DISSENSUS EFFORTS IN KAWALI DAN PISTOL BY ALFIAN DIPPAHATANG

Upaya Disensus Dalam Kawali dan Pistol Karya Alfian Dippahatang

Dwi Rezki Hardianto Putra Rustan

English Literature, Makassar University of Sawerigading, Makassar
dwireski22@gmail.com

Abstract: *This study uses the short story Kawali and Pistol (KDP) by Alfian Dippahatang as a material object and Jacques Ranciere's aesthetic politics concept as a formal object. This study aims to reveal the form of sensibility distribution based on the environment of the two main characters in KDP, and examine the dissensus efforts of the main characters as subjects in KDP. The method used is descriptive qualitative by analyzing the data using the historical hermeneutic method. The research results show that KDP has illustrated the arche of the Bugis-Makassar society, and it is also based on imitation of localities in Bugis-Makassar. KDP opens a space for dissensus within the police for allowing the process of subjectification in the Bugis-Makassar society. However, with the presence of the disendissensuse, Ramlah and Rungka failed to act politically. Their equality is just a mere assumption, not in the realm of politics.*

Keywords*: Aesthetic of politics, Dissensus, Jacques Ranciere, Police, Kawali dan Pistol*

Abstrak: *Penelitian ini menggunakan cerpen Kawali dan Pistol (KDP) karya Alfian Dippahatang sebagai objek material, dan konsep politik estetika Jacques Ranciere sebagai objek formal. Melalui keduanya, penelitian ini bertujuan menyingkap bentuk distribusi sensibilitas berdasarkan lingkungan kedua tokoh utama dalam KDP, menilik upaya disensus kedua tokoh utama sebagai subjek yang tak terdengar dalam KDP. Metode yang digunakan adalah metode deskriptif kualitatif dengan menganalisis data menggunakan metode hermeneutika historis. Hasil penelitian melalui KDP ditemukan bahwa KDP telah mengilustrasikan bentuk arkhe tatanan masyarakat Bugis-Makassar Di sisi lain, KDP juga menghasilkan entitas tertentu atau sebagai imitasi terhadap lokalitas di Bugis-Makassar. Secara tekstual KDP membuka ruang disensus di dalam police. Keterbukaan itu memungkinkan terjadinya proses subjektivasi demos terhadap police di masyarakat Bugis-Makassar. Namun, dengan hadirnya ruang disensus tersebut, Ramlah dan Rungka gagal dalam bertindak politik. Konsep kesetaraan mereka sekadar pengandaian belaka, bukan pada ranah tindakan politik.*

Kata-kata kunci*: Disensus, Jacques Ranciere, Police, Politik Estetika, Kawali dan Pistol*

INTRODUCTION

In the tradition of Bugis-Makassar, marriage is one of the traditions built through reciprocity—the union between a man and a woman. The unification is not just doing the *ijab kabul* and uniting them with the mere "*sah*" speech. However, there is a union ceremony performed by a union ceremony previous relationship with the intention of strengthening it.

This strengthen effort is inseparable from a kinship system formed by tradition in Bugis-Makassar. As in general Austronesian society, the Bugis kinship system adheres to a bilateral system, specifically kinship that is traced through descent—whether descended from the father or mother (Pelras, 2006, pp. 175-176). This kinship is seen by the Bugis-Makassar community as the same generation line between men and women, brothers, sisters, or cousins. They are included in the sibling category. The siblings are not negatively, in the sense of being close to each other. However, the generation has been seen as a kinship that has two ancestral lines. Namely, the line from the father and the mother. In other words, distant relatives with a common ancestor will be brought closer through marriage traditions.

The marriage can be called an inward relationship or in-marriage, which aims to maintain kinship relations in the Bugis-Makassar society (Fitriana & Nisa', 2020, pp. 72). It binds all the members of the family who are scattered everywhere. So, the traditional Bugis-Makassar marriage traditions as building a strong family.

From that notion, there is a Bugis term emerged which is called *siala* or taking each other. The idea of *siala* is associated with their view of life that places *siri'* as a reference for translating their lives—including in marriage and raising a family (Fitriana & Nisa', 2020, pp. 72). *Siri'* can be given the meaning as a sense of pride or shame. Abdullah (1985) interprets *siri'* as an element that has principles in the Bugis-Makassar society. For them, there is nothing to defend on this earth besides *siri'* (pp. 37). So, *siri'* as the soul, dignity and self-esteem in the Bugis-Makassar society. When *siri'* is polluted from other people, the consequence is a high sacrifice for the Bugis-Makassar sociey. In this case their body and soul in order to enforce *siri'* in their lives.

From the *siri'* principle, many things are further considered by the Bugis-Makasssar society to get married. Some of them look at the lineage, for the patricians see the degree of suitability between men and women. According to Christian Pelras (2006), that is different from male patricians, who are allowed to marry a partner of lower status, while women are not allowed to marry men of lower status (p. 179). However, the Bugis people do not just prioritize one ancestral pair, because the most important thing is the achievement of a high level in the system of social stratification.

Social stratification in marriage is most important for the Bugis-Makassar society, because it can have an impact on offspring in terms of inheritance of rights. So, many people were frustration which results in problems that are directly related to *siri'*. For example, if someone's request is rejected, the suitor may feel *mate siri'* (loss of self-esteem), so it is not uncommon to find cases of *silariang* (elopement) which aims to take back the lost self-esteem. However, for the families who were taken away, actually it is a form of imposing *siri'* as well. So, the male relatives of the women who were taken away are obliged to kill the perpetrators to take back the *siri'*. The other cast, there are some people who take very reckless actions like in Jeneponto, South Sulawesi. They both eloped because they could not fulfill the wishes of the woman's family regarding the amount of *uang panai'*. Finally, the woman who

was already the wife of the man committed suicide because the women's family still did not accept them (Natsir, 2019).

However, it should be underlined that, apart from kinship, the problem of marriage in the Bugis-Makassar society also sees the motive for strengthening, social stratification—in this case the position of men or women based on their background. Where it aims to elevate a person's high level and self-esteem. Based on that, these phenomena are also often responded to through literary works—including short stories.

Short story is a prose fiction literary work in which a narrative is found which becomes a discourse. This form tells an event so that it looks as if the reader saw or experienced the event (Keraf, 2003, pp. 135-136). The fictional story is a form of short prose, where the elements of the story are centered on one main event. So, the number of actors developing is limited, and the whole story gives a single impression (Jabrohim, 1994, pp. 169). The narrative which is built limits itself in discussing one element smallest aspect of fiction. The shortness of a short story is not because its form is much shorter than a novel, but because the aspect of the problem is very limited. Based on a limitation, a problem will be described much clearer and much more impressive for the reader (Sumardjo, 1984, pp. 69). Through short story, the impression left in it must be sharp and deep. So that once we read it we will not easily forget. A story about the situation in a family is definitely not a short story. However, an essay about the situation in a family will become a short story if an incident is related to the mental problems of one person in the family with another family or with the environment. Yet, it can be concluded that the short story is a story that describes an event or any incident that concerns the issue of the soul or human life (Zulfahnur, 1997, pp. 62).

One of the short stories that raises the issue of marriage is *Kawali dan Pistol* (2018) or *KDP*. This literary work was written by Alfian Dippahatang, a writer from Bulukumba, according to the author's confession, is not a local writer in Makassar. Because according to his confession the word local is very disturbing (Gandi, 2019). *KDP* was first published by *Rakyat Sultra* on September 17, 2018, and reissued by lakonhidup.com. *KDP* was included in the newspaper literature (*sastra koran*) category, as Saut Situmorang has mentioned the term several times.

Newspaper literature is a literary product that is present in the print mass media of newspapers (Situmorang, 2018, pp. 23). Although it appears on lakonhidup.com as a website *a la* newspaper, but the presence of lakonhidup.com is not like other media, specially Twitter, Facebook, or Instagram. Lakonhidup.com can be specified as "website *a la* newspaper literature", which is a literary product that still has a certain authority like a newspaper. Because, in it there are editors who have the highest authority in specifying literary works.

The reality of a website newspaper is the same as the reality of a newspaper. Where it has some technical restrictions, or much stricter censorship, as well as restrictions on the number of pages, the unimportance of digging into the theme of the story, the tendency of popular taste, and speaking quickly and straightforwardly because of having to cater to a variety of tastes,

and the level of appreciation of the newspaper readers, which also in accordance with the tastes of press workers (Situmorang, 2018, pp. 25).

KDP is about a pair of lovers, namely Ramlah and Rungka. The two are trying to get married. However, they are hindered by the social order that has been built by the Ramlah family and influenced by the traditions of the society by looking at the family background of Rungka. Rungka's family background is known as a thief. His grandfather and father were known as thieves in their village. It's not that the Rungka family can't afford to survive, but that they are in debt, and the only way to pay it off is by stealing. Based on this view, Ramlah and Rungka's love cannot be united through marriage traditions. In the end they couldn't do anything about it, and hoped that only suicide could unite them, and God bless their relationship. Rungka's grandfather committed suicide using a gun (pistol) to raise the dignity of his family. But it was Rungka and Ram, who had attempted suicide was failed.

From the synopsis, it can be seen that there is a social order (police) that is able to shackle the subject. In other words, the police as partitions the subject through its background by giving birth to inequalities. As Alfian Dippahatang represents through the short story. Therefore, this study seeks to find an attempt to create a disensus or politics of democracy (the politics) in the *KDP*. As democracy can be understood as a space of subjectivization. Democracy is more precisely a space that provides a place to interfere with the police. In other words, democracy is present and disrupts the smooth order through the mechanism of subjectivization (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 99). When Democracy is present as an "and space", then subject of politics is present to interrupt the established social order. This social order is present through sensory perception that only sees what is there and also performs social partitioning based on people's background—use, role, particians, expertise, wealth, or older.

There are many kinds of research that focus on the theoretical study of Jacques Ranciere as a formal object, which basically have a variety of concepts in exploring some of the special terms that are owned by Jacques Ranciere. The first one is a research from Nurliana Fitri (2019) entitled "*Artikulasi Distribution of the Sensible dan Kegagalan Penulis dalam Mengekspresikan Subjek di Dalam Novel Animal Farm karya George Orwell*". Fitri concluded that the distribution of the sensible in the Animal Farm's Novel is articulated in the form of a division of roles towards the police subject and the roles are distributed according to intellectual abilities. This departs from the inequality of the subject which then comes with certain forms, namely there are parts that have parts and parts that have no parts. In addition, as a writer, George Orwell is still trapped in the representation regime so that he fails to voice minority or unheard subjects in the Animal Farm novel, on the grounds that the novel still only represents the oppression carried out by the police.

The second is a research from Moch. Zainul Arifin (2019) entitled "*Menim(b)ang Disensus: Politik dan Estetika Seno Gumira Ajidarma Dalam Cerpen 'Saksi Mata'*". In his research, Arifin sees Seno Gumira Ajidarma as a political subject. Subjects who are able to migrate from the previous ideological order, class migration, socio-politics, and aesthetic narratives. From this,

Dissensus efforts are gaping to destabilize the ethical regime of Suharto and the Representative Regime of the Utan Kayu Community.

The third one is a research from Rosida Erowati (2018) entitled "*Distribution of The Sensible Jacques Ranciere: Antara Estetik dan Politik*". This study discusses issues related to aesthetics in modern Indonesian literature. As Rosida defines aesthetics as the distribution of sensibility which has the aim of destroying the social hierarchy. From that definition, Rosida criticizes the historical conceptualization of literature by A. Teeuw and Ajip Rosidi, in which both view literature as part of an ethical idea about the function of literature in maintaining the spirit and ethos of the community. In other words, they place modern Indonesian literature in a Platonic ethic regime. So according to him, modern Indonesian literature needs to be reformulated, when it was formed, or exactly which events involve literature in a very strong quality, making the subject able to state equality.

From the results of the literature review above, no one has ever researched *KDP* as a material object using Jacques Ranciere's thoughts as a formal object. On the other hand, no formal object has ever been studied. Therefore, this study intends to (1) reveal the form of sensibility distribution or partition based on the environment of the two main characters in *KDP*, (2) examine the dissensus efforts of the two main characters as unheard subjects in *KDP*. These two things will be explored further through the scalpel of Jacques Ranciere's thinking.

Ranciere departs from the notion of "the wrong" and equality. The wrong is defined as people who are part no have part. This relates to the definition of the police which stipulates the distribution of sensibility which divides society into groups, positions and social functions. Thus, there is a dividing space between the seen and the unseen, the audible and the unheard (Ranciere, 2013, pp. xiii). In other words, the problem is related to the perspective that divides the social order based on the background of place, lineage, function, talent and also expertise (Indiyastutik, 2019, pp. 11). But, with the distribution of sensibility as previously stated. Ranciere explicitly stated that it was very contrary to politics. The social order that is formed from the partition or distribution of sensibility is in principle an empty act and there is no supplement from the wrong (Ranciere, 2010, pp. 36).

The wrong was referred to as demos. Demos are people who are supplements (additions)—who verify equality—in the part that are counted but were not taken into account or who are contrary to the qualifications formed by the government in the social order (Ranciere, 2010, pp. 5). It also departs from the basic assumption that all people are actually intellectually equal. However, the social order (police) shapes everything unequally. Inequality is also inseparable from the formation of logical laws and natural laws.

Based on that, Ranciere re-reads and criticizes political philosophy—even beyond what Zizek argues that Ranciere puts politics in the real direction or what is referred to as Ultra-politics (Zizek, 2013, pp. 67)—which was built by previous thinkers. Ranciere read political philosophy from Plato, to Karl Marx. The political philosophy in question is archepolitics, parapolitics, and metapolitics (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 65).

Archepolitics—a model initiated by Platon— is building a community based on law (nomos). The society or community departs from the integral manifestation of the materialized logos. So that their activities must be regulated based on the qualifications of the role and place contained in the communal society. This becomes a political configuration that becomes a social order. In other words, society is divided on the basis of its role proportionally. However, Ranciere views that the solution related to this rule is not only to divide it proportionally but to build society into an inverse proportionality (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 65).

It has a contradiction with democracy, where democracy will be replaced by an archean order to ensure the passage of law (nomos) to control conflicts caused by groups that are not considered part of the dominant social order (Indiyastutik, 2019, pp. 73). Thus, intellectuals, oligarchs, and craftsmen only occupy a part that has no function outside of their position. For example, Intellectuals have no part as craftsmen and vice versa. So that a very domineering one-way hierarchical model ensues. This arrangement, further criticized by Ranciere (1999), archepolitics in the end is only archepolicing. In other words, politics will be erased as an activity (pp. 68).

Parapolitics—a model initiated by Aristotle—that is as an aspect of the identity of the social order as politics. According to Ranciere, equal space and opportunity are given to people who have the qualifications to lead such as those who are intellectual, have wealth, nobility, and even demos. According to Ranciere via Indyastutik (2019) the provision of space and opportunity does seem natural for those who are part, but do not have a part (pp. 79). However, Aristotle is still struggling in the realm of specifying society by pulling it into the arena of power institutions that practice power. This, according to Ranciere, will give birth to dominance between the knowledgeable against the weak in knowledge. So, instead of replacing certain sequences with others, and making parapolitics overlap (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 72). In other words, Aristotle replaced politics as a test of the logic of inequality with politics as a single institution. This will trigger conflict between two parties, namely demos and those in the dominant social order—who are trying to replace each other's power. In short According to Ranciere (1999), for Aristotle, the political form taken is what determines the relationship between the parts of the community (pp. 78).

The third form of political philosophy is metapolitics—which was initiated by Karl Marx. Metapolitics is a discourse about political falsehood that divides every political manifestation of dispute (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 82). In other words, Meta (beyond) politics is defined as a disturbance to the social order. This is because politics provides a distance that separates false rights and also a picture of social reality as truth. As the truth of political lies, the concept of class in Marx's view becomes the central figure of meta-politics which is understood as outside politics.

> "Class is […] a political demonstration. In the police sense, class is a grouping of people who are given a certain status and rank according to their origins or activities […] class can denote a professional group in a weaker sense" (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 83).

Metapolitics can be understood as a complement as well as an accompaniment. In other words, metapolitics becomes a political scientific companion which in the end also becomes a force for class struggle (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 85). So, there is a paradox between the initial concepts that go beyond politics itself. Therefore, metapolitics experiences a dilemmatic condition between the two extreme poles, namely the denial of the ideological illusion of parapolitics, and the appearance of a communal incarnation of social truth that is very similar to archepolitics (Indiyastutik, 2019, pp. 213).

However, the concept of partitions in political philosophy does not only reach empirical spaces. Even that partition is able to influence fictional spaces. As Ranciere also criticized the art philosophy of the various existing regimes. Especially in the Platonian ethical regime, and the Aristotelian representation regime.

In the ethical regime (image), art is identified through certain entities that place emphasis on true art. Art that has forms of knowledge based on precise imitation models. These imitations are distinguished based on their origin, then differentiated based on the end or purpose, by looking at each audience, whether they are still children or adults, or with a certain education and according to the distribution of work (Ranciere, 2013, pp. 16). In other words, this regime requires that art conform to a certain ethos, individual existence, and community.

Different from the ethical regime. The representative regime separates it from the art of the ethical regime itself. This regime has a principle that isolates it in a more general domain. That domain, including how to do and also make the art itself. Where art is ultimately produces a certain entity which is referred to as imitation. In the concept of imitation of this regime, it develops into normative forms that define conditions that can be recognized as belonging to a particular art (Ranciere, 2013, pp. 16-7). It is also rated within the framework, as good or bad, adequate or inadequate. In so doing it certainly forms a partition between the represented and the unrepresented—and the distinction between genres and those that are represented. It further becomes a mimetic distribution that conforms to the principle of conformity, or correspondence, as a criterion for distinguishing and comparing art with other arts.

The two regimes, gave birth to a partition in the arts. This is of course criticized by Ranciere using his idea of aesthetic regime. In the aesthetic regime, art no longer occurs through partitions as suggested by the ethical and representative regimes. However, art is based on a specific mode of sensibility as a product of art. In this regime too, artistic phenomena are identified by their adherence to a certain regime of sensibility and are inhabited by heterogeneous forces (Ranciere, 2013, pp. 18). The aesthetic regime of art is a regime that strictly identifies art in a singular form and frees it from certain rules (Ranciere, 2013, pp. 19). That rule, like the hierarchy of art, and any genre. The aesthetic regime affirms the absolute singularity of art and at the same time, destroys all pragmatic criteria for isolating the singularity. Thus, this political aesthetic regime is identical to the democratic regime.

Basically, democracy is real politics. Where politics begins when people (demos) act to explain and show that they have disagreements over the social

order (Ranciere & Engelmann, 2019, pp. 19; Ranciere, 2014, pp. 73). Disagreement in social order is not something that needs to be avoided, nor should it be forced to become an agreement (consensus). The social order or police gaping in disagreement that leads to consensus, as well as an order that is challenging to think about and can continue to be tested.

Police being open to the possibility of disputes arising is a form of balance in life that makes invisible demos visible, heard and also become a new supplement in the social order. In that social order, the concept of emancipation for everyone and everyone is attached as a presupposition (Indiyastutik, 2019, pp. 38). However, according to Ranciere (2006) The re-application of the politics of equality can only arise because of the inevitable contradictions of the social order that presupposes equality but at the same time denies it (pp. 73). The emergence of this contradiction is also inseparable from the principle of sovereignty, which is also a way to open access to democracy itself. In other words, this further confirms that power itself opens up space that comes from its contradiction as part of demos, as an astonishing answer, specifically that the basis of power to rule does not have any basis at all (Ranciere, 2010, pp. 50).

In this regard, democracy is always a space of disagreement between demos and social order to verify the equality. Although democracy can paradoxically create fear for those who are accustomed to using its background—skills, particians, and wealth to partition society, it will remain a space that sparks courage for those who are willing to place the equality of reason on everyone and everyone to verify equality. So, in a democracy the position of demos will transcend the identity attached to him. As Ranciere and Engelmann (2019) assert that "*Democracy is the power of all, no matter who they are*" (pp. 20). As democratic space, the subjectivization of demos transforms itself from the invisible to the visible, from the uncountable, to the counted. Democracy exists and disrupts the smooth running of the social order.

METHOD

Data collection methods and techniques are basically a set of methods or techniques that are an extension of the human senses because the goal is to collect empirical facts related to research problems (Faruk, 2017, pp. 25). The object of this research data comes from two objects, namely the short story *Kawali dan Pistol (KDP)* by Alfian Dippahatang as a material object and the aesthetic of politics consept of Jacques Ranciere as a formal object.

This study uses qualitative research methods which are also known as descriptive methods. Qualitative methods include literature review methods (Ahimsa 2009, pp. 15). Descriptive qualitative method is also a stage of research that produces descriptive data in the form of written or spoken words from people and observable behavior (Bogdan and Biklen, 1982:5 in Moleong, 2003, pp. 3). This research method is used to collect, filter and analyze data. The data are divided into primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected by carefully reading the text in the *KDP*, then noting concepts that were appropriate to the research needs. Meanwhile, secondary data was collected by reading concepts, thoughts, perspectives, events, and matters related to the aesthetics of politics that are relevant to Jacques Ranciere's view. This

secondary data is sourced from books, journals, magazines, research reports, seminar papers, internet and so on, that can support the purposes of this research.

In analyzing the data, the researcher uses the historical hermeneutic method to reveal what is hidden behind the *KDP* text. The first thing to do is to classify and analyze data from library sources which show that there is an effort to dissect the *KDP* through secondary data that is linked to existing primary data. It aims, firstly, to reveal the existence of a form of distribution of sensibility or partition in certain regimes based on the figures of Runka and Ramlah in the *KDP*. Second, reconfiguring the data to find the dissensus field as a space for the subjectivization of the two figures in *KDP*. Thrid, draw conclusions as giving new meaning to *KDP*.

DISCUSSION

Distribution of the Sensible in Kawali dan Pistol

In KDP, there are two main characters, namely Ramlah and Rungka. Both are unheard subjects, or part no have parts in the police. The part no have part is defined by Ranciere as the wrong. This is the impact of the police who determine the distribution of sensibility which divides the community into groups, positions and social functions. Thus, there is a dividing space between the seen and the unseen, the audible and the unheard (Ranciere, 2013, pp. xiii). In this regard, the textuality of *KDP* begins with the perspective or distribution of sensibility made by Ramlah's parents (as dominant ones) by looking at Rungka's background.

> "*Bukan karena kami membebaskanmu memilih lelaki, kau tak mempertimbangkan lagi siapa keluarganya. Namun, dengan lelaki pilihanmu ini, kami tak akan memberi restu.* [...] *Cari lelaki lain! Keluarga Rungka, tujuh turunan sudah dikenal sebagai pencuri,*" (Dippahatang, 2018).

That view is actually inseparable from the particular regime that exists in Bugis-Makassar. The justification of this researcher, first, cannot be separated from the characterization of characters "*Perjuangan Rungka merebut hati orang tuaku selama enam tahun lebih sudah cukup membuatku yakin, dia lelaki bertanggungjawab dengan ucapannya*", as in the philosophy of the word in Bugis-Makassar, "*Sadda mappabatti ada, Ada mappabatti gau, Gau mappabatti tau* (Sounds create words, words create actions, actions create human)" (Mattualada, 1975). In a sense, Rungka upholds that philosophy within himself. Second, the setting of a place that has a strong sensitivity in South Sulawesi. And thirdly, this view cannot be separated from Bugis-Makassar distribution of the sensibility in marriage

The Bugis-Makassar society always look at the lineage, for the aritocrats see from the level of suitability between men and women. But, it is different from male aristocrats who are allowed to marry a partner of lower status, while women are not allowed to marry men of lower status. However, the Bugis society do not just prioritize one ancestral pair, because the most important

thing is the achievement of a high level in the system of social stratification. This order has always been the strictest rule in marriage (Pelras, 2006, pp. 193). The strict rules cannot be separated from *siri'* which is the reference for social stratification in Bugis-Makassar.

The building of this order is implied as archepolitics, where the building of the Bugis-Makassar society is based on law (nomos) *siri'*. From *siri'*, the community is divided on the basis of their roles proportionally. However, Ranciere views that this rule not only divides it proportionally but builds society into an inverse proportionality (Ranciere, 1999, pp. 65). In the end, the arche order ensures the passage of laws to control conflicts caused by groups that are not considered part of the dominant social order.

Arche's conception is also present through Rungka in the *KDP* text which is built in the social order by referring to the distribution of sensibility from his own family. This can be seen when he no longer listens to what Ramlah has to mention.

> "*Ramlah menarik dan mengembus napas tidak teratur, kutafsir dia miris mendengar kondisi keluargaku yang kacau balau pernah dililit utang. Aku harus mengungkapkannya, agar kejujuranku tidak membuatnya menyesal di kemudian hari telah mencintaiku.* [...] *Kau tak mungkin lagi mendengar suara keluar dari mulutku, tetapi tidak dari hatiku. Bukan begitu, Rungka? Kau perlu tahu, harapan kita menikah secara resmi memang tak akan pernah tercapai. Orang tuaku makin mendidih dalam berkata-kata* [...]" (Dippahatang, 2018).

From this quote, Ramlah is increasingly in an order that makes him not heard by Rungka. Likewise, Rungka is also still judging something according to his background. This further emphasizes the existence of archepolitics, as a form of police born from the distribution of background sensibility based on the application of nomos *siri'* in Bugis-Makassar. Therefore, *KDP* has illustrated the arche form into a narrative that has a strong historical foundation in Bugis-Makassar society. In this way, *KDP* as a literary work, ultimately produces a certain entity which is called an imitation of the locality in Bugis-Makassar. This relates to the representative regime, where this regime has a concept of imitation that develops into normative forms that define conditions that can be recognized as belonging to a particular art (Ranciere, 2013, pp. 16-17). From the explanation above, *KDP* is actually a locality genre, which of course also forms a partition between the represented and the unrepresented—as well as the differences between genres.

But, that does not mean that the illustration is not justified in the aesthetic regime, because Ranciere (2013) asserts that in literature as an aesthetic regime, it is a system that allows historically to be dominantly formed from the previous regime (pp. 47). The presence of *KDP* allows the dehistorisation of the text, thus giving birth to an egalitarian position as a field of subjectivation.

Dissensus Efforts in *Kawali dan Pistol*

As previously explained, democracy is real politics. Democracy is present and disrupts the smooth running of the social order. Democracy becomes the arena of the dispute between the logic of politics and the logic of social order. In this arena, there is a gaping emancipation space, a space for exploration and triggering the courage of demos to take political action (Ranciere, 1991, pp. 27). Such actions disrupt the dominant social order to verify equality. In a democracy, the demos perform subjectivization by making themselves as a calculated part of the social order. In KDP, democracy as dissensus is open to demos. As democracy is in the social order that is formed in the neighborhood of Ramlah and Rungka.

> "*Bukan karena kami membebaskanmu memilih lelaki, kau tak mempertimbangkan lagi siapa keluarganya* [...]," (Dippahatang, 2018).

> "*Begitulah, tak kutunda lagi di malam kesendirianku di kamar setelah khatam menghargai keberanian mewujudkannya. Bunuh diri adalah jalan kematian yang menghindari banyak orang, tetapi kupilih karena inilah takdir yang tak bisa kuelak*," (Dippahatang, 2018).

From the two quotations, there is a gap between the possibility of disturbing the police or social order. This space was formed within the social order which was later shaped by the power of Ramlah's parents. This power holds a control that is basically contradictory. It is inevitable from the social order that presupposes but at the same time denies it. However, the illustration of the "*Bunuh diri*" space contained in the second quote is an attempt to dehistotrize the social order of the Bugis-Makassar society. As in the Bugis-Makassar society, which refers to *siri'* itself, there is a contradiction in the marriage tradition.

Related to that, KDP in textually managed to present a different space from the historical visibility that had been built so far. Dissensus field as an emancipation space is then used as a subjectivation space by Ramlah in reviving the dispute between the political logic and the police logic.

> "*Ucapan orang tuaku, yang terlanjur tak senang dengan keputusanku mencintai Rungka, tentu hanya bermaksud melebih-lebihkan cerita. Memang benar, kakek dan ayah Rungka dikenal di kampungku sebagai pencuri, tetapi kelakuan itu bukan warisan, lagi pula perbuatan tersebut dilakukan mereka di kampung orang lain dengan satu alasan yang mendesak. Sungguh padu ayah dan ibuku meringkas lika-liku hidupku bersama Rungka dengan menegaskan sesuatu yang makin membuatku yakin bunuh diri*," (Dippahatang, 2018).

In this section, Ramlah seeks a dissensus in disturbing the police. These efforts show indications of taking politics (political action, *trans*). Politics in Ranciere's view (2011) has its own university, has its own measure, namely equality (pp. 4). The concept of equality is not simply assumed but is related to action, that is, when the wrong emerges as part of a calculated social order. In other words, the wrong must take political action to test equality. As in the following quote:

"*Kuambil satu dari tiga kawali yang biasa ditaruh Ayahku di bawah kasur pembaringannya, kawali yang juga mungkin sering diselipkan di pinggangnya jika bepergian. Dengan menghadap arah rumahmu yang searah dengan kiblat, kawali begitu mudah memakan darah segarku,*" (Dippahatang, 2018).

However, Ramlah from the text still in the world of presuppositions to take political action, even though the dissensus space is open in the police. Not only Ramlah, the dissensus is also present in the social order of Rungka, "*Pistol ini sudah ada di tanganku,*" (Dippahatang, 2018). "*Pistol*" there as a symbol that comes from the social order. "*Pistol*" provides a stimulus to verify equality. In the meaning of "*pistol*" having bullets is a dissensus symbol. A suicide shot from a "*pistol*" will eliminate Rungka's identity in his police force and make him equal to the others. However, that equality is only presupposed by Rungka. As in the following quote:

"*Baik aku, kakek, dan Ramlah, mungkin bisa disebut orang yang berani memilih bunuh diri sebagai takdir kematian…. Untuk merayakan hidupku terakhir kalinya, kini tubuhku sudah terbalut baju pengatin, Aku sudah siap mengakhiri hidup sebagai pengantin yang menikahi mayat di sisi kuburan Ramlah saat asar masuk, tepat waktu tangisku pertama kali pecah di dunia. Namun, ledakan yang cukup keras membuatku terkejut karena begitu dekat dari kamarku. Apakah Ayahku selama ini menyimpan pistol yang lain di kamarnya?*" (Dippahatang, 2018).

From that quote, once again, Rungka (in textually) just presupposing, without taking any political action to verify equality. Likewise with Ramlah. Dissensus space in the *KDP* did not succeed in making Rungka and Ramlah political subjects in subjecting the demos to the police order. Indirectly the subject implicated failed to verify equality. As Ranciere asserts that equality is not limited to presuppositions but rather to action. In this case it is a political act.

CONCLUSION

From the discussion above, there are several results found through the short story *Kawali dan Pistol* or *KDP* by Alfian Dippahatang. The findings are based on the aesthetic of politics concept of Jacques Ranciere, and also use qualitative descriptive data collection methods, as well as historical hermeneutic data analysis methods.

Textually, *KDP* has illustrated the arche form of the Bugis-Makassar society into a narrative that has a historical basis. The results found that in marriage, there is a sensibility distribution of lineage backgrounds that causes the presence of partitions in the police. On the other hand, related to that, *KDP* as a literary work, ultimately produces a certain entity which is called an imitation of the locality in Bugis-Makassar. It didn't stop there, but textually *KDP* also opened up a space for dissensus within the police. This openness allows for political action and the process of subjectivation of demos to the police in a historical textual manner in the Bugis-Makassar society. However, with the

presence of the dissensus space, Ramlah and Rungka were not successful to take the advantages of the space with political act. The concept of equality between Ramlah and Rungka is only a mere supposition, not in the realm of political action.

REFERENCES

Abdullah, Hamid. (1985). *Manusia Bugis-Makassar: Suatu Tinjauan Historis terhadap Pola Tingkah Laku dan Pandangan Hidup Manusia Bugis-Makassar*. Jakarta: Inti Dayu.

Ahimsa Puta, H.S. (2009). Paradigma Ilmu Sosial-Budaya –Sebuah Pandangan. Makalah Kuliah Umum. *Paradigma Penelitian Ilmu-ilmu Humaniora*. Bandung; Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia.

Arifin, Zainul. (2019). "*Menim(b)ang Disensus: Politik dan Estetika Seno Gumira Ajidarma Dalam Cerpen 'Saksi Mata'*. Atavisme, 22(1), 47-60.

Dippahatang, Alfian. (2018). "*Kawali dan Pistol*". https://lakonhidup.com/2018/09/17/kawali-dan-pistol/, diakese 10 Desember 2020.

Erowati, Rosida. (2018). "*Distribution of The Sensible Jacques Ranciere: Antara Estetik dan Politik*". Jubindo, 3(3), 109-117.

Faruk. (2017). *Metode Penelitian Sastra; Sebuah Penjelajahan Awal*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Fitriana, Dian., & Nisa'. (2020). "*Pergeseran Sistem Pernikahan Endogami Masyarakat Etnis Bugis*". Al-Qalam, 26(1), 71-80.

Fitri, Nurliana. (2019). "*Artikulasi Distribution of the Sensible dan Kegagalan Penulis dalam Mengekspresikan Subjek di Dalam Novel Animal Farm karya George Orwell*". Makalah Seminar Bahasa, Sastra dan Seni.

Gandi, Wahyu. (2019). "*Alfian Dippahatang: Merokok Dapat Menyebabkan Kantong Kering*". http://epigram.or.id/2019/12/21/alfian-dippahatang-merokok-dapat-menyebabkan-kantong-kering/, diakses 11 Desember 2020.

Indiyastutik, Sri. (2019). *Disensus : Demokrasi sebagai Perselisihan Menurut Jacques Ranciere.* Jakarta: Kompas.

Jabrohim. (1994). *Pengajaran Sastra*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Belajar.

Keraf, Gorys. (2003). *Argumentasi dan Narasi.* Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Mattulada. (1975). *Latoa: Satu Lukisan Analitis Terhadap Antropologi-Politik Orang Bugis*. Universitas Indonesia.

Moleong, Lexy J. (2003). *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif.* Bandung: Rosda.

Natsir, Zulkifli. (2019). "*Isa Bunuh Diri Karena Uang Panai Rp 15 Juta, Tetangga Terkejut*". https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4617454/isa-bunuh-diri-karena-uang-panai-rp-15-juta-tetangga-terkejut, diakses 11 Desember 2020.

Pelras, Christian. (2006). *Manusia Bugis*. Jakarta: Penerbit Nalar.

Ranciere, Jacques. (1999). *Dissagreement: Politics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Ranciere, Jacques. (1991). *The Ignorant Schoolmaster: Five Lessons in intellectual Emancipation.* California: Stanford University Press.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2006). *Hatred of Democracy*. London: Verso.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2010). *Dissensus: On Politics and Aesthetics*. New York: Continuum.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2011). *The Thinking of Dissensus: Politics and Aesthetics*. New York: Continuum.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2013). *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of The Sensible*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Ranciere, Jacques. (2014). *Moments Politique*. New York: Seven Stories Press

Ranciere, Jacques. Engelmann, Peter. (2019). *Politics and Aesthetics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Situmorang, Saut. (2018). *Politik Sastra, Edisi Kedua*. Yogyakarta: Jual Buku Sastra.

Sumardjo, Jakob. (1984). *Masyarakat dan Sastra Indonesia*. Jakarta: Nur Cahaya.

Zizek, Slavoj. (2013). The Lesson of Ranciere. Dalam Ranciere, Jacques. *The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of The Sensible*. New York: Bloomsbury.

Zulfahnur. (1997). *Teori Sastra*. Bandung: Angkasa.

Natsir, Zulkifli. (2019). "*Isa Bunuh Diri Karena Uang Panai Rp 15 Juta, Tetangga Terkejut*". https://news.detik.com/berita/d-4617454/isa-bunuh-diri-karena-uang-panai-rp-15-juta-tetangga-terkejut, diakses 11 Desember 2020.