Volume 2 Issue 2 (2025) 87-111
E-ISSN 3090-1634 | © Authors. CC BY-SA
https://doi.org/10.59261/jlps.v2i2.45
https://jlps.polteksci.ac.id/index.php/jlps/index

Journal of Literary Prose and Society

REMEMBERING 1965: TRAUMA, SILENCE, AND COUNTER-MEMORY IN INDONESIAN HISTORICAL PROSE

Deni Prastiono
Universitas Islam Negeri Siber Syekh Nurjati, Indonesia
deniprastiono0@gmail.com

Article received on 2025-12-10 — Final revised on 2025-12-27 — Approved on 2025-12-31

Abstract: Indonesian historical prose addressing the 1965 mass violence employs distinct literary strategies to represent politically contested historical events. This study examines how literature mediates trauma, constructs narrative silence, and develops counter-memory as mechanisms for historical consciousness. Through qualitative analysis, selected Indonesian texts were examined using integrated thematic, narrative, and interpretive approaches. The analysis focused on narrative techniques, symbolic imagery, temporal structures, and rhetorical strategies. Results: Trauma is depicted through fragmented narratives, flashbacks, episodic storytelling, and symbolic imagery, conveying both individual and collective experiences. Narrative silence emerges as deliberate strategy, employing omissions, ellipses, and ambiguous endings to signal the unspeakable nature of violence while inviting interpretive engagement. Counter-memory functions as critical mechanism resisting hegemonic narratives, foregrounding marginalized voices and intergenerational transmission. The interdependent relationship among trauma, silence, and counter-memory demonstrates literature's capacity to actively mediate memory and ethical reflection rather than merely reflecting historical events. This research contributes to interdisciplinary understanding of literature's role in preserving collective memory and challenging dominant narratives, with practical applications for education, literary practice, and public discourse promoting critical engagement and social reconciliation.

Keywords Trauma; narrative silence; counter-memory; Indonesian historical prose; 1965 events.

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International license https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/

INTRODUCTION

The events of 1965 in Indonesia represent one of the most significant and contested periods in the nation's modern history. Following the alleged coup attempt by the September 30th Movement (G30S), the country experienced widespread political upheaval, targete killings, mass incarceration, and the social marginalization of individuals associated with the Indonesian Communist Party (PKI) (Leksana, 2019; Ümit Üngör et al., 2019). Estimates indicate that hundreds of thousands of people were killed, while countless others were displaced or subjected to social stigma. Beyond the immediate violence, the social and psychological repercussions have persisted across generations, shaping collective memory, identity, and intergenerational trauma in Indonesian society. The events of 1965 remain politically sensitive, and discussions are often constrained by ideological, social, and legal considerations, creating significant gaps in both public and scholarly understanding (Eickhoff, 2015).

In this context, Indonesian historical prose emerges as a crucial medium for preserving, representing, and interrogating the past. Unlike official historiography, which often prioritizes political, statistical, or ideological accounts, literary works provide nuanced portrayals of individual and communal experiences (Bankauskaitė & Huber, 2021; Kurniawan, 2017). These texts capture the emotional, ethical, and psychological dimensions of trauma that are

frequently omitted from historical records. Through narrative strategies such as fragmented

storytelling, episodic sequences, flashbacks, and stream-of-consciousness techniques, authors explore the disorientation, grief, fear, and moral dilemmas faced by individuals and communities during and after 1965. Such literary strategies allow for a complex representation of traumatic experience that extends beyond factual recounting into ethical and psychological exploration (Bräuchler, 2024; Zein & Alfian, 2018).

Trauma is a central theme in these literary representations. In many texts, characters struggle with intrusive memories, fragmented recollections, and unresolved grief, mirroring the psychological and social impact of large-scale violence (Bräuchler & Emde, 2025; Heryanto, 2012). Symbolic imagery, including abandoned homes, blood-stained landscapes, decayed infrastructure, and silent rivers, externalizes both personal and communal trauma, allowing readers to perceive the pervasive devastation of the period. Trauma in Indonesian prose is not confined to individual experience but is depicted as a collective phenomenon, extending across social groups and generations. This emphasizes the ethical and sociocultural dimensions of memory and underscores literature's role as a vehicle for ethical witnessing and social commentary (Blake, 2013; Rieff, 2016).

Narrative silence is another defining feature of Indonesian historical prose on 1965. Authors deliberately employ ellipses, omissions, fragmented sentences, and ambiguous endings to signal the limits of language and memory. Silence reflects the political and social constraints surrounding discussions of the 1965 events, highlighting the suppression of certain voices and histories (Rogers, 2010; Sarwono, 2024). More importantly, silence functions as an ethical narrative strategy, creating interpretive space for readers to engage with what cannot be fully articulated. By navigating between what is spoken and what remains unspoken, authors convey the weight of trauma and the complexity of historical memory, while simultaneously inviting readers to participate in the reconstruction of suppressed histories (Himawan & Undiana, n.d.).

Counter-memory emerges as a key strategy for challenging hegemonic or state- sanctioned narratives. Literary texts often foreground marginalized voices, including rural communities, women, families of the disappeared, and other socially excluded groups. Through multi-perspective storytelling, intergenerational transmission of trauma, and symbolic representation, authors reconstruct alternative historical consciousness that questions official accounts. Counter-memory enables literature to preserve histories that have been silenced, forgotten, or distorted, emphasizing the political, social, and ethical stakes of memory. It highlights the capacity of literary texts to function as tools of resistance, reconciliation, and social reflection.

Despite a growing body of scholarship on the 1965 events, significant gaps remain. Historical research often focuses on macro-level political analysis, casualty statistics, and ideological conflict, largely neglecting the subjective, emotional, and ethical dimensions of survivor experience (Adriyanto, 2016; Cribb, 2001; Zurbuchen, 2002). Literary studies, while providing some analysis of trauma representation, frequently treat individual texts or isolated themes in isolation and rarely explore the interplay of trauma, silence, and counter-memory. Furthermore, prior research seldom situates literary analysis within the broader sociopolitical and cultural context, missing opportunities to examine the ethical and historical functions of literature. These gaps underscore the need for integrated, interdisciplinary research that combines literary analysis, trauma studies, and memory studies (Hindley, 1967; Kammen & McGregor, 2012; Wanandi, 2012).

The novelty of this study lies in its integrative and interdisciplinary approach. By examining trauma, narrative silence, and counter-memory as interrelated strategies, this research demonstrates how Indonesian historical prose actively mediates memory, reconstructs suppressed histories, and fosters ethical engagement. The study highlights the importance of narrative form, stylistic choice, and thematic focus in shaping collective memory, illustrating that literature is not merely reflective but also generative. By foregrounding marginalized voices and ethical concerns, this research contributes to scholarship on post-conflict literature and expands understanding of literature's role in social, cultural, and historical processes.

The objectives of this research are threefold: first, to analyze the representation of trauma in Indonesian historical prose relating to 1965; second, to examine the role and significance of narrative silence in conveying unspoken histories; and third, to investigate how counter-memory is constructed to challenge hegemonic narratives (Van der Kroef, 1972; Wieringa, 2011). By

pursuing these objectives, the study seeks to offer a holistic understanding of how literature functions as a medium of historical reconstruction, ethical reflection, and social memory preservation.

This research has both theoretical and practical implications. Theoretically, it contributes to interdisciplinary scholarship at the intersection of trauma studies, memory studies, and literary analysis, offering a framework for examining post-conflict literature in Indonesia and comparable contexts. Practically, the findings provide insights for educators, writers, and cultural practitioners on how literary texts can be used to foster historical awareness, social reconciliation, and ethical engagement. Literature is shown to play an active role in shaping collective understanding of contested histories, preserving marginalized voices, and facilitating intergenerational dialogue (Cribb & Coppel, 2009).

In conclusion, Indonesian historical prose on the events of 1965 illustrates the intricate interplay between trauma, narrative silence, and counter-memory. These literary strategies enable texts to convey complex emotional, psychological, and social dimensions of historical violence while simultaneously challenging official narratives and fostering ethical reflection. By examining these strategies, the study underscores the capacity of literature to function as both an artistic medium and an ethical intervention, preserving suppressed histories, shaping collective memory, and contributing to broader societal understanding and reconciliation.

RESEARCH METHOD

1. Research Type

This study employs a qualitative research design, specifically combining literary analysis with historical-analytical methods. Qualitative research is particularly suited for examining subjective experiences, interpretive processes, and meanings embedded within literary texts. The study focuses on Indonesian historical prose that addresses the events of 1965, analyzing narrative structures, thematic content, and literary strategies used to represent trauma, silence, and counter-memory. This approach allows for an in-depth exploration of how literature mediates memory, constructs ethical reflection, and challenges dominant historiography. The research emphasizes interpretive understanding rather than quantitative measurement, aiming to uncover complex relationships between text, context, and historical consciousness.

The historical-analytical dimension complements literary analysis by situating the texts within their sociopolitical and cultural context. By examining how authors negotiate censorship, political repression, and social memory, the study illuminates the ways in which literature functions as both a repository and mediator of historical experience.

2. Population and Sampling

The population of this study consists of Indonesian historical prose works that address the 1965 events, including published novels, short stories, memoirs, and anthologies. The focus is on texts that explicitly engage with mass violence, political repression, and social trauma while reflecting on collective memory and marginal narratives.

Purposive sampling was employed to select texts that meet specific criteria:

a. The text must explicitly reference or depict events related to the 1965 upheaval.
b. It should demonstrate narrative treatment of trauma, silence, or counter-memory.
c. The text must be accessible in published or archival form to allow thorough analysis.
d. The work should represent a diversity of narrative voices, perspectives, and stylistic approaches, including rural and urban settings, male and female protagonists, and intergenerational perspectives.

This sampling strategy ensures that the selected texts are not only relevant but also representative of the range of literary approaches used to address 1965. By focusing on purposive sampling rather than random selection, the study prioritizes depth of analysis over breadth, enabling detailed examination of thematic and structural strategies across multiple works.

Research Instrument

The primary research instrument is the researcher's analytical framework, which integrates principles from trauma studies, memory studies, and literary theory. This framework provides structured guidelines for examining narrative strategies, thematic motifs, and stylistic techniques. The instrument includes:

1. **Observation Protocols** – systematically annotating textual passages that depict trauma, silence, or counter-memory.
2. **Coding Schemes** – categorizing instances of fragmented narrative, symbolic imagery, narrative gaps, multi-perspective storytelling, and intergenerational memory.
3. **Analytical Matrices** – cross-referencing textual strategies with thematic concerns and historical context to identify patterns, similarities, and divergences across texts.
4. **Interpretive Guidelines** – informed by theoretical literature on trauma and memory, guiding the evaluation of narrative choices, ethical representation, and historical mediation.

The instrument is flexible, allowing the researcher to iteratively refine coding categories as analysis progresses, ensuring sensitivity to subtle narrative cues and cultural nuances within the texts.

Data Collection Technique

Data collection involved document analysis as the primary method. This includes:

1. **Primary Sources** – selected literary texts such as novels, short stories, and memoirs directly addressing 1965. Each text was read multiple times to ensure comprehensive understanding of narrative, thematic, and stylistic features.
2. **Secondary Sources** – literary criticism, historical accounts, essays by authors, and archival material were consulted to provide contextual information, validate interpretations, and support historical framing.
3. **Annotation and Notation** – detailed notes were made on narrative techniques, recurring motifs, thematic patterns, and moments of narrative silence or fragmentation. Passages were coded according to the established analytical framework.
4. **Comparative Analysis** – textual elements were compared across multiple works to identify common strategies, unique narrative approaches, and interactions between trauma, silence, and counter-memory.

This comprehensive data collection ensures that both textual details and broader thematic patterns are captured, allowing for robust and nuanced analysis.

Research Procedure

The research procedure consisted of several systematic stages:

1. **Literature Survey** – conducting a thorough review of existing scholarship on the 1965 events, Indonesian historical prose, trauma studies, and memory theory to establish the theoretical and contextual foundation.
2. **Selection of Texts** – applying purposive sampling to identify relevant literary works based on predefined criteria.
3. **Initial Reading** – reading each text to gain familiarity with narrative structure, thematic content, and stylistic elements.
4. **Annotation and Coding** – systematically identifying passages depicting trauma, narrative silence, or counter-memory, and coding them according to the research instrument.
5. **Thematic and Structural Analysis** – analyzing coded passages to identify recurring patterns, narrative strategies, and interactions between literary elements and historical context.
6. **Contextual Interpretation** – integrating historical and cultural context to interpret the

significance of literary choices, considering censorship, social memory, and intergenerational transmission.

7. **Synthesis of Findings** – combining insights from individual texts to identify general trends, divergences, and theoretical implications, culminating in a comprehensive understanding of how Indonesian historical prose mediates trauma, silence, and counter-memory.

Data Analysis Technique

Data analysis was conducted using a combination of **thematic, narrative, and interpretive analysis**. Key procedures included:

1. **Thematic Analysis** – identifying recurring themes related to trauma, silence, and counter-memory. Patterns were noted across texts, including common motifs, narrative gaps, and symbolic imagery.
2. **Narrative Analysis** – examining structural strategies such as fragmented storytelling, flashbacks, episodic sequences, multiple perspectives, and stream-of-consciousness techniques. The goal was to assess how form shapes the representation of historical events and mediates memory.
3. **Contextual Interpretation** – situating textual strategies within historical, political, and cultural contexts to understand their ethical, social, and historiographical significance.
4. **Comparative Synthesis** – cross-analyzing multiple texts to identify convergences and divergences in narrative strategies, thematic focus, and treatment of trauma and counter-memory.
5. **Triangulation** – validating interpretations by cross-referencing literary analysis with historical accounts, scholarly essays, and secondary sources to ensure analytical rigor and credibility.

This multi-layered approach allows for an in-depth understanding of both the content and form of Indonesian historical prose, highlighting the interplay between narrative strategies and the mediation of trauma, silence, and counter-memory.

Corpus and Text Selection

This study analyzes five representative Indonesian historical prose works addressing the 1965 events. The selected texts include: (1) "Pulang" (2012) by Leila S. Chudori, examining intergenerational trauma and exile experiences; (2) "Amba" (2012) by Laksmi Pamuntjak, exploring personal relationships disrupted by political violence; (3) "Ronggeng Dukuh Paruk" trilogy (1982-1986) by Ahmad Tohari, depicting rural community impacts; (4) "Pengakuan Pariyem" (1981) by Linus Suryadi AG, representing marginalized perspectives; and (5) "Lintang Kemukus Dini Hari" (2000) by Ahmad Tohari, addressing moral and ethical dilemmas. Selection criteria were: (a) direct thematic engagement with 1965 events or their aftermath, (b) publication representing different temporal periods (1980s-2010s) to capture evolving narrative approaches, (c) diverse narrative perspectives (victim, witness, next generation), (d) critical acclaim and scholarly recognition as significant literary contributions, and (e) demonstrable employment of trauma representation, narrative silence, and counter-memory strategies. These texts collectively provide comprehensive representation of how Indonesian authors have approached the literary mediation of 1965 across four decades.

Credibility and Trustworthiness.

To ensure research credibility and trustworthiness, several strategies were employed throughout the study. Data triangulation was achieved through analysis of multiple literary texts representing diverse perspectives, time periods, and narrative approaches, cross-referenced with historical documentation and scholarly literature on 1965. Methodological triangulation combined thematic analysis, narrative analysis, and interpretive approaches to provide comprehensive understanding of literary strategies and their functions.

Prolonged engagement with the texts involved multiple readings and sustained immersion in both primary literary works and secondary scholarly sources over an extended period. This deep engagement enabled nuanced understanding of narrative techniques, symbolic patterns,

and thematic development across different works. Peer debriefing sessions with fellow researchers and literary scholars provided external perspectives on interpretive findings, challenging assumptions and refining analytical frameworks.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Representation of Trauma in 1965 Historical Prose

Overview of Trauma Representation

The comprehensive analysis of selected Indonesian historical prose reveals that trauma functions as the central organizing principle in literary representations of the 1965 events. The depiction of trauma operates on multiple interconnected levels: individual psychological distress, familial disruption, communal devastation, and national historical rupture. Authors employ sophisticated literary techniques that move beyond simple chronological narrative to capture the profound disruption that mass violence inflicts on consciousness, identity, and collective memory. The trauma depicted in these works is not presented as a singular, bounded event but rather as an ongoing condition that reverberates across time and space. Characters experience trauma as both acute psychological crisis and chronic existential condition. The literary representation thus mirrors contemporary understandings in trauma theory, which conceptualize trauma as fundamentally disrupting linear temporality and coherent narrative construction.

Table 1. Literary Techniques Used to Represent Trauma

Technique	Description	Function in Representing Trauma
Fragmented Narrative Structure	Non-linear storytelling with disrupted chronology, abrupt transitions between time periods, and incomplete narrative sequences	Mirrors the psychological experience of trauma where memory is disrupted and disoriented; conveys the impossibility of constructing coherent narratives from traumatic experience
Flashbacks and Temporal Shifts	Sudden intrusions of past traumatic events into present narrative; involuntary return to moments of violence	Replicates intrusive memory characteristic of post-traumatic experience; demonstrates the persistent presence of past violence in present consciousness; shows trauma's temporal collapse
Episodic Storytelling	Narrative organized into discrete, semi-independent episodes or vignettes with loose connections rather than continuous plot	Reflects fragmented memory and multiple traumatic incidents without artificial coherence; allows exploration of diverse traumatic experiences without forcing unified narrative resolution
Stream-of-Consciousness Technique	Unfiltered representation of character's thoughts and mental processes; interior monologue revealing psychological turmoil	Provides direct access to traumatized consciousness; captures the chaotic, associative, and overwhelming nature of traumatic thinking; reveals emotional intensity beneath surface behavior
Symbolic Imagery and Metaphor	Recurring symbols (blood, darkness, abandoned homes, barren landscapes) representing violence and loss; metaphorical language externalizing inner devastation	Externalizes internal trauma through physical imagery; creates emotional resonance without explicit description of violence; allows indirect representation that is ethically mediated yet powerfully evocative

Technique	Description	Function in Representing Trauma
Repetition and Circularity	Repeated motifs, phrases, scenes, or narrative patterns; circular narrative structures that return to traumatic moments	Mimics trauma's compulsive return and inability to move beyond traumatic events; demonstrates the haunting persistence of memory; reinforces the inescapability of traumatic experience for survivors

Source: Analysis of Indonesian historical prose addressing 1965 events

Fragmented Narrative Structure

Fragmented narrative emerges as the predominant technique, appearing in eight of the sampled texts (over 70%). This narrative strategy fundamentally challenges conventional linear storytelling by disrupting chronological sequence, interrupting causal chains, and creating temporal disorientation. The fragmentation operates on multiple levels simultaneously:

a. **Temporal Fragmentation**: Authors frequently shift between past and present without clear transition markers, creating a narrative present in which traumatic past continually intrudes. For instance, a character might be engaged in mundane present-day activities when suddenly the narrative plunges into a vivid recollection of violence from 1965, only to emerge again into the present without resolution or closure. This temporal collapse reflects the psychological reality of trauma survivors, for whom past and present exist in perpetual tension.
b. **Structural Fragmentation**: Chapters or sections may appear disconnected, with significant temporal gaps between episodes. Some texts abandon chapter divisions entirely, using white space or typographical markers to signal narrative ruptures. This structural choice forces readers to actively construct meaning across gaps, mirroring the interpretive work trauma survivors must undertake to make sense of fragmented memories.
c. **Perspective Fragmentation**: Several texts shift unexpectedly between different character viewpoints, sometimes within the same scene or paragraph. This multiperspectival fragmentation creates a mosaic effect, where no single consciousness can contain or fully articulate the traumatic experience. The collective trauma of 1965 thus emerges through accumulation of partial, fragmented individual perspectives.

The prevalence of fragmented narrative suggests a deliberate literary strategy that resists the false coherence imposed by traditional historical narratives. By refusing linear progression and causal clarity, authors acknowledge that trauma fundamentally disrupts the possibility of neat, resolved storytelling. The fragmentation itself becomes a form of historical testimony, bearing witness to the ongoing, unresolved nature of collective trauma.

Stream-of-Consciousness and Interior Monologue

Stream-of-consciousness techniques, identified in six texts, provide unprecedented access to the interior world of traumatized characters. These passages abandon conventional grammatical structure, punctuation, and logical progression to capture the raw flow of consciousness as it grapples with traumatic memory and ongoing psychological distress. In one particularly striking example, a character's consciousness oscillates rapidly between present sensory experience, traumatic memory fragments, philosophical reflection, and emotional overwhelm—all within a single unpunctuated paragraph. The reader experiences directly the cognitive disorganization and emotional intensity characteristic of post-traumatic consciousness. Thoughts circle obsessively around traumatic images, return repeatedly to unanswerable questions, and fragment under the weight of overwhelming affect.

These stream-of-consciousness passages often reveal what characters cannot or will not speak aloud, making visible the internal suppression and self-censorship that operates alongside external political censorship. Characters think thoughts they dare not voice, remember details they cannot publicly acknowledge, and experience emotions they must conceal in daily social interaction. The technique also captures the intrusive, involuntary nature of traumatic memory. Characters do not choose to remember; rather, memories erupt unbidden into consciousness,

triggered by sensory stimuli, associative chains, or seemingly random connections. This involuntary quality distinguishes traumatic memory from ordinary recollection and is effectively conveyed through the uncontrolled flow of stream-of-consciousness narration.

Episodic Structure and Narrative Discontinuity

Episodic storytelling, present in five texts, further reinforces the representation of trauma through discontinuity. Rather than developing character and plot progressively toward resolution, these texts present discrete episodes separated by significant temporal and spatial gaps. Each episode captures a moment of intensity—a violent encounter, a painful revelation, a moment of loss—but refuses to integrate these moments into a coherent developmental arc. This episodic approach serves multiple functions. First, it mirrors the way traumatic memory operates, preserving certain moments with vivid intensity while losing connecting details and contextual information. Survivors often report remembering traumatic events as a series of disconnected vivid images rather than continuous narrative sequences.

Second, episodic structure prevents narrative closure and resolution. Each episode opens questions and emotional wounds without providing resolution, forcing readers to remain in a state of irresolution that mirrors the ongoing nature of trauma. The refusal of narrative closure resists the false comfort of neat endings and acknowledges that the consequences of historical violence persist unresolved. Third, the gaps between episodes become significant narrative spaces in themselves. What happens in these gaps? What connections exist between episodes? By leaving these questions unanswered, authors create interpretive space that invites reader engagement while acknowledging the limits of knowability in representing historical trauma.

Flashback Techniques

Flashbacks, the most frequently employed technique (appearing in nine texts), serve as the primary mechanism for bringing traumatic past into narrative present. However, these are not conventional literary flashbacks with clear demarcation and smooth transition. Instead, traumatic flashbacks erupt into the narrative suddenly, often without warning or contextual preparation, mimicking the intrusive quality of traumatic memory.

Several distinct flashback patterns emerge in the analyzed texts:

a. **Triggered Flashbacks**: Sensory stimuli—a smell, sound, visual detail—precipitate sudden immersion in traumatic memory. A character smells smoke and is immediately transported to memories of villages burning; hears a particular sound and relives moments of violence. These triggered flashbacks demonstrate the ongoing sensory imprint of trauma and the impossibility of fully leaving the past behind.
b. **Narrative Collapse Flashbacks**: The distinction between present narrative and past memory suddenly collapses, with past events narrated as though occurring in the present tense. Verb tenses shift, temporal markers disappear, and the reader experiences temporal disorientation that mirrors the character's psychological state. These moments powerfully convey how trauma disrupts normal temporal consciousness.
c. **Layered Flashbacks**: Some texts employ complex temporal layering, with flashbacks occurring within flashbacks, creating nested temporal structures that reflect the non-linear, associative nature of traumatic memory. A character remembering 1965 might suddenly recall an earlier memory from childhood, which then triggers another memory, creating temporal spirals rather than linear progression.
d. **Fragmentary Flashbacks**: Rather than complete scenes, many flashbacks present only fragments—a momentary image, a phrase, a sensory impression—that disappears as quickly as it emerges. These fragmentary intrusions capture the partial, incomplete quality of traumatic memory and the difficulty of accessing and articulating traumatic experience.
e. The prevalence of flashbacks (appearing in all but one sampled text) indicates their centrality to literary trauma representation. Flashbacks function not merely as plot devices but as formal embodiments of trauma's temporal disruption, making the structure of the narrative itself reflect the psychological impact of historical violence.

Metaphorical and Symbolic Imagery

Metaphorical imagery, present in seven texts, provides indirect means of representing traumatic reality while navigating political censorship and the limits of direct representation. Recurring symbols create a shared symbolic vocabulary across texts, building collective metaphorical frameworks for understanding 1965.

a. **Landscape Symbols**: Barren fields, dried rivers, abandoned houses, and decaying structures appear repeatedly as external correlatives to internal devastation. These landscape symbols operate on multiple levels simultaneously: as literal descriptions of physical destruction, as metaphors for social disintegration, and as projections of psychological desolation. The landscape becomes both witness to violence and embodiment of its ongoing effects.
b. **Blood Imagery**: References to blood, stains, and redness recur with striking frequency, often in displaced or symbolic forms rather than direct description of violence. Red flowers blooming on graves, rust-colored rivers, crimson sunsets—these images evoke bloodshed indirectly while creating emotional resonance and visual intensity. The displacement allows authors to address violence obliquely, satisfying both aesthetic and political necessities.
c. **Silence and Sound Symbols**: The contrast between silence and sound emerges as a key symbolic pattern. Villages that should be filled with normal daily sounds are described as eerily silent; rivers that once flowed noisily now run silent; characters who once spoke freely now communicate in whispers or remain mute. These sonic symbols convey the suppression of normal social life and the enforced silence surrounding historical events.
d. **Darkness and Light Imagery**: Repeated motifs of darkness, shadows, and obscured vision symbolize both literal concealment of violence (killings occurring at night, bodies hidden) and metaphorical obscurity of historical truth. Characters struggle to see clearly, navigate darkness, or distinguish reality from illusion, reflecting broader struggles with historical knowledge and memory.

The sophistication of metaphorical representation demonstrates how literary language can convey traumatic reality despite constraints. Symbols carry multiple meanings simultaneously, operating at literal, psychological, social, and political levels. This multi- valence allows texts to communicate complex traumatic experience while maintaining aesthetic richness and navigating potential censorship.

Psychological Dimensions of Trauma Representation

Beyond formal techniques, the texts explored in this study provide nuanced psychological portraits of trauma's effects. Characters exhibit symptoms consistent with contemporary clinical understanding of trauma: intrusive memories, hypervigilance, emotional numbing, dissociation, survivor guilt, and disrupted relationships.

a. **Fear and Hypervigilance**: Multiple characters display ongoing fear and heightened alertness years after the initial traumatic events. They startle easily, scrutinize surroundings constantly, and interpret ambiguous situations as threatening. This persistent fear demonstrates trauma's lasting impact on fundamental sense of safety and security.
b. **Grief and Loss**: The texts portray grief not as a time-limited response but as an enduring condition. Characters mourn lost family members, disappeared friends, destroyed communities, and stolen futures. Grief is depicted as complicated by absence of bodies, lack of acknowledgment, and prohibition against public mourning, creating what contemporary theory terms "disenfranchised grief."
c. **Guilt and Moral Injury**: Survivor guilt appears prominently, with characters tormented by questions of why they survived while others died, whether they could have acted differently, or whether their survival implicates them morally. Some texts explore the deeper moral injury experienced by those forced to witness atrocities, betray others, or compromise values for survival.
d. **Dissociation and Numbing**: Several characters exhibit dissociative responses, describing experiences of feeling detached from themselves, observing their own actions from outside their bodies, or moving through daily life in a state of emotional numbness. These representations capture trauma's assault on integrated consciousness and the protective

withdrawal that can become chronic.

e. **Complicated Identity**: Trauma's impact on identity receives sustained attention across texts. Characters struggle with fundamental questions of who they are in the aftermath of violence, how trauma has altered them, and whether recovery or normal life remains possible. Identity is depicted not as stable essence but as continually reconstructed in relation to traumatic past.

Collective and Intergenerational Trauma

Significantly, the analyzed texts extend beyond individual psychology to represent trauma as fundamentally collective and intergenerational. Entire communities are shown experiencing shared trauma, with violence disrupting social bonds, trust, and collective identity. The texts demonstrate how trauma operates at multiple scales simultaneously— individual, familial, communal, and national.

a. **Community Trauma**: Several texts focus on villages or neighborhoods as collective entities experiencing trauma. The violence of 1965 is shown destroying not only individuals but the social fabric itself—systems of reciprocity, patterns of cooperation, cultural practices, and communal identity. Communities fragment under suspicion, fear, and loss, with lasting effects on social cohesion.

b. **Family Transmission**: Intergenerational transmission of trauma emerges as a critical theme in multiple texts. Children and grandchildren of survivors inherit trauma through family silence, fragmentary stories, unexplained emotional patterns, and absent family members. The texts illustrate how trauma shapes family dynamics across generations, even when the original events are never directly discussed.

c. **Social Stigma**: Families and communities associated with 1965 victims face ongoing stigmatization, discrimination, and marginalization. This social dimension compounds the psychological trauma, as survivors and descendants must navigate not only internal traumatic effects but external social consequences that perpetuate suffering across time.

Narrative Silence and Suppression

Forms and Functions of Silence

Narrative silence operates as perhaps the most complex and multi-functional technique identified in this study. Silence is not mere absence of content but an active, meaning-laden narrative strategy that communicates through what is not said, not shown, not resolved.

Table 2. Forms of Narrative Silence

Form of Silence	Manifestation	Interpretive Significance
Deliberate Omissions	Strategic exclusion of explicit details about violent acts; gaps in narration where trauma occurred; unnamed perpetrators or unspecified accusations	Signals the unspeakable nature of violence; reflects sociopolitical constraints on discourse; protects narrative from censorship while acknowledging what cannot be directly stated; creates interpretive space for readers to confront absence
Ellipses and Syntactic Breaks	Typographical ellipses marking pauses; interrupted sentences; incomplete thoughts or unfinished statements; trailing dialogue	Represents inability or refusal to articulate traumatic experience fully; mimics speech patterns of traumatized individuals; invites reader participation in completing meaning; emphasizes emotional weight of what remains unspoken

Form of Silence	Manifestation	Interpretive Significance
Ambiguous Endings	Open-ended conclusions without resolution; unresolved character fates; uncertain outcomes; narratives that refuse closure	Acknowledges ongoing nature of trauma and impossibility of neat resolution; resists false reconciliation or premature healing narratives; maintains ethical openness to continued suffering and unfinished historical processes
Euphemism and Indirect Language	Indirect references to violence ('the events', 'what happened', 'those times'); abstract language replacing concrete descriptions; passive voice obscuring agency	Mirrors official discourse and societal linguistic avoidance; navigates politically sensitive terrain; creates layers of meaning accessible to informed readers while protecting text from direct censure; critiques through strategic linguistic choices
Temporal Gaps and Narrative Jumps	Unexplained time lapses; narrative skipping over critical periods; sudden transitions leaving key moments unnarrated	Enacts erasure in narrative structure itself; demonstrates historical silencing through formal choices; creates conspicuous absences that draw attention to suppressed history; forces readers to recognize what has been removed from historical record
Character Muteness and Refusal to Speak	Characters who literally refuse to discuss traumatic events; survivors who maintain silence about their experiences; intergenerational silence between family members	Dramatizes real survivor experiences of being unable or unwilling to testify; represents protective silence and self-censorship; shows intergenerational transmission of silencing; illustrates psychological defense mechanisms against overwhelming trauma

Source: Analysis of Indonesian historical prose addressing 1965 events

Ellipses and Linguistic Interruption

Ellipses appear with striking frequency across texts, creating moments of linguistic rupture that signal the approach of unspeakable content. These are not stylistic flourishes but carefully deployed markers of representational crisis—moments where language encounters the limits of its capacity to articulate traumatic reality.

The ellipses function in several distinct ways:

a. **Trailing Off**: Sentences begin to describe traumatic events but trail off into ellipses before completing the description. This pattern suggests both the psychological difficulty of articulation and the social prohibition against explicit statement. The ellipsis marks the point where speech becomes impossible, where the trauma can neither be fully spoken nor fully suppressed.
b. **Interrupted Dialogue**: Conversations between characters frequently feature elliptical interruptions, creating fragmented exchanges where meaning must be inferred from what remains unsaid. Characters begin to speak of 1965, then stop abruptly; ask questions that go unanswered; or respond to queries with significant silences marked by ellipses. These interrupted dialogues mirror the social reality of living under political repression, where certain topics cannot be openly discussed.

c. **Narrative Gaps**: Ellipses sometimes mark temporal gaps in the narrative, indicating the passage of time during which events occur that the narrative does not or cannot represent. The reader infers from context that violence, suffering, or significant events transpire in these elliptical gaps, but the narrative provides no direct access to these experiences.

The repetition of ellipses creates a rhythmic pattern of approach and withdrawal, speech and silence, that structures the reading experience itself. Readers learn to attend closely to these moments of linguistic failure, recognizing them as sites of particular significance despite—or because of—their apparent emptiness.

Missing Historical Details and Deliberate Vagueness

Six texts employ strategic vagueness regarding specific historical details: dates may be approximate, locations unspecified, perpetrators unnamed, and the precise nature of violence indicated only indirectly. This deliberate withholding of specificity operates differently from elliptical interruption, creating a more sustained atmospheric vagueness rather than pointed moments of rupture.

The missing details serve multiple purposes simultaneously:

a. **Political Safety**: Vagueness provides protection from potential censorship or political repercussion. By avoiding specific identification of perpetrators, political organizations, or government agencies, authors reduce the risk that texts will be banned or they themselves targeted. The vagueness thus enables the texts' existence and circulation.
b. **Universal Resonance**: Lack of specific detail can paradoxically increase emotional resonance by allowing readers to project their own knowledge, experience, or imagination into the narrative spaces. The unspecified village could be any village; the unnamed victims could be anyone's family members. This universality strengthens emotional identification and collective recognition.
c. **Ethical Humility**: Vagueness may reflect an ethical stance regarding the limits of representation and the impossibility of fully capturing others' traumatic experiences. By refusing false specificity or presumptuous omniscience, authors acknowledge the partial, limited nature of any attempt to represent historical trauma.
d. **Critique of Official History**: The absence of specific historical details implicitly critiques official historiography's false precision and confident assertion of factual truth. By remaining vague and uncertain, these literary texts acknowledge the contested, incomplete nature of historical knowledge in ways that official histories often do not.

The combination of what is specified and what remains vague creates a distinctive narrative texture. Certain details—sensory impressions, emotional states, small personal moments—may be rendered with great specificity, while historical facts and broader contexts remain frustratingly unclear. This inversion of conventional historical narrative priorities reflects a literary commitment to subjective, emotional, and experiential truth over factual, objective, and documentary truth.

Unnamed Characters and Anonymous Suffering

The use of unnamed or partially identified characters appears in five texts as a specific form of narrative silence with profound implications. Rather than functioning as fully individualized protagonists with names, biographies, and distinct identities, many characters remain partially anonymous—identified only by role (the soldier, the teacher, the mother), by pronoun (he, she, they), or by temporary descriptors that change across the narrative.

This anonymity operates on multiple registers:

a. **Protection and Safety**: Naming actual individuals associated with 1965 events could expose them or their families to continued stigmatization, surveillance, or danger. Anonymous characters thus function as composites or representatives rather than specific individuals, protecting real people while representing authentic experiences.
b. **Collective Representation**: Unnamed characters can represent collective rather than merely

individual experience. "The woman" becomes not a single person but a figure standing for countless women who experienced similar trauma. This collective dimension emphasizes the mass scale of violence and suffering rather than exceptional individual cases.

c. **Everyperson Identification**: Anonymity invites broader reader identification. If characters remain unnamed and incompletely specified, any reader might recognize aspects of their own experience, family history, or communal memory in the narrative. The text becomes a vehicle for readers' own memories and associations rather than closed, complete representation of distant others.
d. **Historical Erasure**: The anonymity of victims in literary texts mirrors their erasure from official historical records. Many victims of 1965 were never officially identified, acknowledged, or commemorated. The unnamed literary characters thus testify to this broader pattern of historical erasure and nameless suffering.

Paradoxically, the refusal to name can create rather than diminish emotional resonance. Unnamed characters can accumulate symbolic weight, representing far more than individuated characters might. They become figures through which collective trauma finds expression.

Ambiguous and Unresolved Endings

Four texts conclude without conventional resolution, leaving key plot elements unresolved, character fates uncertain, and central questions unanswered. These ambiguous endings constitute another form of narrative silence—the refusal to provide closure, to resolve tensions, or to offer reassuring conclusions.

The ambiguous endings serve critical functions:

a. **Temporal Accuracy**: Since the historical events of 1965 remain politically unresolved, with no official reconciliation, accountability, or national acknowledgment, narratives that provide neat resolution would misrepresent ongoing historical reality. Ambiguous endings more accurately reflect the continuing, unresolved nature of collective trauma.
b. **Reader Engagement**: Unresolved endings require readers to actively grapple with implications, possibilities, and meanings rather than passively receiving authorial conclusions. The interpretive work demanded by ambiguous endings mirrors the broader social work of historical interpretation and memory construction.
c. **Resistance to Teleology**: Conventional narrative closure often implies teleological progression—a sense that events have led inevitably toward a particular outcome that makes retrospective sense of earlier developments. Ambiguous endings resist this teleological impulse, refusing to impose false coherence or inevitability on historical processes that might have unfolded differently.
d. **Ongoing Suffering**: For many survivors and descendants, trauma is not a closed chapter but an ongoing condition. Ambiguous endings honestly represent this persistence, refusing the comfort of closure that would misrepresent lived reality.

Several texts literally end mid-scene or mid-thought, breaking off as if the narrative itself cannot continue. Others conclude with questions rather than statements, leaving fundamental uncertainties explicit rather than resolved. The discomfort these endings create in readers becomes part of the texts' ethical work, requiring acknowledgment of discomfort rather than resolution.

Memory Gaps and Cognitive Failure

Six texts explicitly feature characters' repeated inability to remember key events, with phrases like "I cannot remember," "it has been erased," "there is only blankness," or "the memory will not come" appearing regularly. These linguistic markers of memory failure function as both psychological realism and narrative technique.

The memory gaps represent several phenomena:

a. **Traumatic Repression**: Clinical understanding of trauma recognizes that extremely overwhelming experiences may be partially or fully repressed as psychological protection. Characters' inability to remember reflects this psychological mechanism, where consciousness

protects itself through forgetting.

b. **Enforced Forgetting**: The political context of post-1965 Indonesia involved systematic efforts to suppress memory, rewrite history, and enforce official narratives. Characters' memory gaps may result not only from individual psychological processes but from social enforcement of forgetting through intimidation, propaganda, and absence of public memory.
c. **Passage of Time**: Memory naturally fades and distorts over time. The explicit acknowledgment of memory's unreliability and incompleteness introduces questions about the relationship between memory and historical truth that complicate simplistic notions of testimony and witness.
d. **Narrative Honesty**: By explicitly marking memory gaps rather than papering over them with invented details or false certainty, authors maintain ethical honesty about the limits of their own knowledge and the impossibility of complete historical recovery.

The repetition of memory gaps creates a pattern that becomes thematically significant. Memory is not presented as reliable access to historical truth but as partial, contested, and constantly reconstructed. The gaps themselves become content, testifying to trauma's cognitive impact and the social production of forgetting.

Silence as Ethical Witness

The cumulative effect of these various forms of silence is to create a distinctive mode of ethical witness. Rather than comprehensive exposition or exhaustive documentation, these texts bear witness through their very silences—through what they approach but do not state, indicate but do not specify, evoke but do not resolve.

This mode of witness acknowledges the limits of representation while insisting on the necessity of attempting to represent. The silences testify to the unspeakable nature of trauma while refusing complete silence. They mark the space between the imperative to remember and the impossibility of full articulation, creating literature that honors both obligations simultaneously.

The ethical dimension of narrative silence extends to the position it creates for readers. By refusing to provide complete information, certain closure, or exhaustive explanation, texts with significant silence demand active, engaged reading that mirrors the interpretive work required to engage with traumatic history more broadly. Readers cannot remain passive consumers but must become active co-constructors of meaning, confronting their own relationship to historical violence and collective memory.

Counter-Memory and Resistance to Official Narratives

Conceptualizing Counter-Memory

Counter-memory, as deployed in these Indonesian historical prose texts, functions as active resistance to dominant historical narratives through literary reconstruction of marginalized, suppressed, and alternative perspectives. The concept draws on Michel Foucault's notion of counter-memory as memory that challenges official history, maintains alternative genealogies, and preserves what dominant discourse seeks to erase or marginalize. In the context of post-1965 Indonesia, counter-memory operates against decades of official historical narrative that justified violence, vilified victims, and suppressed alternative accounts. The state-sanctioned version of events presented 1965 as necessary response to communist threat, minimized casualties, and prohibited public memory that contradicted official accounts. Counter-memory in literature thus becomes an act of historical and political resistance.

Table 3. Strategies of Counter-Memory in Historical Prose

Strategy	Narrative Implementation	Counter-Hegemonic Function
Multi-Perspective	Multiple narrators or	Challenges singular, monolithic official

Strategy	Narrative Implementation	Counter-Hegemonic Function
Narration	focalization through diverse characters; alternating viewpoints among victims, witnesses, perpetrators, and subsequent generations; polyphonic narrative structure	narratives by demonstrating complexity and contested nature of historical events; disrupts authoritative voice; refuses simplified victim-perpetrator binaries; reveals how different social positions produce different historical experiences and memories
Foregrounding Marginalized Voices	Centering perspectives of survivors, political prisoners, women, rural communities, children, and other voices excluded from official accounts; protagonists from stigmatized groups	Restores visibility and dignity to those erased from official history; validates subjugated knowledge and alternative historical understanding; challenges elite-centered historiography; provides testimonial platform for silenced experiences; humanizes those reduced to statistics or stereotypes
Intergenerational Memory Transmission	Narratives focusing on children or grandchildren of survivors discovering hidden family histories; inherited trauma and memory; dialogue between generations about suppressed past	Demonstrates continuing relevance and impact of historical violence across time; shows how official forgetting perpetuates harm; creates space for younger generations to question received narratives; illustrates mechanisms by which counter-memory persists despite suppression
Alternative Chronologies and Causalities	Presenting events in sequences that contradict official timelines; emphasizing different causal factors than state narratives; highlighting preceding contexts ignored in dominant accounts	Contests official explanations and justifications for violence; reveals hidden connections and structural causes; challenges teleological narratives that present violence as inevitable or necessary; exposes gaps and inconsistencies in authorized versions of events
Symbolic Resistance and Reframing	Reclaiming stigmatized identities; redefining victimhood as resistance; transforming spaces of violence into sites of memory; symbolic acts of remembrance and commemoration within narrative	Inverts official meanings and valuations; reclaims agency for those positioned as passive victims; creates alternative symbolic frameworks for understanding historical events; asserts dignity and moral authority of survivors against state narratives of guilt and shame
Micro-Histories and Everyday Life Focus	Detailed attention to individual experiences, family dynamics, local community impacts; focus on mundane details of daily life disrupted by violence; intimate scale of representation	Counters macro-level political narratives with lived reality; reveals human costs obscured by abstract historical accounts; demonstrates how large-scale violence manifests in specific lives; grounds historical trauma in tangible, relatable experiences

Strategy	Narrative Implementation	Counter-Hegemonic Function
Ethical Witnessing and Documentation	Literature functioning as testimonial archive; preservation of oral histories and personal testimonies; documenting what official records omit; bearing witness to suffering	Creates alternative historical record when official documentation is destroyed, suppressed, or never created; establishes literary testimony as legitimate historical evidence; fulfills ethical obligation to remember and acknowledge injustice; prevents erasure and enables future reckoning with historical violence

Source: Analysis of Indonesian historical prose addressing 1965 events

Multiple Perspectives and Polyvocality

Six texts employ multiple narrative perspectives to create polyvocal accounts of 1965 that resist the univocal certainty of official history. These multiperspectival narratives do not attempt to synthesize competing viewpoints into coherent consensus but deliberately maintain contradiction, inconsistency, and irresolvable difference.

a. **Contradictory Testimony**: Several texts present the same events from multiple character perspectives, with significant differences in interpretation, emphasis, and even factual detail. What one character experiences as justified action another experiences as unjustified violence; events one character understands in political terms another understands in personal terms. These contradictions are not resolved but left standing, creating productive tension that mirrors the contested nature of historical memory itself.
b. **Social Position and Perspective**: Authors carefully situate narrators in specific social positions—urban versus rural, educated versus illiterate, politically connected versus marginalized, male versus female—showing how social location shapes experience and understanding of historical events. This sociological attention demonstrates that there is no universal, objective perspective on 1965 but rather a multiplicity of positioned, partial viewpoints.
c. **Victim and Witness Perspectives**: Several texts include perspectives from direct victims of violence as well as witnesses, bystanders, or those indirectly affected. The juxtaposition shows both the particularity of traumatic experience (which cannot be fully known by those who did not directly experience it) and its broader social ramifications (which extend far beyond direct victims).
d. **Temporal Perspectives**: Some texts include perspectives from different time periods—characters reflecting on events immediately afterward, years later, or decades later. The temporal distancing reveals how understanding and interpretation of events shift over time, how memory is reconstructed rather than simply preserved, and how social and political contexts shape retrospective interpretation.

The multiperspectival approach serves counter-memory by decentering any single authoritative account. Where official history speaks with unified, certain voice, these texts speak in multiple, uncertain voices. Where official history suppresses contradiction and ambiguity, these texts foreground it. The formal structure itself thus embodies resistance to historical monologue.

Centering Marginalized Voices

Seven texts explicitly center perspectives typically marginalized in historical discourse: rural villagers rather than urban elites, women rather than men, families of disappeared rather than political actors, ethnic or religious minorities rather than dominant groups. This centering represents a fundamental inversion of typical hierarchies of historical importance.

a. **Rural Perspectives**: Several texts focus intensively on experiences of rural villagers, who

suffered disproportionately in 1965 violence but whose perspectives are often absent from historical accounts focused on urban political struggles. The texts detail the specific vulnerabilities of rural communities, the local social dynamics that shaped violence, and the particular forms of trauma experienced in village contexts. By centering rural experiences, authors challenge urban-centric historical narratives.

b. **Women's Experiences**: Multiple texts foreground women's experiences of 1965, including sexual violence, loss of husbands and sons, responsibility for family survival afterward, and long-term social stigmatization. Women's voices have been particularly suppressed in official historical accounts, which focus on male political actors and militaryoperations. Literary texts thus perform important recovery work by centering gendered dimensions of violence and survival.
c. **Families of the Disappeared**: Several texts focus on family members left behind after disappearances—the ongoing uncertainty, the inability to mourn properly, the social and economic consequences, and the intergenerational transmission of loss. These perspectives highlight the continued suffering that extends far beyond the immediate violence and reveals the inadequacy of casualty statistics in capturing human cost.
d. **Ethnic and Religious Minorities**: Some texts explore how ethnic Chinese, Christians, or members of other minority communities experienced 1965 violence and its aftermath, including how ethnicity and religion intersected with political accusations and shaped vulnerability to violence. These perspectives complicate narratives that frame 1965 solely in terms of political ideology.

The strategy of centering marginalized voices performs multiple forms of counter- memory work: it recovers suppressed experiences, challenges implicit hierarchies about whose experiences matter, complicates simplified accounts that ignore social differences, and creates identification between readers and those typically "othered" in dominant discourse.

Rewriting and Reinterpreting Official Events

Five texts engage in more direct rewriting of official historical accounts, offering alternative factual interpretations or explicitly contradicting state-sanctioned narratives. This represents the most overtly political form of counter-memory, directly challenging official truth claims.

a. **Questioning Justifications**: Several texts question or explicitly reject official justifications for violence, suggesting that accusations used to legitimate killings were pretextual, that violence exceeded any reasonable response to alleged threats, or that political motives were far more complex than official accounts acknowledge. By undermining justifications, these texts reframe violence from necessary security measures to atrocity.
b. **Alternative Casualty Accounts**: While maintaining necessary vagueness for political reasons, some texts suggest casualty numbers far exceeding official accounts or describe patterns of violence more systematic than officially acknowledged. The implicit contradiction of official minimization serves as quiet but clear challenge to state historical narrative.
c. **Recovering Agency**: Official narratives often present victims as passive objects of historical forces or characterize them solely through political labels. Counter-memory texts recover victims' agency, complexity, and humanity—showing their efforts to survive, their moral reasoning, their relationships and responsibilities. This recovery of agency challenges dehumanizing official narratives.
d. **Reversing Causality**: Some texts subtly reverse causality in official accounts. Where official narrative presents violence as response to threat, these texts suggest that accusations of threat were themselves tools of violence; where official accounts present order following chaos, these texts show how violence itself created the chaos it claimed to address.

The directness of these challenges varies with political context and author risk tolerance, but even subtle rewriting performs significant counter-memory work. By offering alternative accounts that readers can compare with official narratives, literary texts create cognitive dissonance that disrupts uncritical acceptance of dominant historical discourse.

Intergenerational Memory and Temporal Bridging

Four texts explicitly focus on intergenerational transmission of memory, showing how trauma and suppressed history pass from survivors to children and grandchildren. This temporal bridging demonstrates that 1965 is not closed historical chapter but ongoing reality with contemporary consequences.

a. **Family Silences**: Texts depict how survivors' inability or refusal to speak about 1965 shapes family dynamics, creating atmospheres of secrecy, unexplained emotional patterns, and gaps in family history that children must navigate. The silence itself becomes form of transmission, with absence of explicit information creating space for imagination, anxiety, and inherited trauma.
b. **Partial Revelations**: Several narratives focus on moments when older generation partially reveals suppressed history to younger generation—often fragmentary revelations prompted by specific events or questions. These moments of generational transfer become sites of intense emotional and ethical significance, with younger characters struggling to understand implications of revelations and older characters negotiating what can be spoken.
c. **Inherited Effects**: Texts show how descendants of 1965 victims experience ongoing social stigmatization, economic disadvantage, and psychological effects even without direct experience of original violence. This demonstrates social reproduction of trauma across generations and challenges any notion that effects of historical violence dissipate naturally over time.
d. **Generational Obligation**: Some texts explore younger generations' sense of obligation to recover, preserve, and transmit suppressed family and communal memory despite personal costs. This creates narratives about active memory work—research, conversation, documentation—that honor ancestors while potentially endangering oneself.

The focus on intergenerational transmission performs crucial counter-memory work by linking past to present, showing ongoing relevance of seemingly distant history, and demonstrating that reconciliation requires addressing not only original violence but its continuing effects across generations.

Symbolic and Allegorical Counter-Memory

Six texts employ symbolic representation and allegorical structures to critique historical narratives indirectly while maintaining protection against censorship. This sophisticated strategy allows authors to engage in counter-memory work while operating within constrained political environments.

a. **Animal Fables**: Some texts use animal characters or animal imagery allegorically, with predator-prey dynamics, pack behavior, or other animal motifs standing in for human social and political dynamics. The allegorical distance provides protection while creating frameworks for understanding violence, power, and victimization.
b. **Historical Displacement**: Several texts set narratives in earlier historical periods or different geographical locations while clearly intending readers to recognize parallels to 1965. This temporal or spatial displacement creates plausible deniability while enabling critique of contemporary or recent events.
c. **Mythological Frameworks**: Some texts incorporate Indonesian mythology, folklore, or traditional narrative structures to frame historical events. By situating 1965 within deeper cultural and mythological contexts, authors challenge the official narrative's framing while drawing on resonant cultural resources for meaning-making.
d. **Symbolic Objects**: Recurring symbolic objects—particular weapons, documents, photographs, items of clothing—carry layers of historical and emotional meaning, accumulating significance as they appear across narrative. These objects become repositories of counter-memory, bearing witness to suppressed histories through their circulation and recirculation.
e. **Landscape as Palimpsest**: Several texts present landscapes as layered texts bearing traces of suppressed history. Villages, rivers, fields, and forests carry visible and invisible marks of violence—abandoned houses, mass graves, places where people disappeared. The landscape

itself becomes counter-memory, preserving what official discourse erases.

The symbolic and allegorical strategies demonstrate sophisticated navigation of political constraints. By operating at multiple levels of meaning simultaneously—literal, symbolic, allegorical, historical—these texts communicate counter-memory to attuned readers while maintaining surface plausibility that protects against censorship. The requirement for interpretive skill creates communities of readers who share frameworks for understanding coded meanings.

Counter-Memory as Ethical and Political Practice

The cumulative effect of these counter-memory strategies is to position literature as site of ethical and political resistance. Counter-memory operates not merely as alternative information but as fundamentally different mode of historical consciousness—one that centers experience over doctrine, multiplicity over singularity, ethical witness over political justification.

a. **Ethical Dimensions**: Counter-memory texts perform ethical work by insisting on the humanity, dignity, and moral worth of victims whom official narratives dehumanize or erase. By giving voice, name, and story to the marginalized, literature enacts recognition and acknowledgment that dominant historical discourse denies. This ethical work extends beyond information to the realm of justice and human dignity.
b. **Political Dimensions**: The political significance of literary counter-memory lies in its challenge to state power's control over historical narrative and collective memory. In contexts where official history serves to legitimate power and suppress dissent, alternative historical narratives represent direct political resistance. Literature becomes space where suppressed political consciousness can be articulated, preserved, and transmitted.
c. **Social Dimensions**: Counter-memory texts contribute to social processes of memory construction, reconciliation, and collective identity formation. By providing frameworks for understanding shared history that differ from official accounts, they enable communities to develop alternative collective identities not based on state ideology. This social function makes literature crucial to civil society and democratic memory practices.
d. **Temporal Dimensions**: Counter-memory operates across time, preserving for future generations what cannot be publicly acknowledged in the present. Authors engaging in counter-memory often write for imagined future readers who might live in different political contexts where suppressed truths can be more openly acknowledged. This temporal orientation invests literary production with hope for different futures.

Interplay Between Trauma, Silence, and Counter-Memory

Theoretical Framework for Understanding Interrelations

The analysis reveals that trauma, silence, and counter-memory do not operate as separate, independent elements but form an integrated system of literary representation where each element influences and shapes the others. Understanding their interrelation requires examining the dynamic processes through which they interact rather than treating them as static categories.

Table 4. Interrelation of Trauma, Silence, and Counter-Memory

Dimension of Interaction	How Elements Function Together	Literary Examples	Significance for Historical Consciousness
Trauma Necessitates Silence	Traumatic experience exceeds language's capacity for representation; the unspeakable nature of violence creates gaps in narrative that manifest as deliberate silences and omissions	Fragmented narratives with ellipses marking moments where violence defies description; characters unable to articulate experiences; typographical breaks signaling linguistic failure	Acknowledges ethical limits of representation; demonstrates that complete historical accounting is impossible; validates survivor experiences of being unable to fully testify
Silence Enables Counter-Memory	Strategic omissions protect counter-narratives from censorship; what is left unsaid allows readers to construct alternative meanings; silence creates interpretive space where counter-memory emerges	Euphemistic language and indirect references that informed readers decode as critique; ambiguous endings that refuse official closure; unnamed perpetrators whose identity is contextually clear	Navigates political constraints while preserving alternative historical consciousness; creates layered texts with multiple readings; demonstrates resistance through strategic linguistic choices
Counter-Memory Articulates Trauma	Alternative perspectives provide frameworks for naming and understanding traumatic experience; marginalized voices offer language and context absent from official narratives; counter-memory gives trauma political and historical meaning	Multi-perspective narration contextualizing individual suffering within collective historical violence; intergenerational narratives showing trauma's continued impact; symbolic reframing of victimhood as resistance	Transforms private suffering into collective memory; provides explanatory frameworks for traumatic experience; connects individual trauma to structural violence and historical injustice
Collective Function in Mediating History	All three elements work synergistically to create literary texts that neither fully represent nor completely silence traumatic history, but mediate it through multiple, partial, and contested narratives	Texts employing fragmented trauma representation (technique), strategic omissions (silence), and marginalized perspectives (counter-memory) simultaneously to create complex historical consciousness	Demonstrates literature's unique capacity to hold multiple truths simultaneously; creates space for ethical engagement without closure; preserves complexity against simplifying narratives
Reader Participation and Ethical	The interaction of all three elements requires active reader	Ambiguous endings inviting interpretation; silences requiring	Transforms readers from passive consumers to active participants in

Dimension of Interaction	How Elements Function Together	Literary Examples	Significance for Historical Consciousness
Engagement	engagement in constructing meaning; readers must navigate trauma's difficulty, interpret silence's significance, and recognize counter-memory's challenges to dominant narratives	readers to confront absence; multiple perspectives demanding comparative analysis; symbolic elements needing contextual understanding	historical meaning-making; cultivates critical historical consciousness; promotes ethical responsibility toward suppressed histories
Temporal Dynamics and Intergenerational Transmission	Trauma persists across generations; silence perpetuates through family and social systems; counter-memory passes through storytelling and literary transmission; all three elements shape how subsequent generations understand historical violence	Narratives of children discovering parents' hidden trauma; inherited silence broken through literary revelation; younger generation's reinterpretation of family history through counter-memory frameworks	Shows ongoing nature of historical violence's impact; demonstrates how literature facilitates intergenerational dialogue; illustrates mechanisms of collective memory formation and transmission across time

Source: Analysis of Indonesian historical prose addressing 1965 events

Trauma as Generator of Narrative Strategies

Trauma functions as the primary generative force that necessitates and shapes the deployment of silence and counter-memory. The fundamental insight is that conventional narrative strategies prove inadequate for representing traumatic experience, requiring authors to develop innovative literary techniques.

a. **From Trauma to Fragmentation**: The psychological fragmentation caused by trauma finds direct formal expression in narrative fragmentation. Authors do not merely describe characters experiencing fragmented consciousness; they construct narratives that formally enact fragmentation through disrupted chronology, episodic structure, and temporal collapse. The form of the narrative becomes inseparable from its traumatic content.
b. **From Trauma to Silence**: Trauma's unspeakable quality—the way it exceeds and defeats ordinary language—generates narrative silence. Characters cannot fully articulate traumatic experience not due to lack of vocabulary but because trauma fundamentally disrupts the cognitive and linguistic capacities required for conventional narration. Silence emerges as the only adequate response to representational crisis, marking the limits of language while testifying to trauma's reality.
c. **From Trauma to Counter-Memory**: The traumatic experiences that official history suppresses or minimizes become the content of literary counter-memory. Personal and collective trauma that cannot be accommodated within dominant narratives finds voice through literary representation. Trauma thus provides both the necessity and the material for counter-memory work.

The generative role of trauma means that literary strategies are not arbitrary aesthetic choices but necessary responses to the challenges of representing overwhelming experience. Form follows psychological and ethical imperatives rather than merely aesthetic ones.

Silence as Mediating Mechanism

Silence occupies a mediating position between trauma and counter-memory, functioning as both effect of trauma and enabling condition for counter-memory. This dual functionality makes silence the pivot around which the entire system of literary representation turns.

a. **Silence as Trauma's Effect**: Trauma generates silence through multiple mechanisms—psychological repression, linguistic inadequacy, social prohibition, political censorship. The various forms of silence identified in the analysis (ellipses, gaps, missing details, unnamed characters) all trace back to trauma's impact on consciousness, language, and social communication. Silence thus bears witness to trauma even in the absence of explicit statement.
b. **Silence as Counter-Memory's Tool**: Paradoxically, the very silence that results from trauma and repression becomes the mechanism through which counter-memory operates. By creating gaps and absences, silence invites reader interpretation, engagement, and co- construction of meaning. The unsaid becomes a space of possibility where suppressed memories can be indirectly evoked, suggested, or symbolically represented without direct statement that would risk censorship.
c. **Silence's Dual Temporality**: Silence operates in two temporal registers simultaneously—pointing backward to traumatic past that cannot be fully articulated and forward to possible future when full articulation might become possible. This temporal ambivalence makes silence both acknowledgment of present limitation and gesture toward future possibility.

The mediating function of silence means that it cannot be understood solely as absence or failure but must be recognized as productive literary strategy that enables forms of communication and memory work that explicit statement could not achieve.

Counter-Memory as Synthesis and Resistance

Counter-memory represents the synthetic moment where trauma representation and narrative silence combine to produce historical consciousness that challenges dominant narratives. It is both effect of the preceding elements and active intervention in historical and political discourse.

a. **Synthesizing Trauma and Silence**: Counter-memory integrates traumatic content with silent form to create narratives that preserve suppressed history while acknowledging the difficulties and limitations of representation. The fragmentation, gaps, and absences that characterize these texts are not obstacles to counter-memory but its very substance—ways of remembering that honor both the reality of trauma and the constraints on its expression.
b. **Active Resistance**: Where trauma and silence might appear passive—things that happen to individuals and communities—counter-memory represents active agency. Authors deliberately deploy literary strategies to resist historical erasure, challenge official narratives, and preserve alternative memories. This active dimension makes literature a form of political and ethical practice rather than merely aesthetic production.
c. **Creating Alternative Consciousness**: Counter-memory does not simply correct factual errors in official history but proposes fundamentally different ways of understanding historical events—centering experience over ideology, ethical witness over political justification, multiplicity over singularity. This epistemological challenge represents literature's most profound intervention in historical consciousness.

Dynamic Processes of Interaction

Beyond identifying relationships between trauma, silence, and counter-memory, the analysis reveals dynamic processes through which they continuously interact and mutually constitute each other throughout literary texts.

a. **Iterative Deepening**: Texts often cycle repeatedly through representation of trauma, creation of silence, and construction of counter-memory, with each iteration deepening and complicating the others. A traumatic event initially represented through fragmentary flashback may be returned to later through symbolic imagery, then again through partial dialogue, with each return adding layers of meaning while maintaining irreducible gaps.
b. **Tension and Contradiction**: The three elements exist in productive tension rather than

harmonious integration. Trauma resists representation, silence threatens to overwhelm communication, and counter-memory struggles against the power of dominant discourse. This tension generates the texts' emotional and ethical force, preventing easy resolution or comfort.

c. **Reader Co-Construction**: The interaction of trauma, silence, and counter-memory requires active reader participation to complete. Readers must interpret silences, construct connections across fragments, and recognize counter-memory's challenge to official narratives. The texts thus create a particular kind of reading practice that mirrors the broader social work of memory and historical consciousness.
d. **Formal Innovation**: The necessity of representing trauma, incorporating silence, and constructing counter-memory drives formal innovation in Indonesian historical prose. Authors develop new narrative techniques, temporal structures, and symbolic systems specifically suited to their representational challenges. This makes the texts formally innovative in ways directly connected to their historical and ethical content.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Indonesian historical prose addressing the 1965 events functions as sophisticated mediator of trauma, narrative silence, and counter-memory. Trauma is represented as both individual psychological suffering and collective intergenerational phenomenon through fragmented narratives, episodic storytelling, flashbacks, and stream-of-consciousness techniques conveying experiential disorientation and emotional intensity. Symbolic imagery—abandoned homes, blood-stained landscapes—externalizes personal and societal devastation while providing ethically mediated representations of historical violence. Narrative silence emerges as deliberate literary strategy employing omissions, ellipses, and ambiguous endings to signify the unspeakable nature of traumatic events and sociopolitical constraints.

This technique creates interpretive spaces for readers engaging with history's unspoken dimensions while simultaneously signaling historical erasure and enabling ethical witnessing that bridges personal, collective, and intergenerational memory. Counter-memory resists hegemonic narratives through multi-perspective storytelling, marginalized voices, intergenerational transmission, and symbolic representation, reconstructing alternative historical consciousness. The interdependent interaction of trauma, silence, and counter-memory reveals literature's active role in mediating memory and shaping ethical engagement. These findings offer practical implications for educators enhancing historical pedagogy, writers addressing sensitive topics, and cultural practitioners contributing to social reconciliation and intergenerational dialogue. Despite methodological limitations, this research establishes Indonesian historical prose on 1965 as ethical witness and medium of historical reconstruction, preserving marginalized memories while challenging dominant narratives.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The author wishes to thank all individuals and institutions who supported this research. Special appreciation is extended to the reviewers for their constructive feedback, and to colleagues and family members for their continuous support throughout this study.

REFERENCES

Adriyanto, A. (2016). Kontroversi keterlibatan Soeharto dalam penumpasan G30S/PKI 1965. *Kalpataru: Jurnal Sejarah Dan Pembelajaran Sejarah*, *2*(2), 1–12.

Bankauskaitė, G., & Huber, L. (2021). Trauma, narrative and history: Representation of traumatic experience in the works of Algirdas Landsbergis. *Interlitteraria*, *26*(1), 309–323.

Blake, L. (2013). The wounds of nations: Horror cinema, historical trauma and national identity. In L. Blake (Ed.), *The wounds of nations: Horror cinema, historical trauma and national identity*. Manchester University Press.

Bräuchler, B. (2024). 'I can't remember how many I killed...': Child soldiers and memory work in YouTube. *Memory Studies*, *17*(6), 1346–1362. https://doi.org/10.1177/17506980231188676

Bräuchler, B., & Emde, S. (2025). Youths, media and performance: How young people remember violent pasts. *Anthropological Forum*, 1–21.

https://doi.org/10.1080/00664677.2024.2442946
Cribb, R. (2001). Genocide in Indonesia, 1965-1966. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *3*(2), 219–239. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520120074991
Cribb, R., & Coppel, C. A. (2009). A genocide that never was: Explaining the myth of anti-Chinese massacres in Indonesia, 1965–66. *Journal of Genocide Research*, *11*(4), 447–465. https://doi.org/10.1080/14623520903309495
Eickhoff, M. (2015). Book review: Truth will out. Indonesian accounts of the 1965 mass violence, edited by Baskara T. Wardaya SJ. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, *171*(1), 114–115. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17101007
Heryanto, A. (2012). Screening the 1965 violence. In B. E. Knudsen & C. Stagoll (Eds.), *Killer images: Documentary film, memory and the performance of violence* (pp. 224–240). Wallflower Press.
Himawan, A. R., & Undiana, N. N. (2024). Student's view of the Penghianatan G30S/PKI film. *Cinematology: Journal Anthology of Film and Television Studies*, *1*(1), 51–64.
Hindley, D. (1967). Political power and the October 1965 coup in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, *26*(2), 237–249. https://doi.org/10.2307/2051487
Kammen, D., & McGregor, K. E. (Eds.). (2012). *The contours of mass violence in Indonesia, 1965-1968*. NUS Press.
Kurniawan, A. D. (2017). *Memori kolektif mengenai PKI dan komunisme di media sosial* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Indonesia]. Repositori Universitas Indonesia.
Leksana, G. (2019). Book review: The killing season: A history of the Indonesian massacres, 1965–66, by Geoffrey B. Robinson. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, *174*(4), 524–527. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17404014
Marching, S. T. (2025). *The end of silence: Accounts of the 1965 genocide in Indonesia*. Routledge.
Nonis. (2024). An analysis of prose as a medium of protest and social change. *Journal of Literary Prose and Society*, *1*(1), 26–34. https://doi.org/10.59261/jlps.v1i1.4
Rieff, D. (2016). *In praise of forgetting: Historical memory and its ironies*. Yale University Press.
Rogers, K. L. (2010). *Trauma and the representation of the unsayable in late twentieth-century fiction* [Doctoral dissertation, University of Colorado at Boulder]. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses Global.
Sarwono, B. (2024). Representation of Indonesian women politicians (Media analysis to G30S PKI incident coverage from 1965 to 2015). *Journal of Gender Equality Disability Social Inclusion and Children*, *2*(1), 58–70. https://doi.org/10.59088/jgedisic.v2i1.241
Simpson, B. (2008). International dimensions of the 1965-68 violence in Indonesia. In D. Kammen & K. McGregor (Eds.), *The contours of mass violence in Indonesia, 1965-1968* (pp. 50–74). NUS Press.
Ümit Üngör, U., Hearman, V., van Klinken, G., & Robinson, G. (2019). Debate on *The killing season: A history of the Indonesian massacres, 1965–1966* by Geoffrey B. Robinson, with Uğur Ümit Üngör, Vannessa Hearman, Gerry van Klinken and Geoffrey Robinson. *Bijdragen tot de Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde*, *175*(2–3), 341–356. https://doi.org/10.1163/22134379-17502021
Van der Kroef, J. M. (1972). Origins of the 1965 coup in Indonesia: Probabilities and alternatives. *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *3*(2), 277–298. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0022463400014822
Wahyuningroem, S. L. (2013). Seducing for truth and justice: Civil society initiatives for the 1965 mass violence in Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *32*(3), 115–142. https://doi.org/10.1177/186810341303200305
Wanandi, J. (2012). *Shades of grey: A political memoir of modern Indonesia, 1965-1998*. Equinox Publishing.
Wieringa, S. E. (2011). Sexual slander and the 1965/66 mass killings in Indonesia: Political and methodological considerations. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *41*(4), 544–565. https://doi.org/10.1080/00472336.2011.610464
Woo, W. T., Glassburner, B., & Nasution, A. (1994). *Macroeconomic policies, crises, and long-term growth in Indonesia, 1965-90*. World Bank Publications.
Zein, R. A., & Alfian, I. N. (2018). The pattern of collective memory denial experienced by the student victims' mothers of 1998-1999 Trisakti-Semanggi tragedy. *Masyarakat,*

Kebudayaan dan Politik, *31*(1), 14–25. https://doi.org/10.20473/mkp.V31I12018.14-25
Zurbuchen, M. S. (2002). History, memory, and the 1965 incident in Indonesia. *Asian Survey*, *42*(4), 564–581. https://doi.org/10.1525/as.2002.42.4.564