonization is troubled by a schism of identification with colonial attitudes. Fanon describes the way that the oppressor’s ideologies are dismantled by those who are poised between social classes. He describes the case of a French woman in Algeria
who rejects the ideals of her father, a man who is a militant advocate of colonial oppression (Fanon, *The Wretched* 204-5). A similar schism occurred for women in Indonesia, where the traditions established during colonial rule that structured women’s roles in society offered greater opportunities for prosperity for some than the outcast status of affiliation with the resistance movement, while the expectation that women’s decisions should adhere to the traditional social roles established during the colonial regime became open to debate. Raden Adjeng Kartini, an Indigenous Indonesian woman writer during the colonial period, resisted marriage “through writing, making herself so public and outspoken as to appear as damaged or tainted goods to any suitor” (Shackford-Bradley 6). Kartini represents the complexity of pre-independence arrangements of marriage and family in her writing, and the precariousness of women’s social status while striving for equality and social change. At the same time, Rukiah’s description of an Indigenous woman’s ambivalence regarding the resistance movement in Indonesia is representative of Fanon’s statement: “We are wary of being zealous. Every time we have seen it hatched somewhere it has been an omen of fire, famine, and poverty” (*Black* xiii). Oscillating between tradition and modernity as holding potential for women’s agency and empowerment in their communities, Indigenous women in Indonesia during the transition to independence were positioned at the margins of both colonial society and ‘modernity.’

Hellwig explains that there is a history of entangled relationships between Indonesian women and Dutch men (*Adjustment* 31-9), providing examples of two colonial period stories that demonstrate the complexity of Indigenous women’s social status in a tiered colonial system. In *Njai Dasima*, intrigue and deception result in the murder of the Indonesian wife of a Dutch man, after she is convinced to honour her Indigenous Muslim cultural customs (62-4). In the story of *Njai Paina*, on the other hand, an Indonesian woman risks her own life by deliberately
contracting smallpox in order to infect, and end the life of, the Dutch man who has schemed and used his power to subordinate in order to force her into marriage (64-5). These stories draw attention to the social dynamics that surrounded Indonesian women’s status during the colonial period, where women would find themselves forced into submission by both colonists, and by members of the Indigenous community.

A movement for national liberation gained momentum in Indonesia in 1928, and the language of Bahasa Indonesia, originally a derivative of Malay and described as “a practical, and not very warm, medium of communication with strangers” (Mrazek 32), was adopted as a language of the revolutionary nationalist struggle (32-4). As a result, revolutionary writing was produced in Bahasa Indonesia in journals and newspapers (37-42), and toward the end of the period of Dutch rule, appeared in a creative form in literary magazines (Frederick, “Dreams”). While women were active as writers prior to and following Indonesian independence (Hellwig, In the Shadow 47), “Women were not among the prominent figures in political discussions. Therefore, their specific interests were not brought clearly to the fore” (46) despite involvement in the revolutionary struggle. Hellwig provides an example to support her claim. She describes a literary representation in Marlaut’s Dokter Haslinda of a woman during the revolution who, “Under the guise of patriotism, [she] denies her own position as a doctor and hides her true identity behind the role of a subordinate” (51). While women had valuable skills to contribute to the revolutionary effort in Indonesia at the end of the colonial period, Hellwig’s example of this show of a skilled woman supporter’s subservience and passivity presents an allegory for women’s oppression among the members of Indigenous communities, and for the continued impact of colonial values of subjugation, despite the expressions of anti-colonial ideological sentiments that characterized revolutionary discourse.
Together, Hatley and Susan Blackburn discuss the interests and concerns of Indonesian women in the 1930s, prior to national independence, as described in women’s magazines. Women addressed their more conservative roles within the family (Hatley and Blackburn 49), their rights within traditional Indigenous communities (50), and also issues of inequity for women of different social classes (54). Goals of progress in the form of Westernization (51) were concurrent with interests in empowering women to support themselves and their families, regardless of the type of family configuration (52-3). Despite the efforts of Indonesian women’s organizations of the 1930s to engage in dialogue around women’s concerns (47-8), gender inequity continued long after the establishment of the Indonesian nation-state, and through successive regime changes.

Indonesian women’s post-war literary ambivalence toward revolution exposed an inconsistency between the actions derived from the revolutionary ideologies that motivated the movement for independence, and the needs determined by the truths of the heart that were cultivated in meaningful personal relationships. In these cases, political ideologies developed through philosophical rhetoric, and concepts such as communist materialism or nationalist altruism, did not necessarily coincide with the emotional realities and pragmatic interests of individuals. This suggests that the sentiments of the community as a whole, including women and marginalized people, were overlooked in favour of revolutionary fervour, in some instances at least. In fact, the revolutionary actions against the Dutch colonial regime did not resolve issues of women’s social inequity within Indigenous societies, and women’s oppression continued following Indonesian independence. Toeti Heraty describes contemporary Indonesian literature in terms of the persistence of themes of “gender-identity where the development of stereotyped feminine virtues serves to guarantee security for a woman in a patriarchal society” (131). By this,
Heraty implies that contemporary literature continues to represent Indonesian women within a social context of gender inequality, reflecting both readership demand and an actuality of Indonesian society. As recently as 1977, Katoppo’s *Raumanen* was a popular novel that presented a tragic, but socially-acceptable plotline, where the loss of a young woman’s virginity in the absence of a future prospect of marriage prompted a woman’s suicide (Heraty 135-7). This literary representation of the overwhelming oppression of gendered social norms and the limited options for women was, given its popularity, accepted as plausible and resonated with its readership as reflective of an actuality of gender relations. This indicates a cultural internalization of the values of the oppressor in terms of the subjugation of women persisting within Indigenous Indonesian communities in the years following independence. I will discuss in more detail in Chapter 3 that ways that the hierarchies of power cause the voices of the most marginalized, in this instance the Indigenous woman, to be neglected and de-valued in contemporary Indonesia.

**Literature Review: Robinson**

Eden Robinson is a Haisla Indigenous woman from British Columbia, Canada (Hoy 153). Her work is of increasing interest to critics of Indigenous literature since the publication of her first novel, *Monkey Beach* in 2000. *Traplines* is Robinson’s 1996 collection of short stories, and the events in the short story, “Queen of the North” are re-worked in *Monkey Beach*. However, the short story depiction remains shockingly violent when contrasted with the later re-writing of the narrative. Two critics, Glenn Willmott and Vicki Visvis, focus specifically on “Queen of the North.” Willmott explores the conception of Indigenous authorship, and makes an argument that the deconstructed notions of kinship in “Queen of the North,” a story that enlists family and
community in a complex web of inter-relations, represents Indigenous values of family and community as the foundations of Indigenous society. Willmott argues that in Robinson’s work, “The signifiers of kinship relations float free of stable signifieds and referents, as protagonists struggle with what postmodern theory describes as the breakdown of the signifying chain in relation, here, not to the individual-I but to the kinship-I” (902). Willmott develops an essential guiding principle attributable to all Indigenous writing as the basis for defining “Queen of the North” as a work of Indigenous literature (906). I am inclined to suggest that Willmott’s postmodern analysis better depicts Robinson’s representation of the Indigenous struggle against internalized colonial discourses through the efforts of the characters to assert multiply-defined Indigenous identities; what Willmott describes as a “modern heritage” (898).

Visvis explores “Queen of the North” from a psychological analytical perspective, interpreting the depictions of traumatic violence in Robinson’s work as indications of the internalization of oppression (3, 9). Visvis’s work is relevant to my own discussion of the internalization of oppression within Indigenous communities, though I take a literary approach to this topic. Visvis also analyzes the hatbox gift in detail, and generates an interesting comparison between James Reaney’s “The Box Social” and Robinson’s “Queen of the North,” where the similarity is a box gift of an unborn child to a perpetrator of sexual abuse (Visvis 7), suggesting Reaney’s influence on Robinson’s work.

Other in-depth analysis of Robinson’s work with discussion of either “Queen of the North” or Monkey Beach, includes Kristina Fagan’s “Weesageechak Meets the Weetigo: Storytelling, Humour, and Trauma in the Fiction of Richard van Camp, Tomson Highway, and Eden Robinson,” Jodey Castricano’s “Learning to Talk with Ghosts: Canadian Gothic and the Poetics of Haunting in Eden Robinson’s Monkey Beach,” Martina Rossler’s discussions of Eden

Fagan explores the use of humour in the works of Indigenous authors to communicate traumatic histories and experiences, with Robinson’s Adelaine as a representational example (221). Castricano explores the element of the supernatural in Robinson’s Monkey Beach, and how this is relevant to a discussion of:

the psychological and emotional damage to Aboriginal children in residential schools where the suppression of language and culture and the outlawing of First Nations spiritual practices all manifest in emotional and spiritual trauma that leads to alcohol and drug abuse, sexual abuse and date rape, violence, suicide, and murder. (802)

Rossler and Appleford also discuss the use of the supernatural in Robinson’s work as it is presented in the development of Indigenous identity. Soper-Jones offers an eco-critical analysis of Monkey Beach, linking Indigenous identity with tradition and nature. However, Soper-Jones opts to normalize violence in Indigenous communities through her misreading of Hoy (Soper-Jones 20), and by stating, “The characters that populate Robinson’s stories and novels partake of the warrior sensibility of the Kwakwaka’wakw in their ‘chilling and matter-of-fact explorations of violence’ ” (20). I will argue to the contrary that the violence in Robinson’s work does not represent a stereotyped, essential quality of Indigenous peoples, but rather shows how the overwhelming impact of colonization obscures the potential to distinguish Indigenous identity. Hoy examines the issue of authorship and content in defining Robinson’s work as Indigenous writing, questioning whether Robinson’s work can be read in a way that is “race cognizant”
(170) in order to generate a full spectrum of interpretation. This is something that I feel an exploration of the significance of Indigenous identity in Robinson’s work will address. Lane performs his analysis of *Monkey Beach* by examining the significance of gender and Indigenous identity, citing Beth Brant’s discussion of Indigenous women’s writing in his introduction, and like Visvis, describes Robinson as presenting “subversive humour” (Lane 168).

Andrews’ writing on *Monkey Beach* in her articles, “Native Canadian Gothic Refigured: Reading Eden Robinson’s *Monkey Beach*” and “Rethinking the Canadian Gothic: Reading Eden Robinson’s *Monkey Beach*,” is notable for her examination of the way that Robinson reclaims the gothic genre and upends the colonial expectations of horror and the ‘Other’ by positioning these within an Indigenous context through the art of ‘retelling’ (208). Andrews’s criticisms provide valuable support to my argument that Robinson dismantles colonial stereotypes through challenging hegemonic norms.

**Political Background: Indigenous Canada**

There are some significant political differences between post-independence Indonesia and contemporary Indigenous Canada. These differences might explain some of the variations in strategies of resistance between Indonesian and Indigenous Canadian revolutionaries. Noticeable distinctions come to mind: while a nationalist movement superseded colonial rule in Indonesia, Indigenous Canadians continue to resist the oppressive hegemony of the Canadian colonial government. For example, Indigenous Canadians are governed by the Federal Canadian Government *Indian Act*, which determines where Indigenous territories officially recognized by the Canadian government are, and who is recognized by the Canadian government as an Indigenous person (Ouellette 87-8). The criteria that determine who is recognized by the
government as an Indigenous person have not, in recent history, been determined by Indigenous peoples. Carole Blackburn writes that “Aboriginal people continue, [however,] to struggle against hegemonic criteria of belonging linked with a normative white identity as well as for recognition of their rights to land and self-government” (68). Blackburn explains that Indigenous groups in British Columbia have had to reclaim their status as citizens on their traditional lands, since the Indigenous status recognized by the Indian Act inadequately provides for the rights associated with Indigenous citizenship (70). One of the results of the Indian Act is to distinguish Indigenous Canadian communities and cultures by the cultural diversity and distinct territories, bands and nations of Indigenous Canadian peoples. Emma LaRocque, Alberta Plains Cree Metis critic, explains that “The Indian Act has determined identity and locality, defining margins and centres even within the Native community” (10). She describes one of the strategies of resistance of Indigenous Canadian communities as recognizing the commonalities of Indigenous experience, while dismantling the stereotyped generalizations of colonial representation of Indigenous peoples (10-11).

The original 1876 Indian Act in Canada marginalized Indigenous women by allocating Indigenous land to Indigenous men, and by politically disempowering Indigenous women (Huhndorf and Suzack 5). The Indian Act was amended in 1985 to address marriage laws and status guidelines that discriminated against Indigenous women (Ouellette 87-8), yet the internalization of colonial oppression through the subjugation of Indigenous women persists within Indigenous communities in Canada. Shari Hunhdorf and Cheryl Suzack provide statistics: “recent Amnesty International reports have exposed that Status Indian women in Canada are up to five times more likely than other women to die of violence, and their counterparts in the United States are 2.5 times more likely than non-Indigenous women to be raped” (5). Maracle
specifically addresses the internalization of colonial oppression within Indigenous communities when she writes of Indigenous women that “I believe they have been lied to, not just by Western colonialism but by their own leaders” (“Decolonizing” 31). The work of restoring Indigenous women’s traditionally respected roles within their communities, and of having Indigenous women’s voices recognized in the political sphere, is ongoing (Hunhdorf and Suzack 6-8).

With this consideration, I draw a parallel between the efforts for self-representation by women of the revolution in Indonesia and Indigenous women in Canada. While Rukiah portrays Susi’s emotional struggle to have her voice heard within the context of the Indonesian revolutionary movement, Robinson represents Adelaine’s coded communication that channels her emotions in order to point to the source of her oppression. While Susi is systematically oppressed in both traditional and revolutionary Indonesian societies, Adelaine is re-victimized through sexual abuse by a member of her Indigenous community. The effects of oppression on the lives of the Indigenous women in these two works are similar, though their responses, and the way that their subject-positioning is articulated in the texts, differ. The characters respond to the realization of their subject-positioning on a deeply personal level, and the expression of emotion is a transformative force. Both works explore the context of revolutionary social change, whether on a scale of mass movement or on the local community and individual level, within which Indigenous women must articulate their subject-positions. These Indigenous women’s voices in literature are of particular interest for their emphasis on emotional expression as a response to political circumstances, and for offering significant observations and critical perspectives on the impact of oppression, and on possibilities of resistance, for Indigenous women.
Indigenous Women in Canada

Indigenous communities in Canada remain subject to the oppression of colonial society, and must resist the impact of generations of families and communities fragmented by violence, abuse, prejudice, and the experience of being systematically marginalized. Visvis describes attempts by Indigenous communities to articulate their identities and to undermine continued attempts to repress their voices (13). She discusses communication within Indigenous communities in terms of “the ‘talking cure’ and explores this narrative paradigm as a potential reconciliatory strategy for coping with intergenerational trauma” (Visvis 6). The significance of narrative as a tool to empower and strengthen Indigenous communities in Canada is also acknowledged by Maracle, who states the need to “create a whole new series of transformation myths based on the old story set in the modern or contemporary context” (“Toward” 85). Women’s uniquely significant role in this process in described by Andrews, who draws from Paula Gunn Allen’s explanation in Answering the Deer: “American Indian women who write poetry draw on the ancient bardic tradition by primarily employing the themes of love and death, ‘themes’ that ‘encompass the whole of human experience’ ” (Andrews, In the Belly 22). Allen addresses women’s roles as the bringers of life, whose experiences of childbirth are intrinsically connected to the ever-present spectre of the advent of death. By emphasizing Indigenous women’s roles as generating the metaphysical knowledge base that sustains Indigenous communities, Allen’s position is prescriptive in her effort to restore the respect that would traditionally have been accorded to women in Indigenous societies.

LaRocque argues that the popular acceptance of highly simplified or stereotyped representations of Indigenous peoples continue to reinforce imposed colonial perceptions of Indigenous peoples, as when she states, “Hollywood, for example, keeps on producing and
reproducing movies that still largely depict ‘Indians’ in the tradition of captivity narratives” (63).

A Canadian Indigenous woman writer, Robinson’s work has been described as gothic, with associations made between this literary genre and a general atmosphere of ambivalence (Andrews, “Rethinking” 210). Andrews defines ‘gothic’ literature as combining terror and horror, where “horror may disgust the reader and suggest the futility of fighting evil, terror creates sympathy towards otherwise monstrous characters, in whom readers see themselves” (Andrews, “Rethinking” 209). Robinson’s work can be defined as gothic, with colonial oppression representing an external horror, and the internalized violence due to the re-victimization of Indigenous women representing terror. In light of LaRocque’s statement, Andrews argues that Robinson upends the gothic colonial inclination to impose the source of colonizer fears upon Indigenous communities, claiming that Robinson “transports the Gothic to a Native context, and, rather than depicting the Haisla characters who populate the novel as potential threats to the safety of a white, Eurocentric community, these individuals form their own world in which monsters exist but are not necessarily a destructive force” (“Rethinking” 212). Andrews adds that “Robinson negotiates a space in which her Aboriginal characters can examine the possibilities inherent in connecting to the natural world, monsters and all” (212). In this way, Andrews explains Robinson’s approach as one that seeks to reclaim the eerie atmosphere of the Canadian wilderness by introducing the Indigenous community as co-existing with the land, while occupying subject-positions defined by the horrors of colonial society. This innovative writing style addresses issues of identity through resistance to the type of essentializing described by LaRocque, and undermines stereotyped colonial perceptions by re-positioning gothic elements. I argue that, in dismantling colonial stereotypes, Robinson’s portrayals of Indigenous communities present an inversion of gothic threat to the oppressor by
demonstrating the perspective of, and generating sympathy with, the Indigenous protagonists, therefore undermining the hegemonic power of the imposed influence of colonial society.

Robinson’s resistance to essentialized associations between Indigenous peoples and the land is conveyed in *Monkey Beach*. Lisamarie’s final return to the land through an underwater vision in the chapter, ‘In the Land of the Dead’ (Robinson, *Monkey Beach* 367-74) is harshly alienating. The passage, “I lie on the sand. The clamshells are hard against my back. I am no longer cold. I am so light I could just drift away. Close, very close, a b’gwus howls – not quite human, not quite wolf, but something in between” (374), describes the haunting experience of an Indigenous woman who is on the line between reality and transcendence. Robinson’s character connects with the land at the end of the novel in a way that pays homage to the structure of final passages by other Indigenous novelists, as in Leslie Silko’s *Ceremony*. However, Robinson conveys this concept as entailing an exposure to a bluntly cruel reality defined by the human struggles to survive in an unforgiving natural environment that is negotiated through interaction in a complex web of human relationships. Robinson leaves the reader unsure of the protagonist’s fate, and her unflinching portrayal of the real danger found in nature dismantles preconceptions of Indigenous connection to land as associated with an inhuman power over, or essential identification with, nature. This is a strong example of Robinson’s efforts to dismantle preconceived notions of Indigeneity in her work.

Robinson confirms that there is tension around her efforts to undermine assumptions about Indigenous identity in her writing when she states, “As a Native writer, and as a female writer, some parts of publishing are much easier and some parts are more difficult. Telling stories that aren’t what people are expecting is difficult. They’re not as accepted” (Robinson, Interview). Yet, Robinson provokes the reader to question the assumptions generated by claims
to Indigenous identity by portraying female characters’ passages toward ambivalent final realizations that, nevertheless, articulate Indigenous women’s complex subject-positionings. In up-ending the expectations surrounding the connection to land that establishes Indigenous identity in *Monkey Beach*, Robinson creates a political allegory for women’s participation in First Peoples’ governance processes that “tend to be male dominated and appear to have adopted the European patriarchal system as a form of organization and control” (Ouellette 79) over land and community, and run counter to Indigenous women’s own interests. To address the emergent disjunctions between politicized activity, identity, and emotional self-definition, Robinson creates a portrait of a fractured community in “Queen of the North.” In this story, the revolutionary action of seeking retribution has destructive results that are anticipated by the female protagonist. Robinson examines the disharmony of neglecting women’s voices, as well as the need to prioritize the emotional health of individuals, relationships, and communities – with implications of the significance of this for the future of Indigenous communities in Canada.
Chapter 2: Analytical Approach

Definitions of Terms

In this thesis, I will use a number of terms that are worth defining. These include the concepts of decolonization, resistance, internalization of oppression, subaltern Indigenous woman, and articulation. These concepts form the categories that will be the basis of my literary comparison.

Decolonization

Decolonization involves the liberation of peoples from colonial rule and the occupation of Indigenous territories. This involves shifting perspectives in order to dismantle the colonial constructs that inhibit Indigenous articulations of identity. According to Emma LaRocque, “Besides deconstructing colonial frameworks, the advancement of Aboriginal knowledge is essential” (164). LaRocque implies that resistance to the colonial appropriation of Indigenous identity to validate the colonial cause, as with stereotyping (44-5), involves the re-assertion of Indigenous identity based on Indigenous experience, interests, and self-definition, toward articulating positionality.

Resistance

Resistance and decolonization are separate, but related concepts. Resistance can entail revolution, retribution, and anti-colonialism, and can occur locally within communities, as mass movements within the context of the nation-state, or within a global framework. Acts of resistance can take on personal or ideological meaning, with goals of individual empowerment or
widespread social change. I will apply the term resistance as encompassing all of the above, preferring Bill Ashcroft’s flexible definition of the term: “a ‘resistance’ that manifests itself as a refusal to be absorbed, a resistance which engages that which is resisted in a different way, taking the array of influences exerted by the dominating power, and altering them into tools for expressing a deeply held sense of identity and cultural being” (20). In this way, resistance is defined as a conscious occurrence, whether in the form of action or outlook, that disrupts the perpetuation of oppression and challenges established hierarchies of power. LaRocque explains the strategy of dismantling stereotypes as resistance through ‘disarming,’ using counter-narratives to assert articulated Indigenous identity (LaRocque 98). Resistance through literary representation is a powerful tool to undermine hegemonic assumptions about Indigenous peoples, and to present self-defined Indigenous identities through re-telling personal and historical, fictional and non-fictional narratives of Indigenous experience.

Internalization of Oppression

Decolonization is closely linked to the process of undoing the internalization of oppression, something that is described as a cyclical occurrence by Vikki Visvis. Visvis describes internalization as indicated by “performative modes of expression” (9) that are generated by, what Dominick LaCapra explains as, “possession by the repressed past, repetitious compulsions, and un-worked through transference” (qtd. in Visvis 9). Drawing from LaCapra, Visvis suggests that the re-enactment of oppression is exposed by the emotional exhibition of trauma. LaRocque describes internalization as the result of the process of fracturing a coherent Indigenous identity in order to impose a stereotype or expectation as an essential component of
identity (135). Internalization of oppression manifests in struggles that draw attention to the focus of decolonization.

Subaltern Indigenous Woman

In my literary analysis, I will focus on subaltern Indigenous women characters. While I define the concept of Indigeneity in detail in this chapter, I think that it is important to specify here the theoretical context with which I will define subaltern Indigenous woman. The subaltern is defined by Asok Sen as, “the entire people that is subordinate in terms of class, caste, age, gender and office, or in any other way” (203). In this sense, subordination on the basis of Indigeneity and gender position the Indigenous woman as subaltern.

Spivak explores the dynamic of both gender and race oppression with her provocative allegory for the position of Indigenous women as subaltern: “White men are saving brown women from brown men” (“Can the Subaltern” 296). In this sentence, Spivak exposes the oppressive dynamics of subjugation by white men who assert their self-congratulatory ‘saving’ upon Indigenous peoples. The inherent racism that underlies the dynamic described by Spivak can be recognized in the deceptiveness of the word ‘saving’ – since a woman who is removed from her community is not ‘saved,’ but rather abducted. Here, it is the colonial oppressor who defines the moral quality of the action, relying on the imbalance of power to justify the action. The pretence of rescue creates associations of powerlessness and lack of morality with race and ethnicity, contributing to an internalization of the ideologies of the colonial oppressor. In this way, Spivak exposes the affirmation of a hierarchy of power that dismantles community solidarity, and establishes the ideological foundations of colonial rule. Spivak intends both shock and irony in this statement, attempting to echo the sentiments of the dominant hegemony so that
its oppressiveness may be exposed for critical contemplation. Ultimately, Spivak intends the
dynamic represented in this statement to be recognized as connoting a social wrong, and offers
the opportunity to reflect upon the conundrum of the oppression of Indigenous women within
their own communities. By making the inherent racism that contributes to gender oppression
explicit, Spivak illuminates multiple trajectories of oppression, including stereotyping and
exoticizing. These involve the ‘Othering’ process of creating difference, where an Indigenous
woman is subject to assumptions about who she may be, as well as having colonial ideas
imposed upon her about who the oppressor wishes her to be. These must be untangled in order
for Indigenous women’s voices to emerge as actively articulating their own interests and the
interests of their communities.

Spivak describes subaltern silence as the state of marginalization from hegemonic
discourse, where silence signals a need for criticism (Spivak, “Can the Subaltern” 307-8): “The
subaltern cannot speak” (308). However, according to Homi Bhabha (Mohanram 195-6) and
Victor Li, the complete demonstration of oppression that Spivak describes does not exclude the
possibility of selective identification toward articulation, as described by Stuart Hall. Robinson
and Rukiah both articulate their positions as Indigenous women through authorship, where
depictions of subaltern Indigenous women’s subject-positionings are textually represented,
though negotiated through a medium that is concretely limited by either the demands of the
publishing industry, or the politics surrounding cultural production. The struggle of Indigenous
women characters to articulate identity through representational hybridity (Hoy 165; Shackford-
Bradley 236-7) offers textual engagement in discourse around the opportunity to concretize
identity through cultural representation, while Adelaine negotiates between traditional
Indigenous and Western cultural elements (Visvis 25). Through the characters, the authors represent complex positionalities in their works.

Rukiah’s experience of imprisonment for her writing (Shackford-Bradley 42) certainly demonstrates the articulative limits of authorship as an Indigenous woman, while Robinson’s status as the first Haisla novelist (Methot 13) shows the ongoing struggle for Indigenous women authors to generate opportunities for articulation in the literary form. Spivak outlines the trajectory of marginalization, subordination, and oppression, enabling an understanding of the subaltern Indigenous woman as doubly marginalized by race and gender, and re-victimized within the Indigenous community as a result of the internalization of oppression. My approach to subaltern gender oppression is on the basis of subordination and disempowerment within a hierarchy of power, and on the basis of norms and ideals imposed by the dominant hegemony that result in exclusion.

Articulation

In defining the concept of articulation, I draw upon Hall’s idea of articulation as a linking principle (Hall, “Postmodernism” 53). This implies the ability and opportunity to communicate in a way that illuminates a web of interaction as context. The role of articulation is to draw awareness to the influence of the dominant hegemony in defining identity, and this awareness can be achieved on an individual level, on a group level, or across positionalities and marginalities. I extend Hall’s concept of articulation as “a way of understanding how ideological elements come, under certain circumstances, to cohere together within a discourse” (53), to posit that articulation can refer to a range of forms of communication or ways of generating understanding. Therefore, articulation can occur through self-representation, and in the case of
the subaltern, through self-dialogue. By this, I mean that subaltern articulation can consist of the freedom to consider and describe one’s subject-position unhindered, regardless as to whether this type of coherent description or understanding is witnessed by an external audience. This is important because subaltern articulation contributes toward developing a self-defined identity, and therefore, cannot be dependent upon the validation, acknowledgement, or response of the oppressor who is positioned securely within the descriptive plane of dominant hegemonic discourse. This complicates the concept of articulation as positioning that is communicable across barriers of marginality, but also attempts to resolve the issue of subaltern silence by conceiving of articulation as occurring within a plane of understanding or awareness that is not dependent upon hegemonic definition. As a result, articulation has the opportunity to occur (or begin to occur) through the achievement of internal dialogue and insight, such as those that follow from the catalysts of self-expression by the characters of Susi and Adelaine, or likewise, as underlying postmodern narratives that drive overt communications, as in the textual repositioning of Adelaine from victim to aware, independent woman through metaphoric representation. Further, Rukiah and Robinson’s representations of Indigenous women may draw from the authors’ own knowledge of strategies of self-identification in relation to their own subaltern subject-positioning, and respond to the political realities that contribute to Indigenous women’s subjugation.

Hall approaches the concept of articulated identity as a way to indicate a subject-position that is “constructed within the play of power and exclusion” (“Introduction” 5). Articulation allows the subject to engage within a field of discourse from a vantage that is clearly defined and described by the subject for, but not by, the external observer (6). Li argues that the articulation of subaltern identity involves an inter-exchange of cultural experience and a fluctuating
positionality that empowers through the potential of dialogue (215-6). Li argues that “this ‘othering,’ which ensures the subaltern’s autonomy, also betrays the vulnerability of subaltern identity, its problematic unchanging role as reactive opposition to active Western domination” (225). In this way, Li challenges Spivak’s notion that the subaltern is relegated to absolute silence through oppression, and considers instead that the pursuit of cultural interests through political activism is a component of subaltern articulation (Li). In this way, Li expands the range of possibilities for subaltern engagement to include hybrid communications (in the sense of the appropriation of authoritative cultural elements or signifiers to communicate the subaltern position, as described by Bhabha [Mohanram 195-6]) to generate subaltern articulations of identity (Li 216). Li’s emphasis on Bhabha’s “enunciative agency” (qtd. in Li 216) attempts to unsettle the circumstance of subaltern subjectivity through recognizing the subaltern’s creative application of authoritative signifiers within a discursive context. This can be applied to the Robinson and Rukiah’s subaltern Indigenous women characters who undermine their subjugation and silencing by using varied and unconventional forms of communication. Susi adopts an unfeminine, stoic manner as protests against gendered norms (Kertapati, “An Affair” 63), and Indigenous characters in “Queen of the North” re-claim Westernized signifiers of resistance by wearing dyed Mohawks (Robinson 205).

Theory

I will outline the theories that I will apply to my discussion of Indigenous women and literature, and will examine the significance of these theoretical approaches to the social and political context of Indigenous women’s subaltern articulations of identity.
Friedman

Jonathan Friedman provides a conceptual framework for Indigenous issues within the context of global postmodernity. Friedman argues that the assertion of Indigenous identity within a global context occurs in opposition to “homogenizing processes that were the mainstays of the nation-state” (300). He adds that demands for recognition are based on “claims of territory as such, and they are based on a reversal of a situation that follows from conquest” (300). By this, Friedman points to the role of local efforts for sovereignty, self-determination, and rights to traditional territories as the basis for the articulation of Indigenous identity. Friedman also addresses the role of the “global elite representatives of various groups who are immediately implicated in a field of tension, between their very rooted places of origin and the inordinate power of global funds to incorporate them into the global cocktail circuit” (307). Friedman specifies that “The process of fragmentation via indigenization is subject to processes of social verticalization” (307), meaning that the selective representation of Indigenous voices among circles of power and influence determine the groups that are, and that are not, protected based on external criteria for the recognition of Indigeneity. Friedman’s ideas are significant when describing the political context of Indigenous movements, and the significance of generating Indigenous representations that counter those generated by the dominant hegemony. This is relevant when considering Rukiah’s representations of a subaltern Indigenous woman who is systematically silenced within the political context of an Indigenous movement, and when considering the significance of Robinson’s dismantling of Indigenous stereotypes through challenging textual representations.
Spivak, the Subaltern, and Gender

Gayatri Spivak’s article, “Can the Subaltern Speak?” addresses the complexity of articulating subaltern identity in the absence of opportunity for expression, and I support her position in arguing against the examples of subaltern subjugation that she presents. In her article “Can the Subaltern Speak?” Spivak discusses the “self-immolating woman” (299) in her analysis, and describes the Indian practice of sati as one where a widow’s choice to join her husband in death is associated with the definition, rather than the cessation, of a woman’s identity (299-302). Spivak interprets this as an extreme indication of women’s subaltern positioning, writing of the “asymmetry in the status of the subject, which effectively defines the woman as object of one husband” (303), and citing the material motives of relatives who encourage the practice of sati (300). Spivak’s example of the practice of sati evokes an extreme, where the amplified expression of gendered identity in the form of the devoted widow corresponds to subjugation and silencing. Spivak compares this ritual tradition with the example of a woman who wished to prove that she did not decide to end her life because of an unwed pregnancy, but rather did so for political reasons, and committed suicide during menstruation so that there would be no misinterpretation of her action (307-8). In this instance, menstruation as an indicator of female identity was acted upon to expose silence. However, in anticipating the external witness, the woman’s identity is neither described nor articulated in a way that does not conform to the hegemony that defines the marginalized subaltern as ‘to be silenced.’ Here, the rationale for representation is challenged by the conundrum associated with simultaneously negating the potential for self-representation. Spivak’s example of the inscription of gendered politics on the body as a means to articulate a gendered identity exposes a limit of representation
within the matrix of the subaltern’s subject-positioning, and therefore, reveals the challenge of articulating subaltern experience.

Kamala Visweswaran explains that the subaltern woman is uniquely positioned in relation to others within a social hierarchy of power based on gender, class, and other criteria (87). She draws attention to the impact of subordination on women’s articulations by the fact that “Colonial records rarely tell us what women said, but rather emphasize how women spoke” (90). Visweswaran shows that resistance to colonial values intervening in the interpretation women’s articulations and negation of the relevance of the content of women’s ideas entails “a project of subject retrieval” (91). She explains that the colonial recognition of only certain aspects of women’s communications serves to define the subaltern woman within a colonial hegemonic context, and simultaneously validates the colonial authority’s perceived right to do so. As a result, subaltern women’s articulations of identity must contend with the colonial desire not to know: “it was their social status or standing rather than elocutionary skill that made their speech worthy of notice [to the colonizer]” (92). Visweswaran’s ideas align with Spivak’s, in that the subaltern woman’s status is conveyed in silence because the words that represent her subaltern positioning are systematically unheard.

Feminist discourse acknowledges the implications of gender in the creation of social inequity. Judith Butler explains that “sexuality is culturally constructed within existing power relations,” and that “the postulation of a normative sexuality that is ‘before,’ ‘outside,’ or ‘beyond’ power is a cultural impossibility” (Gender 30). In contextualizing regulated gender roles and sexuality within a matrix of power relations, Butler elaborates on Spivak’s criticism that the limited possibilities for expression of gendered identity subsumes the female subaltern’s capacity for articulation. The concept of the subaltern Indigenous woman is particularly
significant when examining the characters in Rukiah and Robinson’s works. In these works, the opportunity for self-definition is not granted to the characters by the social environment of the narrative, and must be negotiated through textual representation from within the matrix of power hierarchies that position the subaltern.

Diana Fuss argues that “the adherence to essentialism is a measure of the degree to which a particular group has been culturally [or politically] oppressed” (qtd. in Mohanram 189). Essentialism refers to a set of qualities that are believed to be generally inherent characteristics of members of a group of peoples, and therefore, are used to define the ‘Other.’ The attribution of essentialist qualities to a group is an integral strategy of oppression. Conversely, the act of representation – the goal of the subaltern approach – undermines essentialism and its manifestations as stereotypes and exoticisms through examining common experiences associated with subject-positioning, distinguishing these from more deeply conceived and self-defined identities. I posit that subaltern oppression involves the subordination and control of the body through defining the body in essentialist ways in order to subordinate and control the person. Because of the social and political circumstances that make Indigenous women vulnerable to having their bodies manipulated, violated, and imposed upon, it is my position that the subaltern approach conceptualizes Indigenous women’s experiences of oppression within the context of a matrix of power relations, and exposes the dynamic that contributes to Indigenous women’s subordination. The political emphasis of the subaltern approach leaves room to examine the overt social and political contexts that make up the greater part of the content in Rukiah and Robinson’s narratives. The subaltern Indigenous woman’s effort to articulate her identity entails both a personal and community process of decolonization, while freedom from oppression is
inclusively and reciprocally defined by the autonomous actions of Indigenous women whose voices are made heard.

**Hall and Kellner**

Hall and Douglas Kellner apply deconstructive methodology in conjunction with analysis of context and ideology, theorizing that the factors of context and ideology irrefutably impact on deconstructive interpretative articulation of subaltern identities.

Kellner explores postmodern identities as contextual, and writes that “identity is highly fluid, multiple, mobile, and transitory” (157), referring to the social shifts where transformations of identity take place. Kellner also explains that “images are connected to content and values, to specific modes and forms of identity, and [...] saturated with ideology, so that identity in contemporary societies can (still) be interpreted as an ideological construct” (157). In this way, Kellner explains construction of identity as occurring within a political context, revealing that fluid postmodern identities continue to negotiate and challenge hegemonies with their own contesting forms of self-identification. Hall's articulated identity responds to “the relations of power which structure the inter-discursivity, or the intertextuality, of the field of knowledge” (“On Postmodernism” 49), meaning that identity is defined in discourse in relation to power structures and, therefore, is an articulation of a distinct subject-position within a matrix of power relations. Hall's idea of articulation as the linking of meaningful points of identification to create a deliberately constructed whole within a discursive domain (55-6), means that selected signifiers of identification can be adopted to represent the aspects of subject-positioning that impact upon individual experience. These combine to draw attention to systematic processes within a matrix of power that perpetuate the dynamic of oppression. In this way, subaltern
signifiers of Indigenous identity within a text may be re-framed by the author and reformulated by the reader, creating self-representations and articulations.

Jameson

Jameson's Marxist methodology engages the premise that political context influences textual representation. Jameson describes “cultural artifacts as socially symbolic acts” (20), and considers the political circumstances that contribute to literary production to be intrinsically related to the representational content of literary texts.

Jameson draws upon the idea of 'mediation' between the contexts of cultural production and consumption of text, and its internal composition (39-42). Jameson explains 'mediation' of the text as a “term for the establishment of relationships between, say, the formal analysis of a work of art and its social ground” (39), claiming that the relation between a work and the context of its production is significant to its interpretation. Jameson claims that “allegorical narrative signifieds are a persistent dimension of literary and cultural texts precisely because they reflect a fundamental dimension of our collective thinking and our collective fantasies about history and reality” (34). By this, he explains that political realities not only contribute to shaping and structuring textual narratives, but motivate textual production. Because cultural production occurs within a sphere of social influence, it is therefore, politically meaningful. Jameson's Marxist approach allows that the political position and involvement of the author influences the construction of a work of literature. As a result, literary analysis engages the ideologies within which, and against which, the work is read.

In order to conceptualize subaltern representation as articulation, it is helpful to engage with the concept of narrative transformation. Fredric Jameson’s idea of ‘romance’ in narrative
creates a conceptual ground for the type of transformative narrative that enables subaltern articulation. Jameson uses an example of the ‘Other’ whose identity is revealed, and who then becomes re-integrated into the group through a dramatic, emotionally-invested narrative of conflict and resolution. Jameson claims that this type of ‘romantic’ narrative functions to allegorically represent a contradiction within the dominant hegemonic discourse (118-9). This concept of ‘romance’ does not reflect the common usage of the term, but rather indicates an occurrence in a narrative that is fantastic in effecting dramatic change. This change involves re-positioning a narrative element or character within the dominant social order, and involves a substantial shift in interpretation of the narrative context. This shift leading to re-interpretation is revealed through narrative events, and forms an allegory for contradictions within the established hegemony that contribute to the composition of the text itself.

Jameson does not specifically apply the concept of ‘romance’ to subaltern articulation, yet the transformative aspect of Jameson’s dramatic narrative to illustrate the identity of the ‘Other’ describes the dynamic of subaltern articulation, as I will consider it. Jameson’s transformative ‘Other’ in literature negotiates the boundaries between hegemonic and marginalized social positions through dramatic movement (103-50) and the ability to “project[s] and block[s] out a world of a determinate structure” (132). This challenge to established power hierarchies allows static, outdated, and oppressive social realities to be re-imagined and re-defined. Both Rukiah and Robinson’s subaltern characters express emotional conflict through confrontation before their personal insight about their subject-positions is fully represented in the text. Adelaine, for example, is known in her community by the adopted cultural signifier and nickname, Karaoke, but at the end of the story she is represented embodying an ideal that is unattached to the external perceptions that were generated during her struggles around being
victimized. Though articulation involves the transformative reversal of subaltern status, a
reversal of oppression does not entail the cooption of the subaltern by the dominant hegemony.
Therefore, I will apply Jameson’s concept to the *incomplete* process of integration of the
subaltern ‘Other,’ where the transformation is sufficient for the subaltern position to be
articulated, expanding the subaltern’s range of choice and possibilities for action. This is
particularly relevant to the transformative impact of the conclusions of both Rukiah and
Robinson’s works, where the characters articulate insight of their subaltern status in textual
representations for the reader that re-situate the significance of the subaltern Indigenous
women’s subject-positioning.

**Politics of Indigenous Identity**

I will discuss some of the ways that Indigenous identity is defined, with an emphasis on how
Indigenous identity is claimed in ways that relate cultural knowledge to transition and adaptation
in response to a changing matrix of socio-political relationships. Michael Dodson, an Australian
Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander human rights advocate, explains Indigenous identity in his
statement, “The right to self-representation includes our right to draw on all aspects of our sense
of Aboriginality, be that our blood, our descent, our history, our ways of living and relating, or
any element of our cultures” (40). Dodson draws attention to the fact that Indigenous self-
identification, while often rooted in Indigenous experience of traditional territory and land
appropriation, and colonial oppression, is defined and acknowledged according to a flexible
criteria of culture, ancestry, community, and worldview, among other wisdom- and value-based,
and soul-sustaining forms of knowledge. In this way, Indigenous self-identification is comprised
of personal significance and meaning that is derived from personal relationships, daily living,
contributions to community, and the experience of sustaining societies on Indigenous land, as well as the relevance of these in structuring worldview.

With the idea of Indigenous identity as self-defined, it is possible to distinguish self-definition from subaltern compliance with imposed external assumptions about Indigeneity. In this way, the expression of Indigenous identity through literary representation, signification, and allegory forms an articulation of identity that has significance for understanding the socio-political constructions that contribute to Indigenous subject-positioning. Examples of this occur in both Robinson and Rukiah’s works, where both Susi and Adelaine explore their Indigenous identities. Susi intellectualizes her position within the revolutionary political context of Indonesian independence. She retaliates with debate and study when she discovers that her ideas are dismissed by members of the revolutionary camp (Kertapati, “An Affair” 73). Adelaine explores the emotional empowerment of self-acceptance within the context of a personal relationship, and has the opportunity to display her knowledge of the stars and the constellations to Jimmy, even though she has been led to believe that this is, as she describes it, “pretty nerdy” (Robinson, “Queen” 195), and has had her skill casually dismissed in the past by her cousin, Ronny (“‘That’s Venus.’ ‘Like you’d know the difference’” [191]). Susi and Adelaine’s demonstration of their abilities and insights are empowered movements toward articulative self-understanding. Rukiah and Robinson amplify the efforts of their characters to articulate identity through added textual elucidation. The subaltern characters must rely on emotional expression followed by personal insight that is shared solely with the reader, in order to demonstrate their subject-positioning as Indigenous women. The authors show their characters’ subalternity through textual indication of political and community constraints upon voice, representing
identity as clearly situated within a matrix of power relations, and presenting textual articulation of Indigenous women’s subalternity drawing from authorial insight.

Definitions of Indigenous identity may also be derived from solidarity in revolutionary mobilization against a colonial oppressor. Franz Fanon describes the oppression of Indigenous peoples in terms of the imposition of colonial systems: “The ruling species is first and foremost the outsider from elsewhere, different from the indigenous population, ‘the others’” (*The Wretched 5*). By this, Fanon means that the different tribes of Indigenous peoples are connected by the shared experience of colonial oppression (104-9). He explains that “Decolonization, therefore, implies the urgent need to thoroughly challenge the colonial situation” (2), and includes Indonesia in the list of countries that have resisted colonization with armed struggle (42). In fact, Indonesia’s nationalist movement against Japanese occupation and the return of Dutch colonization following World War II culminated in a nation-building project following Indonesian independence in 1945 that was earmarked by the integration of Indigenous cultures. The implementation of the Pantja Sila, the five constitutional guiding principles of the newly established Indonesian nation, was developed on a pretence of being in accordance with Indigenous Indonesian philosophies of “attachment of values to communal harmony, social solidarity, and their feeling of oneness with their leaders” (Bourchier 160, 164), and as “Sukarno subsequently claimed, was not his own creation but was ‘dug’ by him from Indonesian soil” (van der Kroef 274). From this, it is clear that Indonesian national identity was initially cultivated to represent the Indigenous cultures and traditions in diverse communities, despite “the extent to which cultural traditions are open to manipulation” (Chalmers 26) in serving the state agenda (Bourchier).
The interests and ideologies of national unification do not necessarily represent the multiple interests of diverse Indigenous communities, despite the fact that Indigenous communities are enlisted in the nationalist cause. This became apparent in Indonesia following Independence, with the nationalist project for Indonesian modernization. Rudolf Mrazek points to the state processes that fragmented Indonesia’s communities under the banner of ‘progress.’ He provides an example that demonstrates the New Order’s authoritative assertion of economic development as a nationalist ideology, and the use of misinformation and mystification to justify the means to achieve this end. Mrazek states: “At one point of their exile on Buru, the prisoners were informed by the camp authorities that they were not prisoners actually – captured fighters, souls of resistance – but ‘settlers,’ thus a part of the New Order Indonesian government’s long-term, social-engineering program to open new lands and to build for the future” (emphasis added 221). While Mrazek’s example may be an unusual occurrence, it presents the New Order government’s interest in imposing nationalist ideologies and agendas at the expense of local, rural, and Indigenous communities’ interests, cultures, and traditions. The New Order state’s intention was to ‘de-Indigenize’ local cultures by uprooting and relocating communities within a framework of government politics and policies (Duncan; Mrazek 221). The drive toward modernization generated social and governmental stigma against traditional, rural and / or self-identified Indigenous communities, and resulted in discriminatory policies toward traditional, rural and / or Indigenous peoples in Indonesia – who would eventually be recognized by their lack of integration into the nationalist project for modernization: while Indonesia does not address the rights of Indigenous peoples in its state policies, it does perpetuate the “Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Sosial Komunitas Adat Terpencil” program that targets Indigenous minorities for relocation and integration into urban and modern lifestyles (Duncan 90-7). It is therefore possible
to surmise that Indigenous movements against colonization must also address internalization of
the colonizers’ ideals, whether individually or systematically, in order to prevent a resurgence of
oppression that takes the form of ‘internal’ divisions, as is the case with contemporary
Indigenous groups and the Indonesian state.

**Indigenous Women’s Assertions of Decolonization**

Indigenous women’s representations are subject to multiple trajectories of
marginalization, including gender, race, and fourth-world class and territorial positioning.
Maracle asserts the pointed claim that “our women are the most violated human beings, the least
educated, the most overworked and underloved and unprotected human beings in the history of
Turtle Island” (“Decolonizing” 30), drawing attention to the degree of inequity that afflicts
Indigenous women in Canada, but also echoing the sense of injustice around the subjugation of
Indigenous women across the globe (Chenault; Smith). Venida Chenault positions the oppression
of Indigenous women within a global context, and provides facts and statistics that reveal
disproportionate suffering of Indigenous women in the global community (3-16, 17-42).
Indigenous women face some of the greatest challenges, both locally and globally, to having
their voices recognized.

Indigenous women in Indonesia were vocal about their experiences during the period of
Dutch colonization, and engaged in dialogue and debate around the complex social and political
dynamics of gender, race, and class hierarchies that structured Indonesian women’s realities.
Raden Ajeng Kartini was one of the most prolific historical Indonesian woman writers, who
criticized traditional cultural practices that oppressed women, and familiarized herself with
Western literature and ideas. Her ideas of having the colonial government accountable for
policy-making to ensure women’s equal rights were in keeping with the enactment of the Dutch ‘debt of honour’ toward Indonesia, in the form of the 1901 Ethical Policy that required the provision of equal opportunities for education for female and male children in Indonesia (Hellwig, *Adjustment* 28-9). Interestingly, many colonial-era Indonesian women writers resisted the oppressions of traditional society by expressing a revolutionary desire for gender equality that was derived, to some degree, from exposure to Western values (Sumardjo 42-5). However, post-war Indonesian women authors often critically address the personal and community sacrifices that have been the result of the revolutionary struggle (46). An example of the idealization of military women’s “feminine purity and simplicity” representing “national mimicry of a familial genealogy” (Sunindyo 14) shows the limitations of nationalist advocacy for women’s empowerment. The result was the disillusionment of Indigenous women with promise of egalitarian Indonesian nationalism.

At the same time, Indigenous women are uniquely situated to voice the needs that must be met in order for efforts at social change to constitute empowerment, arguing from the vantage of social roles that involve caring and relationships, providing sustenance, and creating growth and harmony in the family and in the community. Maracle elaborates on the importance of Indigenous women’s voices in carrying the knowledge gained from their contributions to society. She says, “Suppose we said, our laws clearly state that the home, the gardens, the river’s fish, the village itself, is the dominion of women, and we as women are assuming our inherent aboriginal right to exercise the dominion of our homes and villages” (Maracle, “Decolonizing” 38). Maracle is referring to Indigenous women’s traditional positions of power associated with their roles of nurturing family and extending this caring to the community, as well as ensuring
sustenance and survival. Maracle suggests that, in validating the importance of Indigenous
women’s contributions, the Indigenous community validates itself.

In light of this, the systematic degradation of Indigenous women can clearly be seen to fulfill
colonial and imperialist interests in devastating and disempowering Indigenous communities.
The weight of the challenge to restore Indigenous women’s roles within Indigenous societies is
described by Chenault, who states that “Indigenous women are increasingly targeted for a wide
range of violence and abuse, both within tribal communities, and throughout mainstream society”
(emphasis added 8). Maracle provides examples of the ways that Indigenous women’s interests
are neglected by male Indigenous leaders, as with one Indigenous leader who failed to pay his
abandoned wife child support after leaving her, and as with another who left his wife
hospitalized after battering her (“Decolonizing” 47-8). Indigenous communities fractured by
violence against women suffer from the perpetuation of disharmony. The political negotiations
that do not involve Indigenous women’s voices inevitably censor important critical perspectives
on the ranking of power in societies in relation to colonial oppression, and therefore, the keys to
resist assimilation.

---

**Literature as Tool of Articulation**

I would like to comment on the significance of literature as a tool of articulation of
Indigenous women’s identities representation.

Authorship is important as a context of production that contributes to self-representations of
Indigenous identity in literature. LaRocque explains that Indigenous narratives do not begin with
the modern capitalist medium of published text, but instead, include published text as one of
many mediums for conveying Indigenous narratives (19). In this way, LaRocque repositions the
privilege often applied to medium, and instead, restores the importance of narrative – reinstating Indigenous authors’ role of sharing dialogue and adding to Indigenous narrative histories. Lee Maracle combines the concepts of decolonization and reconnection. She examines the importance of discerning hegemonically imposed colonial distortions of Indigenous societies (“Toward” 86), and unearthing the remnants of past Indigenous knowledge to combine with knowledge newly acquired from recent Indigenous experiences (84-5) to repair existing fissures in the threads that symbolize the transmission of knowledge from one generation to the next (82). Maracle describes transformative literature that is relevant to the contemporary situation of Indigenous peoples (85) as the culmination of efforts of restoring Indigenous knowledge to produce new Indigenous narratives. She also frames this process as demanding, not archival authenticity, but contemporary relevance that is informed by Indigenous traditions and histories. From this, it is possible to recognize that Indigenous identity, authorship, and narrative are correlated to both the contemporary and historical situation of Indigenous peoples, Indigenous peoples’ experiences, and the worldviews and transformative discourse that continue to convey Indigenous narratives.

Jameson develops a concrete approach to analyzing literature within the political context of its production, integrating the author’s subject-position as influencing the construction of the text. Jameson describes the text as ‘limited’ by its historical and political context, determining both textual relevance and objective (147-8). Therefore, it is possible to consider literary analysis as a mediation of the text and the context of its production. Jameson, like Hall and Kellner, considers poststructural critical methodology as contextualized by social and political discourse. Jameson says of Derridean deconstruction, “If such perceptions are to be celebrated in their intensity, they must be accompanied by some initial appearance of continuity, some ideology of
unification already in place, which it is their mission to rebuke and to shatter” (53). By this, Jameson implies that the critical methodologies of literary analysis must work within a framework of social context that has contributed to the production of the text in order to distinguish what is significant and meaningful about a particular narrative. In this case, Jameson argues that poststructural analysis depends upon the ability to expose and undermine a pre-existing hegemonic discourse. In this way, the postmodern occurs within a matrix of responsive change, where the very dismantling of signifiers from their ideological foundations critically references the very social discourse that it discredits.

Postmodernism can be defined as a way of living, a contemporary culture, and a phenomenal social reality within an era (Norris 9). Poststructuralism, on the other hand, can be described as the practice of dismantling a hegemonic metanarrative, and defined as “a story that […] claims to have achieved an omniscient standpoint above and beyond all other stories” (Norris 10). This is accomplished by reading the text as decentered. Jacques Derrida explains, “The center is not the center” (Derrida, Writing 279). By this, Derrida suggests that the central focus of a text is supplied by the dominant hegemonic discourse in the form of the metanarrative. The text that revolves around this metanarrative takes on different significance when the “repetitions, substitutions, transformations, and permutations […] taken from a history of meaning” (Derrida 279) are read against the intended central focus in order to illuminate signifiers of contradictions within the dominant discourse. In this way, the strategies of poststructural analysis can be applied within Jameson’s framework for political context of cultural production, if political and social context is associated with the metanarrative that the text responds to and challenges.
Hall’s take on poststructuralism is that “the attempt to gather them all [postmodern elements or signifiers] under a singular sign – which suggests a kind of final rupture or break with the modern era – is the point at which the operation of postmodernism becomes ideological in a very specific way” (“On Postmodernism” 47). In this sense, Hall presents poststructural analysis as informed by ideological and political discursive constructs, validating a poststructural analytical approach that recognizes the significance of cultural production within a political context. Kellner claims that it is possible to conduct a poststructural analysis on “mass-mediated artefacts to see what they tell us about identity in contemporary society” (144). Kellner shows that postmodern signification in the form of symbols, metaphors, and representations occur within an interactive cultural domain that includes an audience, and competing lines of discourse. Therefore, the practical methods of poststructural literary analysis can be applied to illuminate a cultural dialogue that mediates between narrative and political context.

LaRocque explains how Indigenous literature functions to refute the narrative of the colonial hegemony by asserting alternative historical claims, and exposing injustice and abuse. While presenting histories of stolen traditional territories (LaRocque 87-8), dehumanizing stereotypes (98), and stolen families (88-9), “The theme of Native people’s confusion and despair runs through much of Native writing and cuts across centuries” (89). In this sense, literature offers a counter-narrative to that of the dominant hegemony through disrupting its coherence and consistency.

In the works that I will study, the subaltern women characters struggle to communicate, both in words and in actions, their self-understanding of their position in the world. In Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, for example, Susi makes a pragmatic choice. In doing so, she demonstrates the limited options for women, and the emotional conflict of being caught between adherence to
tradition and family obligation, and love relationships developed through personal affinity and shared politics. Rukiah illustrates the conflict surrounding women’s options in her work, and may have drawn from her struggle in her own life to resolve her values and ideals with a practical reality. Rukiah herself followed a very different life path than her character, Susi. Rukiah married a politically active man who was eventually forced to leave the country because of his ideals, causing Rukiah hardship (Shackford-Bradley 39-42). Kedjatuhan dan Hati anticipates the challenges that Rukiah experiences later in her life, likely drawing from Rukiah’s insight into the options for women, and offering a somewhat loaded counter-argument to pursuing revolutionary ideals at the expense of family and tradition. Susi is not happy with her eventual decision to marry Par and to live a life of deception, but maintains her resolve to sacrifice her personal interests for the well-being of her family. This warns the reader of the implications of gender inequality, and functions to garner sympathy for the cause of having women’s rights acknowledged by the new Indonesian nation. Rukiah critically addresses poverty and the false promise of nationalism through a lens of personal implication and associated emotion. Through representation, Rukiah exposes an inherent contradiction in the ideals associated with the revolution in terms of their practical support of women, and elucidates women’s positionality within the political moment.

Robinson, as an Indigenous writer, mixes traditionally Indigenous and non-traditionally Indigenous symbols and content. Of the inclusion of Indigenous tradition in her works, Robinson states, “I would know when it was wrong to write about certain things” (Methot 12). This brings up, not only the question of ‘what is Indigenous writing?’, but also whether the inclusion of sacred traditions meant only for the Indigenous community necessarily defines Indigenous literature. Helen Hoy asks the rhetorical question, “Where do I mark the border of the reserve
and how narrowly do I configure it? – fry bread on one side of the line, Rice Crispies on the other” (179), drawing attention to the integration of traditional Indigenous and Western cultural influences as representing the Indigenous community within a contemporary context. In this sense, Robinson engages literary representations of Indigenous characters to undermine stereotyping of Indigenous peoples, such as Ella Soper-Jones’ essentialization of Indigenous violence. Soper-Jones draws a parallel between a traditional ceremonial dance of the Indigenous community that included a performance of a monstrous being, with the brutal realities of daily violence in reaction to colonial oppression represented in Robinson’s works (19-20). However, Robinson’s simultaneous integration of Indigenous, colonial, and non-traditional cultures in her narratives serves to withhold opportunities for essentialist analysis by showing that multiple cultural influences contribute to Indigenous hybridity of experience and identity. Bhabha describes hybridity as composed of a replication that entails a “ruse of recognition” (qtd. Mohanram 196) that undermines colonial authority. In this sense, the integration and adoption of signifiers associated with colonial culture challenge their authoritative use by the oppressor, and change their significance. Robinson’s depiction of Adelaine’s violence in “Queen of the North” is clearly represented as a situational expression of personal emotion that is less an inherent component of identity, than it is a response to the cumulative realization of an Indigenous women’s subject-positioning within the community and in the world.

Beth Brant says that “When we hold up the mirror to our lives, we are also reflecting what has been done to us by the culture that lives outside that mirror. It is possible for all of us to learn the way to healing and self-love” (qtd. in Lane 161). Brant draws attention to the impact of colonization on the web of interaction within Indigenous communities. Robinson makes this influence evident by framing the incidents of Adelaine’s violence within a historic colonial
context in the form of residential school sexual abuse, and also grants her characters non-
essentialized Indigenous identities that reflect the contemporary Indigenous reality of combined
cultures. In this way, Robinson distinguishes the substance of personal relationships, such as
Adelaine and Jimmy’s (“Queen” 199-200), from the assumptions that are attributed to
Indigenous peoples, such as those presented by the bannock customer (206-9). By drawing the
lines of identity around the experience of personal relationships in “Queen of the North,”
Robinson represents Indigeneity through resistance to stereotyping and fixed definition, and as
discernible within an emotional reality.

Through the creation of sympathy with depictions of visceral experience and emotion,
literature can be reworked past its hegemonic structuring in order to elucidate the subject-
position of the subaltern. Gyanendra Pandey suggests that postcolonial transformation entails the
“struggle to recover ‘marginal’ voices and memories, forgotten dreams and signs of resistance”
(214) if the stories of marginalized histories are to have meaning. The depiction of expressions,
communications, and actions of emotion in literature, framed within a literary discursive context,
contributes to restoring the subaltern’s story toward articulated representation.

**Focus of Discussion**

I will focus on the voices of Indigenous women during historic periods of insurgency,
and their emphasis on the emotional strength of connection formed through relationships, family,
and community. I am particularly interested in the way that the Indigenous women characters in
the works of Rukiah and Robinson represent gender oppression, both by the colonial oppressor,
and within their communities. I will address representations of emotion in literature as
transformative, both for the characters in the form of articulated insight that is textually
represented to the reader, and as ‘romantic’ narrative shifts that cause the reader to re-evaluate the impact of the characters’ subaltern positioning on their experience and prompt the reader to conceptually reposition the subaltern in relation to the narrative events. In this sense, textual elucidation of the subaltern position creates a subaltern articulation by provoking the reader to question situational constraints by the dominant hegemony upon articulated identity. These representations, while systematically overlooked as ‘silences,’ are clear articulations of, and critical engagement with, resistance; they are the root potential for sustained, positive change.

I will apply Spivak’s concept of subalternity to refer to articulated identities subject to multiple trajectories of oppression, such as those experienced by Indigenous women who are marginalized on the basis of race and gender, and compounded by oppressions such as those associated with economic class status and political positioning. Both Rukiah’s Susi and Robinson’s Adelaine are multiply oppressed and use emotional outbursts to communicate their need to articulate their subject-positions. I will adopt Jameson’s concept of transformative ‘romance’ as represented by expressions of emotion, Kellner’s concept of symbols within a social context toward the articulation of identity, and Hall’s approach to articulation, in order to examine the composition of identity through the creation of notable connections between indicators of subject-positioning. Both Susi and Adelaine choose to disrupt the passage of events that threaten to leave them literally and emotionally abandoned by using emotional expressions of dissent to draw attention to their unarticulated subjectivity, thus enabling the potential for reparation. Susi asks Luk to leave with passionate animosity, but also begins an internal dialogue around the subsumation of the subaltern’s voice. Susi presents this in the form of a “tiny red question I tucked in the desk drawer locked securely away” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 105) (“Tanja mérah ini kusimpan dilatji dan kukuntjikan”; Kedjatuhan 204), metaphorically symbolizing both
the repression and continued assertion of her critical perspective. Adelaine responds to
Michelle’s distressing news with violence toward a stranger, indirectly communicating that there
is something not right about Jimmy’s new job (Robinson, “Queen” 214). While this is partially
resolved in Robinson’s work, Monkey Beach, where Michelle is renamed Lisamarie, and
investigates her brother Jimmy’s disappearance, the incident reflects Adelaine’s sense of her own
powerlessness to communicate, leaving her to be the sole figure at the end of the narrative,
standing on Indigenous land in contemplation (215).

My intention is to show that the depictions of emotional interaction by Indigenous
women in literature contribute to the construction of Indigenous women’s identities in ways that
emphasize the significance of experiences of oppression to identity formation that is
representative of Indigenous women’s marginalized subject-positions. The literary depictions of
Indigenous women’s expressions of emotion are transformative in their potential to indicate a
trajectory of oppression that, when distinguished, illuminates the pathway and potential for
insight toward the articulation of identity.
Chapter 3: Shattered Hearts in S. Rukiah Kertapati’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*

In this chapter, I will discuss S. Rukiah Kertapati’s novella, *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*. I will examine the historical context of the novella, and Rukiah’s positioning between traditional and modern ideas of women’s social roles. I will specifically address the complexity of Rukiah’s depiction of emotional attachment that is confounded by both the constraints of tradition, and by loyalty to revolutionary ideals. I will explore the idea that Susi, Rukiah’s protagonist, articulates a critical perspective on the Indonesian movement for independence for having neglected to resolve issues of gender inequality by not acknowledging the emotional realities of women that convey women’s interests. Susi’s final rejection of her lover, Luk, along with her resignation to a life that she perceives as offering no pragmatic options that will satisfy her soul, demonstrates disillusionment with the power of radical idealism to overcome gender inequality that is perpetuated through traditional practices and expectations in Indonesia. Through the narrative, Rukiah shows that inequality persists within Indigenous communities in Indonesia, despite the popular ideological resistance against colonization. This critical stance is articulated by Susi’s self-awareness that follows her emotionally engaged interaction. Susi’s experience of oppression shows that gender inequality within Indigenous communities in Indonesia remains unresolved, with implications for the trajectory of the nation-building project.

**Theory: Indigenous Indonesia**

The distinctions between widespread revolution and localized resistance that distinguish mass movements from local rebellions reflect different circumstances of oppression of Indigenous peoples. The Indonesian revolution, as a struggle against colonial oppression
consisting of territorial occupation, can be categorically defined as an Indigenous movement for the purpose of comparison with other forms of Indigenous resistance.

The separate identification of ethnic identity from national identity in Indonesia suggests a perpetuation of Indigenous awareness that was initially generated in the struggle against Dutch colonization, and that continues to undermine the implication of Indigenous consent to the actions of the Indonesian nation-state. Jonathan Friedman describes “indigenous, immigrant, sexual, and other cultural political strategies aimed at a kind of cultural liberation from the perceived homogenizing force of the state” (300) to show that diverse voices resist common oppressions. Friedman explains that “no nation can logically precede the populations that it unified in its very constitution” (301), arguing that it is territorial identities of distinct groups that contribute to a composite national identity, and that must perpetually struggle for recognition in order to prevent the nation-state from re-enacting the dynamic associated with the force of conquest. Revolutionary resistance was inclusive of Indonesian women, who were interested in achieving equality within the context of their relationships, households, and communities, and therefore, within society as a whole (Hatley and Blackburn 47-55). Barbara Hatley and Susan Blackburn state that, prior to Indonesian independence, “writers sometimes admitted that divorce might lead to the need for women to support their children themselves” (52). These pragmatic interests in women’s welfare were of profound importance in the establishment of a national political structure. The interest in gender equality continues to concern Indonesian women to this day (Tiwon, “Reconstructing”), and this struggle is represented in Indonesian literature. Several contemporary Indonesian women authors are critical of gendered and socio-political inequity. The poetry of Saraswati Sunindyo examines systematic gender inequity that leads to widespread poverty and prostitution, while Leila Chudori considers the challenge of articulating identity as a
woman in Indonesia in “Air Suci Sita,” where hypocritical gendered expectations, described as “the contradictions and restrictions of female experience” (Hatley 113-2), dictate Indigenous women’s most heartfelt emotions.

Franz Fanon uses the terminology ‘native’ and ‘indigenous’ (The Wretched 4, 8) to describe the people who collectively engage in decolonization through revolution. The description does not allude to a traditional tribal lifestyle or brand of Indigenous exoticism, but rather, to the groups of peoples who have had their land and rights appropriated by colonial governance. Fanon explains further, “For a colonized people, the most essential value, because it is the most meaningful, is first and foremost the land: the land which must provide bread and, naturally, dignity. […] The colonized subject has never heard of such an ideal. All he has ever seen on his land is that he can be arrested, beaten, and starved with impunity” (9). This means that Indigenous resistance against colonization originates in the mobilization around an identity that is formulated through awareness of rightful land and territory, and of the circumstance of colonial oppression. Fanon emphasizes the continuing need for localized mobilization in order to pressure the state to represent the nation as diverse voices, rather than merely representing the isolated interests of colonial powers within a national-state structure (115). Friedman claims that “Both regional and indigenous identities in nation-states make claims based on aboriginality. These are claims on territory as such, and they are based on a reversal of a situation that follows from conquest” (300). From Fanon’s perspective, this ‘reversal of a situation that follows from conquest’ must continually be enacted, as decolonization involves not only resistance to the presence of the colonial oppressor, but also to the lasting impact of the implementation of colonial systems and the internalization of oppression. Diverse and localized community mobilization in both resistance to colonization and in asserting the voices that define the nation,
including those of women, are defined as the process of decolonization (Fanon, *The Wretched* 2-3).

Spivak’s description of Indigenous women’s position in relation to the male colonizer as one of impotent rescue, where Indigenous women are subject to a strange and exoticized form of objectification (“Can the Subaltern” 305-6), is echoed in Rukiah’s novella. Susi “wanted the Dutch to regain their strength and take over this country again, not because I do not recognize this land as a nation in its own right, but because I wanted the government that imprisoned Luk to fall” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 95) (“ingin supaja Belanda terus kuat menguasai negara ini bukan karena aku tidak tahu negara, tapi karena aku ingin supaja tentara² pemerintah jang mengangkap Luk itu hilang kekuasaannya”; *Kedjatuhan* 193). Susi becomes ambivalent about resistance to the colonizer, legitimizing the colonial ‘saving’ that, nevertheless, positions her more vulnerably within a power structure where she is doubly marginalized by both race and gender. The relationships between Indigenous women and the colonizers in Indonesia have historically been characterized by exploitation, including sexual exploitation through concubinage (Hellwig, *Adjustment* 32-3). However, the violent suppression of Susi’s lover by the Indigenous nationalist government causes Susi to perceive colonial occupation as personally preferable, and politically comparable to an Indigenous nationalist authority. The Indigenous nationalist government exhibits internalization of colonial oppression by re-oppressing members of the Indigenous community in the persecution of communists. Rukiah represents the complexity of Indonesian politics, reminiscent of Spivak’s tiered hierarchy of ‘Indigenous woman,’ ‘Indigenous man,’ and ‘colonizer’ (“Can the Subaltern” 296). Rukiah’s narrative is the product of an Indigenous woman’s realization that the transference of political power through revolution does not depend upon consideration of women’s interests and needs.
Spivak examines the paradox that results when women are the inspiration for a revolutionary movement, describing this as “instrumental in the shifting of the function of discursive systems, as in insurgent mobilization” (“Subaltern” 356), while at the same time, the importance of women’s roles is neglected. Spivak discusses how Gyanendra Pandey and Dipesh Chakrabarty’s discussions of the proletariat do not distinguish the ‘female’ subaltern, or address the rejection of women leaders throughout Indian history (357). Spivak asks:

In terms of social semiosis, what is the difference between maneating goddesses, objects of reverence and generators of solidarity on the one hand, and secular daughters and widows, unacceptable as leaders, on the other? (357)

Spivak draws attention to the transformative role of women in effecting social change, while noting that women’s importance in this process is systematically under-represented. Saraswati Sunindyo places this dynamic within the Indonesian context, citing many examples of Indonesian women’s involvement in resistance movements, yet who are relegated to passive inspiration, domesticity, and positioned to support a gendered nationalism. Referring to Sukarno’s Indonesia, Sunindyo writes, “nationalism demands a specific kind of femininity which, in this case, is dictated to women through masculine imagination” (16). Sunindyo questions the reality of women’s equality in the revolutionary or nationalist cause, and supplements this with evidence, such as Sukarno’s preference for women who used traditional beauty products and who represented the nation in ways that distinguished them from Western countries (8), to reveal a correlation between the practice of nationalism and women’s submission and dependence.

Rukiah’s Susi attempts to have her active interest in the revolutionary movement recognized when she joins the Red Cross. Susi seeks to understand her own role in relation to the significant social changes taking place around her, when she asks:
“If one has failed in gentleness, beauty, honesty, and love, can she be faulted or prevented from searching for another way, even if that route is cruelty, arrogance, roughness, or bloodshed?”
(Kertapati, “An Affair” 61-2)

–Bila manusia telah gagal dalam kelembutan, keindahan, dan kedjudjuran kasih-sajang, apa salahnya mengambil djalan jang lain, djalan kekasaran, keganasan, kesombongan, dan pembunuhan?–
(Kedjatuhan 148)

In this passage, Susi explains her inability to conform to feminine ideals, and her consequent interest in the revolutionary process of social change. She is drawn to the promise of being repositioned in society in a way that will allow her to exercise her capabilities for action, personal growth, and relationship building, though these may express themselves outside existing gendered norms. Judith Butler discusses gender in terms of its definition through a combination of language and institutions of power to generate a gendered norm (Gender 26-9). This is the very norm that Susi challenges in her struggles to have the significance of her dissent acknowledged, and in doing so, encounters the persistent thread of gendered social inequity.

Through conceiving of a re-invented social reality by contrasting her experiences and options with her ideals, Susi takes on the transformative role described by Jameson’s ‘Other’ (132). In Rukiah’s work, the “substitutions, adaptations, and appropriations” (131) that signal the shift “of the collective and the associative [toward] the ‘decentering’ of the individual subject […] in such a way that individual consciousness can be lived” (125) are expressed through Susi’s appeal to the truth of her emotions through expressing them, and the transformative potential of her realization of her position as an Indigenous woman.
Plot Summary: *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*

S. Rukiah Kertapati’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, translated as “An Affair of the Heart,” was published in 1950, and is set in the period leading to Indonesian independence. It is the story of three sisters, Susi, Lina, and Dini, born at the time of the Indigenous mobilization for independence into a traditional Indonesian household whose class status has been established within the colonial system of social organization. Susi narrates her life experience from early childhood. She tells of growing up in a traditional household in Central Java with an oppressive mother who pressures her daughters to strive for domestic success and a prosperous future through a suitable marriage. Susi explains her mother’s gendered expectations of her daughters: “For Mother, a woman had to be gentle and pretty. She must glow, be charming enough in speech and manner to acquire a husband and, finding one, make sure that he became sufficiently well-off to allow her to repay her parents for the long and arduous work of raising her” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 50) (“Kemauan ibuku, perempuan itu mesti tjantik dan mesti lembut seperti perempuan; mesti bertjahaja dan mesti bisa bertjerita memikat hati, sedang kemudian mesti ber-tjita nu punja suami kepada orang jang berada atau kaja, buat membalas guna dengan budi dan benda kepada orang tua jang sudah sekian lama ketjapéan menguruskan”; *Kedjatuhan* 133). This expectation forms the foundation of the three sisters’ understandings of womanhood, and structures their various responses.

Susi describes her older sister, Dini, as a stubborn tomboy (Kertapati, “An Affair” 50), and her younger sister, Lina, as “slim and pretty” (51) (“tjantik dan langsing”; *Kedjatuhan* 134). Susi’s mother’s abuse of Dini warns Susi against challenging her mother’s instructions. After Dini is berated by her mother for being unattractive, Susi describes how Dini’s “eyes would glow with a vengeful light that gradually worked its way into her heart and turned it to stone” (“An
Affair” 51) (“sedang dimatanja terkumpul dendam jang kemudian turun dihati djadi mengeras seperti batu”; Kedjatuhan 133-4). Susi shares sympathy with Dini, but does not wish to share her fate, and expresses this when she claims that “Unlike Dini I never displayed these feelings by complaining or behaving vengefully” (“An Affair” 51) (“tidak aku perlihatkan dengan keluhan atau dengan muka jang penuh dendam seperti Dini”; Kedjatuhan 135). Susi is also mystified by Dini’s bravery and self-determination. When Dini reacts to her mother’s harsh words by preparing herself to leave home and relinquish marriage, Susi responds, “I couldn’t imagine what kind of woman – or rather how a woman – could possibly live alone without a husband” (“An Affair” 51) (“Tak terbajangkan oléhku, bagaimana matjamnja seorang perempuan tak bersuami, hidup sendiri”; Kedjatuhan 134). Susi describes the restricted gendered expectations and roles that are associated with identifying as a woman in society. This telling statement reveals both norms and limited options for women, as well as introducing Dini’s character as a model of woman who is willing to step outside the boundaries of the norms ascribed to her gender.

Susi’s younger sister, Lina, is a model of her mother’s ideals, but alienates Susi with her demeanour: “the praise she [mother] heaped on Lina only served to make her the more vain and haughty” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 51) (“Djuga segala pujian² kepada Lina, mendjadikan Lina bertambah sombong dan djadi galak”; Kedjatuhan 134). Susi creates a portrait of her two sisters, situating them as though representing opposite extremes of femininity, and drawing attention to the contrast between them. Rukiah writes:

I stared at Dini and compared her face with Lina’s as she stood listlessly toying with the necklace draped around her neck. Her slender fingers were beautiful and her pale skin shone white in the lamplight. […] Dini slowly turned her head away, and for a moment I caught sight of the gleam in her eyes. (“An Affair” 52)
Aku padangi mata dan air muka Dini, dan kemudian kubandingkan dengan Lina jang ketika itu sedang memper-mainkan kalungnya diléhér. Djari tangannya indah lampai, dan kulitnja putih bersinar kena tjahaja lampu. [...] Pelan² dipalingkannja muka Dini kepinggir, dan sekilat sadja kekerasan tjahaja matanja terasa dihati dan menjentuh kelembutan.  
(Kedjatuhan 135)

This comparison emphasizes the opposition of passive and active, beautiful and ugly, manipulative and hard-working, domestic and political. The characters of Lina and Dini represent contrasting positions on a gradient of values associated with either tradition or modernity. Rukiah’s portrayals of Lina as coy and demure, and of Dini as ferocious and headstrong, become the foundations of the sisters’ worldly roles when Dini leaves to work in a hospital in Semarang in Central Java and Lina marries a man that she does not love in order to satisfy her mother’s wishes. Susi describes Lina’s callous materialism in a time of social struggle, stating, “So people were forced to live in suffering while Lina lived a luxurious existence with her new husband. Whatever Lina wanted, she got, no matter how far one had to go to find it” (“An Affair” 55) (“Begitu menderitanja orang banjak, tapi begitu senangnja pula Lina dengan suaminja. Mau apa sadja Lina, selalu ada, dan selalu ditjari hingga sedia, sekalipun benda² jang diingininja itu djauh tempatnja”; Kedjatuhan 140). Rukiah portrays Lina as blindly representing the hopes for prosperity following independence, despite the harsh reality of abject poverty that surrounds her.

Representing a medium between her two sisters’ extremes of compliance and dissent, Susi questions the world’s expectations of her, and notices the historic events taking place around her. She describes Lina’s marriage as occurring “six months after the signing of the Proclamation of Independence” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 55) (“6 bulan setelah proklamasi kemerdekaan”; Kedjatuhan 139), generating an ironic twist to complement a marriage bond that is “empty of love” (“An Affair” 55) (“tidak punja kasih-sajang”; Kedjatuhan 139). However, the
poverty that afflicts Indonesian communities following independence is a catalyst for Susi’s growing awareness. Susi is critical of the false promise of revolution, stating:

But now, with this new ‘freedom,’ with the ‘revolution,’ they had nothing at all save some free advice on deceiving themselves about the harsh realities they had just begun to grasp.

(“An Affair” 55)

Sebab dengan adanja révolusi kemerdékaan ini, meréka jang bodoh ini tidak mendapat apa dari révolusi, ketjuali meréka dipeladjarinja membohongi dirinja sendiri, dan menipu perasaannja jang sudah mulai mau meraba kenjataan jang bisa diraba.

(Kedjatuhan 140)

Susi’s vision of the widespread poverty following Indonesian independence is combined with her dismay at the oppressive tradition that determines her mother’s plans for her future. Susi describes her possible prospects as inevitably leading to “A story without a happy ending” (“An Affair” 56) (“tjerita […] jang gagal itu”; Kedjatuhan 140). Susi’s family’s middle class status established during the colonial period is evident by the family’s inclusion of hired help for the household among their expenses (“An Affair” 89), and the implication of widespread poverty during the period of the Indonesian revolution (55, 77) allows that the pressure for Susi to adhere to restrictive traditions and expectations around marriage is indicative of the tensions surrounding her family’s falling class status during a period of social change.

Susi finds a first love in Rustam, a young man that she shares a genuine feeling of connection with. However, because Rustam is “from Sumatra and therefore an ‘outsider,’ a ‘foreigner’ as Mother called him” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 56) (“Dia orang Sumatera, orang Seberang, orang asing kata ibu”; Kedjatuhan 140),Susi would never be able to marry Rustam with her mother’s blessing. Susi describes her mother’s position on the relationship as “so old-fashioned and so unreasonable” (“An Affair” 56) (“Ibu mémang terlalu usang pikirannja”; Kedjatuhan 141), showing the conflict that her mother’s traditional expectations cause for her.
Susi reflects on her resulting separation from Rustam: “The pain I felt could not have been imaginary. But I stored it neatly away inside” (“An Affair” 57) (“Sakit terasa bukan buatan, tapi sakit ini kusimpan rapih dihati”; *Kedjatuhan* 142). This shows that Susi begins to repress her emotions, but does not let go of the resentment she feels for being forced to betray her heart. As a result, Susi is driven to seek meaning in working to change the world around her. With Susi’s resolution, “Why do I need love?” (“An Affair” 58) (“buat apa aku punja kasih-sajang?”; *Kedjatuhan* 143), she plunges her energy into involvement with political organizations, beginning with the Young Women’s Movement, and then with greater commitment, rejects an arranged marriage with a respectable member of the community named Par in order to join the Red Cross (“An Affair” 58-9). This represents Susi’s transition from a young woman who is in the process of planning her domestic future, to one who becomes actively involved in shaping her future possibilities through political organizing.

Learning that Rustam has married, Susi decides to relocate to a section of the Red Cross located on the further outreaches of the city run by Dr. Mansur, hoping that her feeling of being “hollow inside, empty of cares or feelings” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 60) (“kosong tidak punja perasaan apa², aku tak peduli”; *Kedjatuhan* 146) might be transformed by work that would, as she says, “stir the spirit of revenge and retribution” (“An Affair” 61) (“membangunkan dendam dan pembalasan”; *Kedjatuhan* 147). Susi contemplates the gendered socialization of her mother’s household, where waiting on men entailed restraining personal emotions: “We couldn’t show our dislike for him even if he was impolite or otherwise quite detestable” (“An Affair” 62) (“Kami tak bolēh bentji, sekalipun laki² itu kurang ajar dan patut buat dibentji”; *Kedjatuhan* 149). Her exposure to violence with Dr. Mansur’s group pushes Susi’s limits, and challenges her to “divest myself of all my feelings as a woman and match my own character with that of the male rebels”
Rather than an essential association between femininity and emotion, I interpret this to indicate Susi’s unwillingness to associate herself with the gendered expectations of an arranged marriage that is in contradiction with the emotional reality of her attachment to Rustam. Ironically, in removing herself from an intolerable personal conflict due to gender inequality, Susi’s dedication to her work is expressed in the ideals she shares with the revolutionary, Luk, and leads to a relationship.

Susi’s relationship with Luk is also one that would draw reprehension from her mother. Susi exclaims, “A Freedom Fighter! Defender of the People! The very thought of having such a person in the family would have been alien to Mother” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 65) (“Orang apa dia? Perdjuangan? Pembéla rakjat? Ah, asing dan djauh buat ibu punja keluarga baru jang begitu’an”; Kedjatuhan 153). Luk supports the guerrilla units of the revolutionary cause (“An Affair” 65), and though in love, Susi perceives the difference in Luk’s and her motives. She states, “this memory too must die. You will die with your communism and I will die with my uncertainty. And we will die apart” (67) (“Dan mémang ingatan ini mesti mati. Engkau akan mati dengan komunisme-mu, aku djuga akan mati bersama ketidak-tahuanku. Dan kita akan mati berpisahan”; Kedjatuhan 156). Susi realizes that her goal to escape the oppression of the traditional expectations for Indonesian women still does not provide her a role within Luk’s world of passionate political ideals. When Dr. Mansur learns that the camp will be attacked by the government, Luk leaves Susi, and risks his life to defend the revolutionaries, despite Susi’s argument that “Capitalism and communism don’t enter into it at all. The only thing that matters for me now is that we find a way to keep from being separated” (“An Affair” 81) (“kita bawa pula berputar kepada soal komunisme dan kapitalisme. Sebab jang penting bagiku, soal kita, soal
Disillusioned with love and pregnant after Luk is captured, Susi returns to her childhood home to marry Par, the husband of her mother’s choice (“An Affair” 95, 98). Susi entertains the deception to the community that her baby with Luk is, instead, a child born from her marriage (99).

After returning home, Susi learns that her mother is mentally ill, and that Dini has left for Bali. She is told that “Her [Dini’s] goals were still knowledge and the achievement of her ideals. [...] Dini, unlike me, had strength” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 89) (“Dan kuat aku tidak. [...] Dini mengatakan, bahwa dia tetap dalam djandjinja jang semula [...] kawin dengan tjita² dan pengetahuan”; Kedjatuhan 185). Susi continues to admire her older sister’s determination to make a living without being dependent upon a husband to sustain her. Lina, on the other, has changed since the hardship of their mother’s illness has taught her to work and care, and to find love in her relationship with her husband: “Fortunately, Jono was good and patient and, as time went on, came to love me more. It’s his love that helped me change what you called my ‘vicious streak’” (“An Affair” 90) (“Dan untung sadja Jono makin lama makin sajang kepadaku, dan sesajangan ini bisa mengubah sifat²ku jang dulu djelék katamu itu”; Kedjatuhan 186-7). Susi’s family has not been immune to the struggles following independence.

Regardless, the community dynamic feels regressive for Susi. She describes “ ‘friends’ [...] of that class who like to call themselves ‘new women,’ ‘women of the struggle of 1945.’ But it was only that number that was new. [...] These women had the power to speak out, of course, but the majority of their conversation was devoted to clothes, parties, dances, children and the like” (“An Affair” 94) (“Kawan² ini tentu gadis² jang maunja disebut gadis perdujangan tahun 45. Tapi tahunja sadja dia tahun baru [...] Meréka bisa bertjerita, tapi dasarnja tjerita itu lebih banjak kepada pakaian, pésta², minum² dan anak² muda”; Kedjatuhan 191). Susi becomes
critical of the claims of women’s revolutionary empowerment when she realizes that the
mindsets of the women of the community with regards to their social roles and positions have not
shifted significantly. Susi resigns herself to her marriage, yet without enjoyment:

Well, I hate them too and all their wicked hearts and evil desires. I keep the wire fence in
repair, and the gate is always closed. I stay behind it, keeping my heartache and vengeful
desires inside me.
(“An Affair” 101)

Penghinaan jang ditimbulkan dari kedjahatan rasa ini, bisa menimbulkan kebentjianku.
Dan dalam pagar kawat jang tak pernah pintunja terbuka inilah aku tiap hari
mengumpulkan sobékan hati, dosa dan dendam.
(Kedjatuhan 200)

Despite the revolutionary ideals that accompany Indonesian independence, Susi discovers herself
trapped in, and resigned to a domestic role that conforms to her family’s traditional expectations
of her. Susi’s disappointment and bitterness is directed, not only at the limited options of
traditional expectations of women, but also at the false promise of liberation promised by the
revolution for independence.

Susi struggles with Luk’s abandonment of her, but also with the self-contradictory
ideologies that drive the revolution. While in the camp, she argues against the minimal
importance placed on art and spirituality (Kertapati, “An Affair” 70-2), and in particular on love.

Harun, a revolutionary, explains revolutionary leadership in the following terms:

a leader of the people must stand among those same people he says he is struggling for.
[…] But he must be able to stand above them as well, with a torch in his hand, not as an
angel or messenger from on high, but as a normal human being with flesh and bones, able
to feel hunger and pain
(72)

—orang jang mengaku dirinja mendjadi pengandjur rakjat, mesti berdiri di tengah²
rakjat dibélanja itu, […] Dia mesti berdiri dengan obor didepan, bukan sebagai malaikat
atau gaib dari kajangan, tetapi sebagai manusia biasa jang berkumis, berdjénggot,
kadang² sakit lapar dan pening juga…—
(Kedjatuhan 163)
Harun describes the role of the revolutionary as one that is all-consuming – both sympathetic and altruistic. However, Susi does not feel emotionally bound by Harun’s assertion of revolutionary pride: “[Harun] had reached the climax of his speech, sounding just like a speaker at a rally” (“An Affair” 73) (“Bila Harun sudah tiba kepuntjak pembjitjaraan matjam orang pidato begini ditanah lapang”; Kedjatuhan 163). She remains unconvinced that the social and cultural bonds that tie members of the community to one another, including art, poetry, and spirituality, should be discarded by those who claim to represent ‘the people’ in revolutionary leadership. Susi is told that “Poetry takes you into the mysterious and the miraculous and will present you with a set of bourgeois morals” (“An Affair” 74) (“Sadjak⁵ jang menudju ke-kegaiban dan keabadian begitu, akan membawa engkau kesuatu moraal burgerlijk jang tjuma ada dibuku⁵ kuno sadja”; Kedjatuhan 165) in order to discourage her from what are perceived as indulgent pastimes. However, Susi claims that “art or anything that has eternity as its goal. [Such things] will always be heard, treasured, and loved” (“An Affair” 71) (“Lain dengan tjerita² atau sesuatu jang langsung mentjari jang tunggal, mentjari djalan jang menjendiri, lepas dari ikatan² pengaruh luar, sampai kapan djuga ia masih ditjinta dan masih bisa buat didengar penuh keabadian seni atau keindahan jang lembut”; Kedjatuhan 160-1), showing that she believes in the intellectual and emotional value of these pursuits (“An Affair” 71, 74). Further, Susi accuses Luk of unfairly prioritizing his revolutionary goals over his emotional commitment to her, stating, “you’ll let it wipe out any hope we might have had for happiness. You’ll be taken away” (80-1) (“Keributan itu akan menelan harapan hari bésok kepunjaan kita dalam kepandjangan berbahagia. Dan engkau akan ditangkap”; Kedjatuhan 174) and “Love for you is something apart, separate from all your other thoughts and emotions” (“An Affair” 82) (“Dan djika engkau ingin bertjinta buat kepentingan rasamu jang terpisah, engkau mesti mau lepaskan diri dari fahammu atau
kejakinanmu jang berlainan”; *Kedjatuhan* 175). Because of the sacrifices demanded by the revolution, Susi perceives Harun as hypocritical despite his passion. She challenges Harun’s stoic communism, drawing from her emotional response to Harun’s statements. Susi expresses her valuation of love and emotional bonds and her desire to act on these, despite the structured demands of political philosophies or authoritative institutions that seek to supersede personal decision-making and judgement based on individual needs:

I couldn’t be bothered with any more stories about ‘the people’ who needed defending. I wanted to satisfy my own hunger for love and wanted that love to be gentle and pure. In the end we have two distinct realities to choose from: we can declare that we can no longer accept religion or the teaching it embodies and bow to the strongest group, or we can demand that all the power vested in the government and in political, military and police bodies be abolished.

(“An Affair” 73)


( *Kedjatuhan* 163)

In this way, Susi develops her position toward the popular revolutionary ideologies of the time. She continues to draw on the political ideas that resonate with her, sympathizing with another revolutionary named Haris, whose description of humanism conveys the values of “trust, hope, and love” (“An Affair” 73) (“kepertjajaan, harapan dan kasih-sajang”; *Kedjatuhan* 164). Yet, Susi is increasingly ambivalent toward a cause that demands the sacrifice of her love relationship with Luk (“Looking at him I knew I loved him” [“An Affair” 81] [“Kasih jang ichlas bening seperti katja”; *Kedjatuhan* 174]), showing her personal motives for her own ideological position.

*Kedjatuhan dan Hati* ends when Luk arrives unexpectedly at Susi’s new family home, where she lives with Par and her son. Luk introduces his presence with the words, “Even now I
feel like a sinner standing before a saint” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 102) (“sudah kuanggap sebagai satu ke-kurang adjaran dari manusia jang tidak bersusila terhadap manusia jang bersusila”; Kedjatuhan 201). Susi accuses, “You don’t even know what feelings are. All you know are beliefs” (“An Affair” 102) (“Engkau tidak tahu, apa bédanja hati dan kejakinan faham”; Kedjatuhan 202), positioning herself against the politicized bond of their relationship. Susi refuses to have anything to do with her former lover, and dismisses his appeals to politics with the statement, “Even I don’t have any feelings of nationalism left. I hate every one of those people who have made this country what it is” (“An Affair” 103) (“Aku sendiri tak punja lagi kesadaran kebangsaan. Aku bentji kepada segala jang mendjadikan Negara ini djadi begini”; Kedjatuhan 204). This allusion to the perpetuation of poverty and inequity implies, not only Susi’s change of heart in the relationship, but also her disillusionment with independence.

Susi passionately demands that Luk leave her, and in her final statement, mourns the senseless loss and daily suffering of continued poverty and armed conflict following independence and the perpetuation of restricted opportunities for women through gender inequity, along with the traditional norms associated with gender roles (Kertapati, “An Affair” 87-8, 92-3). Her discovery that her mother is “sickly and coughing” (87) (“kekurusan ibu dan batuknja”; Kedjatuhan 183) invokes the weight of obligation: “I want her to be well […] Even if I have to suppress my own desires forever” (“An Affair” 87) (“Aku ingin menjembuhkan ibu. […] sekalipun keinginan itu akan membikin aku lagi menindas hati buat sekian kalinja”; Kedjatuhan 183). Susi conforms to a poisonous lie surrounding the identity of the father of her baby and man she loves (“That is not his son! That boy is mine and Luk’s” [“An Affair” 100] [“Anak itu bukan anak dia! Anak itu anakmu dan anak Lukman”; Kedjatuhan 199]), and in doing so, relinquishes her ideals, and expresses her disillusionment with the promises of the revolution:
“I hate the revolution for what it has done” (“An Affair” 100) (“Ibu sebabna aku bentji révolusi”; *Kedjatuhan* 200).

**Analysis: *Kedjatuhan dan Hati***

In *Kedjatuhan dan Hati*, Rukiah draws on the key theme of emotion in her critical representation of the revolution in Indonesia, emphasizing the way that women’s rights are inadequately addressed. This overarching theme is represented through the character of Susi, who becomes involved with the Red Cross and a revolutionary group at the outskirt of the city. Susi appeals to love and understanding, drawn from her experience in personal relationships, as a component of reason in her vocal debates. Susi draws attention to the emotional and social considerations that are overlooked by the revolutionaries, resulting in the loss of her loyalty and support for their cause. I argue that the emotional conflict that results in the subsumation of women’s voices involves the politicized romanticism of martyrdom for the cause. The failure of revolutionary ideals to consider personal love connections as the basis for strategy and action was a crippling oversight of the Indonesian revolution. Indonesian women’s struggles to have oppressive gendered traditions, such as arranged marriage and concubinage, were incompletely addressed (Struers 138-40, Appendix E 174-5), with repercussions of social devastation and inequality throughout the nation-building process for years following independence and even to the present day. This is evident from the persistence of gender inequality aggravated by efforts during the 1960s to suppress popular uprisings against the government (Sundhaussen 176), along with the ideals of gender equality associated with the communist movement and repression of the communist women’s organization, Gerwani in 1965 (Hatley 100-1). The long-term impact of these policies continued to affect Indonesian women’s opportunities for equality into the 1990s,
with only two conservative organizations serving women in Indonesia, the PKK and Dharma Wanita, and those emphasized women’s domestic roles (98).

Susí communicates her status as a woman in both traditional society and the revolutionary movement through her response to her circumstances and her dialogue throughout the progression of the narrative. The political context positions Susí as an Indigenous subaltern woman who communicates her position by rejecting the ideals of martyrdom that she eventually recognizes at the very source of her own oppression. The culmination of Susí’s response to her experiences during personal exploration of her identity and her relationship results in Jameson’s ‘romantic’ transformation. I will examine Susí’s introduction into the Red Cross, her discussion with Harun about art and spirituality, and her appeals to Luk to not sacrifice their relationship in order to serve the revolutionary cause, as well as her eventual resignation to an arranged marriage and her refusal to forgive Luk’s emotional betrayal of Susí, upon his return. Susí’s appeal to emotion to advocate for her position as a woman shows the significance of emotion as an easily overlooked factor in the revolutionary trajectory toward gender equality.

When Susí’s mother pressures her to marry an appropriate match despite her love for another man (Kertapati, “An Affair” 56-8), Susí becomes aware of the expectations placed upon her to sacrifice her own values, her happiness, and the emotions that tell her who she loves and trusts, and therefore, her sense of self. Susí describes her anticipation of the demand for self-sacrifice: “Gradually my tears dried. My eyes sank deeper into my skull and a dryness touched my heart. I asked myself, ‘Why do I need love?’ ” (58) (“Tapi lama² air matakku habis, kelopak mata djadi tjekung, dan timbul kekeringan disegenap hati. Aku bisa bertanya, bahawa buat apa aku punja kasih-sajang?”; Kedjatuhan 143). Rukiah describes the soul-searing devastation of the
spirit that Spivak refers to when she describes the community-enforced pressures that propel women toward silence (Spivak “Can the Subaltern”).

Susi rejects the oppressive traditional women’s roles and criticizes their lack of consideration for women’s emotions. She begins to formulate a set of personal values that involve her determination to live free from institutional oppression:

For myself, love would be enough. A relationship based on love alone. […] Humanity has such a propensity for laying down rules, even when those rules serve only as shackles. Today laughing requires a special permit; our very footsteps are licensed and controlled. So too love and affection must be controlled and consideration given to matters of status and wealth. Humanity has belittled itself with all its regulations and requirements. Now we are held back by rules that violate and destroy the possibility of true love and affection.

(Kertapati, “An Affair” 58)

Through Susi’s voice, Rukiah introduces concepts of power, social regulation, and gender, and her most powerful point is Susi’s criticism of social expectations that entail reining in emotion in order to serve the interests of society. While Susi explores many ideological outlooks throughout the course of the novella, she consistently reacts against rules and regulations, and seeks ideological validation of her emotional reality. She resents the pressures on her to marry in order to satisfy social expectations (“I keep the wire fence in repair, and the gate is always closed. I stay behind it, keeping my heartache and vengeful desires inside me” [“An Affair” 101] [“Dan dalam pagar kawat jang tak pernah pintunja terbuka inilah aku tiap hari mengumpulkan sobékan hati, dosa dan dandam”; Kedjatuhan 201], and questions prioritizing Indonesian politics over supporting the people that one cares about (“An Affair” 105). Butler approaches the topic of
socially-constructed gendered identity by drawing on the ideas of Foucault. She claims that “prohibitions are invariably and inadvertently productive in the sense that ‘the subject’ who is supposed to be founded and produced in and through those prohibitions does not have access to a sexuality that is in some sense ‘outside,’ ‘before,’ or ‘after’ power itself” (Butler, Gender 29). Through the character of Susi, Rukiah draws attention to the oppressive control of every aspect of women’s persons, from their actions and bodies to their thoughts and emotions.

When Susi chooses to join the Red Cross, she does so as an act of rebellion, defying the social constraints imposed upon her by tradition. Despite Susi’s awareness of the conflict between gendered social expectations and her emotional reality, she subversively proceeds with the trajectory of sacrifice and ‘martyrdom’ (at least, of her heart and time). The image Susi presents of herself after joining the Red Cross amplifies the visual representation of self-sacrifice that is initially prompted by the pressure to marry a man she does not love. The passages, “hollow inside, empty of cares or feelings” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 60) (“kosong tidak punja perasaan apa², aku tak peduli”; Kedjatuhan 146) and “I look older; there is a shell around my heart that grows harder” (“An Affair” 63) (“Aku djadi begini. Muka makin tua, hati makin mengeras dan kosong tak kenal rasa”; Kedjatuhan 149), show that Susi’s sacrifice of her femininity or sense of being a woman by refusing to conform to gendered expectations, is accompanied by a sentiment of loss. Susi rejects her femininity and “paid no attention to the men’s smiles or remarks when I behaved coldly toward them, so unlike the soft and gentle woman they dreamed of” (“An Affair” 63) (“Dan aku tak peduli, bila sekali² mendengar utjapan² meréka jang mengédjék melihat aku tegang sadja tiada lembut selembut perempuan jang biasa di-tjinta²kan meréka”; Kedjatuhan 151). In this way, Susi undermines the social roles and subjection associated with her gender by refusing to fulfill the expectations of the external gaze,
but she does so by unhappily ‘sacrificing’ her understanding of her identity as a woman. Spivak describes similar subaltern actions in terms of displacement, so that the message of sacrifice or martyrdom cannot be misread as willing submission to social standards (“Can the Subaltern” 307-8). Susi challenges the assumption of women’s complacent self-sacrifice, but in the first section of the novella, sacrifices the transformative potential of emotion to indicate her subject-positioning as a subaltern Indigenous woman in order to do so.

Involvement with the Red Cross gives Susi an opportunity to politicize her experience as a woman in Indonesia during the transition to national independence. In her discussions of political ideology and philosophy, Susi gains awareness of her Indigenous articulation of identity through resistance, but also questions those ideologies. When she is welcomed to the camp of rebels at the outskirts of the city, Dr. Mansur explains, “You will find bitterness here, but your feelings will be one with the peoples.’ Their bitterness will be your own” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 63) (“Disini engkau akan mengalami kepahitan, tapi hati bersatu dengan rakjat. Kepahitan rakjat adalah kepahitanmu”; *Kedjatuhan* 150). In this way, Susi begins to learn the principles of empathy and solidarity that fuel the revolutionary movement. In her discussions with Luk, she is introduced to the idea that love can flourish regardless of class difference. Luk explains, “Love isn’t for the bourgeoisie alone. We may love, too. And why shouldn’t we? It’s true, I am a communist” (“An Affair” 66) (“Hak milik kita semua, bukan hak kaum bordjuis sadja. ‘Human right are for us all, they are not just the rights of the bourgeoisie.’ Kita boléh bertjinta. Mengapa tidak? Tjuma sajangnja, ja, aku seorang Komunis”; *Kedjatuhan* 155). At the same time, Luk states that, “To achieve our goals the communist has to be a revolutionary, which means more or less becoming a soldier willing to risk his life for the struggle” (“An Affair” 67) (“Dan dalam mengedjar tudjuan, kaum komunis biasanja mendjadi beroepsrevolutionair, artinja kurang lebih,
pedjuang jang menggantungkan hidup-matinja kepada perdjuangannja”; Kedjatuhan 155). Luk communicates the ideals of communist martyrdom, while Susi points out its hypocrisy. She replies, “For that reason then, you should not fall in love,’ I said, trying to keep the truth from my aching heart” (“An Affair” 67) (“– Itu sebabna engkau tak boléh bertjinta, kataku menindas kebenaran suara dihati jang sedih”; Kedjatuhan 156). While Susi can appreciate the communist ideal of the disintegration of class barriers, she questions a love that is not stronger than the appeal of altruistic sacrifice for a collective cause, and advocates for the importance of the individual.

Luk feels that his love for Susi has become too over-powering and may cause him to betray his communist ideals. Susi explains that this is “enough to kill all hopes I had of a life together” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 68) (“Kata² ini tentu membunuh harapan buat hidup bersama menurutkan maunja hati”; Kedjatuhan 157), and her feelings toward the communist ideal diminish as a result. She “wanted to scream out and deny everything they said’ (“An Affair” 68) (“Ini rasanja aku berteriak menjangkal kata²nja itu”; Kedjatuhan 157). The initial appeal that the revolution held for Susi, with its promise of an alternative future for women, becomes restricting in its demands for loyalty and adherence to its principles, and in the minimizing of the importance of emotional bonds: “The pain I felt was real. But what could I do? A bond had grown between us that no amount of pain or hate could ever erase” (“An Affair” 68) (“aku sakit bukan buatan. Tapi hubungan kami telah telandjur, tak bisa lagi dipisahkan oléh kebentjian dan kesakitan jang bukan buatan itu”; Kedjatuhan 157).

Susi extends this criticism of communist ideology in her discussion with Harun, who attacks her ‘restored’ femininity through her relationship with Luk, saying, “You’re becoming like one of those fairytale princesses. Your voice is soft and you’re always smiling. […] What you’re
doing is in effect destroying the soul of a revolutionary” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 70) (“Mengapa engkau makin hari makin lembut seperti puteri bangsawan kuno, Sus? […] Suaramu lunak, senjumanmu berat […] Itu artinja merusak djiwa seseorang jang sedang berdjuang”; Kedjatuhan 160). Harun implies that femininity and sentiment are incompatible with the trajectory of the revolutionary movement. Susi challenges the suggestion that gender equality entails a rejection of femininity, her identity as a woman, and her emotions, with her statement, “But can’t you understand, Harun? This is how I am” (“An Affair” 70) (“Tapi aku sekarang sudah begini, Run”; Kedjatuhan 160). Susi asserts that being a woman is as much a component of her identity as her involvement with the revolutionary movement, and must struggle to represent the importance of recognizing the value of Indigenous women’s voices as offering significant contributions to the revolutionary movement.

Susi argues that ‘the people’ are composed of “distinct colors and markings. […] like that artist friend of yours. You have your own beliefs, he had his. Tell me, honestly, do the people actually share these ideals and beliefs of yours?” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 72) (“pembawaan tjorak masing. […] si seniman tadi. Engkau sendiri kini punja kejakinan tjita. Tapi apakah tjita2 mu itu diakui oleh gerombolan masjarakat?”; Kedjatuhan 162). In this debate, Susi advocates for the individuality and human diversity that is expressed with the passion and spirit of love, art, and spirituality (“An Affair” 71). In doing so, she denies Marxist materialism and its reductionist approach to social processes, questioning the concept of a ‘people’ unified in agreement with a shared ideology that overlooks individual diversity. Susi emphasizes the problem of communism as an ideology that is not necessarily adopted or acknowledged by the people whose interests it claims to represent. She criticizes the practical incompatibility between acting on ideals of social justice and equality, and the actuality of sacrificing personal
relationships and emotional bonds in order to achieve this end. Because of this, Susi attempts to ‘decentre’ her own gendered role within the revolutionary movement (Jameson 125), challenging the hypocrisy of a movement intended to be transformative but which still maintains the subjugated status of women within local hierarchies. Despite the fact that Susi feels oppressed by Indonesian gendered social traditions, she appeals to cultural communication and human emotion as the forces that propel her to seek empowerment. Through destabilizing the dominant ideologies in Indonesia in order to assert her own experiences and interests as a woman, Susi progresses toward articulating her identity as an Indigenous woman. Stuart Hall explains that “identities are never unified and, in late modern times, increasingly fragmented and fractured; never singular but multiply constructed across different, often intersecting and antagonistic, discourses, practices and positions” (“Introduction” 4). By this, Hall describes the various loyalties, allegiances and interests (2) that, when defined, compose an articulated identity. Through debate, Susi communicates her search for a way of living that may satisfy the contradicting values and loyalties that contribute to her sense of self.

Susi eventually rejects the revolutionary movements and relinquishes her involvement, discarding the communist ideal of martyrdom, and asserting an appeal to prioritize emotion and the heart as a transformative strategy. The statement, “In addition to the knowledge of political science, in addition to communism, there was another voice, a feeling, a sound that could never be made explicit in any tangible way” (emphasis added Kertapati, “An Affair” 74) (“Djuga selain dari ilmu pengetahuan politik, selain dari faham komunisme, masih ada suara, rasa, bunji dan tjinta, jang tak bisa sama sekali dinjatakan dengan benda”; Kedjatuhan 165), draws attention to Susi’s consideration of love, passion, and emotional instinct as foundations that both motivate and temper political action. Rather than having the importance of emotion as associated
with an essentialist quality of womanhood, Susi explores the bonds of her personal relationship from a political vantage, where the passage, “I am still and forever will be a woman. Like it or not I must bow to such deceit” (“An Affair” 78) (“aku tetap perempuan jang mau tidak mau mesti mengakui segala bikinan itu”; Kedjatuhan 170) refers to constraints of social ceremonies that accompany women’s gendered positions in the community. Susi’s asks for her feelings to be respected by having the reality of women’s subject-positioning recognized, in the same way that the significance of sympathy and empathy as the basis for the social bonds that allow mobilization around a cause are described by Harun and Haris, in their description of their ideological positions (“An Affair” 71-3). Harun advocates for sharing “sorrows and joys, their love and sadness” (72) (“dalam duka dan suka, disedih dan kasih-sajangnja”; Kedjatuhan 163), while Haris states, “Our goals must always be trust, hope, and love” (“An Affair” 73) (“Tjuma tudjuan kita tetap pada kepertjajaan, harapan, dan kasih-sajang”; Kedjatuhan 164). Susi adopts components of her own ideological positioning from her discussions with the revolutionaries (Shackford-Bradley 277-8), and draws attention to the discrepancy between communist ideals in practice, and the significance of her emotional bond with Luk (“making no attempt to hide my anxiety. ‘What about Luk?’ I asked again as he seemed to pay no attention to my question” [Kertapat, “An Affair” 79] [“dengan ketjemasan bukan buatan. – Dan Luk? – Katak sekali lagi, karena kulihat Mansur diam sadja tak memperhatikan”; Kedjatuhan 172]). Susi is critical of the hypocrisy of the revolutionary movement for neglecting to sustain the personal bonds of relationships, family, and community that are meant to form the foundations of revolutionary ideals, and inspire the revolutionary movement.

Susi examines the influence of the social environment on her identity, explaining that “I was destroyed, a person whose sense of self had been torn to pieces. To hide this I had forced
myself to create a set of new emotions and thoughts, in effect create a whole new personality for
myself” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 73) (“Mémang aku manusia jang sudah rusak dan tersobék ketjít². Supaja djangan terlihat sobékan² itu, aku paksakan diriku mentjiptakan perasaan baru, pikiran baru, dan manusia baru didalam diri sendiri”; Kedjatuhan 164-5). By this, Susi describes her increasing awareness of the impact of unbending established traditions and social inequalities on her self-understanding. However, it is important that Susi is able to recognize and distinguish the impact of political position through an assessment of her own thoughts and emotions, thus dismantling the internalization of an imposed identity. I argue that, although Susi expresses the degree of suffering and frustration that she feels at finding herself in a domestic life not of her choosing, her communication of the emotional weight of her distress through her passionate demand that Luk leave her and their child (“An Affair” 104) serves to emotionally articulate the experience of her subject-positioning as an Indigenous woman in Indonesia.

Susi criticizes Luk’s ideals of perpetual sacrifice. She explains that she has to “guard my honour” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 75) (“mesti punja kehormatan dan kesutjian jang terpelihara”; Kedjatuhan 166) when Luk pressures her for her love and company so that he may leave with a clear heart the next day: “Now, all I want is a little company, and you tell me to wait. Susi, I have to leave tomorrow” (“An Affair” 75) (“Dan engkau sekarang mau menambah ketjapéanku lagi dengan menjuruh menunggu bertemu sampai bésok? Dan bésok djuga aku mesti pergi meninggalkan engkau”; Kedjatuhan 166). Luk presents his request, and Susi asks Luk to recognize that, while social change is desirable, she does not wish to live entirely outside of the boundaries of society and her world of family and community relationships. She hopes that Luk will make the sacrifice needed in order understand how important it is to her to remain connected with her community. She explains, “I want to go home and I want you to go with me. […]"
 Couldn’t you spare a little time to pay lip service to the ceremonies the normal man and woman care about?” (“An Affair” 78) (“Aku mau pulang sadja. Dan engkau djuga mesti ikut. […] Bisakah engkau membuang waktu sedikit mengakui upatjara bikinan itu?”; Kedjatuhan 171). Luk consents to “sacrifice a part of my own beliefs” (“An Affair” 78) (“mengambil sepotong kejakinanku”; Kedjatuhan 171) at Susi’s request by relinquishing his own honour so as to not stain hers. Luk explains that he will not ask her to lose her status or dignity in her community by offering him her consent, saying, “I’ll take you to your room, Susi. And I’ll wait with you until you’ve fallen asleep” (“An Affair” 79) (“Aku antarkan engkau kekamarmu, ja Susi? [– ia berkata menjentuh.–] Dan tentu aku boléh diam melihat engkau sampai tidur dikamarmu”; Kedjatuhan 171). Luk’s assertion of his power over Susi by telling her that he intends to wait until she has fallen asleep and is helpless if she will not consent to have sex with him, allegorically conveys the extent of Susi’s vulnerability in the camp of soldiers, where Luk has many allies and supporters and Susi has few.

This vulnerability has been implied throughout the story. Susi explains her interest in joining the soldiers’ camp on the outskirts of the city and her friend, Anna, warns her, “That’s no good for a woman” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 61) (“Kurang baik buat kita perempuan”; Kedjatuhan 148), suggesting the danger of Susi’s decision. Susi is aware that she has limited support in the camp, when “There was no feigning the pain I felt when hearing their cruel comments” (“An Affair” 64) (“Sakitnja hati buatan buatan pabila telinga sudah dipasang mendengar tjakap angin merêka jang begitu merobêknja”; Kedjatuhan 151) that are directed toward Susi’s unwillingness to act more feminine (“An Affair” 63-4). Susi’s “return to gentleness” (64) (“Kembali kepada kelembutan kasih-sajangku”; Kedjatuhan 151) occurs when she “began to lose this newfound strength” (“An Affair” 64) (“Tapi lama² aku tak kuat begini ini”; Kedjatuhan 152) after meeting
and being befriended by Lukman. This suggests that Susi’s strength is derived from an independence she cannot maintain while in the camp. When Susi challenges the ideological stance of different members of the camp, but she is routinely dismissed. While in debate, Harun walks away without hearing Susi reply to his stated position, and “his voice in the distance cursing a death no one would want” (“An Affair” 73) (“terdengar suaranja me-maki\(^2\) kematian jang sama sekali tak dimau manusia”; *Kedjatuhan* 163) implies his disdain for what he perceives to be Susi’s unenlightened political position. Haris greets Susi’s scepticism with, “Well, Susi, you’re a coward” (“An Affair” 73) (“engkau pengetjut”; *Kedjatuhan* 164). Luk and Harun tell Susi, “Don’t spend too much of your time reading books like that” (“An Affair” 74) (“Djangan terlalu banjak membatja tulisan perasaan jang lemah\(^2\) begitu rupa”; *Kedjatuhan* 165), and Dr. Mansur is unswerving in his instructions to Susi when it is time to leave the camp without Luk (“An Affair” 84). There is little interest within the camp in Susi’s opinions, and she is told what to think, along with what to do. While Susi joins the camp by choice, she is not in a position to assert her own critical strategies. She becomes dependent upon the support of a partner, and is pressured to submit to his requests on the basis of this. The fact that Susi is made vulnerable by losing her honour is emphasized when she later approaches Luk, despite critical and pitying stares from his comrades (80), and claims, “I didn’t care what any of them thought, Harun, Mus, or Haris” (80) (“Tapi aku tak peduli akan mendeliknja mata Harun, dan aku tak ambil pusing akan rupa Haris dan Mus jang mengasihani”; *Kedjatuhan* 173-4) and later complains, “You’ll let them laugh at me, won’t you? Let them drive me out” (“An Affair” 81) (“apa sampai hatimu melihat aku ditjatji dan diusir oléh masjarakat disamakan dengan machluk kasar jang tidak punja peradaban?”; *Kedjatuhan* 174). Susi’s contribution in the camp is under-acknowledged so that, even within the context of a love relationship, Susi’s position is one of dependence and arguably
continued subjugation, while the impact of her shared opinions and perspectives on decisions and activities of the revolutionaries remains limited.

When Susi returns home, community gossip further disempowers Susi through imposing misperceptions and stereotypes onto her experiences: “The third one took off for the front to join one of those rebel bands. She’ll end up being either a soldier or a playmate for the men. Doesn’t matter how strong she thinks she is” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 90) (“Jang ketiga, tiba^2 lari kepinggir kota kegaris depan pertempuran ikut dengan gerombolan laskar^2 jang liar tak tahu aturan. Siapa tahu, ia djadi serdadu perempuan atau ia djadi mainan orang^2 perdujuan disana. Se-kuat^2 nja perempuan”; Kedjatuhan 186). This conservative interpretation of Susi’s political work neglects to credit her for her efforts to affect social change, and reasserts the gendered norms associated with submissiveness and domesticity. Finding neither empowerment within the communist rebel camp, nor acceptance in her home community, Susi is sensitive to the reality of being a woman in Indonesian society, and marginalized from different angles.

Rukiah draws on a depiction of emotion to emphasize the implications of the circumstance surrounding Susi’s submission to Luk’s sexual advances. She creates a focus on the way that Luk’s sacrifice of his ideals by indicating that he will wait until Susi is sleeping and is unable to reject him, entails Susi’s disempowerment. Susi states, “Luk’s words frightened me but I said nothing” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 79) (“Aku takut mendengar utjapan ini. Tapi aku diam sadja”; Kedjatuhan 171). Luk’s concept of support and understanding does not overcome his inclination to satisfy his own wants and interests, and leaves Susi ‘cold’ and threatened. Susi succumbs to Luk’s incessant pressuring her to have sex with him, and in Susi’s words, she “surrendered to Luk that night” (“An Affair” 79) (“mengapa malam ini terlalu banjak aku memberikan penjerahan kepada Luk?”; Kedjatuhan 171). Yet, she attempts to address her
feelings of hurt with Luk the next day. Susi challenges the truth of Luk’s expressions of love for her when she questions Luk’s decision to sacrifice their relationship and future in order to embark on a dangerous mission for the communist cause. She argues, “Now that I’ve lost everything, you’ll go” (“An Affair” 81) (“Kemudian engkau tinggalkan aku dalam keadaan kehilangan se-gala”; Kedjatuhan 174). Susi challenges Luk’s decision even more directly when she says, “Whether you want to admit it or not, in doing so you will be wrong” (“An Affair” 81) (“Dan dalam hal ini, tentu engkaulah jang salah”; Kedjatuhan 175). Susi claims that Luk’s martyrdom for the cause of communism is actually a neglect of his personal responsibility to her: “Luk, we have something to settle, involving you and me alone” (“An Affair” 81) (“Aku tak ingin soal hubungan kita jang mesti pertanggung djawabkan ini […] Sebab jang penting bagiku, soal kita, soal hubungan kita”; Kedjatuhan 175). These statements show that Susi appeals to the heart and to the emotion of her bond in the relationship with Luk in order to prove that she, a single person that is known by him, is as important as an entire community known through ideals. She argues this point when she claims that Luk’s appeal to an altruistic martyrdom (“Complete surrender of body and soul to the struggle and the defence of one’s beliefs” [“An Affair” 82] [“penuh bulat serta keichlasan menjerahkan djiwa raga dalam mempertahankan kejakinan jang sekali sudah dianut”; Kedjatuhan 176]) is false and misdirected. She responds to him with, “you’re only willing to shoulder that set of laws you call humanitarianism. Since you won’t bear the greater burden, our love is doomed” (“An Affair” 82) (“Engkau akan membatasi dirimu dengan undang-2 kerakjatanmu jang gila2’an itu. Kita tak bisa bertjinta pandjang”; Kedjatuhan 176). Susi uses the term ‘greater burden’ to suggest that personal relationships entail a level of responsibility that cannot be fulfilled by acting solely in the interests of general humanity. She continues, “the masses – make up only a tiny drop of something infinitely larger
and more significant” (“An Affair” 83) (“djumlah omongan dan manusianja itu, tjuma merupakan setétés air dari lautan besar jang meluas biru”; Kedjatuhan 177). From her previous statement, it is possible to infer that Susi considers the ‘something infinitely larger’ to be love within the context of a personal relationship, something that she perceives as more meaningful than the shallow unification of a collectivist ideology (“people are fascinated by mere talk” [“An Affair” 83] [“manusia jang hidup sekarang ini, sungguh suka omong besar sadja”; Kedjatuhan 176-7]). By this, Susi makes a profound statement that prioritizes the bonds formed through personal emotion and empathy, positioning these as of fundamental significance to understanding daily political realities.

Susi finally rejects Luk’s love and the communist movement, as she does not find fulfillment in her involvement with either. Luk’s statement, “But I love you and I love communism” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 82) (“Tapi aku tjinta kepadamu, dan aku tjinta komunisme”; Kedjatuhan 176), does not recognize that support of the communist ideals should entail support and understanding for Susi’s vulnerable position in society, and for the development of strategies to maintain the bond of affection. She reacts to news of Luk’s capture venomously, expressing resentment for the nationalist army and a reactionary hope for the Dutch to return, reasoning that “I imagined that Luk would be freed” (“An Affair” 95) (“tentu Luk akan bébas”; Kedjatuhan 193) under a colonial authority. It is clear that Susi’s appeals to her emotions to convey her personal and political interests. While still in love with Luk, and angry and upset at his absence (“He took my honor; he took my heart” [“An Affair” 95] [“Luk pergi dengan membawa djanjiku, kehormatanku, hatiku, dan segala kekajaanku”; Kedjatuhan 193]), Susi rejects the idea that political ideals define love, and seeks instead to stabilize her life and her emotions. Susi integrates the various discursive positions that contribute to her sense of her
identity as an Indigenous woman while engaging the competing political ideologies that resonate with her experiences and emotional responses. As Hall explains, “identities are constructed within, not outside, discourse” (“Introduction” 4), and Susi establishes her identity through engagement in discourse in the form of critical debate, active resistance, and emotional expression of her personal perspective.

When Susi says, “Shut up, just shut up! [...] Nothing, not a single thing has any meaning for me now. Not revolution, not nationalism, not Sukarno, communism, or jail. What do they mean for me besides an end to my promises and the hope of our reunion? I hate them! I hate them!” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 103) (“Djangan kaubitjarakan jang begitu’an. [...] Semua bagiku tak ada jang berarti. Révolusi, gerilja nasionalis, Sukarno, komunis, pendjara, apa itu buatku selain dari djandji kita habis, dan hari pertemuan kita dichianati dan dihantjurkan?”; Kedjatuhan 203), Susi’s outburst positions her as unacknowledged and neglected in the movement for social change, and also shows that she is emotionally expressive in her attempt to make her voice heard by the revolutionary through attempting to counter her situations of being unheard and silenced. Susi communicates her hurt and frustration by asking Luk to leave (“An Affair” 104), and creates space for her emotions where there is no other avenue to have her voice heard.

When Luk returns and attempts to re-establish his relationship with Susi, she rejects his plea for sympathy for his suffering in jail and need for flight (Kertapati, “An Affair” 102). Through Susi’s emotional assertions, she rejects Luk’s decision to adhere to the ideal of martyrdom. She resigns herself to a life that is not fully of her choosing, but does so with emotional resistance by questioning the ideologies that position love second to nation, and its gendered expectation. Rukiah closes the narrative with a poetic description conveying the extent of the emotional toll that Susi’s experiences have had on her. She writes:
The destruction of my heart, the pieces of my heart, the suppression of feigned pride all had ended in isolation and one small question for him: ‘Luk, what messages are there in this story of ours except the hatred of everything upright and moral, even devotion to the nation and the revolution?’

(Pembunuhan hati, robékan hati, dan tindasan kesombongan jang dibikin² ini berachir dengan kepergian, pengusiran, dan sedikit tjerita tanja: –Luk, apa kesannja tjeritamu dan tjerita ini, selain dari kebentjian kepada segala jang dianggap djudjur, bersusila, dan kebaktian kepada negara dan révolusi jang dibikin oléh manusia? – (Kedjatuhan 204)

Rukiah makes it clear that the focus of the story is Susi’s emotional response, and her sorrow at having the bonds of love broken and betrayed. Susi dismisses political righteousness and action as irrelevant if it is not able to redeem the personal relationships and bonds across social classes without complete self-sacrifice. Susi challenges the ideals that underlie nationalism, drawing on the story of her star-crossed love relationship as evidence for an inconsistency in nationalist and revolutionary ideologies. Here, emotion functions as Jameson’s ‘romantic’ catalyst of transformation (Jameson 115, 118-9). After Luk leaves, Susi draws energy to differently define and distinguish the politics that culminate in Indigenous women’s oppression. She argues, not for her animosity toward her former love, but against the suspect ideologies that enabled her voice, as an Indigenous woman, to be subsumed by political rhetoric and intellectualization, questioning the neglect of the movement to maintain avenues for the strength and growth of emotional bonds. Rukiah draws the reader’s awareness to Susi’s subaltern subject-position, creating an articulated identity through textual elucidation of Susi’s reality and experiences.

Susi takes stock of her experience of being prevented from becoming “quite simply […] a man among men” (Fanon, Black 92), as Frantz Fanon describes it, or in this case, a woman among persons. Fanon explains the process of ‘Othering’ in terms of the sequence of experiences that contribute to building awareness of difference and marginalization (89-119), eventually
leading to the awareness of oppression such as that which causes Susi to seek to articulate her social vantage point. Rukiah elucidates the oppression that shatters Susi’s heart in a pivotal moment of transformation that dissolves the legitimacy of Susi’s subjugation and the subsumation of her voice. Jameson explains this in terms of the politically decentered subject-position (125) that, when articulated, “projects and blocks out a world of a determinate structure” (132). By this, Jameson refers to a character’s articulated emergence that overshadows, or directly challenges and contradicts, hegemonic domination of the character’s representation. The description of Susi’s emotional state redefines the quality and value of political logic. Susi realizes, “Everything he [Luk] said was the same as before” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 102) (“Utjapan itu utjapan lama”; Kedjatuhan 202), discovering that the words associated with the ideologies of social change remain empty when the emotions of love, compassion, and understanding do not give their words meaning.

Spivak’s oppressed subaltern in the character of Susi, is repositioned to articulate an Indigenous woman’s identity. Although betrayed by the promise of political ideals (Susi says, “You don’t need to promise anything that doesn’t concern your personal beliefs” [Kertapati, “An Affair” 102] [“Engkau tak usah punja djangji réstang jang ada diluar kejakinanmu”; Kedjatuhan 202]) and of her heart (“Now that you’ve broken my heart you want me to do the same to my husband, the man who helped me?” [“An Affair” 103] [“Setelah engkau merobék hatiku, engkau akan menjuruh lagi aku merobék hati suamiku, hati jang menolong aku”; Kedjatuhan 203]), Susi has the ability to express her emotions. This is evident when she “sobbed, shuddered and cried” (“An Affair” 105) (“tangisan ter-sedu”; Kedjatuhan 204), and when she relegates the hurt she feels to an appropriate place in her repertoire of experience. When Susi describes her position as, “locked securely away” (“An Affair” 105) (“dilatji dan kukuntjikan”; Kedjatuhan 204), she
repositions the suffering she feels to a place where it is manageably grasped as reflective of a political social reality.

Rukiah shows Susi’s awareness of her subject-position, and her ability to distinguish herself from her social role. Susi accomplishes this by criticizing the ideologies and social processes that follow on the trajectory of Indonesian nation-building after independence, while overlooking the importance of Indigenous women’s voices. I posit that Susi’s steadily accumulated sense of her identity as an Indigenous woman through her life experiences and ideological debates is articulated when her emotional communications lead to her expression of closing sentiments of political despair that are tempered by her appeal to her emotions for insight and understanding. Though the question that Susi asks is hidden from other characters, it forms an internal articulation through Susi’s awareness of her own political positioning and subaltern status. Rukiah’s portrayal of Susi’s secret emotional reality is contextualized by Susi’s subject-positioning, clearly defined by Susi’s experiences and options, and completes Rukiah’s articulated textual representation of a subaltern Indigenous woman.

Rukiah’s novella anticipates the increasingly widespread social discontent that made the new Indonesian nation vulnerable to internal conflict. Popular resentment of the nationalist administration manifested in the form of uprisings, evident in the increase in communist party membership to “over 2.5 million” (Sundhaussen 166) in 1963, despite the notable absence of PKI representation in political power (167), along with rural resistance to nationalist governance by “poorer peasants advocating for land reform” (176) in the form of uprisings (Sundhaussen 176; Swift 1). Internal conflict in Indonesia was devastatingly suppressed by the counter-coup of 1965 that resulted in the persecution, imprisonment, and death of “communists, suspected communists, communist sympathisers, and innocent victims” (Lawrence 2) – including members
of the Chinese diaspora (Cribb and Brown 103).\footnote{See documentation in Chalmers 21; Cribb and Brown, ch. 7; Cribb, “Problems” 12; Cribb “Unresolved” 227; Frederick, Introduction 1; McVey 115-6. Cribb and Brown provide a figure for the resulting deaths officially recognized by the Indonesian government (106).} The suppression of communists in Indonesia during the Sukarno regime and into the New Order had a devastating impact on gender equality, despite hopes for women’s emancipation through revising the traditional expectations of gender roles in Indonesian society. Under the Dutch colonial regime, Raden Adjeng Kartini writes, “I want to be free, so that I will be allowed to, will be able to, stand independently, not to be dependent on other people, so that I may never… never be forced to marry. (Saya berkehendak bebas, supaya saya boleh, dapat berdiri sendiri, jangan bergantung kepada orang lain, supaya jangan… – jangan sekali-kali dipaksa kawin)” (Tiwon, “Models” 55). Kartini advocated against forced marriage and other traditions that oppressed women, rather than specifically for an end to colonial power. In the transition to Indonesian independence, women had still not achieved the status of liberation that Kartini dreamed of having. Sunindyo explains that, “the general construction of woman as daughter, and woman as natural physical marker of the nation as defined by a male leader, worked to constrain women’s roles and choices during the Sukarno era” (11). Examples include Sukarno’s discouragement of Indonesian women from using Western make-up (8), and the expounding of essentialist characteristics as representing ideals of femininity (14). Sunindyo shows that nationalist claims to gender equality (8) rested on limiting choice by perpetuating gendered essentialisms. During the 1950s, it was through the support of the women’s organization, Gerwani, that the Madjelis Permusjawaratan Kongres Wanita Indonesia introduced a request to parliament for recognition of Indonesian women’s free choice of a marriage partner, monogamy, the combating of prostitution,” and “regulation of constitutional rights (Struers 138-40). Women’s concerns included “abolition of child marriage,
female labor in factories,” “abolition of the system of concubinage,” “education for girls, mothers of the new generation,” and “bureaus to help pregnant women” (Appendix E 174-5). This process of constitutionally integrating women’s rights in Indonesia was left incomplete when, in 1965, the radical women’s organization, Gerwani, was suppressed for its communist affiliations (Hatley 101), leaving women no recourse to organizational support for ideologies contributing to women’s empowerment.

History will never know if the voices of Indigenous women in Indonesia might have contributed to greater social harmony following Indonesian independence, had greater social equality presented Indigenous women more opportunity to articulate their positions in relation to the process of decolonization within the Indigenous community and nation. Through resolving Rukiah’s representation of subalternity as an emotional articulation of marginalization, restriction and suppression, and political exclusion of Indigenous women’s voices, and therefore challenging the revolutionary trajectory, I would like to suggest that Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* emphasizes the position that Indigenous women’s insights have value in informing community organization, mass movements, and political decision-making.
Chapter 4: Emotive Disjunctions in Eden Robinson’s “Queen of the North”

In this chapter, I will discuss Indigenous Canadian Haisla author Eden Robinson’s contemporary short story “Queen of North.” Adelaine, the main character in “Queen of the North,” creates a complex, coded articulation of her identity as an Indigenous woman by way of her hatbox gift. Her violent outbursts demonstrate both Adelaine’s sense of powerlessness and subjectivity, and communicate the emotional impact of her experiences of sexual abuse. This draws attention to the persistence of social problems under the surface of the community. Adelaine’s own position is constrained by the multiple oppressions of race, gender, and class, and her voice is unrecognized. Her interest in maintaining a strengthening relationship is overlooked when her lover chooses to risk his life under the pretence that his action is on Adelaine’s behalf. Robinson creates a distinct representation of Indigenous identity that does not conform to stereotypes of Indigenous peoples, and in doing so, draws pointed attention to the perpetuation of colonial violence.

Theory: Indigenous Literature

One question that arises in terms of contemporary Indigenous literature is how to define the genre, what criteria is used to decide Indigenous authorship and content, and who determines this. Glenn Willmott argues that Eden Robinson’s representation of family connections in Indigenous communities is as a means of identification, and defines her work as representative of Indigenous narrative. Willmott creates an association between Indigenous identity and kinship, drawing on the ideas of Thomas King to describe “ways of producing meaning belonging to kinship and its oral traditions that interpolate ‘who we are’” (Willmott 902), and argues that
“Every one of the stories turns upon the figure of family relations displaced from a normative birth family” (902). Willmott accepts a generalization of what constitutes defining Indigenous values, and applies this to Robinson’s work. However, it may not be necessary to determine a single characteristic or value that contributes to a definition of Indigeneity in order to read Robinson’s work as an Indigenous narrative. Jennifer Andrews argues that, while writing within the framework of colonial literary and publishing traditions, Robinson repositions the viewpoint of her narrative from within an Indigenous community (“Rethinking” 212-3). Vikki Visvis argues that this viewpoint is not fixed, using as an example, “for Robinson, bannock or ‘Ichiban’ are as ‘Native’ as ‘Kraft or hotdogs’ ” (25). Visvis considers the juxtaposition of traditional and adopted cultural signifiers as creating a “liminal and diverse space” (25) within which Indigenous identity is formulated. James Clifford conceptualizes the shifting symbols of Indigenous identity in terms of the recent advent of global mobility, writing, “As we try to grasp the full range of indigenous ways to be ‘modern,’ it is crucial to recognize patterns of visiting and return, of desire and nostalgia, of lived connections across distances and differences” (470). By this, Clifford emphasizes that the shifting actual contemporary practices of Indigenous communities are a significant component in defining Indigenous identity. Andrews acknowledges the complexity of defining Indigenous literature, explaining her choice to examine the works of writers who seek to “find a way to retain their Native identities in a global society” (In the Belly 6). I take the position that the superimposition of traditional Indigenous and global symbols in Indigenous literature is integrated in Robinson’s work in a way that communicates multiple levels of Indigenous identity. In “Queen of the North,” for example, a girl nicknamed Cola participates in an Indigenous cultural performance as a jingle dancer. The line between performance and authenticity is self-referentially blurred when Cola’s Indigenous dance outfit is
complemented by a “bobbed wig to cover her pink mowhawk” (Robinson, “Queen” 205). In this way, Robinson portrays Indigenous identity, not only in terms of tradition, but also in terms of change; contemporary adaptations of tradition and adoption of new practices are combined to represent multiply defined Indigenous identities. As Indigenous literature, Robinson’s works stretches the concept of Indigeneity to encompass contemporary lived Indigenous experience and culture.

**Plot Summary: “Queen of the North”**

“Queen of the North” is the story of a Haisla woman named Adelaine who grows up on a British Columbia reserve. Adelaine is sexually abused by her uncle Josh from early childhood, and emerges into young adulthood following a lifestyle of violence and substance abuse. Robinson describes Adelaine’s violent and self-destructive escapades, explaining how Adelaine acquires the nickname Karaoke while brandishing a knife to guard her position at a karaoke machine. Adelaine explains, “No one can get near until some kid from school has the bright idea of giving me drinks until I pass out” (Robinson, “Queen” 192). In the community, Adelaine is later haunted by her performance, and she becomes notorious as Karaoke. In a turning point in the story, however, Adelaine discovers a side of herself that promises personal growth when she begins dating Jimmy, who encourages her to learn about the world around her. With Jimmy, Adelaine enjoys picking blueberries, and reading the constellations (94-5). Adelaine tries to tell Jimmy about a dark secret that is most likely the sexual abuse that she continues to experience at her family home, but cannot bring herself to shatter the idyllic atmosphere when they are together (200). On a visit with relatives in Vancouver, Adelaine suffers a heavy period that might be a miscarriage or the after-effects of an abortion, though this is not specified in the text. Later,
while fundraising at a bannock booth for a community centre charity event, Adelaide is subject to racialized sexual harassment by a customer, revealing the perpetuation of colonial oppression for Indigenous women.

When Adelaine returns home, she discovers a photograph of her uncle Josh as a child standing next to a residential school priest. Adelaine’s mother explains, “Your Uncle Josh was a bright student. They were fond of each other” (Robinson, “Queen” 212). However, Adelaine draws the connection between Josh’s sexual abuse of her, and the possibility that he experienced molestation in residential school. Adelaine discovers that she can prevent Josh from his routine rape of her by making reference to his relationship with the priest. Robinson writes Adelaine’s response to her success at deterring her abuser: “I felt light and giddy, not believing it could end so easily” (213). Encouraged, Adelaine prepares a surprise for Josh, leaving a gift-wrapped hatbox on the kitchen table with a message inside. She includes the photograph of Josh and the priest, pasting a photograph of herself over Josh’s face, and a photograph of Josh over the priest’s face. She also includes a period clot, and a note that reads, “It was yours so I killed it” (213), implying that she has aborted Josh’s child.

Contrary to Adelaine’s plans, it is Jimmy who discovers the hatbox gift, and subsequently learns Adelaine’s secret. After not being able to contact Jimmy, Adelaine finds out that he is leaving with her uncle Josh to work on the commercial fishing boat, *Queen of the North.* Adelaine responds to the news by resorting to a violent outburst at school: “The lunchtime buzzer rings as I smash this girl’s face” (Robinson, “Queen” 214). Adelaine blindly retaliates against the implications of Jimmy’s actions. The passage, “I see Jimmy carrying two heavy bags. As he walks down the gangplank, his footsteps make hollow thumping noises that echo off the
mountains” (215), invokes imagery that suggests that the fishing trip will be an opportunity for Jimmy to act upon a more sinister motive.

Eden Robinson expands on Adelaine’s story in her novel, *Monkey Beach*. The story is centered around the *Queen of the North*’s disappearance. Jimmy’s sister is named Michelle in “Queen of the North,” and renamed Lisamarie in *Monkey Beach*. In *Monkey Beach*, she engages in a quest to find out what happened to her brother. Jimmy’s sister confirms that there are tense emotions surrounding Josh’s sexual abuse of Adelaine (Robinson, *Monkey Beach* 361-5).

Robinson writes Adelaine’s violent outburst in response to Jimmy’s decision to leave on *Queen of the North* with additional detail in *Monkey Beach*:

I went up to her and told her Jimmy was going to call her. She shrugged. The lunchtime buzzer rang. A bunch of girls were standing by their lockers, laughing and joking. Karaoke pulled her fist back and smashed it into the nearest girl’s face. [...] Her friends jumped in and twisted Karaoke’s arms behind her back and held her while another girl started whacking Karaoke’s face. She grinned as if she didn’t even feel it.

(364)

The section continues with Adelaine being taken to hospital, and emphasizes the violent outburst as provoked, not by the victim, but by Adelaine’s own emotional response to Jimmy’s absence. Despite the fact that Robinson provides an external perspective of Adelaine in *Monkey Beach*, portraying her as a dangerous woman immune to the implications of violence, this is countered by the fact that in *Monkey Beach*, the incident is in direct view of Jimmy’s sister. Adelaine’s actions indirectly communicate to Jimmy’s sister that there is something wrong with Jimmy’s decision. Further, in *Monkey Beach*, Jimmy’s sister’s otherworldly visions confirm Jimmy’s intention to enact retribution against Josh for Josh’s perpetuation of sexual violence and oppression and re-victimization of Adelaine: “For what he did to Karaoke, he knew that Josh deserved to die” (269). The implication in “Queen of the North” that Jimmy will engage in violent conflict against Josh is speculatively reconfirmed in *Monkey Beach*. 
“Queen of the North” ends when Adelaine watches the boat that Jimmy is on as it disappears across the ocean. Adelaine crouches behind tall grass watching the docks where Jimmy will leave on the boat. She waits through the night, and witnesses the sunrise before Jimmy and her uncle appear and depart. Adelaine decides to “come out of the bushes and stand on the dock, watching the Queen of the North disappear” (Robinson, “Queen” 215).

Analysis: “Queen of the North”

Robinson’s description of Adelaine’s experiences on the reserve positions “Queen of the North” from the vantage of distinctly Indigenous experience. Robinson herself has acknowledged that “Queen of the North” is a work of short fiction that is about Indigenous peoples (Visvis 22), and she addresses issues that are specific to Indigenous women in the story.

Robinson explores exotic stereotypes of Indigenous women when Adelaine is approached by a customer while making bannock. The man objectifies and exoticizes Adelaine, offering her a large amount of money so that he can watch her cook. Adelaine is not enticed by the man’s signifiers of colonial power, stating with irony, “He had teeth so perfect I wondered if they were dentures. No, probably caps. I bet he took exquisite care of his teeth” (Robinson, “Queen” 208). Adelaine’s ‘I bet’ implies her mockery and disdain for the man’s shallow emphasis on trivial vanities that, coming from a position of poverty in an Indigenous community (Hoy 154), she has reason to de-prioritize. From Adelaine’s perspective, the customer’s ‘bought’ appearance demonstrates neither Pepsi and Cola’s creativity or undermines the capitalist impulse as the logo-influenced nicknames do, nor does this compare with Jimmy’s athletic skill, positioning the bannock customer outside of what Adelaine knows of as the values that strengthen Indigenous communities. Pepsi with ripped jeans and purple Mohawk, and Cola in a bobbed wig and jingle
dancer outfit (Robinson, “Queen” 205), make strong examples of the types of community-based social status signifiers that gain approval for their unique ways of defining identity, while the customer displays a demonstrated lack of awareness toward this.

Adelaine undermines the sense of ownership and ‘Otherness’ that the customer attempts to project onto her through his asserting of power based on class, gender, and ethnicity, by retorting with bland, uninterested replies. When the man asks how to eat the bannock, Adelaine’s response is, “With your mouth, asshole. ‘Put some syrup on them, or jam, or honey. Anything you want’ ” (Robinson, “Queen” 208). She neither accepts the sexually implicit invitation to engage in conversation, nor conveys more than absolutely necessary to remain civil in her replies. Further, Adelaine’s de-mystifies the exotic display of letting her hair down by revealing to the reader her disinterest and critical perspective. Robinson writes:

I shrugged, pulled the cap off, and let my hair loose. It hung limply down to my waist. My scalp felt like it was oozing enough oil to cause environmental damage. (209)

From this perspective, Adelaine observes herself being observed, and applies her own perspective in order to diminish the significance of the man’s self-induced fantasy. As Visvis explains, Adelaine “does not submit to his objectifying gaze” (10). This subaltern strategy of resistance denies the authority of the objective gaze, and Robinson maintains a literary focus on Adelaine’s unique cognitive vantage of her experience (Spivak, “Subaltern” 336).

Adelaine does not respond to the customer’s question, “Why’re you so pale?” (Robinson, “Queen” 209). Robinson exposes the underlying assumption by colonial society that Indigeneity will conform to a set of preconceived ideas regarding Indigenous peoples. As Emma LaRocque explains, “To repeat what should be obvious, but often is not, we were and are multidimensional” and “Individual dreams were encouraged, and people were given nicknames
based on their personalities or events significant to them” (155). By this, LaRocque emphasizes the significance of individuality and diversity within Indigenous communities, citing difference and uniqueness as characteristic qualities of the members of the Indigenous community that she grew up in. In Robinson’s work, the customer’s perspective creates an allegory for the challenges of identification for Indigenous and Métis peoples in connection with acquiring status through the Indian Act. The Indian Act defines Indigeneity based on a “racial blood definition” (Blackburn 72), yet, as Blackburn states, “Blood has a long history in the racialization of aboriginal people in North America, but is not a criterion for citizenship in the Nisga’a nation” (72). In this sense, Blackburn points to the way that the narrow definitions of Indigeneity according to the Indian Act do not sufficiently represent the self-defined status for members of some Indigenous communities. Further, Blackburn examines the sexist criteria of the recently revised Indian Act, stating that “Nisga’a are matrilineal in their kinship reckoning” (72). Blackburn shows the inconsistency of the Indian Act’s emphasis on paternal kinship relations with the cultural norms of some Indigenous communities. Robinson exposes the negative impact of the perpetuation of Indigenous inequality by allowing systematic injustice toward Indigenous peoples to remain unresolved through her portrayal of the extend of the imposition of pre-conceptions and stereotyped essentialisms upon Indigenous peoples.

“Queen of the North” details events that are specific to women’s bodily experiences. Adelaine’s excessive menstrual bleeding is described: “I stripped off my blood-soaked underwear and hid them in the bottom of the garbage” (Robinson, “Queen” 204). This scene leaves the possibility of a miscarriage or abortion that is expanded upon in Adelaine’s hatbox gift to her uncle Josh. The fact that Adelaine uses the implication of abortion in her note to the man who perpetuated the colonial legacy of sexual abuse with her, writing, “It was yours so I killed
it” (213), emphasizes the circumstance of oppression of Indigenous women. Robinson points to the internalization of colonial oppression in Indigenous communities in the character of Josh, and the impact that this has in contributing to the multiple oppression of Indigenous women, as subjects of colonization and as women, and their re-victimization.

It is this situation of multiple oppressions that gives Robinson’s character, Adelaine, her subaltern status. Adelaine’s attempts to elucidate her subaltern positioning evoke many of the issues surrounding subaltern identity. When Adelaine pinpoints the source of her oppression as the result of the practices associated with colonization, she is able to dismantle the power of her abuser. She says the name of the priest who abused her uncle Josh, in order to prevent him from sexually abusing her (Robinson, “Queen” 212). Her hatbox gift attempts to articulate the full force of her oppression, and her position in relation to her oppressor. By replacing the heads of the photograph of Josh and the priest and including her own instead, Adelaine creates a visual representation of the hierarchy of oppression. The shadow of the priest represents colonization, and the photograph of herself replaces that of the young child, indicating the generational nature of colonial oppression and Adelaine’s own position of vulnerability. Further, Adelaine’s note adds an emotive component to her articulation. Her violent expression shows that she feels anger toward her abuser (213). In this sense, her hatbox gift communication articulates Adelaine’s personal emotional vantage in relation to her experience of oppression.

Jennifer Andrews emphasizes Robinson’s ability to undermine the polarization of victim and oppressor in Monkey Beach, whether from the Indigenous or colonial vantage, stating that, “The novel, for example, lacks a single perfect heroine or dark villain,” and adding that in the text, “the struggles of the community and the tribe reflect the long-term impact of colonization” (Andrews, “Rethinking” 223). In this way, Andrews describes the way that Robinson challenges
the internalization of colonial oppression by dismantling stereotypes of Indigenous peoples, and allowing the significance of personal relationships to be redefined.

With this in mind, Robinson exposes a pattern of withholding emotional expression in “Queen of the North.” As a child, Adelaine responds stoically to sexual abuse, describing the experience as, “like when the dentist gives me extra suckers for not crying, not even when it really hurts” (Robinson, “Queen” 190). When Adelaine’s tough cousin gives her a homemade tattoo, Adelaine claims that, “I concentrated fiercely on not crying in front of her” (190). The dynamic of Adelaine’s subalternity is reinforced by the inhibitions on emotional expression, specifically by her unwillingness to lose ground by showing vulnerability, as well as the necessity of finding alternative ways to make her subject-position recognizable, such as by permanently marking her body with a scorpion tattoo (191). Robinson addresses the unique experience of a shift of emotion when Adelaine discovers that she can stop Uncle Josh’s sexual abuse. Adelaine feels “light and giddy” (213) when she successfully undermines her oppressor, in contrast to the previous descriptions of her unwillingness to display tears. However, when Adelaine finds out that Jimmy is leaving on the boat, Queen of the North, she resorts to a violent outburst (214). Adelaine must once again articulate her situation from the vantage of her subalternity, doing so in a way that indirectly calls attention to the disruption of harmony in the community, yet succeeds only in re-enacting through violence the hurting of bodies and emotions. Adelaine is situated vulnerably in her community when she discovers that the person who loved and supported her, and contributed to her ability to empower herself, has sacrificed his transformative role in her life in order to embark upon a vengeful journey of retribution. It is implied that Jimmy will retaliate against Josh on the fishing boat in a way that echoes the revolutionary desire to overcome the enactor of oppression. Jimmy’s decision to leave, whether
motivated by an intended retribution or in misguided anger at Adelaine, takes place in the community and occurs on a personal, not a consciously political and ideological, level. Jimmy’s decision does not protect the community from external threat, such as that posed by the exploitative, prejudiced customer in Vancouver and the ongoing threat of colonial oppression that he represents, or protect Adelaine from further vulnerability to members of the community.

Adelaine’s relationship with Jimmy functions as a revolutionary medium of articulation. Their interaction undermines Western colonial conventions by appropriating and replacing symbols of romance. For example, the fireweed is “as dark pink as prize roses” (Robinson, “Queen” 200), implying the equal symbolic weight of fireweed and roses, and emphasizing the appropriateness of fireweed as a romantic symbol given the context of Indigenous territory, as well as given the assumed lack of economic resources for the young couple (Hoy 154) to acquire ‘prize’ flowers as romantic gifts when fireweed grows in fields on Indigenous territory without cost. Another example of the cultural-context specific way that Robinson represents romance is the class-status indicator of a sneaker, where Jimmy ironically pours Baby Duck (200). Within the narrative framework of Adelaine and Jimmy’s relationship, the symbolic power of hegemonic signifiers (such as roses for romance) are dismantled and replaced with symbols recognizable within Indigenous communities as representative of Indigenous political positioning and daily reality.

Other symbols of Indigenous identity are included within a context of strengthening and healing. Adelaine meets Jimmy when they go to pick blueberries together (Robinson, “Queen” 192), suggesting an Indigenous engagement with sustenance lifestyles that is in keeping with political positions that advocate for rightful claim to Indigenous territory. When Adelaine goes to Vancouver, she sells bannock, a traditional Indigenous food, at a charity fundraiser (205-6),
drawing an association between Indigenous culture and the healing actions of helping and sharing. Adelaine listens to a Nisga’a radio broadcast the morning she discovers, and brings to light in discussion, a history of colonial oppression through residential school abuse in her family. These symbols of Indigenous identity provide context for Adelaine’s increasing sense of empowerment through finding a supportive relationship, and a strategy to end her victimization by her uncle.

The indication that the relationship between Adelaine and Jimmy strengthens Adelaine’s sense of identity through healing experiences is given in atmospheric passages that are tempered with a contemporary awareness. When Adelaine wakes up beside Jimmy, she notices that “the sun broke through the mist and streamed to the ground in fingers of light, just like in the movies when God is talking to someone” (Robinson, “Queen” 193). Adelaine associates her experience with a familiar image from media culture, while simultaneously contemplating the actuality – showing how her understanding of lived experience draws from multiple cultural influences that are juxtaposed in the construction of Indigenous identity. Jimmy tells Adelaine that, “I’m never going to leave the village,” and Adelaine agrees, “This is what we’ve got, and it’s not that bad” (my emphasis 211). This shows that, while poverty may not be celebrated, there is empowerment in the freedom from intrusive capitalist values of perpetual consumption, and in the self-acceptance that is shared in Adelaine and Jimmy’s relationship.

Robinson represents the way that a healing relationship and its potential may be destroyed by divisions within the Indigenous community that have their root in the internalization of colonial violence. Adelaine expresses her dissent against Jimmy’s betrayal of her need for reciprocated love and support by attempting to clearly signal her subaltern position;
her actions of violence are subsumed in the silence of violence, yet infused with the emotions of anger and hurt that testify to her unresolved experience of being victimized.

Adelaine’s display of emotion is followed by a brief passage that suggests at the possibility for personal transformation. She has hours to contemplate the impact of her experiences of sexual abuse and the significance of her relationship with Jimmy. Hidden from the dock, Adelaine has the power of an observer, as opposed to being the centre of negative attention in a bar fight, and examines the two men from a safe distance. Hiding behind tall grass, she enlists the natural environment of the reserve, the Indigenous lands, in obtaining the important knowledge that she needs. This shows that her potential to emerge from her experiences of victimization are tied to the process of drawing from, and defining, her Indigenous identity. Adelaine watches one man take the hand of the other before they both disappear from view (Robinson, “Queen” 215), creating a contrast between lover and oppressor that can only be recognized in narrative context. Adelaine’s silent and distant observation of the scenario suggests that the knowledge that the two men are leaving accompanies an awareness that the experiences Adelaine has had with them may continue to affect her self-understanding.

At the end of the story, Adelaine is standing on her own with the knowledge that a part of her life is ending, metaphorically represented by the finality of the phrase, “watching the Queen of the North disappear” (215). Allegorically, Adelaine realizes her independence as an Indigenous woman standing on Indigenous land, freed, if tragically, from the constraints of oppression. Through textual metaphor, Robinson represents Adelaine as finally having ‘articulated’ identity, illuminating the impact that her experiences of both oppression and healing have had on the formulation of her identity as an Indigenous woman.
Chapter 5: Comparison

While there are significant differences in the political context surrounding both Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* and Eden Robinson’s “Queen of the North,” there are also striking similarities in the dynamic of oppression that impacts the main characters, and the female authors’ portrayals of ambivalence and resistance to the emotional betrayals that are masked as revolutionary. Despite the different temporal and locational settings, both works represent the internalization of external oppression that results in the re-victimization of women. In both works, the vulnerable are victimized during struggles for decolonization, whether in the form of mass movement or on the local level. Finally, in both works the Indigenous characters are subject to conflict over social conventions around their experiences associated with gender and impacting on their women’s bodies, including pregnancy, marriage, sexual abuse, and abortion. I will draw a parallel between women’s struggles against oppression in both narratives, and compare the characters’ methods expression to communicate their positions. I will also discuss the distinct political circumstances of mass mobilization in Indonesia, and of localized and individualized resistance within the colonial system by Indigenous Canadians. I suggest that these different political circumstances may be the reason for Indigenous women’s different strategies of articulation: ideological debate and emotional adherence to principle in post-independence Indonesia, and restrained emotional expression in favour of coded, highly personal dialogue and confrontation in contemporary Indigenous Canadian communities.

Both stories engage with the complexity of being a woman in society. The Indigenous women characters struggle most in their emotional attempts to articulate their doubly marginalized subaltern subject-positions. This frames narrative events, such as the social
necessity of an arranged marriage to conceal an unwed pregnancy in Rukiah’s work, and the implication of abortion following sexual abuse by a family member in Robinson’s work. In both stories, the lasting impact of colonial oppression is felt by Indigenous women who negotiate their options in the community for addressing their gendered and sexual experiences. However, in Rukiah’s novella, the child of an unwed pregnancy is “conceived in love” (“An Affair” 103) (“anak tjinta, anak kebenaran kasih”; *Kedjatuhan* 202), as described by Susi and later, Luk (“An Affair” 104), and the child is hugged by both parents (103, 105), implying that the child is wanted despite the fact that Susi asks Luk to leave (104). If we accept Adelaine’s assertions that the blood in the hatbox is an aborted child, the implication of pregnancy from incest combined with the reasonable facility of acquiring a safe medical abortion, suggests that pregnancy to term would be an undesirable option without emotional significance in that instance. This means that the women’s choices, though constrained by social limitations and oppressions in both instances, are differently situated in terms of personal motives and political vantages, in each work. The political context involves competing political parties in Rukiah’s work, whereas the conflict takes place on the local level and within the family in Robinson’s work. Parallel to this, there is a difference between the actions of resistance taken by both Luk and Jimmy. Luk acts to support a revolutionary cause within the context of a greater social movement, while Jimmy does not consciously formulate his decision to resist the enactor of oppression as a political action attached to an ideal principle. Yet despite the fact that the revolutionary action takes place at different levels in both works – the national level in the Indonesian case, and the local level in Indigenous Canada – both Susi and Adelaine enact their emotional resistance and dissent on a personal level in their attempts to articulate their marginalized positions within the Indigenous communities, and in relation to the revolutionary action. Both use emotive action to engage
directly with individuals within the Indigenous community in attempts to communicate their unrepresented voices in the decision-making regarding resistance to an oppressor.

The context of revolution that Rukiah describes in *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* is significant to Susi’s emotional accusation of betrayal in response to Luk’s decision to support the communist cause at the expense of his relationship with her. Luk explains helplessly, “But I love you and I love communism” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 82) (“Tapi aku tjinta kepadamu, dan aku tjinta komunisme”; *Kedjatuhan* 176) when Susi complains that Luk is sacrificing their love to pursue his revolutionary ideals and perceived obligations (“An Affair” 81-2). When Susi responds, “I do want victory. But I want it without bloodshed and killing” (83) (“Aku mau djuga lihat kemenangan, tapi kemenangan dengan tidak mengeluarkan darah dan pembunuhan”; *Kedjatuhan* 178), she elucidates her position by articulating the importance of hers and Luk’s love relationship in contributing to social change. She advocates for a solution that does not necessitate absence from, and risk to, loved ones. Unlike in “Queen of the North,” where the story takes place within a localized context, the fact that Luk’s decision to support the communist cause is made in an atmosphere of mass movement for political change indicates that Luk’s motivations are ideologically-based. Susi directly confronts Luk with her tears in an effort to have the implications of her experience impact upon him past the intense and compelling pressure of the popular revolutionary ideologies. Susi’s response to Luk’s decision is plaintive and emotional, sobbing and screaming to Luk at the end of the story in a way that directly engages Luk, at the same time that she asks him to leave.

In Robinson’s “Queen of the North,” Jimmy’s motives for taking vengeance upon Josh, the enactor of oppression, are personal. Adelaine’s relationship with Jimmy is revolutionary on a personal level, in that, through learning about each other, they are able to meaningfully self-
identify as Indigenous peoples, unhindered by limited colonial stereotypes. This is represented when they meet over a blueberry–picking excursion (Robinson, “Queen” 193-4), through the use of fireweed as a symbol of romance (199-200), and especially in Adelaine and Jimmy’s agreement that the Indigenous village reserve community is a place they choose to be (211). This process is not a conscious and deliberate attempt to resist an oppressor based on clearly defined ideological principles. Instead, Jimmy’s actions occur within the context of the formation of relationships within the community toward developing an Indigenous worldview.

Rather than an indication of mass mobilization, Jimmy’s action of retribution is a local event. Like Susi, Adelaine expresses her ambivalence and discontent in response to the discovery that her lover will leave her, and will risk his life to pursue a set of ideals that are intended to address the issue of the oppression of Indigenous women, but that result in abandonment of the important love relationships that lead to healing and community strengthening. Like Susi, Adelaine expresses this dissent in what Vicki Visvis describes as “performative modes of expression” (9) by acting on her emotions in ways that call attention to the conflict of the situation. Unlike Susi, Adelaine employs violence, lashing out randomly on a member of the community in an indirect communication of her sense of betrayal (9). Adelaine draws attention to the unresolved legacy of colonial violence, and exposes how this is internalized within the community. Her actions target the personal and the local, just as the political implications of Jimmy’s actions are not intended to extend beyond the community-level. Clearly, Indigenous women’s ambivalent dissent to assertions of resistance that, nevertheless, mask the internalization of colonial oppression, takes different forms.

In both stories, Susi and Adelaine develop their understanding of their identities as Indigenous women through relating to the world around them, and through growth and self-
awareness within the context of their relationships. Susi positions herself ideologically in debate with others at the camp, guided by her personal values, while Adelaine is surrounded by motifs of Indigenous culture as she learns about her relationships in her family and community. In developing their identities, the characters of Susi and Adelaine engage with their political environments, and their textual representations are strategically established in relation to their subaltern subject-positions. In these works, Indigenous women’s identities are made clear by the symbols and expressions that are meaningful to their stories, and identity is cumulatively defined in the text. The Indigenous women characters must elucidate their subaltern status through substituting emotional signals for articulative communication, but the narrative events of emotional outbursts are followed by articulative insight. Susi writes a note that defines her subaltern status within a political context, and only she knows that it is locked in a drawer. Adelaine is portrayed as powerfully independent and free from her oppressor, standing watching the dock as the Queen of the North leaves shore. Both instances are infused with the lasting sorrow of the experience of having been oppressed, yet the textually represented articulations strongly suggest resolution through the characters’ conclusive understanding of the context of their oppression. Articulative empowerment occurs through the implication of personal change for Susi, and of external change for Adelaine. The reader is the sole audience for the Indigenous women’s moments of personal insight at the close of the narratives. However, a fictional witness is not necessary for the textual representation of the characters to form a complete articulation that affirms the self-represented identity of the otherwise unrecognized subaltern. In this way, Jameson’s transformative ‘romance,’ in the form of the Indigenous women characters’ expressions of emotion toward insight, leads to a shift in the reader’s assumptions about the
established hegemonic constructions that drive the text, and forms an articulation of subaltern identity.

In both Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* and Robinson’s “Queen of the North,” emotion functions as a catalyst for the Indigenous women characters to explore the transformative potential of their experiences. Susi writes a personal statement that contradicts the sentiments that she expressed to Luk, secretly articulating an alternative understanding of her relationship and situation within a socio-political context. Susi admonishes Luk, “Go back to your prison and die there along with your beliefs and your teachings” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 104) (“dan kusuruh engkau kembali kependjaramu, dan disana matilah engkau dengan kejakinanmu dan adjaranmu”; *Kedjatuhan* 203), implying that she rejects her former political ideals. Yet, in defining her position in terms that are critical of Indonesian politics, challenging “everything upright and moral, even devotion to the nation and the revolution” (“An Affair” 105) (“segala jang dianggap djudjur, bersusila, dan kebaktian kepada negara dan révolusi jang dibikin oléh manusia”; *Kedjatuhan* 204), Susi represents herself as politically positioned and aware of the social circumstances that contribute to her gendered oppression. This articulation is made directly to the reader, and contradicts Susi’s decision to conceal her sense of self in a “mask of lies” (“An Affair” 99) (“Kata jang menelandjangi hati sendiri”; *Kedjatuhan* 198) by hiding the truth about who her child’s father is (“An Affair” 99), and rejecting Luk despite the sorrow this causes her (104-5).

In a similar mode of contemplation, Adelaine is left at the end of “Queen of the North” as the sole figure watching the dock on the reserve. She no longer, and possibly never again, experiences the oppression that she has been taught since childhood to believe to be an unquestioned aspect of her identity. The common element of transformation from emotion in
both works is obtained through different narrative paths and different socio-political circumstances. While the dynamic of ambivalence to shattered relationships for the sake of resistance, and the conflict amongst different factions of the community due to internalization of oppression, is remarkably similar in both works, *Indigenous women’s strategies of communication differ within the context of mass social change, and within personal and local contexts, toward a common goal of articulative transformation.*

**Discussion**

While Indigenous women’s subalternity represents their social and political positioning within a hierarchy of oppression and subjugation, women’s emotive actions in Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* and Robinson’s “Queen of the North” occur as direct and personal communication between individuals toward transformative articulation of Indigenous women’s subject-positions. This strongly suggests the high significance of dialogue at a personal and individual level within communities in the effort to affect social change that will address systematic inequality and the perpetuation of hegemonic oppression.

In the beginning of her May 24, 2012 lecture at The Vogue Theatre in Vancouver, Judith Butler describes bodies gathered in public spaces in demonstrations of joy (Butler “A Politics”). Both Rukiah’s Susi and Robinson’s Adelaine express emotions publically, and use the power of their bodies and voices to communicate and interact. Yet, in both works, these characters seem isolated and alienated for their differences. Susi is one of few women in the camp, and is encouraged to change her views and accept a gendered role that more closely corresponds to the expectations and ideological positions of the men in the camp. Adelaine is removed from the support of normal socialization through the routine disruptions of violence and abuse in her life.
Susi and Adelaine, therefore, express not joy, but sorrow in the form of anger, devastation, and frustration. Shelley Kulperger examines the 'Othering' of Indigenous peoples as a tool of colonial “dispossession and appropriation” (112). She explains that “A gothicizing of the spaces, bodies, and beliefs of the ‘Native’ is particularly active in this process” (Kulperger 112). Kulperger draws a link between the colonial interest in appropriation of Indigenous resources and the personal and immediate suppression of Indigenous peoples’ lived expressions of harmony and joy. Rukiah and Robinson expose the distance between the ideal of communications defined by Butler’s joy in public gathering, and Indigenous women’s expressions of their actual emotional experiences. In doing so, Rukiah and Robinson convey the extent of colonial impact.

Susi and Adelaine gesture to their subalternity through their emotional outbursts. These outbursts function as Jacques Derrida’s ‘dangerous supplement’ (Derrida, *Of Grammatology* 159), where the symbolic action substitutes for an unspeakable actuality. In these instances, the unspeakable is the subaltern status position of the Indigenous women that makes her vulnerable to acts of oppression. Gayatri Spivak defines the subaltern’s silence with the words, “The subaltern cannot speak” (“Can the Subaltern” 308). Despite the imposed silencing of the oppressed, the ‘gothic’ actions (Kulperger 112) that reaffirm the actuality of experiencing sorrow and hurt enable the possibility of notice, recognition, or attention; there is, in these ‘gothic’ actions, the possibility that questioning will lead toward the original source of oppression. As Stuart Hall explains, “The silent majorities do think; if they do not speak, it may be because we have taken their speech away from them, deprived them of the means of enunciation, not because they have nothing to say” (Hall “On Postmodernism” 52). In this way, Hall affirms the potential for the articulation of the subaltern position. Hall describes articulation as a process of linking various components of discourse into a coherent whole (53). If this concept is applied to
Rukiah’s and Robinson’s works, the expression of emotion by the Indigenous women characters considered in connection with their narration of their hopes and wishes for love and happiness, and the socio-political context they must navigate, combine to generate an elucidation of the subject-position of these Indigenous women. This succeeds in describing challenges that Indigenous women are subjected to when they seek to have their political voices heard, participate in the community, and engage in personal relationships on terms determined by their self-defined identities. Because of this, the concept of articulative dialogue must be inclusive of emotional expression.

In pointing to the existence of internalized oppression within Indigenous communities, representations of Indigenous women seek to articulate the significance of decolonization. Victor Li describes subaltern articulation as defined by a “relational and positive version of freedom (freedom to), a freedom enabled rather than constrained by social relationships” (215). Both the character of Susi and the character of Adelaine assert their dissent when they discover that their freedom to pursue their love relationships is denied. Both demonstrate their emotional response to this by engaging in the expression of emotion as a remaining freedom that has the potential to induce change. As with Fredric Jameson’s “magical categories of Otherness” (Jameson 131), Susi and Adelaine’s communications through “substitutions, adaptations, and appropriations” (131) in attempts to convey the full significance and impact of their experience of subalternity, function in ways that are transformative. Susi and Adelaine’s articulations of their subject-positioning as Indigenous women expose the discrepancy between the socially proclaimed and actual acknowledgement of Indigenous women’s self-defined identities.

Jonathan Friedman situates the struggles of Indigenous peoples within a global matrix of self-definition and external perception, emphasizing that the marginalization of Indigenous
peoples is subversively perpetuated through the imposition of a conception of Indigeneity: “the indigenous is now part of a larger inversion of Western cosmology in which the traditional other, a modern category, is no longer the starting point of a long and positive evolution of civilization, but a voice of wisdom, a way of life in tune with nature, a culture in harmony, a *gemeinschaft*, that we have all but lost” (297). As Friedman implies, these exoticized assumptions of Indigeneity are validated through the manipulations of colonial, imperialist, and international powers and agents who persuade Indigenous groups to conform to performative Indigenous stereotypes, rather than supporting articulations of Indigenous identities to be recognized in terms that are self-defined (305-6). This shows the importance of self-definition through the articulation of Indigenous women’s subject-positions when seeking to have Indigenous women’s voices heard at every level – from local to global. It is particularly important to strategize the articulations of women’s double marginalization that accompanies their gendered position within their communities, along with the internalization of colonial violence within gendered hierarchies of power, in order to expose the divisive impact of colonial ideologies. Franz Fanon describes the resistance of Indigenous communities in the following idealistic terms: “Tribes well-known for their stubborn rivalry disarm amid rejoicing and tears and pledge their help and support. In this atmosphere of brotherly solidarity and armed struggle, men link arms with their former enemies” (*The Wretched* 84). If Fanon’s ideal of Indigenous solidarity is to be achieved, it is imperative that Indigenous women’s emotional dissent to the creation of divisions within the Indigenous community, and to the deceptiveness of internalized conflict presented as revolutionary resistance, as represented in the two texts examined here, be heard. Indigenous women’s articulated emphasis on the strength of individual relationships as the foundations of decolonization illuminate the path of Indigenous solidarity and resistance.
Conclusion

In conclusion, I have shown that there are comparable elements in Rukiah’s *Kedjatuhan dan Hati* and Robinson’s “Queen of the North.” While the situation of mass movement in Rukiah’s work differs from the dynamic contained mostly within the local community in Robinson’s work, and similarly, the motivations for revolutionary action differ in that Luk’s is ideological and Jimmy’s is personal, the dynamics of oppression of Indigenous women in both works share remarkably similar characteristics. Susi and Adelaine are both suppressed by their status as Indigenous women, and are re-victimized through internal conflicts within the Indigenous communities. In both works, the Indigenous women seek to articulate their subaltern status through emotional outbursts that communicate the need for a deeper sense of decolonization within Indigenous communities – one that comprises an understanding of the needs of Indigenous women. The sense of betrayal by the women’s lovers’ decisions to sacrifice their relationships and their lives for a cause, and the women’s overwhelming expression of their shattered hearts, is powerfully represented in both works. As Susi states, “The destruction of my heart, the pieces of my heart […] all had ended in isolation” (Kertapati, “An Affair” 105) (“Pembunuhan hati, robékan hati […] berachir dengan kepergian, pengusiran”; *Kedjatuhan* 204).

The importance of dismantling the social constructs that disempower women and prevent their voices from being heard may have implications, based on the Indonesian case, for the success of movements for social change and their stake in implementing gender equality, as in the case of Indigenous Canada.

Spivak presents the concept of “measuring silences” (Spivak, “Can the Subaltern” 296), where the multiple repressions of women’s interests are examined in order to pinpoint the ideological frameworks that contribute to the suppression of Indigenous women’s voices. This
becomes significant when the ideologies of revolution exclude the critical voices of women, whose visions of change represent the needs of the community in ways that are inclusive of women. In Indonesia, women’s voices continue to be overlooked even in the present day, and struggles around poverty and ethnic conflict persist. Women’s voices may have had an impact on the social and political trajectory of nationalism following the achievement of Indigenous sovereignty in Indonesia, had there been opportunity and acknowledgement for women who wished to have their complaints about the limitations and constraints of gendered expectations surrounding their social roles, heard. This might have allowed the holistic needs of the diverse communities in Indonesia to be more fully represented, with greater potential for healthy decision-making that could benefit the nation and reduce conflict during its period of growth. This suggests the importance of women’s involvement and opinions during historic periods of insurgency, and it is conceivable that women’s power to direct revolutionary change has a significant effect on the long-term success of revolutionary processes. Clearly, liberation in Indigenous communities must be accomplished with respect for the emotional bonds that enable strengthened relationships, as described by women, since the recognition of women’s critical positions positively contribute to equitable divisions of social power for the future.
Works Cited


van der Kroef, Justus M. “Sukarno’s Indonesia.” *Pacific Affairs* 46.2 (Summer 1973): 269-88. Print.


Appendix A

“Eden Robinson: Identity and Articulation,” Interview

EDEN ROBINSON: I have some very traditional Aunties. They ground my identity into me very early. I was very, very clear about who I was, and where I fit in my community. I am from the Two Beavers Sharing at the Tree of Life Clan. I was adopted into the clan when I moved up to Kitimat. Traditionally Bella Bella, I was supposed to go to my mother’s clan, which was an Eagle Clan. When I moved up here, we didn’t have an Eagle name. And growing up, I didn’t think a lot about my identity. I knew that I was Native, and we would ride the bus into town to go to school. Kitimat was unusual for the North because there was a very big mix of different cultures. There was Sikh, Portuguese, Italian, Norwegian, Icelandic. We didn’t know a lot about each other. I just thought everyone lived like that. I thought all communities were like that. And I thought everybody knew who the Haisla were.

So when I came to writing, I didn’t feel a great drive to find my identity. I already knew who I was. I had a very clear idea of what I wanted to write. There were some Native writers at the time who were playing with the forms, and that’s what I wanted to do. I was very interested in what I could and couldn’t do. […]

As a Native writer, and as a female writer, some parts of publishing are much easier and some parts are more difficult. Telling stories that aren’t what people are expecting is difficult. They’re not as accepted. I like to play with it, and I find it a lot of fun. And the things I want to say, they might not be what anyone is interested in hearing right now. And the places I want to go, not many people might want to follow me. […]
For the number of Native people that are in Canada and in North America, I think we actually occupy a fairly large part of the consciousness of mainstream, but it’s a kind of muddled awareness. I hesitate to say stereotypes, but we’re still a big mystery spot.

When I was growing up, the presence of Native people in literature was very limited. There were the super poor; they were down-and-out, they were downtrodden, they were mired in addiction or self-destructive behaviour – or they were the super-achievers. They were, you know, they were very ambitious, and very smart. There was no one in literature at the time that I was writing *Monkey Beach* that reflected the people that I met and interacted with and lived with, and I wanted to give them a story; I wanted to give them a place. This was at the height of the Fraser River salmon wars, it was just after Oka, so there was a lot of tension between the Native and non-Native communities in British Columbia, and that was the atmosphere I was writing *Monkey Beach* in. Part of the drive behind it was to say, ‘Ok, here we are!’

(Robinson, Interview)
Appendix B

Judith Butler “A Politics of the Street,” Lecture

JUDITH BUTLER: [That] sometimes bodies assembled on the street are clearly cause for joy, even for hope. […] [So] from the start, we have to be prepared to ask, ‘Under what conditions do we find bodies assembled on the street to be cause for celebration?’ For what forms of assembly actually work in the service of realizing greater ideals of justice and equality? Minimally, we could say that those demonstrations that seek to realize justice and equality are worthy of praise. But even then, we are called upon to define our terms, since as we know, there are conflicting views about justice, to be sure, and there are many different ways of thinking and valuing equality. […] Think about conditions of intense police surveillance or military occupation. Crowds may not swell on the streets without risking imprisonment, injury, or death, and so alliances are sometimes made in other forms, ones that seek to minimize bodily exposure to violence, at the same time that demands for justice are made. Hunger strikes within prisons, as we recently saw in Palestine, are forms of resistance that must take place in spaces of enforced confinement. They are themselves, bodily demands for public space and public freedom. So, let us remember that heightened bodily exposure is not always a political good, or at least, not always the most successful strategy. The Israeli occupation of Palestine is a case in point. […] some basic requirements of the body are at the centre of political mobilization. We could certainly make a list of those. Bodies require food and shelter, protection from injury and destruction, freedom to move, employment, health care. Bodies require other bodies for support, for passion, for survival.

(Butler “A Politics”)