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Russian’s literature is one of the interesting topics to talk about. It has its own uniqueness that made it different from European literature. Russia has several famous authors whose works have always been studied by the scholars, Anton Chekhov’s works were the example. Chekhov wrote many works including drama and short stories. His famous short story is “Ward No. 6”, the object that the writer chose as the object of this thesis. “Ward No. 6” is worth to examine because it depicts the development of psychiatry in Russia and how the discourse on madness works during the story.

“Ward No. 6” is analyzed through two problem formulations in this research. The first is how Chekhov arranged the plot, and the second one is how madness and its power relation are revealed through the plot. The aim of this study to show that madness was unstable term and madness was used as a discourse in the psychiatry and there was a set of power relation within it.

The method of this study is a library research. Some steps applied in this study are collecting the data, gaining the data necessary for the problem formulations and reading and revealing madness and its power relation through the plot. As a knife to observe the object of the study, the writer of this research used post-structuralism approach. Post-structuralism itself is an approach that rejects the objectivity of truth in the work of literature. Post-structuralist believed that there many truths and that structures in the work of literature must become unstable or decentered.

Through the analysis of plot, the way Chekhov described the madman is revealed. The next step of the analysis, the writer of this research found out that there was a discourse on madness which was showed by the conflict between Ragin and Gromov. Besides the discourse on madness, the writer of this research also found the examination and normalizing judgment during discourse on how madness worked. The examination and normalizing judgment can be found from Gromov’s and Ragin’s case. The function of this disciplining method is to make society keep in order and to make the disciplinary objects become obedient. But the result, Ragin as the main character did not follow the punishment. He decided to end his life to liberate himself from institution that kept him as mental ill patient.
ABSTRAK


“Ward No. 6” akan dikaji melalui dua perumusan masalah. Yang pertama adalah bagaimana Chekhov menyusun alur cerita dan yang kedua adalah bagaimana kegilaan dan relasi kekuasaan terungkap melalui plot. Tujuan dari penelitian ini adalah untuk membuktikan bahwa kegilaan itu sendiri adalah definisi yang berubah-ubah dan ada sebuah relasi kekuasaan yang terjadi di dalamnya.


CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

A. Background of The Study

Russia is a country which is known by its history of communism. This country is different from other European countries. Located between Europe and Asia, this country has mix culture of West and East. West’s rationality mixed with East’s spirituality made Russia almost secluded from Europe. Russia is left behind among its neighbors. Russia as a country placed in the border of West and East is special region because she is in the middle of two cultures. Although Russia consisted of European people, she has different culture from Europe.

The seclusion of Russia finally ended when Peter the Great started to modernize the country and saw Europe as a teacher. Peter itself known as “modernizer” or “westernizer”. He is regarded as a shadow in the development of Russia. In 1846 the Russian historian, Nikolai Pogodin wrote as taken in *Gale Encyclopedia of Russian History*,

The Russia of today, that is to say, European Russia, diplomatic, political, military, commercial, industrial, scholastic, literary—is the creation of Peter the Great. Everywhere we look, we encounter this colossal figure, who casts a long shadow over our entire past (Millar, ed, 2003: 1168)

The result of Peter’s modernization made Russia develop and learn from Europe. Russia became a good learner. She took everything from Europe, especially European’s thoughts. Starting from learnt the philosophy, art, and literature, Russia developed her own characteristics in most of the works on philosophy, literature and art.
Due to the modernization of Tsar, Russian learnt a lot from the West, literature was one of them. Many Russian writers were avid readers of Western Literature. They learnt a lot from it, but they were against it. They had a fear that their literature was too imitative, so they tried to make a different style. It can be seen from Catriona Kelly in *Russian Literature: A Very Short Introduction*.

During the eighteenth century, Russians had been haunted by fears that their literature was too imitative, too dominated by translations. Such fears were replaced during the nineteenth century by pride in native achievements, but receptivity to French, English, German, Spanish, and Italian literature continued. Even writers who had only a poor knowledge of Western languages absorbed foreign material avidly. Dostoevsky’s novels were as indebted to Dickens as they were to Gogol. (Kelly, 2001: 5)

Although Russians and Western people write in the same style, realism for example, Russian literature has its own style. They cannot simply reject the influence that comes from the Asia. If Western is well known by its rationality, Russian literature is known by its contents that tell lots about soul, life, individual, and spirit. Russian literature mostly tells about individuality versus individuality or individuality versus the sphere surrounds them.

Anton Chekhov, a dramatist and an author, is included in the three great Russian authors. Along with Leo Tolstoy and Maxim Gorky, Chekhov pioneered the Russian literature. Chekhov is well known by his dramas, such as “The Sea Gull” and “The Cherry Orchard”. Not only his dramas but also Chekhov’s short stories are famous and well-acclaimed by the scholars and the readers.

Chekhov lived in the end of 19th century. He saw the development of Russia. His view on the development was documented in his works. Most of his
works told about how the developments made results in the characteristics of the Russian. Before he turned to be an author, Chekhov studied medicine. The background on his discipline that he learnt before could be seen in most of his works. In the “Ward No. 6”, one of Chekhov’s amazing short stories that the writer chose as the object of the study, he told about the psychiatry in the end of 19th century. The characters in the story dealt with psychiatry and how the psychiatry used to make the society keep in order of the standard of normality.

Chekhov was good at writing the suppression of the State toward Russian people. He was a good photographer of life and a good writer also. Virginia Woolf in her essay “The Russian Point of View” stated how Chekhov can make good stories.

Tchekhov, too, is aware of the evils and injustices of the social state; the condition of the peasants appeals him the reformer’s zeal is not his—that is not the signal for us to stop. The mind interests him enormously; he is a most subtle and delicate analyst of human relations. But again, no; the end is not there. Is that he is primarily interested not in the soul’s relation with other souls, but with the soul’s relation to health—with the soul’s relation to goodness? These stories are always showing us some affectation, pose, insincerity. (Woolf, 1953: 181)

Chekhov, as a mentioned before, was a good photographer. He caught the social condition of Russians and he wrote it in his works. He wrote several events that happened in the end of 19th century, such as an emerging of the intellectual people in Russia. “Ward no. 6” pictured the resurrection of the intellectual people in Russia. The development of the intellectual people made Russia facing the way to revolution. Communism, anarchism, and all the left thoughts were flooding the intellectual sphere in Russia. Russian leftist tried to throw Tsar, ruler known by its absolutism and suppressive acts toward the people. This situation made the government tried to silence the assault from the intellectual movement. One of the
ways to maintain this attack to the government was to send the critical people, the leftist, who has different opinion with the Tsar to the asylum. In the “Ward no. 6” Chekhov showed the repression from society in viewing the leftist people vividly.

“Ward no. 6” also had irony as tool to make this short story worth to examine. Andrey Yefimitch Ragin, the main character depicted the irony. As a doctor, he examined his patients and sent a patient to the Ward no. 6, a building in the hospital that was used to treat the mad. But in the end, he became “mad”. He was put to the ward only because he talked and admired the characteristics of Ivan Dmitritch Gromov, a patient who suffered from persecution mania. This intimate doctor-patients relationship as the relationship between mad and normal, were forbidden in the society.

Power relation is one of the issues in this work in Chekhov’s “Ward no. 6”. Taking place in one district in Russia, Chekhov’s shows how society in the story playing great role to send the chosen people to go to Ward no. 6. He draws the hierarchy in the society, not explicitly but clearly. The system which were ruling and choosing the people, selected the mad due to the observation in society. How the power ruled the society can be seen from the various characters. Ivan Dmitriv Gromov for example, although he was a smart and intelligent man, he could not resist the system because he was powerless. He did not have the power to reject Ragin’s decision that put him into the ward. Ragin, the doctor who had the power to put people into the ward and as a representative of the system, later became powerless beneath the system.
To see how power invested in the story, the writer chooses Michel Foucault’s theories. As a historian and thinker, Foucault’s theories are appropriate to see how the idea of madness taking controls the story. In the 1955 until several years later, Foucault studied madness from medical works from the document that was written 16th century until 20th century in the library in Sweden. He studied the works, and later he published *FolieetDeraison (Madness and Civilization)* as result of his research. He did not make a new statement about madness or insanity like the psychologists, but he explained the history of madness, from 15th century until 19th century from the archeology. He was a historian, so his works told many things about how madness became knowledge to power.

The mixture of Chekhov’s work with Foucault’s theories made the writer of this research wanted to show that madness it is an unstable term. It always changed from one time to time. It depended on the society who defined it. With the theories from Foucault, power relation, the writer of this research will show how madness and its power relation worked as seen in the plot of this story. Hopefully, the writer’s reading on this case can give a new perspective to the reader.

B. Problem Formulation

To make the analysis well organized two problems are formulated into following question.

1. How is the plot arranged by Chekhov in “Ward No. 6”?

2. How are madness and its power relations revealed through the plot?
C. Objectives of the Study

Through this research, the writer will answer the questions in the problem formulations. Since the problem formulation consists of two questions, therefore the objectives of study are divided into two parts also.

First, the writer tried to find out the formula of the plot presented by Anton Chekhov in “Ward No. 6”. It is important to analyze the importance of the intrinsic element because the research dealt with the events of the story so that it will help the writer to discover the specific idea that wants to be revealed by Chekhov. Second, the writer tried to find out the issues revealed in the short story, the events, and the actions. The writer tried to find the representation of madness and its power relations from the issues. Hopefully, these objectives can encourage and also can be used as references for other students who are interested in doing further researches. When, the first and second objectives have been reached, the results will help the writer to find out the correlation between the madness as knowledge and the investment of power and how the result of the investment of power gives contribution to the system run in the society.
D. Definition of Terms

1. Madness

According to Foucault madness is an unstable term that can change time to time depended on which society which defined it. Garry Guting in the *Foucault: A Very Short Introduction*, stated madness as follows.

On Foucault’s view, madness as a general phenomenon should be seen as a creditable challenge to normality, even though there are insane horrors to which normality would be a welcome relief (Gutting, 2005: 74)

According from quotation above, madness is challenge to normality which is defined by society. Foucault clearly draws the changing of madness definitions from time to time. Madness is defined first then the standard of normality will be defined.

2. Power Relation

In an interviewed entitled ‘Critical theory/intellectual theory’ Foucault states:

I m not reffering to Power with a capital P, dominating and imposing its rationality upon the totality of the social body. In fact there are power relations. There are multiple; they have different forms, they can be play in family relations, or within institutions, or an administrations. (Kritzman, ed., 1988: 20)

From quotation above, Foucault portrays that poweris a major force in all relations within society. It can play within family relations, institutions, or administrations. He did not say that power is simply as a set of relations between the oppresed and and the oppressors but he said that power is a systems of relations spread throughout society.
CHAPTER II

THEORETICAL REVIEW

This chapter is divided into three parts. The first is the review on some studies conducted on the works of Anton Chekhov, and the position of the present study among those critical writings. The second part is the review on related theories. It is the description of theories used as the knife to surge the works. The last part is the theoretical framework. It is the explanation of the contribution of the theories reviewed in solving the problems formulated in this study.

A. Review of Related Studies

There were few studies related to “Ward No. 6”. It happened because Chekhov was well-known by his plays, not his short stories. The writer of this research only found few criticisms toward the short story. There are three criticisms that the writer choose in this part.

The first came from Edmund Wilson. He studied the way Anton Chekhov write story. Wilson saw the development of Chekhov’s style in writing the story. Starting from satirical jokes, Chekhov went on to master the art of ironic anecdote. It can be seen from the quotation below.

If we follow his line of development, we see that, beginning with satirical jokes, Chekhov goes on to master the art of the ironic anecdote, so often pathetic or tragic (it would hardly, one would think, be possible to complain of a good many of these that one did not understand the point); these, in turn, begin to expand into something more rounded-out (the dense but concise study of character and situation) and eventually — in what Mr. Hingley calls Chekhov’s Tolstoyan period ("A Nervous Breakdown," for example) — take on a new moral interest or attain, as in his "clinical" one ("The Black Monk"), a new psychological depth. These studies become more comprehensive — "The Steppe," "A Dreary Story," "Ward No 6" —
in such a way as to cover a whole life *en raccourci* or an experience in fuller detail. Such pieces are not short stories but what Henry James called *nouvelles*. — Edmund Wilson, *A Window on Russia* (Farrar, Straus & Giroux, 1952)

http://mockingbird.creighton.edu/NCW/

Edmund stated that “Ward No. 6” is Chekhov’s story which contained the fuller detail of the character’s experience. In “Ward No. 6”, Chekhov told the situation in the ward which all inhabitants were insane. He started to tell the condition of the ward so the reader could get the details of the gloomy situation there. He turned to tell the characters. He gave explanation about the character, take for example, Ivan Dmitrievich Gromov, who went mad because several occasion in his life.

Another study which dealt with character came from Mohammad Asror, a writer and blogger for the essays on literature. In his essay “Membincang Palata No. 6 Anton Chekov” (trans. “Discussing Anton Chekhov’s Palata No. 6), Asror focused on Andrey Yefimitich Ragin’s characteristics, a tragic hero in the story. It can be seen from the quotation below.


Andrey Yefimitich is an educated doctor who likes philosophies of life. Unfortunately, he can’t be firm and tends to be defeated and coward. As a powerful person he could change the environment in the hospital but he ignores the disorganized things that happen in the hospital. He always plays safe and won’t get wrong perception from people surround him.

According to Asror, Ragin as a doctor did not have strength to change the bad environment in the hospital. He was powerless. Although he was a doctor who
could order all the things that he wanted, he did not do that. He was aware that people surround him will fought against him if he make change in the hospital.

The last criticism was taken from Cresta McGowan, a high school English teacher and blogger on works of literature. McGowan’s criticism discussed the work from plot, just like the writer of this research would do. In her essay, “Wandering through Ward No. 6: A Psychological Plot from Anton Chekov”. McGowan focused on the conflicts between Ivan Dmitriich Gromov and Andrey Yefimitch Ragin which paints the picture of what happens to those who are trapped in a society of which they don't feel the belong. According to McGowan, Chekov highlighted two major conflicts within Ward No. 6 through the use of the two main characters: internal conflict in the form of man vs. himself and external conflict shown through man vs. society. Both Gromov and Ragin are painted as misfits unable to live real and productive lives, inside and outside of the facility (McGowan, 2010: http://www.suite101.com/content/wandering-through-ward-no-6-a19437).

Having the reviews from Wilson, Asror, and McGowan, the writer of this research needs to write this research more deeply. Although McGowan’s study was same with this study, which is based on plot, but the theme was different. The writer thought that those comments above are superficial and they did not explain more about what the madness is. In this research, the writer of this research will study madness and its power relation, the theme that has never been studied before.

B. Review of Related Theories
1. Theory on Plot

Abrams in *A Glossary of Literary Terms* defines plot as “The plot (which Aristotle termed in mythos) in a dramatic or narrative work constituted by its events and actions, as these are rendered and ordered toward achieving particular artistic and emotional effects” (1999: 224). In order words, the plot of a story is its entire sequence of events. The events may include not only physical occurrence, like a speech or action, but also the character’s change of attitude, a flash of insight, a decision – anything that alters the course of affairs.

According to Robert Stanton in *Introduction of Fiction*, “The plot is the backbone of a story (1965: 15). The readers could not hope to understand the story further if they did not know how the events in the story linked together because the plot links causes-and-effect. A plot aroused expectations in the readers about the future courses of events and actions and how the characters will respond to them.

Many, but far from all, plots dealt with conflict. According to Robert Stanton, conflict is divided into two; internal conflict and external conflict. Internal conflicts are conflicts between two desires within a character. External conflicts are conflicts which happen between character and everything which surrounds him. It can be conflicts between characters or a character and his environment. About conflict, Abrams stated.

Many, but far from all, plot deals with conflict; Thornton Wilders’s play *Our Town* (1938), for example, does not. In addition to the conflict between individuals, there may be the conflict of a protagonist against fate,
or against circumstances that stand between him and a goal he has set himself; and in some works (as in Henry James’ Portrait of a Lady) the chief conflict is between opposing desires or values in the protagonist’s blown temperament (Abrams, 1999: 225)

Basically, a plot had functions to give and to show the structure of the unified and completed dramatic actions. According to Roberts and Jacobs in *Fiction: An Introduction to Reading and Writing Second Edition* (1989), the order of a unified plot consists Exposition, Complication, Crisis, Climax and Resolution. The structure of the plot will be shed below.

a. Exposition

Exposition, a section that Aristotle called beginning, is the first thing that is necessary for the readers in reading a story to understand the situation in the beginning. According to Edgar V. Roberts and Henry Jacobs in *An Introduction To Reading and Writing*, “Exposition is laying out, the putting forth, of the main materials in the work: the main characters, their background, characterization, basic assumptions about life, goal, limitation, and potential (1989: 101). In the beginning, the author will introduce several characters in the story. The beginning also initiates the main action in a way which makes us look forward to something more.

b. Complication

The exposition then moves to the complication or rising action. Roberts and Jacobs state that:
The complication marks the onset of the major conflict in the story--- the onset of the plot. The participants are the protagonist and the antagonist, together with whatever ideas and values they represent, such as good and evil, individualism and collectivization, childhood and age, love and hate, intelligence and stupidity, knowledge and ignorance, freedom and slavery, desire and resistance, and the like (1989: 101).

So, in the complication the readers will get the information about the main conflict in the story. After the exposition, this section usually provides the rising of the problems and information of some difficulties faced by the characters.

c. Crisis

Roberts and Jacobs stated that the crisis is the turning point, the separation between what has gone before and what will come after. In practice, the crisis is usually a decision or action undertaken to resolve the conflict (Roberts and Jacobs, 1989: 101). In crisis, the reader will get the point what action will be taken from the character to solve the conflicts that happened in the complication.

d. Climax

Climax is the high point in the action or the point of great expectancy and the cumulative effect of the previous events. In this part, conflicts and the following tension are brought to the fullest level. Climax is the point that is inevitable and no return, where all the rest of the action becomes firmly set (Roberts and Jacobs, 1989: 101).

Furthermore, the problems or the conflicts reach the top and make the highest point of complexity and emotional intensity in the action.
The climax of a story is the meeting point of its lines of force and determines how their opposition will be resolved – “resolved” rather than “decided” because although one force may vanquish the other, more often as in real life, the outcome is a complex equilibrium in which neither side completely triumphs or completely loses (Stanton, 1965: 16-17).

The climax depicts the leading character’s greatest struggle in the story’s arc of action to effect a reversal of fortune, resolving for good or ill the central conflict triggered by the inciting incident. The climax is the final and usually most intense showdown with all the forces of antagonism that have impeded the leading character’s journey to achieve her objective. It is the highest point of conflict in the story’s arc of action, as well as the final, and most affecting, reversal of fortune the leading character undergoes.

e. **Denouement**

Denouement or resolution is a part of dramatic story that occurs after the climax and continuous to the story’s end. Abrams stated that denouement (French for “unknotting”) the action or intrigue ends in success of failure for the protagonist, the conflicts are settled, the mystery is solved, or the misunderstanding cleared away (Abram, 1999: 227). The key functions of resolution are to show the effects of the climax on the characters and their world.

Denouement will lead the story to an end. The ending of plot, generally, is divided into two kinds, and open end and close end. An open end is an end that gives another or other possibility(s) for the ending of a story. A close end means that is the end of the story and there will be no another or possibly(s) for an ending of story.

2. **Theory on Madness**
Foucault is often treated as a philosopher, a cultural critic, or a social theorist but in fact almost all of his books mainly talked about history. Although some critics said that he was a structuralist based on his method in several of his books, he refused it. He introduced his method as ‘Archeology’. In *Foucault: A very short Introduction*, Gary Gutting said “Nonetheless, he saw his historical work as quite different from standard work in history of ideas and characterized it in distinctive terms, first the ‘archeology’ of though and later as ‘genealogy’” (2005: 32). For many years Foucault had worked with collecting many texts and his objects were madness, knowledge, discipline and sexuality. He dealt with many texts but he did not try to interpret it to recover its deeper meaning like hermeneutics. He treated texts not as documents, but in the manner of an archeologist, as monuments.

In *Madness and Civilization* (1965), Foucault as an archeologist defined madness as an unstable terms that changeable from time to time. In this book, Foucault observed that madness is constructed by society and its institution. His work *Madness and Civilization* (1965) was appearing at a time when alternative psychiatric movement in Britain and America, which tried to challenge the medication of mental illness, was beginning to develop. Rather than redefining madness like many psychiatrists at that time, Foucault traced the way that madness has been constructed in different forms and judged in different ways throughout history. He saw madness as being constructed at a particular point in history; madness is constituted to ring fence reason or sanity and to create clear
distinctions between madness and sanity. Madness is also constructed as part of wider process of the development of modernity.

Let’s take a look of Foucault brief explanation of madness during Renaissance and Classical Ages which stated as follow:

In the Renaissance, madness was present everywhere and mingled with every experience by its images or its dangers. During the classical period, madness was sown, but on the other side of bars; if present it was at a distance, under the eyes of a reason that promise itself by too close resemblance. Madness had become to look at: no longer a monster inside oneself but an animal with strange mechanism, a bestially from which man had long since been suppressed. (Foucault, 1965: 70)

Foucault tried to show that in the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, madness was seen as integrally human phenomenon. Madness was opposed to reason, but alternative mode of human existence, not a simple rejection of it. Madness could attract people but it did not fascinate them. In a general way, madness was not linked to the world and its subterranean forms, but rather to man, to his weaknesses, dreams, and illusions In the 17th century or Classical Age, madness was seen merely the negation of the essential human attribute of reason. Rather than madness being considered as an illness as it now is, it was seen as manifestation of animality. It was regarded as unreason, a plunge into an animality that had no human significance. On the Classical view, the animality of the mad was expressed in their domination by passions, a domination that led them to delirium in which they mistook the unreal for real.

It was in the nineteenth century, psychiatry began took part in madness. The modern therapeutic view of madness is a sharp break with the Classical view,
what Foucault later calls a change in episteme or discursive formation. The mad were returned to the human community, no longer animals beyond the human pale. But, within that community, the mad were now moral offenders (violators of specific social norms), who should felt guilt at their condition. Correspondingly, the characteristic modern mode of treating the mad not only isolated them but subjects them to a moralizing therapy. Still, this move from cudostial confinement of the Classical Age to the modern therapeutic asylum continues to deny madness as a humanly significant challenge.

Discussing about madness is also discussing about asylum, doctor and patient, discourse, and several terms for the mad. The writer of this research found two things which appropriate with this study. They were the development of house of confinements into asylum as a place for the mad had to be “normalize” and doctor-patients relationship which also important in seeing how madness defined from this relationship. The explanation about asylum and doctor-patient relationship will be shed bellow.

a. From House of Confinements to Asylum

Foucault discusses madness in *Madness and Civilization* starts from twentieth until modern era. He began his discussion about madness start from the emerging of houses of leper in 12th century when Europe haunted by infectious disease leprosy. To overcome the leprosy, leper houses were built in Europe to prevent leprosy from spreading to the rest of the population. In England and Scotland alone, 220 leper houses were built during twelfth century. But in the
sixteenth century leprosy was less widespread in Europe. This sudden disappearance, which was doubtless not the long sought effect of obscure medical practices, but the spontaneous result of segregation and also the consequence, after the Crusade, of the break with the Eastern sources of infection. Leper houses became empty.

By the seventeenth century, hospitals which built to house of lepers were taken over to be used as house of confinements for those who were categorized as ‘socially useless’; this included the idle, the poor, those who had scandalized their families, together with those behavior was considered to be in any way abnormal. As Foucault stated in the *Madness in Civilization* “Poor, vagabonds, criminals, and ‘deranged minds’ would take the part by the leper, and we shall see what salvation was expected from this exclusion, for them and for those who exclude them as well (Foucault, 1965: 7). According to this fact, madman was put in the house of Confinements along within the criminals and it will lead to the conclusion that hospitals for the insane did not exist yet.

At the end of eighteenth century, madness is exposed to the clearer light of order as curable. It was Pinel and Tuke who were known by their heroic action to the mad. When French Revolution happened, there was also revolution in the house of confinements; the mad were freed by Pinel and Tuke from the injustice treatment toward the mad because they were confined among the criminals. Pinel and Tuke also built an asylum, place for the mad only.

The legends of Pinel and Tuke transmit mythical values which nineteenth-century psychiatry would accept as obvious in nature. But beneath the
myths themselves there was an operation, which silently organized the world of the asylum, the methods of cure, and at the same time the concrete experience of madness. (Foucault, 1965: 243)

It was Pinel and Tuke who were known by their works: liberation of the insane, abolition of constraint, and constitution of human milieu. But the facts were different. Tuke created an asylum where he substituted for the free terror of madness the stiffing anguish of responsibility; fear no longer reigned on the other side of the prison gates, it now raged under the seals of conscience. Tuke thought that madmen must be disciplinized like children. The mad must be taught religion, morality, and work. While in Pinel’s hands, the asylum became as an instrument of moral uniformity and of social denunciation. Pinel also introduced the operation in which to affect moral syntheses, assuring an ethical continuity between the world of madness and the world of reason, but by practicing a social segregation that would guarantee bourgeois morality a universality of fact and permit it to be imposed as a law upon all forms of insanity. Now in the Pinel hand’s madness belonged to social failure that rose from the lower depths of society.

Asylums look different from the house of confinement; they are smaller and designed to have the appearance of private dwellings. They are placed in the countryside partly as protection against contagious disease but also to signify freedom and health. Gradually asylums acquire their own mode of discipline. They have watchman who always keep an eye upon the mad and give punishment the violation. Surveillance and punishment should be done many times until they are internalized by the mad. The principle of fear, which is rarely decrease by
insanity is considered as of great importance in the management of the patients (Foucault, 1965: 247).

After the asylum was built, doctor is needed. Doctor was present in the house of confinements, but he is more required in the asylum. As stated before, asylum is an institution which injects morality to the patients so they can be normal. In the asylum, the rule is never so much by medical as by moral authority. Doctor is needed and has an authority not because they have knowledge to cure but because they represent moral demands of society.

The doctor’s authority was much greater than that of the lawyers, police, or asylum keepers because they possessed the ability to “cure” – the truth about their patients was in their hands. This doctor/patient relationship was unsymmetrical. From the patients’ point of view the doctor became the figure who may or may not, perform “magical” cures across a distance which permits no true exchange, and in which ‘the authority which he has by borrowed from order, morality, and the family now seems to derive from himself.

3. Theory on Power Relations

Power is often conceptualized as the capacity of powerful agents to realize their will of powerless people, and the ability to force them to do things which they do not wish to do. Power is also often seen as a possession-something which held onto by those in power and which those who are powerless try to wrest from their control. Foucault doesn’t agree with this view. He sees power is something which is performed, something more like strategy than a possession. Power
should be seen as a verb rather than noun, something that does something, rather than something which is or which can be held onto. Foucault puts in the following way in *Power/Knowledge*:

Power must by analyze as something which circulates, or rather as something which only function in the forms of a chain. It is never localized here or there, never in anybody’s hands, never appropriated as commodity or piece of wealth. Power is exercised through a net-like organization. And not only do individuals circulate between its threads; they are always in the position of simultaneously undergoing and exercising this power. They are not only its inert or consenting target; they are always also the elements of circulation. In other words, individuals are the vehicles of power, not its points of application. (1980: 98)

There are several important points to note here: first, power is conceptualized as chain or as a net, which is a system of relations spread throughout the society, rather than simply as a set of relations between the oppressed and the oppressor. And second, individuals not be seen as simply as the recipients of power, but as the ‘place’ where power is enacted and the place where it is resisted. Foucault’s theorizing of power forces us to re-conceptualize not only power itself but also the role that individuals play in power relation – whether they are simply subjected to oppression or whether they actively play a role in the form of their relations with others and with institutions.

Foucault tended to see power less as something which is possessed but rather as a strategy, something which someone does or performs in a particular context. He argued that power is a set of relations which are dispersed throughout society rather than being located within particular institution such as the State or Government. Power operated at the micro levels of social relations, power can be
play in family relations, within institution, or an administration. Power is not simply repressive but it is productive.

One of mechanism which power can be exercised is discipline. Discipline regulates the behavior of individuals in the social body. This is done by regulating the organization of space, of time, and people’s activity and behavior. What is used in the discipline is the systematical scheme to invest power which leads to obedience. This discipline is rather more invisible, smoother and more difficult to be realized by the people. Because, power uses the norms and laws that are abstract, yet have an ability to affect people. Power with discipline does not need to show the condemned body, all it does is enlarging the working area of the norms and laws. Discipline makes the body docile for docile body is easier to be transformed into any kind of body for the sake’s of power (Foucault, 1979: 15-23).

From the explanation above, it can be concluded that discipline is a new paradigm of spreading power. In *Discipline and Punish* (1979), Foucault theorized many ways to do the discipline, but the writer of this research only chose two methods. The methods applied in this research are examination and normalizing judgment. Shortly, examination is a process of gathering information from the disciplinary object. Normalizing judgment is the process of correcting the abnormal.

**a. Theory of Examination**
Examination is the mechanism that always presents in the disciplinary system and it is an essential practice to exercise power. It is firstly found in the mechanism in the hospital. Below is a quotation about examination from Foucault’s *Discipline and Punish*:

…”it is a normalizing gaze, a surveillance that makes it possible to qualify, to classify, and to punish. It establishes over individuals a visibility through which one differentiates them and judges them. That is why, in all the mechanism of discipline, the examination is highly ritualized. In it are combined the ceremony of power and the form of experiment, the deployment of force and establishment of truth… (Foucault: 1979: 184)

From the quotation above, it can be concluded that the examination is the fundamental action to establish truth (discourse) on the object of power, especially to those whom power is exercised on. The word “surveillance” is one important thing in the examination. Surveillance provides any information needed by the state apparatus to build the discourse. Through surveillance, power has the access to the object of power. The discipline begins from the information given from “surveillance”. When the information is enough, the process of normalizing started. The information becomes the basic of normalizing judgment toward the object. Then, the discourse of normal-abnormal will be build up. In this point, power is then invested into the body of the object because as the normalizing judgment penetrates the body, the power follows it. After the normalizing judgment, the body that is now docile (disciplined) is completely under the influence of power.

b. Theory on Normalizing Judgment
After examination, the next step is normalizing judgment. If the examination is action of ‘establishment of truth’, then normalizing judgment is the method to force this truth. “…at the heart of all disciplinary systems function a small penal mechanism…” (Foucault: 1979: 177) writes Foucault. That means the discourse of truth created by the application of the examination is forced to the disciplinary objects using a system of punishment. The quotation below will explain the use of this punishment:

…the art of punishing, in the regime of disciplinary power, is aimed neither at expiation, nor even precisely at repression…the perpetual penalty that traverses all points and supervises every instant in the disciplinary institutions compares, differentiates, hierarchies, homogenizes, excludes. In short, it normalizes (Foucault: 1979: 182-183).

In this process of normalizing judgment, punishment is essential. The aim is more than to hurt or to warn people. It has larger goals. Punishment in this sense is called ‘infra-penalty’ or small penalty (Foucault: 1979: 178). Punishment is not always in the shape of violence. It is sometimes takes shape of humiliation, warning, and accusation. The goals of this punishment are to make the punished knows that the do are not normal. The punished are forced to compare and differentiate their behaviors with the behaviors of those who are considered ‘good’. They are forced to accept these norms called normality. Then, they are forced to follow that. In other words, the punishment tries to homogenize (to make all people follow the same norms) the behaviors of the people.

By judgment that normalizes, a certain system will be kept alive in the society because everybody is forced to follow the system as the system runs
disciplinary system. Power relation works to maintain their existence through this normalizing judgment. It keeps the structures in the society the same from time to time. Therefore, the state can only survive only by practicing and maintaining this system because state needs docility. Docility needs standardization for normal and abnormal. Those who are considered as abnormal, the disciplinary system will run roughly. They will face some punishment. The punishment takes form of a system that is named by Foucault as ‘infra-penalty’ system. The pre-modifier ‘infra’ indicates its area. The area here means the area under its control. Infra-penalty system works in a partitioned area and each area has different kinds of methods of punishment. For example, the punishment in school will be different from the punishment of doing something ‘wrong’ in a hospital. Foucault, in his book, write in short that “…in a disciplinary regime punishment involves a double-juridico reference.” (Foucault, 1979: 179). That means, the punishment given is not only ignited by the fault of doing the command but also the inability to achieve the standard given.

The aim of normalizing judgment is to keep the structures in the society the same from one time to time. The punished people are forced to accept the standard of the normality. For the punished who cannot follow the standard after he receives normalizing judgment, Foucault called them as the recidivists. In the Discipline and Punish, Foucault saw that in the prison there are two effects that will affect the punished; they will became ‘normal’ and could return to the society, or they became recidivists. Foucault explained further about recidivists as follows.
The feeling of the injustice that a prisoner has is one of the causes that may make his character untamable. When he sees himself exposed in this way to suffering, which the law has neither ordered nor envisaged, he becomes habitually angry against everything around him; he sees every agent of authority as an executioner; he no longer thinks that he was guilty; he accuses justice itself” (Bigot Preameneu) (Foucault, 1979: 266).

So, rather than following the norm, recidivists tend to accuse justice and truth that were forced during normalizing judgment.

C. Theoretical Framework

This part explains the contribution of each theory presented to solve the problem formulations. Mainly there are three mains groups of theory used in this research. The first is theory of plot. The second is theory of madness. The third one is theory of power relations.

Firstly, in order to find out how Anton Chekhov arranged the plot of “Ward no. 6”, the theory of plot is used in this research. At first, the analysis of plot begins with finding the plot of the story using the regular formula of plot which consisted of exposition, complication, crisis, climax, and resolution. In the first analysis, the writer of this research also examines the conflict between characters in the story.

Secondly, in order to discover the representation of Madness and Its power Relation in “Ward No. 6”, the theory of madness and theory of power relation are applied in this research. With theory of plot, the writer of this research will see how the discourse on madness narratively builds. Through conflict in the plot, the writer of this research will see the discourses on madness which are brought by the character during the development of the story. Theory from Foucault is used
because this theory related with how the discourse was built for certain of time. Theory on power relation will see who the agents to develop discourse on madness are.

Finally, at the end of the analysis, it will lead us to the answers of the problems that were formulated previously. It can be concluded that plot has great contribution in representing madness and its power relations which is presented by the author through the short story.
CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

A. Object of the Study

The object of this research is a short story entitled “Ward No. 6” taken from the book *Ward.6 and Other Stories*. Anton Chekhov, a Russian writer who is well-known of his plays is the writer of this short story. Chekhov is regarded as a great Russian dramatist. Many of his plays were playing at the theaters around the world. He wrote several dramas such as *The Seagull*, *The Cherry Orchard*, and *Three Sisters* and many short stories, such as “Ward no. 6”, “The Lady with the Dog”, and “The Bishop”.

The edition of *Ward no.6 and the Other Stories* used in this research is the 2003 edition by Barnes and Nobles Classics. The translator of this edition is Constance Garnett and edited with an Introduction and Notes by David Plante. David Plante is a Professor of Writing at Colombia University. He is the author of many novels, including *The Ghost of Henry James*, *The Family* (nominated for The National Book Award), and *The Woods*.

“Ward No.6” had been filmed by in 2009 under title “Palata No. 6”. It was directed by Karen Shakhnazarov and was adapted from the short story for the screen by Shakhnazarov and AleksandrBorodianskii. “Ward No. 6” sits in-between an adaptation into a contemporary context and a costume drama, which professes fidelity to the original. The contemporerarity of *Ward No. 6* is provided by the present-day monastery or asylum in which the film is set, while the plot from Chekhov’s story is meticulously followed.
“Ward No. 6” within its 55 pages that are divided into 14 chapters is a short story which tells about the life of the inhabitants of Ward No. 6. This story is quite short to tell the complexity of the condition in the hospital especially in the asylum. The main character of this story is Andrey Yefimitch Ragin, a doctor in the Ward that was secluded from other wards in the hospital of small town in Russia. Ragin saw the development of how madness can be the knowledge to power to maintain the society. Through madness, the society can define what is normal and what is abnormal. As a doctor, Ragin had a job to examine his patients. Because he had knowledge of medical science and psychiatry, he gained the power then he became the agent to discipline his patients. During his term of service as a doctor, he had conflicts with Gromov, a patient with mental illness. This conflict led to another conflict. Ragin considered Gromov as interesting young man, but this conception was not accepted by other people in the hospital. In the end, Ragin was put in the Ward No. 6 along with other mental ill patients.

From this short story, the writer of this research had an opinion that discourse on madness can be the tool to invest power through every individual. Chekhov gives the proof on how discourse on madness play in the hospital vividly.
B. Approach of the Study

To understand Chekhov’s “Ward No. 6” better, the writer used Post-structuralism as an approach of this study. This approach used to help the writer of this research to give perspective on how to analyze the object of the study.

Post-structuralism offers a study of how knowledge is produced and a critique to structuralist’s claims to "scientific objectivity" and "universality”. In *Beginning Theory* (1995), Peter Barry made comparison between structuralism and post-structuralism. On page 60-61, Barry stated that structuralism derives from linguistic, a discipline which has always been inherently confident about the possibility of establishing objective knowledge. Structuralism believes in method, and reason as being able to establish reliable truth. By contrast, post-structuralism derives from philosophy, which has always to emphasize the difficulty of achieving secure knowledge about things (Barry, 1995: 61). From this quotation, it can be seen that post-structuralist rejects the notion of reliable truth. Rather than accept knowledge as truth, post-structuralist tends to study how knowledge and truth is produced.

Jonathan Culler in his book *Literary Theory: A Very Short Introduction* stated that many thinkers like Barthes, Lacan, and Foucault were regarded as post-structuralists. In seeing the text, post-structuralist recognized the impossibility of describing a complete or coherent signifying system, since systems are always changing. They believed that the systems of signification do not exist independently of the subject, as objects of the knowledge, but are structures for subjects, who are entangled with the forces that produce them (Culler, 1997: 125).
According from Culler’s explanation above, post-structuralist did not try to find the objective truth which the work of literature will bring, but they try to find how the truth in the text is produced. They believed in the instability of meaning and there are many truths in the work of literature. The post-structuralist tends to see how the power structures and how these elements contribute to enforce the truth in the work of literature.

This approach is chosen because the writer of this research studied how madness is produced during the plot. Post-structuralism offered the way to study how the truth and knowledge on madness is constructed and changed over time, depending on society who defined it.

C. Method of the Study

This research was a library research. All data whether from primary or secondary sources were in the form of books. The theories in the previous chapter will be used to analyze the literary work. The primary sources was the short story written by Anton Chekhov entitled “Ward No. 6” which taken from Anton Chekhov’s Ward No. 6 and Other Stories. To analyze the plot, the books that were used were A Glossary of Literary Terms by M.H. Abrams (1999), An Introduction to Fiction (1965) by Robert Stanton and Edgar V. Roberts and Henry Jacobs in Fiction: An Introduction to Reading and Writing (1989). To analyze madness and its relation with power relation, the books that were used were Madness and Civilization and Discipline and Punish which were written by Michel Foucault.
Now, the steps of analyzing the short story that was done in the analysis part will be explained. The first step was reading and re-reading the main source. After re-reading the short story, the writer of this research chose a topic as a focus of the research. Then, the writer of this research gathered some books containing critical theories that are possible to be applied to the focus chosen before. After that, an approach is chosen. Then, the theories from the approach were chosen to be applied in the cases in the short story. After the analysis was completely done, it was the moment to withdrawal conclusion of the research.
CHAPTER IV

ANALYSIS

This chapter contains analysis discussed in this thesis. This part divided into two parts that is answering the problem formulation which is stated in the first chapter. The first part will answer the first problem formulation analyzing the plot of the story that is used by Anton Chekhov in his short story, “Ward No. 6”. The second part will answer the second problem formulation, which analyze madness and its power relations which are revealed in Chekhov’s “Ward No. 6”.

A. The Plot of “Ward No. 6”

Plot, one of the elements in the story plays an important role in linking up the events in order to make the story as a whole. The events are arranged by using cause and effects relationship which put the idea of the story focused. Thus, it keeps the reader’s interest and curiosity with its unpredictable happenings and solutions.

This part will analyze the plot of the short story “Ward No. 6” in order to find some related events that support the unity of the story. The plot will be divided into four stages. They are Exposition, Complication, Climax, and Denouement.
1. Exposition

According to Edgar V. Roberts and Henry Jacobs in *An Introduction To Reading and Writing*, “Exposition is laying out, the putting forth, of the main materials in the work: the main characters, their background, characterization, basic assumptions about life, goal, limitation, and potential (1989: 101).

In the early chapters of the story, Chekhov gave introduction about things which happen in the ward. He started the story with a brief explanation about Ward No. 6 where the conflict mostly took place. Ward no. 6 is a place where the mad kept and did their therapy. The ward itself was separated from other buildings in the hospital because its inhabitants of the ward were the insane. They were different from other patients. They were mentally ill. To cure patients with mental illness were needed extra treatments. Separated building was one way to maintain the insane so they could not disturb other patients in the hospital.

Chekhov gave an image to the reader that the ward is a horrible. The horrible condition of the ward could be seen from the way Chekhov depicted the place. There is a stench of sour cabbage, of smoldering wicks, or bugs, and of ammonia, and for the first minute this stench gives you impression of having walked into menagerie (Chekhov, 2003: 178).

Giving brief depiction of the ward no. 6, Chekhov then turned to give description of the characters which have relation with the ward. They are Nikita, the porter, five inhabitants of the ward, and AndeyYefimitchRagin as the doctor in the hospital.
The first character is Nikita. Nikita is a porter who has duty as watchman in the hospital. He has an authority to beat the patients if they are uncontrollable and they distort the hospital’s rules. Nikita is depicted as an old soldier. He belongs to the class of simple-hearted, practical, and dull-witted people, prompt in carrying out orders, he like discipline better than anything in the world, and so are convinced that it is their duty to beat people. (Chekhov, 2003: 177)

The next characters that Chekhov introduced are the inhabitants of the ward no. 6. The five inhabitants were the people who throw into this ward because they had ‘deranged’ mind. They shared some room and they wore same clothes as a sign that they were the dwellers of the ward. There are bedsteads screwed on the floor. Men in blue hospital dressing-gowns, and wearing night-caps in the old style, are sitting and lying on them. These are the lunatics (Chekhov, 2003: 178).

The five lunatics in the ward no. 6 had different characteristics and different mental illness. The first one was a tall, lean work-man with shining red whisker and tear-stained eyes who always staring at the same point. The second one was very little old man, with pointed beard and curly black hair like a negro’s who always softly sings and titters. The third one was the Jew Moseika, an imbecile, who went crazy twenty years ago when his hat factory was burnt down. Moseika was the only mad person who was allowed to go outside hospital by Nikita. The fourth was Ivan DmitricthGromov who suffered from mania persecution. Gromovwas a character which later will have conflicts with AndreyYefimitchRagin, the main character. And the last inhabitant was a man of
the artisan class who has imagination that he is special among the Stanislav. He often imagined that he will have the Polar Star.

The life of the inhabitants was so monotonous. In the morning the patients, except the paralytic and the fat peasant, washed in the entry a big tub. At the midday they had soup. In the intervals they lied down, slept, and walked from one corner to the other. Even the former sorter always talks of the same orders. There were no special treatments for them. It seemed that they were put in the ward to make the society were put in order. Fresh faces are rarely seen in Ward No. 6. The doctor has not taken in any mental cases for a long time, and the people who are fond of visiting asylum are few in this world (Chekhov, 2003: 187).

That is a brief explanation from Chekhov about the condition, the inhabitants, and the situation in the Ward No. 6. Next, in the second chapter, Chekhov gives explanation about Ivan Dmitriech Gromov, one of the inhabitants that gave contribution to the conflict in “Ward No. 6”. Gromov was a man of thirty three who suffered from the mania of persecution. He was always pale and unhappy, and reflecting, as though in mirror, a soul tormented by conflict and long-continued terror. Gromov came from a notable family. When his family was settled, he was studying in the University of Petersburg. But there was an incident that made him poor. He should struggle with poverty and then gave up his study. He was smart and had great deal with reading. Due to his reading he had different opinion with society. He saw society had no lofty interest, but lived in dingy, meaningless life. He was temperamental. He always had a craving society, but,
owing his irritable temperament and suspiciousness, he never became intimate with anyone, and had no friends (Chekhov, 2003: 181)

In a chapter three, Chekhov described how Gromov became abnormal. Due to his suspicion to everyone, Gromov always thought that people surround him were spies. One day he sensed that people surround him were strange. He felt that they always watched him. He sensed the power relation after his fear grows every day.

A policeman walking slowly passed by the windows: that was not for nothing. Here were two men standing still and silent near the house. Why were they silent? And agonizing days and nights followed Ivan Dmitritch. Everyone who passed by the windows or came into the yard seemed to him a spy or detective. (Chekhov, 2003: 183)

Here, the readers could assume that Gromov imagined that the police seemed to him as spies. It was a kind of hallucination. As his hallucination about people became spies for him, he began to solitude himself. He did not work and just stayed at home. He began to avoid people and to seek solitude. His official work had been distasteful to him before: now become unbearable to him. (Chekhov, 2003: 184)

Gromov was afraid that people would lead him into trouble. For him his fear was real, but no one accept it. His landlady who lived near him took an action to stop him. She called a doctor, Andrey Yefimitch Ragin. Then the doctor told the landlady that Gromov should sent to hospital. He has deranged mind and suggested that Gromov must be nursed in the hospital. At first, Gromov was with several venereal patients. But, his condition grew even worse. He could not sleep
at night, was full of whims and fancies, and disturbed the patients, and was soon afterwards, by Andrey Yefimitch’s orders, transferred to Ward No. 6.

Andrey Yefimitch Ragin, the main characters of the story was introduced by Chekhov lastly. Ragin is a doctor in the hospital which have power to cure and to define the sick. At first, Ragin was not willingly to be a doctor; he wanted to be a priest. But, for his father favor, he became a doctor in the town where Gromov lived. He’d been in the town for twenty years as a doctor and then he found that the hospital was in terrible condition. He knows how the worst the condition but he couldn’t do anything.

Ragin likes reading but he was not a great reader as Gromov. His favorite magazine was the Doctor, a magazine where he found the progress of medicine.

Psychiatry with its modern classification of mental diseases, methods of diagnosis, and treatment, was a perfect Elborus in comparison with what had been in the past. They no longer poured cold water on the heads of lunatics nor put strait-waistcoats upon them, they treated them with humanity, and even, so it was stated in the papers, got up balls and entertainments for them. (Chekhov, 2003: 198)

Here the readers can see the development of psychiatry that treated the mad with humanity. Ragin as Doctor has opinion about what psychiatry is. He likes it but then he refused and criticized it in the quotation below.

There is antiseptic system, there is Koch, there is Pasteur, but essential reality is not altered a bit; ill-healthed and mortality are the same. They get up balls and entertainments for the mad, but still they don’t let them free; so it’s all nonsense and vanity, and there is no difference in reality between the best Vienna clinic and my hospital. (Chekhov, 2003: 198)
2. Complication

From the exposition, the plot goes forward to the next part that is complication or rising action. Robert and Jacobs mention that the complication marks the beginning of the main conflict in the story – the onset of the plot. They, who involved in the conflict, are the whole characters in the story. In addition to the conflicts between individuals, there may be the conflict of protagonist against fate, or against the circumstances that stand between him and a goal he has set himself (Abrams, 1999: 225).

Ragin as the main character in the “Ward No. 6” faced two external conflicts. Firstly he had a conflict with Gromov in viewing the psychiatry and treatment to the insane. The second conflict was between Ragin and his society.

The conflict between Ragin and Gromov happened because the two people had different opinion about what the mad is and different points of view to see the work in hospital. For Gromov, he did not accept Ragin’s decision that put him into the Ward No, 6. He kept asking why he put in the ward. He knew that he is ill but he felt that in the outside there were so many madmen who are more appropriate to be kept in the ward. Gromov also criticized the employees in the hospital. He thinks that they are morally inferior to the inhabitants because they did not use the logic to differentiate whether they are mad or not. Gromov, as patient did not believe that he is insane, but the doctor refused it,

“What are you keeping me here for?”
“Yes, I am ill. But you know dozens, hundreds of madmen are walking in freedom because your ignorance is incapable of distinguishing them from the sane. Why am I and these poor wretches to be shut up here like scapegoats for all the rest? You, your assistant, the superintendent, and all

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
Criticized by his patient, Ragin answered that Gromov’s situation to be shut up in the wards because it was by chance. He did not accept Gromov’s opinion that the employees of the hospital were morally inferior to him. He answers that morality and logic don’t come in, it all depends on chance. There is neither morality nor logic in my being a doctor and you being a mental patient, there is nothing but idle chance (Chekhov, 2003: 200-201).

The debate between Gromov and Ragin still continued. Still Gromov did not accept Ragin’s explanation. He wanted to go out from the ward. As a doctor, who had duties from the committee could not simply open the ward’s gate from Gromov. Ragin explained more if he let’s Gromov out, the other institution will bring Gromov back to the ward. It can be seen from following quotation. “Because it is not in my power. Think, what use will it be to you if I do let you go out? Go. The townspeople or the police will detain you or bring you back.” (Chekhov, 2003: 201). The explanation that Ragin gave to Gromov pointed out that there is power beyond Ragin. He could not let Gromov out because the other will bring him back to the asylum. Here readers could see the power relation how to keep the mad in the asylum. Ragin explained that society will not accept Gromov anymore. He knew that the best thing to do for Gromov is run away, but Ragin thought that it is useless. He would be taken up. “So long as prisons and madhouses exist someone must be shut up in them. If not you, I. If not I, some third person (Chekhov 2003: 201).
Having conversation with Gromov, Ragin felt that he found an interesting man who can talk freely about the system where they lived. He knew Gromov is insane, but he admired the way Gromov could follow the philosophical conversation. Ragin could not reject the desire to have a good conversation about philosophy (Ragin never found people who can talk about philosophy in the town). Ragin gradually visited Gromov.

The second conflict was conflict between Ragin and society. The conflict happened because Ragin’s strange behavior that visited Gromov every day. Gradually visit of Ragin to Gromov made the people in the hospital thought that he was strange. It was strange for common people if there was a “normal” person visits the insane every day. Although Ragin was a doctor, the fact that he visited the mad gradually could not be accepted.

No one --- neither Sergey Sergeyitch, nor Nikita, nor the nurse—could conceive why he went there, why he stayed there for hours together, what he was talking about, and why he did not write prescriptions. His actions seemed strange (Chekhov, 2003: 210)

From quotation above, the employees of the hospital feel that the doctor’s actions are strange for them. Here the readers can assume that gradually visit of Ragin to Gromov made Ragin totally change. He preferred to sit for hours together rather than wrote prescriptions.

Ragin did not feel the suspicion of the employees. He kept visiting Gromov. On one occasion when he had conversation with Gromov, he declared that Ragin enjoy Gromov’s company. He stated that Gromov is intelligent man. Ragin’s declaration was listened by Hobotov, Ragin’s assistant. From this Hobotov has a chance to kick out Ragin as doctor senior in the hospital.
Hobotov had a plan to eliminate Ragin from hospital. He suspected Ragin’s mistake, admiring the mad. He planned to meet the council to tell what Ragin did in the Ward. Hobotov’s accusation was accepted. Ragin got some consequences. He was examined by the council. In the meeting that was made to judge Ragin, he should answer some questions from the committee. When a question about the medical condition in Zemtvo and Ragin’s opinion about the hospital came to Ragin, he could answer the questions. But when Hobotov asked what day is it, Ragin could not answer that. Their examiners kept asking questions to Ragin until they asked whether it was true that there was a remarkable prophet living in the Ward No. 6.

Ragin responded the question about there was prophet living in the Ward No. 6 with shame. He answer, “Yes, he is mentally deranged, but he is interesting young man” (Chekhov, 2003: 213). Then the examiners did not ask him any other questions. They decided that Ragin must rest from his job as doctor.

Greed, shame, and grieve that Ragin felt. He did not accept the examiners’ decision to fire him. It can be seen from quotation below.

As he came out of the hall, Andrey Yefimitch understood that it had been committee appointed to enquire into his mental condition. He recalled the questions that had been asked him, flushed crimson, and for some reason, for the first time in his life, felt bitterly grieved for medical science (Chekhov, 2003: 212).

Ragin never had any ashamed experience in his lifetime. This is the first time he was insulted by people. From quotation above, it can be seen that the examiners try to examine his mental condition. Due to his answer that cannot be acceptable, he lost his job as doctor.
After Ragin was fired by the committee, he decided to go Warsaw. He was trying to be a ‘normal’ person, hoped that he can relax and enjoying the vacation. He tried to forget the day when he was examined and humiliated by the Zemzvto’s committee. He traveled from one town to another.

During the vacation, instead of got relaxation, he got another problem, Mihail Averyanitch acted like a jerk, Averyanitch borrowed his money to use it for gambling. Ragindid not comfortable with that so he decided to go home. Unfortunately, Averyanitchdid not give back his money so Ragin became poor He did not have any money because his savings was borrowed by Averyanitch. He moved to a little house, can’t buy new magazine, and must borrow money from his landlady to buy beer. He was angry with himself for having wasted on travelling the thousand rubbles he had saved up. How useful that thousand rubles would have been now (Chekhov, 2003: 221).

Reflecting such a life, Ragin asked Mihail Averyanitch to bring back his money, but Mihail Averyanitch always excuses that he has no money at all. This made Ragin mad. He felt he was enough to be calm with Mihail. When Mihail and Hobotov came to his house one day, Ragin expel them. He knows that Mihail and Hobotov are being kind because they have some kind of monkey business in their mind. “Go away, both!” Andrey Yefimitch went in shouting. “Stupid people! Foolish people! I don’t want either your friendship or your medicines, stupid man! Vulgar! Nasty!” (Chekhov, 2003: 223). Ragin expelled them with anger.
From the explanation above, Ragin had conflicts with several people that represent the society; the employees of the hospital, Hobotov as his assistant, the Zemvtvo’s committee and MihailAveryanitch. In presenting the conflicts, Chekhov gave clearly description that each conflict will result in another conflict.

3. Crisis

Roberts and Jacobs stated that the crisis is the turning point, the separation between what has gone before and what will come after.

Hobotov and MihailAveryanitch amazed of Ragin’s attitude which change rapidly. So did Ragin. He never thought that he would become impatient and showed his anger to anyone like that. Then next day, he went to apologize to MihailAveryanitch. MihailAveryanitch accepted his apologize. Averyanitch never mind that Ragin yesterday was so temperamental and then he advice Ragin to go to hospital.

My dear friend, the doctor and I implore you with all our hearts, listen to our advice: go into hospital! There you will have wholesome food and attendance and treatment.

My illness is only that in twenty years I have only found one intelligent man in the whole town, and he is mad. I am not ill at all; it’s simply that I have got into an enchanted circle which there is no getting out of. (Chekhov, 2003: 224)

There is an evident that Hobotov and MihailAveryanitch planning something to the doctor to solve problems between Mihail and Ragin. Hobotov’s planning was the solution to end the conflict. Both as Hobotov and Averyanitch knew that if Ragin was not sent to the hospital the conflicts between Ragin and them can be
worst. From quotation above, it is quite clear that Ragin’s temperament was
considered that he is ill. Ragin knows that he is not ill, he just unfortunate that he
found intelligent man that mad. Mihail Averyanitch solutions lead the story to the
climax.

4. Climax

Climax is the point that is inevitable and no return, where all the rest of the
action becomes firmly set (Roberts and Jacobs, 1989: 101). Furthermore, the
problems or the conflicts reach the top and make the highest point of complexity
and emotional intensity in the action.

The climax of a story is the meeting point of its lines of force and
determines how their opposition will be resolved – “resolved” rather than
“decided” because although one force may vanquish the other, more often
as in real life, the outcome is a complex equilibrium in which neither side
completely triumphs or completely loses (Stanton, 1965: 16-17).

The climax depicts the leading character’s greatest struggle in the story’s arc of
action to effect a reversal of fortune, resolving for good or ill the central conflict
triggered by the inciting incident.

The climax in “Ward No. 6” is Ragin was put in the Ward with all five
inhabitants before. He is the new face in the Ward now. Hobotov, who puts Ragin
in the Ward, did not tell the case why Ragin was thrown in that place. He just
went away after Ragin entered the Ward.

The climax is the final and usually most intense showdown with all the
forces of antagonism that have impeded the leading character’s journey to achieve
her objective. It is the highest point of conflict in the story’s arc of action, as well
as the final, and most affecting, reversal of fortune the leading character
undergoes. In the climax, Chekhov showed the consequences of Ragin’s conflict between him and his environments. People surround did not accept his act which was he was so intimate with Gromov, as the insane, so they put Ragin into the Ward. He was considered “abnormal”. Ragin, of course did not accept Hobotov’s decision. He thinks that he was normal and did not proper to be put in the Ward. “It’s some misunderstanding ...” he said, turning out the palms of his hands in perplexity. “It must be cleared up. There is a misunderstanding ...” (Chekhov, 2003: 227)

Knowing that Ragin was put in the Ward No. 6, Gromov said, “Aha! So they have put you in here too old fellow? He said in a voice husky from sleepiness, screwing up one eye. “Very glad to see you. You sucked the blood of others, and now they will suck yours. Exellent!” (Chekhov, 2003: 229). As the patient of the mental illness with no exact explanation why he put in the Ward, Gromov knew that the case of the taking people into Ward was unfair. So he laughed at Ragin who finally has the same situation with Gromov. Gromov thought that it is tyranny because the hospital employee taken their freedom without trial.

Ragin still did not accept Hobotov’s decision. The day when he was put in the Ward he kept struggling. He wanted to go out. He knew that it is unfair. Ragin thought that the one who kept him there have no right to do that and he agreed with Gromov’s opinion that it is tyranny. Situation in the ward became fierce. Both Ragin and Gromov, who knew that the world which they were living was unfair toward them made the ward chaos for a while. They shouted out loud to ask
the employees to let them go. Nikita as the porter did not want to see the chaotic moment in the ward. He then beat Gromov and Ragin to shut them up. First he blows Ragin and the he blows Gromov. The harshness attitude of Nikita is used to keep the Ward in order and to shut them who fight against regulation in the hospital.

5. Denouement

Denouement or resolution is a part of dramatic story that occurs after the climax and continuous to the story’s end. Abrams stated that denouement (French for “unknotting”) the action or intrigue ends in success of failure for the protagonist, the conflicts are settled, the mystery is solved, or the misunderstanding cleared away (Abram, 1999: 227). The key functions of resolution are to show the effects of the climax on the characters and their world.

The effect of climax toward Ragin, the main character, is that Ragin could not accept the hospital’s treat to him. He could not fight anymore because if he fought back there so much people will against him and it was useless. Here, in denouement, Chekhov showed that Ragin became defenseless man. Chekhov showed that the main character cannot change the system. Although Ragin did not accept Hobotov’s decision, he feels powerless below the system. “He ate nothing, he drank nothing. He lay motionless and silent” (Chekhov, 2003: 231).

Denouement will lead the story to an end. The ending of plot, generally, is divided into two kinds, and open end and close end. An open end is an end that gives another or other possibility(s) for the ending of a story. A close end means that is the end of the story and there will be no another or possibly(s) for an
ending of story. In “Ward No. 6”, Chekhov gives a close ending; the readers will assume that there is no possibility for the ending of the story. For the ending Chekhov gives the death of Ragin. Ragin chooses his own death because he knows he is powerless and cannot do anything against the system. Ragin which was first believed in immortality, suddenly changed his opinion.

AndreyYefimitch understood that his end had come, and remembered that Ivan Dmitriitch, MihailAveryanitch, and millions of people believed in immortality. And what if it really existed? But he did not want immortality, and he thought of it only for one instant (Chekhov, 2003: 232).

From quotation above, the readers can see that Ragin is given up. He did not believe in immortality anymore and he chose death as his own solution to be out from the Ward. Ragin is dead. Next day AndreyYefimitch was buried. MihailAveryanitch and Daryushka were the only people at the funeral (Chekhov, 2003: 232).

B. The Representation of Madness and Its Power Relation as seen in the Plot “Ward No. 6”

In the first analysis the writer of this research had explained that the plot revealed madness. The plot went from the Exposition in which Chekhov gave several explanations and the backgrounds of the mad people and the doctor in the Ward No. 6, then the Complication, conflicts between Ragin and Gromov and conflict between Ragin and society, people surround him. The Crisis happened when Averyanitch and Hobotov had a plan to send Ragin into the ward. Ragin was put into the Ward No. 6 among the previous of patients, the writer of
this research regarded it as The Climax, because the main character cannot go back to change the situation. And the last is the Denouement, Chekhov gave the death of the main character as the solution of his problem, and this is a close ending.

In the second analysis, the writer of this research tried to reveal the concept of madness through the plot. The writer of this research use theory of madness from Michel Foucault. The analysis will be divided into two parts, the first one will deal with concept of Madness from young Foucault, seeing madness as something that structured and the second one is seeing Madness from Old Foucault where power relation worked in this concept of madness.

1. The representation of Madness

Madness in the “Ward No. 6” was represented from many points in the plot. Firstly, the writer of this research will sketch several points of Theory on Madness from Foucault. According to Foucault in *Madness and Civilization* (1969), madness is defined as an unstable term that changeable from time to time. In this book, Foucault saw madness to be constructed by society and the institutions. In the *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault explored the changing relationship between madness and “unreason”. According to Foucault, in the modern society madness become mental illness and it is treated and controlled by medical and psychiatric practices.

Firstly, madness could be seen from the way Chekhov explained the ward. In the “Ward No. 6”, the ward for the mad people is built separated from other buildings in the hospital. It is designed to be private dwellings. In the ward,
Chekhov also introduced Nikita, a porter who also had a job as a watchman in the hospital. Nikita always beat the patients. The beating itself had a function to internalize the fear through the patients so the patients will obey to the rule in the hospital. Surveillance and Punishment should be done many times until they are internalized by the mad. The principle of fear, which is rarely decrease by insanity is considered as of great importance in the management of the patients (Foucault, 1965: 247).

The representation of madness also can be seen from the five inhabitants in the Ward No. 6. The five inhabitants were the people who could not adapt in the society. They could not think logically like “normal” people do. In the “Ward No. 6” Chekhov showed several mental illness patient in the Exposition. Patients in the Ward No.6 believe their own illusion as truth so they could not interact like normal people. The five lunatics in the Ward No. 6 are mad because they could not do certain things like common people do, they could not accept reality as truth, and they became problem in the society. According to Foucault, before psychiatry took place, madness is related to passion and delirium. Passion makes madness possible. Madness is beyond imagination because it has its own logic and it asserts imagination as truth. Madness occurs when the madman deceives himself about “dream-like” images access to the truth is clouded. For the four lunatics, Chekhov did not explore more about why they become into such condition. But in the case of Gromov, Chekhov explained it further from the background of his life until he got mania persecution.
In the *Madness and Civilization* (1969), Foucault sketched the development of the aspect of madness. Quoting from Willis in *Madness and Civilization*, Foucault said that mania is different with melancholia: “The maniac’s imagination, on the contrary is occupied by a perpetual flux of impetuous thoughts (Foucault, 1969: 125). In the first analysis, the writer of this research found that Chekhov gave explanation why Gromov became patient of mental illness. Before he was examined by the doctor, Gromov had different way of perception. He had lots of reading and he cannot differentiate between the world in the book and the reality. He became abnormal. His abnormality made Gromov could not stand with society he belongs. He had his own idealism on how to build a good society. He no longer had friends to talk with. He always criticizes the society.

He felt insecure and this made him alienated from society. He could not work like other people in his town because as his alienation becomes more evident, his imagination that there were a lots of people watching him and spying him grows more. He could not bear with this, so he resigned from his job. He was no longer speaking with other people when his imagination grew strong. He believed his imagination as truth which is one of the symptoms of madness.

That was madness related with unreason. But how we could regard Gromov as madman? Foucault said that that madness became mental illness when psychiatry took part to define it. Psychiatry as discipline which had relation with the mental health in the 18th century psychiatry gave several contributions on the categorizing several terms in mental illness. It has a system in which it used the
doctor as examiners so the doctor can check and labeled people with abnormal behavior. In Gromov’s case, he became officially mad after Ragin examined him. It can be seen clearly in the Exposition, when Ragin came into Gromov’s house. As a doctor, Ragin defined and concluded that Gromov was mad. He soon sent Gromov to “Ward No. 6” because he saw several mental illnesses’ symptoms in Ragin. Such as Gromov’s incapability to stand with society.

As a doctor, Ragin hold a power in hospital. He also became the symbol of knowledge in everything about medical and psychiatry concept. In the exposition, Chekhov gave explanation about the development on how people treated madness from time to time. This brief history of madness that Chekhov’s gives related with Foucault research on how madness was treated in *Madness and Civilization* (1969). Both see that before psychiatry took part, the madman was treated like an animal. Through Ragin, the writer of this research saw that psychiatry hold important role in the development of madness. It can be seen from quotation below.

Psychiatry with its modern classification of mental diseases, methods of diagnosis, and treatment, was a perfect Elborus in comparison with what had been in the past. They no longer poured cold water on the heads of lunatics nor put strait-waistcoats upon them; they treated them with humanity, and even, so it was stated in the papers, got up balsa and entertainments for them. (Chekhov, 2003: 198)

Before psychiatry took part, people cured the mad with technique as called the water cure. They believed that liquids could calm the mad. After medical science took part, madness was seen as mental illness. As it called mental illness, it meant madness can be cured.
The development of the discourse that madness is mental illness is related to the change of house of confinements to asylum. It was Pinel and Tuke who built the asylum, a special house to cure the mad. They believed that madness was curable. After asylum was built, it needed a doctor. Doctor could play a part as teacher, examiner, and they represented the moral demands on society.

In the “Ward No.6”, Ragin was the one who took part as the moral demand in the society. He should have a good behavior, so the mad under his treatment could follow him and the rule that he gave. As a person who represented the moral demands in the society, Ragin played this duties. Gromov’s as patient who knew the bad of the system where he belongs to could not accept Ragin’s decision. It led to the conflict in the complication between Ragin and Gromov. Ragin tried to convince Gromov’s condition that the Ward No. 6 was the best place to cure Gromov’s madness. In the conflict, Ragin showed his authority. He gave several explanations that Gromov’s was ill and this is the consequences of his bad behavior. In this conflict, the writer of this research saw that the duty of the doctor is to keep everything in order and to correct.

That was the representation of madness. It is related to discourse on madness that controlled by the medical and psychiatry. Next, analysis will saw madness as a set of power relation.
2. Madness and Its Power Relation

In *History of Sexuality* (1978), Foucault saw that power is something which is performed, something more like strategy than a possession. Power should be seen as a verb rather than noun, something that does something, rather than something which is or which can be held onto. Power is conceptualized as chain or as a net. Power operates at the micro levels of social relations, power can be play in family relations, within institution, or an administration. Power is not simply repressive but it is productive. In the “Ward No.6” the institution that hold power is the hospital where the most conflict takes place.

There were many kinds of power; one of them was disciplinary power. According to Foucault, discipline was mechanism which regulated the behavior of the individuals in the social body. The methods to disciplinize an individual was examination and normalizing judgment. Examination was a process of gathering information from the disciplinary object and normalizing judgment is the process of correcting the abnormal.

As Foucault said, we defined the “abnormal” first then we can define what the normal is. The two representations of the “abnormal” people in the “Ward No. 6” are Gromov and Ragin. Gromov and Ragin have their own examination and normalizing judgment, so in the end they must accept the punishment to be end up in the Ward No. 6.

In the Gromov’s case, before he went to the Ward No. 6, his landlady told the doctor the he is weird. The key of examination was information. Here, the
landlady as informer told the doctor about Gromov’s sickness that affected his condition which could not go to work. After gathering data from Gromov’s landlady, Ragin became examiner. During the examination, Ragin used his knowledge to classified Gromov’s illness. He invested discourse on madness. As the examination happened, the standard of normality was built in this discourse. Based on the Gromov’s case, the ‘normal’ people were the people who had a job and did not regard their imagination as truth.

After the doctor, as the agent of power got the information, with his knowledge in psychiatry and medical he could get the conclusion that Gromov was sick and he must be transferred to Ward No. 6.

Ivan Dmittritch was soon seen to hospital, and was there put into the ward for venereal patients. He could not sleep at night, was full of whims and fancies, and disturbed the patients, and was soon afterwards, by Andrey Yefimitch’s orders, transferred to Ward No. 6 (Chekhov, 2003: 185)

Ragin’s decision to put Gromov in the ward is called normalizing judgment. This step used to show to Gromov, that this was the consequences because he disturbed the other patients with his delirium. It is a punishment to Gromov because he does not have an ability to follow the standard of normality in the society, get a job for instance.

In the examination as Ragin and Gromov’s conflict was on fire, the discourse of normal-abnormal built up. In this point, power is then invested into the body of the object because as the normalizing judgment penetrates the body, the power follows it. The discourse on madness flowed in the conflict. When
Gromov did not accept his condition, Ragin showed how the discourse on madness was supported by the other institution, such as police department. Ragin also insisted that Gromov’s being in the hospital was the best solution. It could be seen from the following quotation.

“... Think, what use will it be to you if I do let you go out? Go the townspeople or the police will detain you or bring you back.”

“... When society protects itself from the criminal, mentally deranged, or otherwise inconvenient people, it is invincible. There is only one thing left for you; to resign yourself to the thought that your presence here is inevitable.” (Chekhov, 2003: 201).

As stated in the early analysis, power was like a chain or net. In the quotation above, the writer of this research saw that all institutions were working together to handle the madman. The existence of madman would ruin the society, so the madman should put into the ward.

That was examination and normalizing judgment in Gromov’s case. For Ragin, he got two kinds of examination and normalizing judgment. The first one was when he was a doctor and the second one after he was fired by the committee.

When he was a doctor, Ragin was not a good doctor. He had different perspective to see the development of medical science. As a doctor, he did not do his job well. He was very rarely visited the patients and he chose to have conversation with the mad Gromov rather than examined the patient. People in hospital who saw the facts, watched him very closely and then they came to such a conclusion that Ragin was weird. The surveillance by the people in the hospital
led Ragin to face the examination from the hospital committee. He was regarded as “abnormal” by people surround him because he intensely visited Gromov.

The normal-abnormal discourse was built during Ragin’s examination. During the examination, the committee asserted that as a citizen in the town Ragin was ‘abnormal’. Ragin did not play cards, going to the club, or had a woman just like any other citizens (Chekhov, 2003: 213). The committee kept pursued Ragin to accept that he was ‘abnormal’ until the committee asked about there was a remarkable prophet living in the Ward No. 6 (Gromov). Ragin felt humiliated with this question and the he answered it by saying that he was mentally deranged, but he was interesting young man (Chekhov, 2003: 213). Ragin’s reply was not a normal thing, so the committee decided to fire Ragin as a doctor. As a doctor, he is failed because he did not do his job properly. This decision is the first normalizing judgment for Ragin

The committee’s decision to fire Ragin made him felt humiliated. And then for the first time in his life he felt insulted and moved to anger (Chekhov, 2003: 214). The aim of normalizing judgment is to make an individual felt that he is not normal. It sometimes takes shape of warning, humiliation, and accusation.

After he lost his job, Ragin tried to live like common people do. Having a holiday would be the best thing in his mind because he never had such a holiday because he did not interest in it. But his holiday led to another problem. He became poor and jobless after he lost his saving money during his holiday with his friend. This condition made him became temperamental and he easily got sick.
Hobotov, as the assistant of Ragin in the hospital always visited him to check the Ragin’s physical health. Through Hobotov’s gradually visit, he could examine Ragin condition. Hobotov could easily gather Ragin’s mental and physical data during this examination.

Ragin was tired of Hobotov and Averyanitch’s regularly visit because he felt that they were lying to him. He was angry in the last visit of Hobotov and Averyanitch. He expelled them with anger. After he expelled them, he felt so shameful. The normalizing judgment still continued. He knew that he must not do that because it is inappropriate. The doctor could not sleep at night for shame and vexation with himself, and at ten o’clock next morning he went to the post office and apologized to the postmaster (Chekhov, 2003: 224). This feeling made Ragin realized that his act of expelling Hobotov and Averyanitch was inappropriate. He wanted to apologize, but Averyanitch just asked Ragin to go to the hospital.

“My dear friend, the doctor and I implore you with all of our hearts, listen to our advice to go to hospital! (Chekhov, 2003: 224). Here, MihailAveryanitch had a plan to put Ragin in the hospital. As a friend, MihailAveryanitch owed much money to Ragin, but he could not give it back. Not only Averyanitch, Hobotov, as a assistant also had a motive to expelled Ragin. Hobotov’s motif to expel Ragin was shown in the introduction. He did not agree with all Ragin’s decision when he became his senior. As a doctor, Hobotov was the agent of power. He can invested power through Ragin. He used his profession, to make Ragin regarded as abnormal and sick. He did not explain more why he kept Ragin in the hospital. The punishment for Ragin is to put Ragin in Ward No. 6 along
with other patients with mental illness. In climax, the writer of this research saw that normalizing judgment for Ragin had its turning point in here.

Climax in the “Ward No. 6” revealed that madness is not only a discourse in the society, but also there were power relations worked in it. The punishment for Ragin without any explanation why he was put in the Ward No. 6 is a proof that doctor could do anything to make society kept in order. Ragin was considered as an individual who could not be able to follow standard given in the society, such as having a job, be patient and calm.

After he was put in the Ward No. 6, Ragin realized that he could not do anything. He was powerless. As a disciplinary object, Ragin thought that the madhouse itself like a prison. It was a place when an individual got its punishment and a place when the surveillance and normalizing judgment worked intensely. The employees could easily watch him and the moral demand could easily transfer in the hospital, just like in the prison.

Trapped in the Ward No. 6, Ragin fully realized that his resistance would not bring best result for him. The more he resisted the punishment from hospital will more serious. He understood it because he was a doctor, an agent to disciplinize his patient so he knew perfectly how the system worked in the hospital. Patient as a disciplinary object will stay in the ward as long as he could not follow the society’s demand.

Ragin’s decision to end his life by eating nothing and drank nothing (Chekhov, 2003: 231) was the best thing that he could do to liberate himself from
the institution. He knew that he could not follow the demand, he failed as a doctor and now the institution turned him to be patient with mental illness. It was hard for him to go back to society. He did not have a job, a beggar, and poor now.

The act of Ragin to choose the death rather than following the aim of normalizing judgment is called recidivist. Ragin’s death shown that detention or punishment could cause recidivism. Ragin felt that the system in the Ward No. 6 was injustice and this made Ragin’s character became untamable. He no longer thought that he was guilty; and he accused that was the justice who made him suffered in the Ward No. 6.

From explanation above, discourse on madness flowed within the conflicts. In the conflict between Ragin and Gromov, Ragin as a doctor spoke and insisted that his position as doctor who made him have an authority toward the patient. He spoke clearly that there was power relations on how madness controlled by society. While in the conflict between Ragin and society, Chekhov showed that doctor is under the committee authority. As a doctor, Ragin failed to do his profession and he should accept the normalizing judgment. When Ragin was put in the hospital, the writer of this research saw that the discourse on madness is being misused by Hobotov. Because of his sentiment feeling toward Ragin, he used his authority as a doctor to make Ragin stayed in the Ward no. 6. With the help of Averyanitch, who also had a motive to get rid of Ragin, they cooperated to make Ragin suffered by Hobotov’s decision. And in the end, Ragin became recidivist, he knew that he could not go back to the society so he chose the death to liberate himself from the hospital.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSION

Having analyzed Anton Chekhov’s “Ward No. 6”, it finally can be concluded that the plot of the short story had a great contribution in representing Madness and Its Power Relation. As it has been explained in the previous chapters, Chekhov presented the plot in “War No. 6” in an organized way. He tried to show some facts on how discourse on madness works with power relation through some conflicts, actions, incidents, and problems that were faced by the characters in each division of the plot.

Through this study, it is clear that the plot gave much contribution in representing madness and its power relation in Chekhov’s “Ward No. 6”. Structures of the plot was divided into five parts; exposition, complication, crisis, climax, and denouement. In the exposition, madness was represented by the background of the patients in Ward No. 6, in which madness considered as mental illness. Also there was a doctor, Ragin, who had power in the hospital who represented the moral keeper that Chekhov introduced in the exposition. In the complication, discourse on madness which was played by the institution was revealed. Hospital as institution played a part to define what normal-abnormal and what madness is. In the climax, madness was presented by Ragin’s case when he was put in the ward because his ‘abnormal’ acts during crisis.

The power relation on madness was revealed in the exposition, when there was examination and normalizing judgment in Gromov’s case. Gromov was
examined and normalized in the Ward No. 6 because he was not normal and he must accept his disability to follow the standard norm in the society. In the complication, the writer of this research saw the conflicts between Ragin and Gromov as normalizing judgment for Gromov. Besides Gromov, the writer of this research also sees the examination and normalizing judgment toward Ragin, the doctor. When he was still the doctor, he was examined by the committee because he had an abnormal perspective, prefer having conversation with the mad rather than writing prescriptions. As the result of this examination, Ragin was fired. In the crisis, Ragin tried to be normal, but the problem led him to other problem. He became bad temper and jobless and it leads him into the Ward. In the denouement, the writer of this research saw that the normalizing judgment for Ragin was failed, because he became recidivist, chose the death rather than being ‘normal’.

By seeing the analysis, it can be concluded that the plot in Chekhov’s “Ward No. 6” gives important contribution in representing madness and its power relation. This thesis follows the regular formula of plot, where the structures of plot are divided into five parts; exposition, complication, crisis, climax, and denouement. As explained before, plot consists of events that have some links of cause-and effect, where those events related or give effect to each other. Each part of the plot provided some conflicts that represent madness and its power relation. The conflicts make the writer of this research easy to understand what Chekhov wanted to say in “Ward No. 6”.

PLAGIAT MERUPAKAN TINDAKAN TIDAK TERPUJI
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