PROCEEDINGS
International Conference on Literature
Himpunan Sarjana-Kesusastraan Indonesia (HISKI)
E-ISSN 2988-4357

Discourses on power in *Perampok* by W.S. Rendra and *Die Räuber* by Friedrich Schiller

M. Yoesoef*
HISKI Komisariat Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
Email: yoesoev@yahoo.com

Abstract: *The play Perampok (1976) is W.S. Rendra's adaptation of the play Die Räubes written by Friedrich Schiller (1781). Specifically, this article aims to compare the two plays by examining the discourse of power underlying family conflicts. The analysis employs Michel Foucault's concept of power relations using the method of comparative literature. Among the findings from this analysis is that W.S. Rendra adapted the 18th-century German setting to the Javanese context of the Mataram era (17th century) by presenting a conflict within the household of the Duke of Lumajang (corresponding to the family of Count Maximilian von Moor in the source text). The conflict of interests that arises—Raden Sudrajat (Franz Moor)'s pursuit of power by any means necessary—becomes the source of the conflict. Consequently, the power relations present take the form of resistance against authority, giving rise to a discourse of resistance; the persecuted party is subjected to slander by Raden Sudrajat (Franz Moor), leading to their moral and social delegitimization.*

Keywords: *power relations, conflict of interest, resistance, persecution.*

INTRODUCTION

The development of modern Indonesian theater in the 1970s and 1980s was marked by the emergence of various theater groups that produced innovative performances and plays. During this period, several figures—such as Arifin C. Noer, Putu Wijaya, Teguh Karya, N. Riantiarno, and W.S. Rendra—played a significant role in shaping the tradition of modern Indonesian theater. Sumardjo (1987) refers to this period as the Second Golden Age of Modern Indonesian Theater because it was marked by increased productivity in playwriting through the DKJ Playwriting Competition and theater performances at Taman Ismail Marzuki.

Among these figures, W.S. Rendra occupies a unique position because much of his creative process involved translating and adapting works of world dramatic literature. Some of the works he translated were by Sophocles, Eugène Ionesco, Eugene O'Neill, Bertolt Brecht, William Shakespeare, and Aristophanes. One of his adaptations is *Perampok* (The Robbers), adapted from Friedrich Schiller's play *Die Räuber*, first published in 1781. The play tells the story of the conflict between two brothers, Karl Moor and Franz Moor, as they vie for power and legitimacy within the Moor family. Their father, Count Maximilian von Moor, is old and ailing.

Die Räuber emerged within the context of the *Sturm und Drang* movement in Germany in the late 18th century. This movement was a response to the spirit of the Enlightenment, which placed rationality as the guiding principle of life. In this work, Friedrich Schiller portrays the conflict between individual freedom, social authority, and the moral values prevailing in feudal society. Through the conflicts between the

*Corresponding author
How to cite (APA 7th): Yoesoef, M. (2026). Discourses on power in Perampok by W.S. Rendra and Die Räuber by Friedrich Schiller. *Proceedings 35th KIK, 35,* 616-629. https://doi.org/10.68634/kik.v35i.93

characters, the play serves as a critique of social institutions perceived as restricting human freedom (Sharpe, 1991).

W.S. Rendra adapted the play to the Javanese context during the Mataram Sultanate under the reign of Sultan Agung. Karl Moor was transformed into Raden Legowo, while Franz Moor became Raden Sudrajat. Although the setting, time, and culture underwent changes, the conflict over the struggle for power remained the dramatic core of both works. This adaptation demonstrates an effort at localization that allows the source text to gain new relevance within the historical and cultural context of Indonesia.

From the perspective of adaptation studies, such changes cannot be understood as merely an imitation of the source text. Sanders (2006) explains that adaptation is a creative process involving rereading, reinterpretation, and adjustment of the text to a different cultural context. Through this process, certain elements are retained, altered, added, or omitted in accordance with the adapter's aesthetic and ideological goals. Thus, adaptation is a form of intertextual relationship that can also be understood through the concept of intertextuality, as proposed by Allen (2000).

Numerous studies have been conducted on *Die Räuber*, particularly in the context of Friedrich Schiller's thought, the Sturm und Drang movement, and the psychological conflicts of its characters. In contrast, studies that specifically compare *Die Räuber* and *Perampok*, particularly with a focus on the discourse of power, remain relatively limited. Yet both plays present representations of power relations through struggles for legitimacy, manipulative practices, resistance, and conflicts of interest within the ruling elite.

Based on this background, this article aims to compare W.S. Rendra's *Perampok* and Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* focusing on the representation of the discourse of power in both texts. The analysis is conducted using a comparative literary approach, drawing on Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of power relations to understand how power is produced, exercised, maintained, and resisted within the dramatic structures of both works.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Numerous studies on Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* have been written from various perspectives, particularly those related to the Sturm und Drang movement, the concept of freedom, and the psychological conflicts of its characters. In contrast, studies on W.S. Rendra's *Perampok*, specifically as an adaptation of *Die Räuber* remain relatively limited. Most discussions of this play have appeared in performance reviews or studies focused on staging aspects.

Research on *Die Räuber* has been conducted, among others, by Putra (1994), who utilized the play as a teaching tool for German listening skills. Another study was conducted by Raja (2014), who examined the psychological conflict of the character Karl Moor through a psychoanalytic approach. Meanwhile, Amatilah (2014) examined the concept of freedom in *Die Räuber* through a sociological approach to literature, highlighting the influence of the Enlightenment and the Sturm und Drang movement on Schiller's thought.

On the other hand, research on the works of W.S. Rendra has focused more on artistic aspects and social criticism. Irawan (2010), for example, discusses the concept

of directing *Perampok* by referring to Bertolt Brecht's epic theater model. Meanwhile, Mulyani (2014) demonstrates that several of Rendra's plays serve as a medium for social criticism of the exercise of power, social inequality, and authoritarianism during the New Order era.

Although research on both authors and their works has been conducted, studies that specifically compare *Perampok* and *Die Räuber* remain very limited. Similarly, analyses that situate these two works within the framework of power relations and resistance have not been widely conducted. Yet, both plays depict conflicts over legitimacy, the manipulation of power, and forms of resistance that serve as the primary drivers of their dramatic structures.

Based on these circumstances, this study positions *Perampok* and *Die Räuber* as two texts connected through the processes of adaptation and cultural transformation. Using a comparative literary approach and Michel Foucault's concept of power relations, as mentioned above, this study seeks to explain how discourses of power are represented, negotiated, and resisted in both plays.

Research Methodology

This study employs a comparative literary approach to analyze the relationship between W.S. Rendra's play *Perampok* and Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber.* The analysis is conducted by comparing textual elements relevant to the representation of power, including characters and characterization, sociocultural settings, conflict, and the thematic structures of both plays.

The comparative literary method is used to identify similarities, differences, and transformations that occur during the adaptation process. This comparison aims to understand how the source text is transformed into a different cultural context without losing its primary conflict structure. Thus, this study not only examines the intertextual relationship between the two works but also explores the meanings generated by this transformation process.

The research data consists of Friedrich Schiller's play *Die Räuber* as the source text and W.S. Rendra's play *Perampok* as the adapted text. The data includes dialogue, characterization, conflict, and various representations of power relations found in both scripts. The data was analyzed through a comparative reading to identify patterns of power representation that emerge in each text.

Theoretical Framework

The following discussion addresses the approaches and concepts used and applied in this article, namely the concept of adaptation as a form of intertextuality and the concept of power relations as a framework for understanding and interpreting the conflicts that occur in both plays, thereby revealing the discourses at work behind those conflicts.

Adaptation and Intertextuality

This study views *Perampok* as an adaptation that has an intertextual relationship with *Die Räuber*. According to Sanders (2006), adaptation is a creative process that involves rereading, reinterpreting, and transforming a text into a different cultural

context. In this process, certain elements of the source text may be retained, altered, added, or omitted according to the adapter's aesthetic and ideological needs.

This view is consistent with the concept of intertextuality proposed by Kristeva and further developed by Allen (2000). Intertextuality holds that no text is entirely self-contained, as every text is always embedded in a network of relationships with other texts that preceded it. Therefore, the relationship between *Perampok* and *Die Räuber* is understood as a dialogic relationship that generates new meaning through a process of cultural adaptation and transformation.

Michel Foucault's Relations of Power

To analyze the representation of power in both plays, this study employs Michel Foucault's (1977) concept of relations of power. Unlike perspectives that view power as belonging solely to the state or those in power, Foucault regards power as a network of relations that is dispersed and operates through various social practices, institutions, and discourses. Power is not only repressive but also productive, as it generates knowledge, norms, and forms of truth accepted by society.

Foucault's (1977) concept of power/knowledge explains that knowledge and power mutually shape and reinforce one another. The production of knowledge serves as a means of legitimizing practices of power, while power determines the forms of knowledge considered legitimate. Furthermore, Foucault (1977) asserts that wherever there is power, resistance always emerges. Thus, the relationship between domination and resistance is a crucial aspect in understanding the social dynamics represented in literary works. According to Hall (2005), the anatomy of power includes knowledge as a form of capital for exerting influence, thereby enabling broad interpretations.

From this perspective, the conflict between Raden Legowo and Raden Sudrajat in *Perampok*, as well as that between Karl Moor and Franz Moor in *Die Räuber*, can be understood as manifestations of power relations involving a struggle for legitimacy, the production of truth, manipulative practices, and various forms of resistance to domination. This framework is used to explain how power is constructed, exercised, maintained, and resisted within the dramatic structures of both works.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A comparison of the two plays yielded data that served as the basis for this discussion. Therefore, this section describes, elaborates on, and discusses various aspects related to the topic at hand. The discussion focuses on the discourse of power at work in both plays, particularly as it relates to internal conflicts that reveal their correlation with various external factors influencing the creation of these two dramatic texts.

Discourse Production and the Struggle for Legitimacy

A comparison between W.S. Rendra's *Perampok* and Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* shows that the struggle for power in both plays does not begin through the use of physical force, but rather through the production of discourse that determines who is and is not worthy of holding authority. From Michel Foucault's perspective, power is not possessed by individuals alone but operates through the production of knowledge that shapes what is considered truth within a society (Foucault, 1977; Gordon, 1980). Thus,

control over information becomes a prerequisite for control over subjects situated within power relations.

In *Die Räuber* Franz Moor positions himself as the sole mediator of information regarding Karl Moor. When Count Maximilian von Moor asks to read a letter that has arrived from Leipzig, Franz says:

> Franz:
> "Forgive me if I do not let you read the letter yourself. You cannot,
> must not, yet know all."

This statement shows that Franz Moor controls access to knowledge. He does not merely convey information; rather, he determines how that information is read and understood. Before Karl arrives or presents his defense, Franz first constructs a representation of him. In Foucault's terms (1977; Gordon, 1980), Franz Moor is establishing a "regime of truth"—that is, a body of knowledge accepted as truth and serving as the basis for subsequent social action. As a result, the delegitimization of Karl Moor took place before the formal struggle over the inheritance or power even began. A "regime of truth" is typically established through the spread of slander, so that the person being slandered faces social exclusion and is viewed with moral suspicion. Such a strategy appears in *Die Räuber* and *Perampok*. One instance of slander in *Perampok* occurs when a letter regarding Raden Legowo is read aloud to Nyai Adipati.

> Raden Sudrajat:
> His Majesty Sultan Agung of Mataram was dissatisfied... Your brother defied that order and fled into the forest. Now your brother is a fugitive.

Raden Sudrajat did not merely report on Raden Legowo. He also interpreted his brother's actions as a political threat to Mataram. Therefore, when he later said:

> Raden Sudrajat:
> If we do not rid ourselves of this stain on the family, His Majesty Sultan Agung will consider the entire Lumajang Regency an enemy of Mataram.

Delegitimization has shifted from the family sphere to the royal sphere. While Franz Moor portrayed Karl Moor as a moral threat to the extended Moor family, Raden Sudrajat portrayed Raden Legowo as a threat to the political stability of the Lumajang Principality and its relationship with Mataram. This shift illustrates what Hutcheon (2013) refers to as a process of ideological reinterpretation in adaptation. The same conflict structure is retained, but its political meaning is reconstructed to fit a new cultural and historical context. Thus, W.S. Rendra transforms the individual moral conflict in *Die Räuber* into a conflict over political legitimacy in *Perampok* (Hutcheon, 2013; Sanders, 2006). Consequently, the power relations in W.S. Rendra's work appear more political than those in Friedrich Schiller's. While Schiller questions the individual's right to resist an oppressive social order, Rendra questions the legitimacy of power constructed through the manipulation of information and the control of social perceptions.

Slander as a Technology of Power

One of the primary instruments in the struggle for legitimacy in *Die Räuber* and *Perampok* is slander. In both plays, the act of slander functions not merely as a morally reprehensible act, but as a technology of power that enables the antagonist to shape (construct) the identity of their opponent before seizing (the contested) authority. Through slander, power operates by creating specific social categories that determine who is deemed worthy of leadership and who must be excluded from the power structure.

In *Die Räuber,* Franz Moor not only conveys negative information about Karl Moor but also attempts to reconstruct Karl Moor's identity as an individual no longer worthy of being recognized as a member of the Moor family. This effort is evident when he says to his father:

> "It is not flesh and blood, it is the heart that makes us sons and fathers! Love him no more, and this monster ceases to be your son, though he were cut out of your flesh."

This quote indicates that Franz Moor's slander went beyond mere criticism of Karl Moor's behavior. Franz Moor placed Karl Moor into a new category—that of a "monster." This new label had the potential to nullify his status as a son and heir to the family. From a Foucauldian perspective, this action constitutes a process of knowledge production that generates a new definition of the subject. Karl Moor is no longer viewed in terms of his genealogical relationship to Count Maximilian von Moor, but rather through an identity shaped by Franz Moor's discourse. Thus, the exclusion of Karl Moor appears justified because he has already been constructed as a figure outside the norms of the family and society.

A similar mechanism appears in *Perampok* through Raden Sudrajat's actions in providing Nyai Adipati with negative information by reading her a forged letter regarding Raden Legowo's conduct.

> Raden Sudrajat:
> My brother, Raden Legowo of Mataram has brought great disgrace upon our family's honor. His debts have piled up to forty ringgit because of gambling and his extravagant lifestyle. Then, some time ago, he defiled the honor of a noblewoman's wife. Naturally, the nobleman was outraged and refused to accept such a heinous insult. He demanded justice, but the unfortunate nobleman was instead killed when Raden Legowo stabbed him with a keris […] His Majesty Sultan Agung of Mataram was dissatisfied with this turn of events and immediately ordered your brother to appear before him, but your brother defied the command and fled into the forest. Now your brother is a fugitive.
>
> Nyai Adipati:
> […] My hopes for him are now shattered as well.

Like Franz Moor, Raden Sudrajat sought to create a negative image of his older brother before seizing the position of Duke of Lumajang. Through allegations of debt and a supposed rebellion against Sultan Agung, Raden Legowo was portrayed as a threat to the family's honor as well as to the political stability of the duchy. In this context, slander was no longer a matter of individual morality but became a political tool to undermine an opponent's legitimacy and pave the way for a power takeover.

Through these accusations, Karl Moor and Raden Legowo were portrayed as a threat to the existing social order. In Foucauldian terms, slander functions as a mechanism of knowledge production that creates specific social categories. These two figures were not persecuted because they were proven guilty; rather, they were first defined as problematic individuals, thereby providing social and political justification for their exclusion. In other words, slander does not follow exclusion but rather precedes it.

This is where an important difference between the two plays becomes apparent. In *Die Räuber*, slander is primarily aimed at altering a father's perception of his son, so its impact remains within the confines of an aristocratic family. In *Perampok*, slander has broader consequences because it touches on the relationship between the Lumajang Principality and the Mataram authorities. While Franz seeks to undermine Karl's moral legitimacy, Raden Sudrajat seeks to undermine Raden Legowo's political legitimacy. This transformation demonstrates that Rendra expands the function of slander from an instrument of family conflict to an instrument of power production within the feudal Javanese political sphere.

The systematic practice of slander carried out by Franz Moor and Raden Sudrajat can be seen in the dialogue excerpts that construct our understanding of the character Karl Moor (Raden Legowo) in the following table.

Table 1: Excerpts from Conversations That Contribute to Social Labeling

Plays	Selected Quotes	Argumentations
Die Räuber	"Love him no more, and this monster ceases to be your son..." (Act I, Scene I)	Franz Moor transformed Karl Moor from a subject into a social category: "monster."
Perampok	"His debt had piled up to 40,000 ringgit as a result of gambling and traveling..."	The main allegations that have created a negative image of Raden Legowo and made him an enemy of Sultan Agung
	"He has lost the right to take your father's place."	The direct effect of slander: the revocation of political legitimacy.

Through these accusations, the figures of Karl Moor and Raden Legowo were portrayed as a threat to the existing social and moral order. In Foucauldian terms, slander functions as a mechanism of knowledge production that generates specific social categories. The two figures were persecuted because they were first deemed guilty; conversely, they were first categorized as problematic individuals so that their exclusion could be justified on the grounds that their morality was questionable.

This is where the key difference between the two plays becomes apparent. In *Die Räuber*, the slander is directed, above all, at altering Count Maximilian von Moor's perception of his son, within the context of a personal conflict. In *Perampok*, slander has broader consequences because it not only touches on family dynamics—particularly

with Nyai Adipati—but also on the relationship between the Lumajang Duchy and the Mataram authorities. Therefore, slander in Rendra's work produces not only a family crisis but also a crisis of political legitimacy.

Slander, as a technology of power, intersects with Machiavellianism—that is, it relates to a person's manipulative and ambitious nature, who will stop at nothing to achieve the power they desire. This is evident in the character of Raden Sudrajat, who manipulates Raden Sumbogo by writing a letter in Nyai Adipati's name to Raden Legowo.

The manipulative actions Raden Sudrajat took against Raden Sumbogo were part of his plan to drive Nyai Adipati toward disappointment, thereby increasing her sense of guilt toward Raden Legowo. The following excerpt illustrates these manipulative actions.

> Raden Sudrajat:
> Don't you know that Roro Kumolo loves you too?
>
> Raden Sumbogo:
> I don't…
>
> Raden Sudrajat:
> That's why you're so slow on the uptake. Actually, she's loved you for a long time, but then she was seduced by my brother, Legowo.

In this regard, Raden Sudrajat used Raden Sumbogo—as if he were an emissary of Raden Legowo and a potential tool to make Nyai Adipati feel increasingly guilty to the point where she could no longer bear it and ultimately committed suicide.

Franz Moor's manipulative actions were also directed at Amelia, Karl Moor's lover, as seen in the following passage.

> "Franz:
> Does such a Karl insipre you with horror? Does the mere picture fill you with disgust? Go, then! Gaze upon him yourself, your handsome, your angelic, your divine Karl! Go, drink his balmy breath, and revel in the ambrosial fumes which ascend from his throat! The vesy exhalations of his body will plunge you into that dark and deathlike dizziness which follows the smell of bursting carcase, or the sight of a corpse-strewn battle-field. (Amelia turns away her face). What sensation of love! What rapture in those embraces! But is it not unjust to condemn a man because if his diseased esterior? Even in the most wretched lump of deformity a soul great and worthy of love may beam fofrth brighly like a pearl on a dunghill. (with a malignant smile) Even from lips of corruption love may—To be sure if vice should undermine the very foundations of character, if with chasi\tity virtue too should like her flight as the fragrance departs from the faded rose—if with the body the soul too should be tained and corrupted."

Through that conversation, Amelia came to understand just how much Franz hated her older brother. The manipulation and slander perpetrated by Franz (and Raden Sudrajat) were merely a strategy to fulfill his ambition to reach the pinnacle of power.

The despicable actions of Franz Moor/Raden Sudrajat—manipulating Amelia/Raden Sumbogo, slandering his older brother, and murdering his mother by using others—demonstrate acute selfishness. The strategy employed by Franz/Raden Sudrajat resulted in the social exclusion of Karl Moor/Raden Legowo from the family circle and his social delegitimization.

Exclusion and the Formation of the Bandit's Identity

This process of delegitimization through slander yields similar consequences in both plays: the exclusion of the character Karl Moor (and Raden Sudrajat) from the center of power and his social circle. However, exclusion does not merely remove an individual; it also shapes a new social identity as a consequence of the discourse attached to him (bandit, indebted, womanizer, and rapist). Due to this situation of exclusion and delegitimization, Karl Moor and Raden Legowo chose to become bandits as a form of resistance against injustice and exclusion. This was not merely a personal choice, but rather the result of power structures that placed them outside the legitimate system.

> "Karl Moor:
> See, it falls like a film from my eyes! What a fool was I to think of returning to be caged? My soul's athirst for deeds, my spirit pants for freedom. Murderers, robbers! with these words I trample the law underfoot—mankind threw off humanity when I appealed to it. Away, then, with human sympathies and mercy! I no longer have a father, no longer affections; blood and death shall teach me to forget that anything was ever dear to me! Come! come! Oh, I will recreate myself with some most fearful vengeance;—'tis resolved, I am your captain! and success to him who Shall spread fire and slaughter the widest and most savagely—I pledge myself He shall be right royally rewarded. Stand around me, all of you, and swear to me fealty and obedience unto death! Swear by this trusty right hand.
>
> All: (place their hands in his). We swear to thee fealty and obedience unto death!
>
> Karl Moor:
> And, by this same trusty right Hand, I here swear to you to remain your captain, true and faithful unto death! This arm shall make an instant corpse of him who doubts, or fears, or retreats. And may the same befall me from your hands if I betray my oath! Are you content?
> *[SPIEGELBERG runs up and down in a furious rage.]*
>
> All (throwing up their hats). We are content!"

In the play, Karl Moor/Raden Legowo's declaration to mount a resistance is expressed in the following dialogue.

> "Raden Legowo:
> Actually, if we paid off those debts, they would have no reason left to arrest us. And we could continue our struggle peacefully. But the fact is, my mother refuses to

understand how important it is for us to pay off those debts. Now there's no choice. I refuse to live chained up in prison. Now I'm going to go into the forest and launch a resistance."

The response of Raden Legowo's friends (Sentanu, Kosambi, Rasmolo, and others) to his determination to support and join the resistance.

"Raden Legowo:
Thank you, friends. Mataram has rejected my service. My mother has sacrificed my safety. Therefore, from this moment on, Raden Legowo is dead. He no longer exists. No., I am Joko Geger. I am the bandit. I am the robber who will raid the rich for the sake of the poor. Come on, let's go to the Wonoroto forest. There, we will form our ranks."

From Foucault's perspective, the subject is the result of the power relations at work upon it. Therefore, the identity of the robber in both plays can be understood as a product of power itself. Power not only produces prohibitions and punishments, but also generates new subjects along with the social identities attached to them.

Nevertheless, there is an important difference in the construction of the two characters. Karl Moor is portrayed more as an individual experiencing an existential crisis due to the clash between freedom and morality. In contrast, Raden Legowo appears as a figure who consciously directs his acts of robbery to defend the common people. In other words, Friedrich Schiller highlights the individual's tragedy, while W.S. Rendra emphasizes the social and political dimensions of these acts of resistance.

Resistance as an Effect of Power Relations

In both plays, resistance emerges as a response to exclusionary practices of power. However, according to Foucault's thinking, resistance cannot be understood as something that exists outside of power. Rather, resistance arises from the power relations themselves and becomes part of the dynamics that accompany them.

Karl Moor/Raden Legowo's choices and stance in resisting the circumstances he faced in his personal life stemmed from a desire to defend justice and help the poor and those oppressed by the system. In this regard, Karl Moor/Raden Legowo channeled his frustration over his younger brother's slander and tyranny and chose to become a benevolent bandit, solely to shift his motivation from (destructive) vengeance to (constructive) advocacy. The choices made by Karl Moor and Raden Legowo were essentially a process of rebuilding the legitimacy that had been formally stripped from them.

Karl Moor and Raden Legowo sought to establish an alternative source of legitimacy distinct from institutional legitimacy. Franz Moor and Raden Sudrajat derived their legitimacy from control over family or political structures, whereas Karl Moor and Raden Legowo derived theirs from recognition by groups that felt oppressed. Thus, the main conflict in both plays is not a clash between power and the lack thereof, but rather a struggle between two competing forms of legitimacy.

The difference lies in the orientation of that resistance. Karl Moor resisted in the name of individual freedom and in rejection of a moral order he considered hypocritical.

In contrast, Raden Legowo framed his resistance within the context of protecting the people and promoting social justice. This shift demonstrates that Rendra's adaptation transformed the spirit of Sturm und Drang—which centered on individualism—into a more collective form of socio-political criticism, particularly during the New Order era.

Spiritual Authority and the Production of Truth

The most fundamental difference between the two plays lies in their mechanisms for resolving conflict. In *Die Räuber*, the tragedy unfolds into a moral and existential crisis that finds no adequate reconciliation. In contrast, *Perampok* presents the figure of Sunan Giri Perapen as a source of legitimacy that mediates the power struggle. The ideological conflict between Sunan Giri Perapen and Sultan Agung is reflected in Raden Legowo's attitude toward the Mataram regime. Conversely, his partisan stance in defense of Sunan Giri Perapen's ideas reinforces Raden Legowo's spirit of resistance.

Raden Legowo:
No, Gender. There's no way I would follow in Warok Iromejo's footsteps.
Order and peace among our own people—that is what I am fighting for.
That is also what my teacher, Sunan Giri Perapen, longed for.

The important message from Sunan Giri Perapen to Raden Legowo—who had become the Duke of Lumajang after defeating his tyrannical younger brother—was a reminder not to harbor ambitions of becoming the king of Java, since Sultan Agung was the King of Java. This message reveals Sunan Giri Perapen's attitude of continued respect and recognition of Sultan Agung's position, even though they were on opposing sides in terms of power dynamics.

From Foucault's perspective (1977), the presence of Sunan Giri Perapen demonstrates that the production of truth occurs not only through political institutions but also through symbolic and religious authority. In the Javanese context as represented by W.S. Rendra, political legitimacy requires the support of moral legitimacy that reflects religious authority. Sunan Giri Perapen's endorsement serves to establish a new "truth"—that Raden Legowo was not a rebel but rather the legitimate ruler of the Lumajang Principality under the authority of the Mataram Sultanate.

This pattern was reinforced by Raden Legowo's statement to the Mataram envoy: "I do not oppose Sultan Agung's authority, but I am obligated to protect the lives of the people of Lumajang. I will soon repay my debts totaling forty thousand ringgit in Mataram. I will cease my activities as a bandit, and I will surrender all the spoils of my raids as tribute to Sultan Agung while begging forgiveness for all my transgressions."

This statement demonstrates an effort to reclaim legitimacy through the construction of a counter-narrative. Whereas Raden Legowo was previously portrayed as a threat to Mataram, he now positions himself as a protector of the people who continues to acknowledge Sultan Agung's sovereignty. In this regard, W.S. Rendra offers a resolution not found in *Die Räuber* namely, a reconciliation between political power, moral authority, and the interests of the people.

A comparison of the two plays shows that power operates primarily through the production of legitimacy, rather than through the direct use of violence. Franz Moor and Raden Sudrajat gain power by controlling the discourse and shaping social truths about

their opponents. In contrast, Karl Moor and Raden Legowo lose their legitimacy by becoming the objects of that discourse, but subsequently build alternative legitimacy through resistance.

While retaining the basic conflict structure of *Die Räuber* W.S. Rendra carried out a significant ideological transformation. Schiller situates the conflict within the realm of individual freedom and moral crisis, whereas W.S. Rendra directs it toward issues of political legitimacy, social justice, and the relationship between state power and moral authority. Thus, *Perampok* is not merely a cultural adaptation of *Die Räuber*, but rather a reinterpretation of issues of power tailored to Indonesia's historical, cultural, and political context.

CONCLUSION

This article demonstrates that W.S. Rendra's *Perampok* is an adaptation that retains the basic conflict structure of Friedrich Schiller's *Die Räuber* but alters its ideological orientation through a process of cultural and historical localization. By shifting the setting from 18th-century Germany to Java during the Mataram Sultanate, Rendra not only creates cultural proximity but also places the story's conflict within a context more closely tied to issues of political legitimacy, power relations, and social justice.

An analysis from Michel Foucault's perspective reveals that the discourse of power in both plays operates not primarily through physical violence, but through the production of discourse and legitimation. Franz Moor and Raden Sudrajat gain power through their ability to shape knowledge that is accepted as social truth, while Karl Moor and Raden Legowo lose their legitimacy by becoming the objects of that discourse production. In this context, slander, manipulation of information, and control of social perceptions function as technologies of power that enable exclusion from the center of authority.

This study also examines the issue of resistance in both plays, which emerges as a direct consequence of oppressive power relations. Karl Moor and Raden Legowo do not merely appear as victims, but as subjects shaped by the practices of power that marginalize them. Their presence as benevolent bandits illustrates how political exclusion can give rise to alternative forms of legitimacy rooted in the support of marginalized communities. In this sense, resistance is not the opposite of power, but rather an inherent part of the very workings of power itself.

A significant difference between the two works lies in the mechanisms of legitimation offered as a resolution to the conflict. In *Die Räuber* the crisis of power escalates into a moral and existential tragedy that finds no reconciliation. In contrast, *Perampok* presents the figure of Sunan Giri Prapen as a source of symbolic authority that provides moral legitimacy for Raden Legowo. The presence of this character demonstrates that, within Javanese cultural constructs, legitimate power depends not only on political authority but also on moral and religious recognition.

Thus, a comparison between *Die Räuber* and *Perampok* reveals that the process of adaptation is not merely the transfer of narrative elements from one culture to another. Adaptation is also a process of discursive transformation that produces new meanings in accordance with the surrounding social, cultural, and political contexts. The main finding of this study indicates that both *Die Räuber* and *Perampok* represent

power as a practice of producing legitimacy. The difference lies in how this legitimacy is constructed: Friedrich Schiller situates it within the framework of individual freedom and moral crisis, whereas W.S. Rendra articulates it within the framework of political power, cultural authority, and social justice.***

REFERENCES

Allen, G. (2000). *Intertextuality*. Routledge.

Bauman, R. (2004). *A world of others' words: Cross-cultural perspectives on intertextuality*. Blackwell.

Cartmell, D. (Ed.). (2012). *A companion to literature, film, and adaptation*. Wiley-Blackwell.

Damono, S. D. (2015). *Sastra bandingan*. Editum.

Downing, L. (2008). *The Cambridge introduction to Michel Foucault*. Cambridge University Press.

Foucault, M. (1977). *Discipline and punish: The birth of the prison* (A. Sheridan, Trans.). Pantheon Books. (Original work published 1975)

Foucault, M. (1980). *Power/knowledge: Selected interviews and other writings, 1972–1977* (C. Gordon, Ed.). Pantheon Books.

Hall, J. A., & Schroeder, R. (Eds.). (2006). *An anatomy of power: The social theory of Michael Mann*. Cambridge University Press.

Hill, D. (Ed.). (2003). *Literature of the Sturm und Drang*. Camden House.

Hutcheon, L., & O'Flynn, S. (2013). *A theory of adaptation* (2nd ed.). Routledge.

Kristeva, J. (1980). *Desire in language: A semiotic approach to literature and art* (L. S. Roudiez, Ed.; T. Gora, A. Jardine, & L. S. Roudiez, Trans.). Columbia University Press.

Mills, S. (2003). *Michel Foucault*. Routledge.

Rabinow, P. (Ed.). (1984). *The Foucault reader*. Pantheon Books.

Raffnsøe, S., Gudmand-Høyer, M., & Thaning, M. S. (2016). *Michel Foucault: A research companion*. Palgrave Macmillan.

Rendra, W. S. (1987). *Perampok* (M. Soetrisno, Adapt.). Pustaka Matahari.

Sanders, J. (2006). *Adaptation and appropriation*. Routledge.

Schiller, F. (2006). *The robbers* (R. D. Boylan, Trans.). Project Gutenberg. https://www.gutenberg.org/ebooks/6782 (Original work published 1781)

Sharpe, L. (1991). *Friedrich Schiller: Drama, thought and politics*. Cambridge University Press.