CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1 Novel

Novel emerged in Spain during the seventeen century and in England during the eighteen. Novel is one of literary works which represents an idea or thought of the author. Novel is the modern or living form of narrative fiction which usually contain of story which related to life experiences. It shares the construction of feature, themes, subject matter of epic, romance, allegory and satire.

Terry Eagleton in his book The English Novel an Introduction (2005: 8) says: “A novel is a piece of prose fiction of a reasonable length. Not all novels are written in prose. The novel is a genre which is resist exact definition. The point about the novel, however, is not just that it eludes definitions, but that it attractively undermines them. In a novel we can find poetry and dramatic dialogue along with epic, pastoral, satire, history, elegy, tragedy and any number of other literary modes.”

The novel is the great vernacular literary art, which draws upon the resources of ordinary speech rather than some specialized literary language. Novel can be used as the platform for propagating the author’s opinion. There are novelist who leave their story and come forward himself to address to philosophize on what is happening, and to interpret his moral purpose (1977, 158).

The word comes from the Italian, Novella, which means the new staff that small. Novel was originally developed in the region from other forms of narrative nonfiction, such as letters, biographies, and history. But with a shift in society and development time, the novel is not only based on data nonfiction, author of novel can change according to the desired imagination.
Sumardjo (1998: 29) says that “novel is a story with the prose form in long shape, this long shape means the story including the complex plot, many character and various setting”

A novel is a totality, a comprehensiveness that is artistic. As a totality, the novel has passages elements, most related to one another in close and mutually dependent. The elements of a novel-builder are collectively form of a totality that-in addition to the formal elements of language, there are many more kinds.

2.1.1 Dystopian Novel (Science Fiction)

Science fiction as a genre or division of literature distinguishes its fictional worlds to one degree or another from the world in which we actually live: a fiction of the imagination rather than observed reality, a fantastic literature. (Roberts, 12: 2000)

Science fiction is a genre of fiction in which the stories often tell about science and technology of the future. It is important to note that science fiction has a relationship with the principles of science—these stories involve partially true-partially fictitious laws or theories of science. It should not be completely unbelievable, because it then ventures into the genre fantasy.

The plot creates situations different from those of both the present day and the known past. Science fiction texts also include a human element, explaining what effect new discoveries, happenings and scientific developments will have on us in the future.

Science fiction texts are often set in the future, in space, on a different world, or in a different universe or dimension. Early pioneers of the genre of science fiction are H. G. Wells (The War of the Worlds) and Jules Verne (20,000 Leagues Under the Sea).
The Sea). Some well-known 20th century science fiction texts include *1984* by George Orwell, *Brave New World* by Alduous Huxley, and *The Fountainhead* by Ayn Rand. In addition, the four most-popular and well-recognized 20th century authors are Isaac Asimov, author of *the Foundation trilogy* and his robot series, Arthur C. Clarke famous for *2001, a Space Odyssey*; Ray Bradbury, known for his *Martian Chronicles*, and Robert Heinlein, author of *Stranger in a Strange Land* and *The Moon Is a Harsh Mistress*.

Reading fiction can drive you mad. In fact, it is not fiction which lead to madness, but forgetting the fictionallity of fiction. The problem arises from confusing it with reality. A fiction which knows itself to be fiction is perfectly insane. Novelist does not lie, because he does not imagine that we take them to be telling the truth. Literary, moral, and epistemological realism are all subtly interlinked.

Fiction does not exactly mean not true. It means something like 'a story (either true or false) treated in such a way as to make it clear that it has a significant beyond itself'. The novel is a utopian image - not in what it represents, which can be gruesome enough, but in the very act of representation - an act which at its most effective shapes the world into meaning with no detriment to its reality.(2005 : 17) as Roland Barthes comments:

The real is not representable, and it is because men necessarily try to represent it by words that there is a history of literature...literature is categorically realist, in that it never has anything but the real as its object of desire; and I shall say now, without contradicting my self...that literature is quite as stubbornly unrealistic: it is considers sane its desire for the impossible.
2.2 Structural Functionalism Theory

Structural functionalism, or in many contexts simply functionalism, is a broad perspective in sociology and anthropology which sets out to interpret society as a structure with interrelated parts. Functionalism addresses society as a whole in terms of the function of its constituent elements; namely norms, customs, traditions and institutions. A common analogy, popularized by Herbert Spencer, presents these parts of society as "organs" that work toward the proper functioning of the "body" as a whole. In the most basic terms, it simply emphasises "the effort to impute, as rigorously as possible, to each feature, custom, or practice, its effect on the functioning of a supposedly stable, cohesive system." For Talcott Parsons (Parsons:1975), "functionalism" came to describe a particular stage in the methodological development of social science, rather than a specific school of thought.

Talcott Parsons was heavily influenced by Durkheim and Max Weber, synthesising much of their work into his action theory, which he based on the system-theoretical concept and the methodological principle of voluntary action. He held that "the social system is made up of the actions of individuals." His starting point, accordingly, is the interaction between two individuals faced with a variety of choices about how they might act, choices that are influenced and constrained by a number of physical and social factors. (Craib, 1992:40)

Parsons (Parsons, 1961:41) determined that each individual has expectations of the other's action and reaction to his own behaviour, and that these expectations would (if successful) be "derived" from the accepted norms and values of the society they inhabit. As Parsons himself emphasised, however, in a general context there
would never exist any perfect "fit" between behaviours and norms, so such a relation is never complete or "perfect."

Social norms were always problematic for Parsons, who never claimed (as has often been alleged) that social norms were generally accepted and agreed upon, should this prevent some kind of universal law. Whether social norms were accepted or not was for Parsons simply a historical question.

As behaviours are repeated in more interactions, and these expectations are entrenched or institutionalised, a role is created. Parsons defines a "role" as the normatively-regulated participation "of a person in a concrete process of social interaction with specific, concrete role-partners." Although any individual, theoretically, can fulfil any role, the individual is expected to conform to the norms governing the nature of the role they fulfil. (Cuff & Payne, 1984:44)

Furthermore, one person can and does fulfil many different roles at the same time. In one sense, an individual can be seen to be a "composition" of the roles he inhabits. Certainly, today, when asked to describe themselves, most people would answer with reference to their societal roles. Parsons later developed the idea of roles into collectivities of roles that complement each other in fulfilling functions for society. Some roles are bound up in institutions and social structures (economic, educational, legal and even gender-based). These are functional in the sense that they assist society in operating and fulfil its functional needs so that society runs smoothly.

A society where there is no conflict, where everyone knows what is expected of him, and where these expectations are consistently met, is in a perfect state of
equilibrium. The key processes for Parsons in attaining this equilibrium are socialisation and social control. Socialisation is important because it is the mechanism for transferring the accepted norms and values of society to the individuals within the system. Perfect socialisation occurs when these norms and values are completely internalised, when they become part of the individual's personality.

Parson states that "this point [...] is independent of the sense in which [the] individual is concretely autonomous or creative rather than 'passive' or 'conforming', for individuality and creativity, are to a considerable extent, phenomena of the institutionalization of expectations"; they are culturally constructed.

Socialisation is supported by the positive and negative sanctioning of role behaviours that do or do not meet these expectations. A punishment could be informal, like a snigger or gossip, or more formalised, through institutions such as prisons and mental homes. If these two processes were perfect, society would become static and unchanging, and in reality this is unlikely to occur for long.

Parsons recognises this, stating that he treats "the structure of the system as problematic and subject to change," and that his concept of the tendency towards equilibrium "does not imply the empirical dominance of stability over change." He does, however, believe that these changes occur in a relatively smooth way.

Individuals in interaction with changing situations adapt through a process of "role bargaining." Once the roles are established, they create norms that guide further action and are thus institutionalised, creating stability across social interactions. Where the adaptation process cannot adjust, due to sharp shocks or immediate radical
change, structural dissolution occurs and either new structures (and therefore a new system) are formed, or society dies. This model of social change has been described as a "moving equilibrium," and emphasises a desire for social order.

Parsons believes that there are four functional imperatives that are necessary for (characterization of) all system:

1. Adaptation (A)
2. Goal (G)
3. Intergration (I)
4. Latency (L) or pattern maintance.

These four functional imperative are known as the AGIL scheme. In order to survive, a system must perform those four function.

According to functionalist theory, the various parts of society are in delicate balance, and a change in one part affects the others. For instance, the function of the law institution is to provide safety and life harmony, while the function of education institutionnal is to train individuals in the skills needed to keep the society operating.

2.3 Freedom

The concept of freedom was born since there was a thought about human existence in this world, where the existence of human in this world not decided by higher powers. Human has it role in creating its existence in life. The everyday actualization will make them realize about their ability in life and world and their environment, too. (Nico Syukur, 1998: 15-16)
The word freedom is often interpreted as a condition where there is no obstacle, coercion, charge, or responsibility in life. An individual called free if his actions may not be enforced or not determined from the outside. He has his own right to do whatever he wanted to. So, it can be concluded that freedom to an individual is the possibility to control their minds and actions. Freedom is self-determination. According to Louis Leahy there are three kinds of freedom, they are physical freedom, psychological freedom, and moral freedom. (Leahy, 1984: 28)

The word freedom refers to the possibility that every person has to make decisions regarding their own lives, yet with certain limitations. We have the ability to choose from a variety of options. Individual in this world has a purpose. The purpose of human life is to achieve happiness, whereas happiness can not be achieved when one does not actualize in an action. It can be seen in one's life, that one who is wise, thinks himself, speaks on his own understanding and states what he says and also knows why he expresses it, compared to a superficial person who always joined in and only repeating what others are saying. The one who is free, has no compulsion, is able to express his free will, indeed the person has attained the perfection of his existence (Nico Syukur, 1998: 47-48).

John S. Mill classifies freedom. The first is the freedom that encompasses the field of inner power, the consciousness which demands the freedom of conscience in the broadest sense of freedom in thinking and feeling, the absolute freedom of opinion and sentiment for any practical or speculative, scientific, moral or theological. Freedom to express and announces his opinion. The second is the freedom associated with individual power and the third is the freedom that is related to others. From the three categories of freedom by John S. Mill, the individual's
freedom experienced by an individual is implies an accountability, since the individual is essentially inseparable from his social relations. The accountability exists when the action is done in relation to or related to another person, while the matter of the person is absolutely free. It is illustrated by Mill that although the state has power over its people, but the freedom of the people as individuals who have freedom of expression can not be impeded by the power of government.

The issues of freedom and independence in Karl Marx's view, is about how a man is capable of creating himself as his master. This means how humans as individuals who have the totality to be able to do a total relationship with the world, able to see, hear, think and have an intention. In summary, human beings are able to affirm and express all the organs of individuality, so not only free from, but humans are also able to free to. (Fromm, 2002: 37-44)

2.3.1 The Impacts of the Lack of Freedom

2.3.1.1 Inability to Choose

The human desire to live freely is one of the most fundamental human needs (Nico Gratitude, page: 5). This essential factor of human freedom causes and encourages various figure to highlight the issue of freedom. Due to the varied investigation of freedom there comes various assumptions, opinions and views that are often different from one another. In some sense the differences in it concept can be understood because freedom itself is not an absolute thing. Freedom has a relative character or is limited by human circumstances. As something relative or situated, human freedom is always mixed with non-liberation. So human beings are never completely free.
Yet, human situation and condition is basically not just a limiting and inhibiting factor of human freedom, but also and simultaneously a factor that enables freedom. The reason is that beyond the limited circumstances humans can not possibly act. Humans have the ability to desire and to wish. He has a tendency and a free will. Humans have the ability to choose. Therefore it is said that man is the master of his own deeds. (Mudji Sutrisno, 1998: 244)

2.3.1.2 Internal and External Conflict

The existence of freedom in human beings can be proven on the basis of the general agreement argument. This means that most people believe that he and others are free. Human freedom exists in the constant struggle of difficulties and obstacles, both within and from outside of the human self. The struggle in these difficulties awakened the man to his freedom. If man is not bent on various forms of obstacles and struggles, he will not realize his freedom. Conversely, if man realizes that he is not free, then it is also impossible he will try to fight over the difficulties and obstacles that hinder his freedom. (Leahy, page: 46, Nico Syukur, page: 36)

2.3.1.3 No Moral responsibility

In everyday’s experience of life we realize we often find that an action that we do is really can not happen if we are not free. For example we negotiate an issue. In negotiation there is freedom in everyone who participates in it. For if there is no freedom, then there is also no negotiation. Perhaps there is only coercion of will. The relationship between freedom and moral responsibility is very close. So it is not surprising that the two terms are often used together. If there was no freedom there would be no moral responsibility. (Glannon, page: 261-263)
According to Kant’s idea of free will, will is a kind of causality belonging to living beings so far as they are rational. Freedom would then be the property this causality has of being able to work independently of determination by alien causes; just as natural necessity is a property characterizing the causality of all non-rational beings — the property of being determined to activity by the influence of alien causes.

According to Thomas Hobbes and David Hume, if our actions were indeterministic, we could not be responsible for them. They feel that there must be a deterministic or causal connection between our will and our actions. This, they say, allows us to take responsibility for our actions, including credit for the good and blame for the bad. Compatibilists identify free will with freedom of action - the lack of external constraints. We are free, and we have free will, if we are not in physical chains. As long as our own will is included in that causal chain, we are free, they say. And they think causality in nature is related to the very possibility of reason and logic. Without causality, they say, we could not be certain of the truths of our arguments.

2.3.1.4 Rebellion and War

Freedom is a state or situation in which a human really feels himself as an independent individual and not alienated from himself (Bernard Berofsky 1993: 98). Freedom is a situation and a stable way of life, a free condition, by which man becomes master of his own life and possesses himself. In such circumstances it is assumed that man can take and manage his own responsibilities. Ideal conditions like that in reality apparently has not been experienced by humans fully. Humans still have to deal with imperfect things. Humans still have to deal with the various
restrictions that always hinder the process of development of his life. Humans still have to try to break all kinds of obstacles that bind her freedom which means if there is no freedom in a human life, it is possible that there will be rebellion and war happens in order to achieve freedom and dependence. (Leahy, page; 43)

2.3.1.5 Non-Existence of Freedom of Thought

In a scholarly essay by Dr. Latif Hussain Kazmi, Jean Paul Sartre (1905-1980), on Human Freedom and Creativity, acknowledges the significance of his original approach: "It provides a new conception of man, and a new outlook by making "human existence" the real frame of reference. For Sartre human reality or human subjectivity is the foundation of all thought and action. He says that we are condemned to confront our being. Each individual has not only the right to choice but has the duty to choose. The freedom to reinvent one’s self is universal and necessary. Who you are is what you do. Actions are indispensable on the road to freedom. Sartre advocated that an individual should criticize everything that is given to you as part of your culture for the survival of humanity and to be able to criticize something, human needs his mind to be freed from any coercions.

Freedom of thought is the precursor and progenitor of—and thus is closely linked to—other liberties, including freedom of religion, freedom of speech, and freedom of expression. Though freedom of thought is axiomatic for many other freedoms they are in no way required for it to operate and exist.

2.3.1.6 Misery and Pain

John Locke formulates the existence of natural rights attached to every human being, namely the right to life, the right to liberty, and property rights. When it comes to Locke's concept of happiness, he says that the existence of liberty is to
pursue happiness. The non-existence of liberty could causes misery which he says
the happiness or pleasure and the misery or pain can affect mind as well as body.
(1894, p.258) Locke goes on to qualify this assertion, since there is an important
distinction between “true pleasures and “false pleasures.” Thus Locke is led to make
a distinction between “imaginary” and “real” happiness:

“The necessity of pursuing happiness [is] the foundation of
liberty. As therefore the highest perfection of intellectual nature
lies in a careful and constant pursuit of true and solid happiness;
so the care of ourselves, that we mistake not imaginary for real
happiness, is the necessary foundation of our liberty. The stronger
ties we have to an unalterable pursuit of happiness in general,
which is our greatest good, and which, as such, our desires always
follow, the more are we free from any necessary determination of
our will to any particular action…” (1894, p. 348)

In this passage Locke makes a very interesting observation regarding the
“pursuit of happiness” and human liberty. He points out that happiness is the
foundation of liberty, insofar as it enables us to use our reason to make decisions that
are in our long-term best-interest, as opposed to those that simply afford us
immediate gratification. Our pursuit of happiness enables us to rise above the dictates
of nature. As such, the pursuit of happiness is the foundation of morality and
civilization. If we had no desire for happiness, Locke suggests, we would have
remained in the state of nature just content with simple pleasures like eating and
sleeping. But the desire for happiness pushes us onward, to greater and higher
pleasures. Locke does suggest that we are “necessitated” to suspend and deliberate
by the same “necessity” that determines us to pursue true happiness. (Locke, 1978: 4)

Without free will one might say there is no need for the emotion of personal
regret. If something could not have happened any other way, this is a useless
emotion. In some cases this can lead to depression. The evolutionary purpose of the
emotion of regret (to modify our future behavior to fit in with society, etc.) does not yield desired effect in this case.

Human free choice breaks the chain of necessitation and allows us to transcend the natural order (rational potentialities are what enable us to choose the bad as well as the good, because they enable us to control how the end appears to us; thus rational potentialities are also at the root of our ability to weakness of will, since the key to weakness of will lies in our capacity to focus our attention on some values and avoid thinking of others (Roderick T. Long, 1992).

2.3.1.7 Slavery

Aristotle says that political rule can exist only where the populace consists of men who are free, that is, sufficiently virtuous that they can rule themselves. The elite or leader should have difference in divide power and functions between them. Not only would members of each class take turns performing the different functions allotted to them, but also the classes themselves would rule over others in one respect and be ruled in another. In these circumstances, then, Aristotle names justice as a virtue that is learned both in ruling and being ruled. Those born to wealth and power are liable to arrogance and the love of command. By subjecting them to the rule of others, including their social inferiors, they learn to respect their freedom and justly appraise their worth.

For Aristotle a component of well-being is that not to be ruled against one's Will. Freedom may not be sufficient for attaining the highest good, but it is necessary. As Aristotle suggested that superior who have thus far put up with being ruled by inferiors would be justified in rebelling (Long, 1992). Aristotle says that
slavery can become an impact of the non-existence of freedom. Beside that Aristotle also explaining about the impact of the lack of freedom for individual as quoted here:

"The solution, the, is most likely this: A person ruled by a godlike king, and so forbidden political rights, is indeed missing something valuable, and as a result is not living the best possible life; granting such a person political rights, however, would not redeem the situation, the absolutely best life would be to be a person of godlike virtue;..."

For Aristotle, freedom is the condition of not being a slave. And there is good reason to think that freedom from slavery is more than a merely instrumental good for Aristotle. Aristotle characterizes freedom as the condition of existing for one's own sake rather than for another. (Metaphysics 982b26)

Our rational capacities give us the ability to stand in judgement over our natural impulses instead of being controlled by them; natural slaves lack this ability entirely, while free women are said to have it only imperfectly (Politics 1260a13)

2. 3. 2 The Importance of Freedom

2.3.2.1 Decisions Making and Actions Control

As described above, it can be concluded that the impacts of the lack of freedom are various and can bring some bad impact on human life. According to these facts, it is shows us that freedom is needed in order to keep the balance and harmony of human life. John Locke was among the most famous philosophers and political theorists of the 17th century. In Book 2, Chapter 21 of the Essay Locke explores the topic of the will. Locke says: one of the things which separate people from rocks and billiard balls is our ability to make decisions and control our actions. We feel that we are free in certain respects and that we have the power to choose certain thoughts and actions.
According to Locke’s analysis, we are free to do those things which we both will to do and are physically capable of doing. Locke’s qualification to this account of the will being determined by uneasiness has to do with what he calls suspension. Beginning with the second edition of the Essay, Locke began to argue that the most pressing desire for the most part determines the will, but not always: “For the mind having in most cases, as is evident in Experience, a power to suspend the execution and satisfaction of any of its desires, and so all, one after another, is at liberty to consider the objects of them; examine them on all sides, and weigh them with others.” (2.21.47, 263).

### 2.3.2.2 Freedom of Thought and Act

Locke describes that freedom is important to us so we can think and act freely (Chappell, 2007: 142). Locke’s definition reflects his modified conception of the will as a power to issue commands to one’s body or mind. So far as a man has a power to think, or not to think; to move, or not to move, according to the preference or direction of his own mind, so far is a Man Free. (E2-5 II.xxi.8: 237)

### 2.3.2.3 Pursue Happiness

In other way, Aristotle explains that “even when human beings are not in need of each other’s help, they have no less desire to live together, though it is also true that the common advantage draws them into union insofar as noble living is something they each partake of. So this above all is the end, whether for everyone in common or for each singly” (Politics 3.6.1278b19–22). Here Aristotle contrasts two different needs of the human soul that give rise to different forms of community. The first need is material. On this account, individuals form communities to secure the necessities of life. Because few of us are capable of fulfilling all our needs alone,
material self-interest forces us to cooperate, developing our particular talents and trading our products with others. The second need is spiritual. Even in the absence of material need, human beings will form communities because only through community can we satisfy our spiritual need to live nobly, that is, to achieve eudaimonia, “happiness,” which Aristotle defines as a life of unimpeded virtuous activity. Aristotle holds that the forms of association that arise from material needs are prepolitical. Individual rights and private property could allow individuals to associate and disassociate freely by means of persuasion and trade, according to their own determination of their interests.

2.3.2.4 Freedom from Slavery and War

For Aristotle, a free man is not merely any man who lives in a free society. A free man possesses certain traits of character that allow him to govern himself responsibly and attain happiness. Aristotle ultimately accepted the Socratic principle that all men desire happiness, education merely compels us to do what we really want. It frees us from our own ignorance, folly, and irrationality and frees us for our own self actualization. Aristotle thinks that freedom from the internal compulsion of the passions is more important than freedom from the external compulsion of force and that force can quell the passions and establish virtue’s empire over them, Aristotle believes as much as Rousseau that we can be forced to be free. War and empire are great enemies of liberty, so isolationists and peace lovers will be gratified. The good life requires peace and leisure. War is not an end in itself but merely a means to ensure peace. Class distinctions cannot be eliminated; therefore, they have to be recognized and respected, their disadvantages meliorated and their advantages harnessed for the common good. (Roderick T. Long, page: 30-40)
2.3.2.5 Moral Responsibilities

Kant, a soft determinist, said that in order to make a moral decision we must have freedom. Kant believed that the ability to make moral decisions lay within the existence of freedom; stating that if we are not free to make our own decisions those decisions could not be blamed for an action if they could have acted differently.

If we have free will we must have the ability to make a decision that is unhindered; Kant believed that we must have free will if we are to be help morally responsible for our actions, if God did not give us free will then our decisions cannot be considered immoral or moral as we would have had to act in the way we did. Thus we cannot be held responsible; a good moral action cannot be praised as you had no other option, whilst an immoral action cannot be punished as once again there was no free choice.

Locke also believed that morality and the ability to make moral decisions developed throughout your lives. Locke believed that freedom is not required in order to make a moral decision it is the determined experiences you live through that create your morality and result in you making immoral or moral decision. (Locke, 1975)

Another soft determinist was David Hume who believed in a limited form of free will, he ultimately believed that nature was in control of human destiny. That freedom was also a subject-based, meaning that you are free to make a moral decision and free to follow through with that action. He went on to argue that determined events create human free will and that each individual is free to response in their own way to those determined events; the morality of the choice the person makes is down to them.