

1

INTRODUCTION AND THEORETICAL CONSIDERATIONS

INTRODUCTION

Hamengku Buwono IX, although so prominent in Indonesian politics for so long, has not yet attracted a full-length study in English. He never had a prominent role in Indonesian foreign policy, except in foreign economic policy in the 1960s. Hamengku Buwono lacked the charisma and oratory of Sukarno, the engaging style of Malik, the administrative tenacity of Hatta, the intellectuality of Syahrir, or the direct command of troops of Nasution. Of the figures who came to notice in the Revolution, however, only Malik¹ had a longer career; but although Malik left no enduring political legacy, Hamengku Buwono bequeathed a thriving principality to his son and successor. When the Republican leaders could no longer bear the increasing dangers of Jakarta in 1945, they were constrained to move to Yogyakarta at the Sultan's invitation. When the Dutch had captured those leaders in 1948, the Sultan was able effectively to defy the invaders. When Sukarno's Guided Democracy failed, the untried General Suharto called on the Sultan to guide the country's economy. When the political leadership faltered, the country turned to the quiet, unassuming Sultan. One image in Indonesian writing about him is that of the goalkeeper, who saves the

side when all else fails.² This of course, like many other assertions about him, is an oversimplification and has to be examined critically.

But there is also something elusive about Hamengku Buwono. As I remark in Chapter 7, he recalls A.J.P. Taylor's description of Lord Halifax — "He was always at the centre of events yet managed somehow to leave the impression that he was not connected with them."³ Historical accounts often mention the Sultan's presence at meetings or events without specifying exactly what his role was. Foreign accounts (e.g., the Australian official records) refer occasionally to meetings with him but rarely give details of the conversations. When the Dutch captured Yogyakarta in 1948, records of nine republican cabinet meetings fell into their hands. In only one of them is there any comment or statement by Hamengku Buwono, who was admittedly a junior minister of state at the time. Few of his public speeches or other records reveal the real man behind the myth. His formal speeches in any period — from the colonial period to the 1950s or 1960s — are usually very orthodox and only occasionally revealing; some may well have been written for him, and despite his good education, the speeches surprisingly contain no erudite literary or historical quotations or references. It is only in his fascinating letter to the Republican delegation after the dramatic meeting with the Dutch occupiers on 2 March 1949 that the emotionally committed, resolute nationalist seems to emerge. He carried almost to an extreme the Javanese tag, *Sabda pandita ratu ora wola-wali* — "a wise king cannot take back his words", with its corollary that the king must be sparing with them.

Hamengku Buwono's long and complex career features several paradoxes and even contradictions. He was "a prince in a republic",⁴ with all the constitutional conundrums this implies (discussed in Chapter 5); he had an important local and regional role in a country which spurned regionalism; he seems to have been a reluctant Sultan⁵ but behaved as a feudal lord in the palace; he moved easily between a traditional Javanese world and a modern Western milieu; he made relatively few public statements although he was so conspicuous in national politics; although representative of a feudal order, he received open hostility from the Indonesian Communist party (PKI) and other radicals only during the 17 October 1952 affair, where he was not the main target; and he was involved in politics for forty years while giving the impression of being apolitical. It could be added that he was widely known as a "democrat" but ended his career as deputy to a highly undemocratic President; whether

intentionally or not, he left open the possibility of preserving his dynasty while allowing a public impression to arise that he intended to end it;⁶ and he provided an example of the continuing strength of ascribed status in a very turbulent polity, in a nation (and a world) where most other royalty became out of date or even thoroughly discredited.

He attracted widely varying characterizations for such a quiet personality. He has been described as “the Napoleon of Indonesia”,⁷ “a political nonentity”,⁸ “not an intellectual but had a strong intuition”,⁹ “a patriot with a democratic spirit”,¹⁰ “the one Javanese leader who has consistently commanded the trust of non-Javanese”,¹¹ and “a problem-solving icon”.¹²

AIMS

The first, but by no means only, objective of this study is to outline the facts of Hamengku Buwono’s political life. This is considerably easier than the accompanying need to describe from time to time what motivated his actions, because he rarely explained this in any detail. Nevertheless, inferences and deductions can be made. A further essential task is to set his life in the wider context of developments in Indonesia and elsewhere as his career progressed, and to outline how his actions were affected by the context. He was an actor in Indonesian history, and his life can only be understood in terms of the dramatic events of his time. He was a prince of Yogyakarta and part of the context is the cultural and social environment in which he operated. He was also a practising politician, and the national political firmament was his milieu for much of his career. Accordingly, his relationships with other important figures, especially Sukarno and Suharto, form an essential part of the story. The difficulty here is to strike the right balance between Hamengku Buwono’s story and the context, and steer between the Scylla of concentrating entirely on him without adequately explaining the background, and the Charybdis of overwhelming the main story with background detail. Ultimately the aim must be to make sense of the life, through whatever evidence we can muster, and to reach judgments about the meaning of Hamengku Buwono’s actions and his role in and influence on the historical events of his time.

This study would be incomplete without some judgments about Hamengku Buwono’s ultimate effect and role in Indonesian history, even though it may still be too early for definitive assessments. What success

did he have? What difference did he make? What, ultimately, did he stand for? How did he survive politically in such a volatile country and during such a turbulent period? How much power did he in fact have during his career? Was he predominantly a modern figure or a traditional one, and how important to his career was his identity as a Javanese feudal ruler? Finally, I will attempt to relate my conclusions about Hamengku Buwono to the theoretical considerations outlined below.

Although Hamengku Buwono died twenty-five years ago, some conclusions about his life may still need to be provisional and tentative, especially in the New Order phase. Many records of that period are not (or not yet) available, and key informants on the period remained sensitive about providing details about the period and the man, no doubt because some of the main actors including Suharto himself were still alive. In Hamengku Buwono's case, some were also clearly reluctant to speak frankly or critically about such an iconic figure.

BIOGRAPHICAL WRITING AND HISTORY

Any biographical writing has to be based on the assumption that the subject is interesting and instructive in some way. Usually a subject has achieved distinction in some field, often politics or literature, and the writer assumes that the reading public would want or need more comprehensive details about them. Royal subjects are different in that their position has arisen through birth rather than achievement, but if the subject is involved with dramatic events, a biography may still be worth writing, even where the subject is manifestly unfitted to his or her role in history, a proposition which does not apply in the present case.

Various subgenres of biography have been identified,¹³ which are explored in more detail below. The genre is healthy, despite a variety of critical assaults upon it; more and more biographies and theoretical writings appear from year to year, the majority being by Westerners about Westerners, although a Western writer or scholar will produce an account of a prominent Asian from time to time.¹⁴ Asian writers and scholars have of course written many biographies about their own leaders. In Indonesia, most well-known political leaders, including Hamengku Buwono, have been the subject of brief and entirely uncritical official biographies, as well as some unofficial but equally uncritical biographies. Hamengku Buwono has attracted only two biographies by individual Indonesian writers.¹⁵

It may be useful to describe briefly the current state of theory about "life-writing", examine how these theories may apply to what we might call the cross-cultural biography, and explore whether this poses certain questions and difficulties of its own. Ideas of power are also relevant, because Hamengku Buwono's career raises some questions of the typology of power. In discussion of the 1950s and 1960s, for example, I refer to Feith's useful distinction between the two different types of political actors in the period, namely "administrators" and "solidarity-makers".¹⁶ Feith placed the Sultan firmly in the former group,¹⁷ a judgment I would concur with.

Another perspective is to examine the influence on Hamengku Buwono of traditional Javanese ideas of power and of ideal conduct. Although the primary focus is on Hamengku Buwono as a political actor in Indonesian national politics, it will be useful to devote some space to examining Hamengku Buwono from a number of viewpoints, because each one may add to the total picture. Referring to Javanese ideas of power in Chapters 3 and 6, I conclude that Hamengku Buwono at times seemed to behave (or tried to behave) as a traditional and ideal Javanese prince should, but in most of his actual policies, he seemed indistinguishable from a Western-style politician. These issues will be revisited in the concluding chapter.

I have referred relatively briefly to Hamengku Buwono's role as a local ruler and administrator in Yogyakarta (and his impact on Yogyakarta after 1950, when he moved into national politics in Jakarta, is hard to identify). I give relatively light coverage to his private life because this never seemed to impinge on his political pursuits; to the extent that women, including his mother and the five wives he married, exerted political influence on him, this is not readily discernible from the available evidence. I have only occasionally adverted to his private economic and commercial interests.

There appears little to say on Hamengku Buwono's attitude to religion. All his life he was an orthodox Muslim, but he did not bring his faith directly into his political life. In his speeches or letters, references to Islam, Allah, or the Prophet Muhammad are surprisingly rare.¹⁸ To the extent that his political ideology is evident (and this is a difficult subject, as I hope will emerge from this account), it seemed to be based more on secular nationalism than on religion. It is a matter for conjecture whether this attitude arose from his Western education or from other factors, notably of course his syncretic Javanese cultural background.

In Chapter 2, I introduce the early influences on him, including his Dutch-style education, and give some detail of the ideology of the Yogyakarta court; and I attempt to outline how this ideology may have influenced him. Chapter 3 provides an account of his first years as Sultan, from the negotiations with the Dutch which gave an early indication of his firmness of character, and Chapter 4 covers the Japanese years up to the proclamation of independence. I examine the various claims made about his relations with the Japanese.

The crucial period of the Revolution¹⁹ is discussed in Chapters 5 and 6. I outline his actions during 1946–47 within the Yogyakarta principality which first identified him as a significant political reformer. I try to reach conclusions about why the young Sultan chose to join the Republic and his relations with other Republican leaders, the military and the Dutch. In particular, the question of how the Dutch came to misjudge Hamengku Buwono so disastrously right up to 1949 merits some attention.²⁰ I examine in some detail the Dutch attack in November 1948 and the subsequent nationalist resistance, including the much-debated *Serangan Umum* (General Offensive), which in some ways was his finest hour.

Hamengku Buwono's role in the 17 October 1952 affair is recounted in detail in Chapter 7, because of its effect on his career and also because of its consequences for military/civilian relations which have some resonance even today. One of his major allies at the time, Nasution, returned to important positions during the fifties, but the Sultan had no significant national role until the mid-1960s, when he made a conspicuous but ambiguous comeback.

Chapters 8 and 9 treat the crucial and turbulent period of the 1960s and the New Order. Hamengku Buwono's role in the formulation, presentation, and implementation of the New Order's economic policies is recounted, although the detail is sometimes sketchy. The record indicates that he played a greater role in the implementation and the presentation of the New Order's economic policies than in their formulation, although direct evidence of his role behind the scenes is deficient. His decision to join the Government owed something to his attitude towards the concept of service to the nation, but also, I believe, to a calculation that his political legacy, the Yogyakarta sultanate, would best be served by resuming a prominent role in the national government. He shared in the growing prestige and confidence of the new government as economic stability was established, aid subventions soared, and prosperity spread, although not

without setbacks and controversies. Among political insiders, his reputation faded because of an alleged lack of dynamism, but his public reputation remained surprisingly high.

His relations with Suharto during the 1960s and 1970s are especially obscure. The natural reticence of both men, the growing sensitivity — especially during the 1970s — of personal relationships with the increasingly powerful President, and the rarity of firsthand accounts of their meetings, militate against an intimate understanding of this important relationship. What does seem clear is that Hamengku Buwono's period in the Vice Presidency, despite its appearance as the apex of his political career, was in many ways its nadir. His power and influence were circumscribed; Suharto needed him less except for his prestige; many of Suharto's military and even his business associates were much more influential than Hamengku Buwono, and he never found a real role for himself; to an extent he did not even seem to try.

I attempt to draw some general conclusions about Hamengku Buwono and his career in the final chapter, as well as re-examining and drawing conclusions about the various theoretical issues raised in this study.

BIOGRAPHICAL THEORY

The following discussion tries to provide an overview of current theories of biography, without being able to delve very deeply into the many complex questions the subject inevitably raises. On theoretical questions, much has been written about biography (or "life writing", thus including autobiography) in recent years, and the genre as a whole remains both a popular subject in itself and a cause of much debate and dissension. One commentator has even claimed that if charges of trivialization and distraction through side issues were not met, "biography may continue to lack a cogent scientific or imaginative justification".²¹ Another described political biography baldly as "bad history".²² Elton wrote many years ago, "even at its best biography is a poor way of writing history".²³ Qualifications and rebuttals of these negative views are discussed a little later in this chapter.

Biographical writing goes back at least to the classical Greeks, notably Plutarch's *Lives*.²⁴ Plutarch was regarded as a model in English biographies such as Boswell's *Life of Johnson*, and was still so regarded in the nineteenth century. During the twentieth century, many new trends and developments

occurred in biography, which might be divided conveniently into several main types, occurring more or less seriatim but overlapping. The first was the traditional "Great Man" biography, common in the nineteenth century and lasting well into the twentieth and longer. In the nineteenth century, many would have agreed with Carlyle that "history is the biography of great men".²⁵ The biography of the time was usually long, hagiographic, often aimed at demonstrating that the subject was a great imperialist, leader, Christian, or adventurer. Either consciously or unconsciously, they implied justification of some ideology, often conservative, colonial or imperialist. They almost always presented the subjects as heroes.²⁶ In one sense, the Great Man biography has been superseded, because very few biographers now would consciously try to present a subject entirely uncritically as an exemplar of a particular ideology or movement. But in another sense, the Great Man (and now Great Woman) biography persists, although normally in more critical and realistic vein.

Lytton Strachey is taken as marking a major departure, because of his debunking and irreverent writing style. Strachey extolled brevity and economy and decried the earlier "tone of tedious panegyric" which characterized biographies of the Victorian period.²⁷ This style is presented as more dispassionate and clear-eyed, not attempting to deceive the reader by clothing didactic purpose in the presentation of a hero's life. The term "New Biography" came into use to describe this mode of writing. Unfortunately, Strachey is not a model of the factual biographer, because despite his care to research his subjects, he occasionally distorted the picture by inventing some of his "facts".²⁸

Many early biographies can also be accused of distortion or at least omission, especially where the subject's private life is concerned. "Though some of the great classic biographies were written under this system [i.e., the traditional heroic biography], what went into them was severely censored."²⁹ By contrast, enormously detailed biographies (such as those by Ellmann, Edel or Holroyd) are again prevalent, but the second era of the monumental biography, after the brevity and wit of the Strachey "period", is different from the first in that nothing at all seems to be censored. Although a biographer may risk criticism as a hagiographer or apologist if the subject's sexual behaviour or personal crises are ignored,³⁰ monumentalism too has its drawbacks, because a biography may lose focus if nearly every available detail is included. Nevertheless, some of these modern biographies are beginning to be regarded as classics of the genre.³¹

The popularization of Freud's ideas and their development by other psychologists such as Jung and Adler led to a sub-genre of "psychobiography", using psychoanalytic techniques to illuminate the subjects' inner life and motivations. This approach attempts to psychoanalyse the subjects through using available psychoanalytical tools, using evidence about their state of mind through deductions from their writings, policies, or actions. As early as 1920, psychology began to influence biography.³² Landmarks in the subgenre are said to include Erikson's *Young Man Luther* and his *Gandhi*, the latter apparently being the only biography of an Asian to be accorded theoretical importance.³³ The psychobiography approach is controversial, but Erikson claimed that "a clinician's training permits and in fact forces him to recognize major trends [in the subject's psychological development] even where the facts are not available".³⁴

It is true that "the professional historian has always been an amateur psychologist".³⁵ In political biography, the analysis of a statesman's motives for his actions is an inevitable part of biographical writing, and this is a psychological matter, albeit contentious. It would be almost unimaginable to produce a biography without making some attempt to delve into the subject's motivations, values and ideology, which derive from and form part of their psychological inner self; in other words, the biographer usually seeks to discern at least some elements of the Jungian Shadow. Carr's call for the historian to have "an imaginative understanding for the minds of the people with whom he is dealing"³⁶ is really a plea for historians to attempt to penetrate the psychology of their subjects. A further useful point is made by Clendinnen who indicates that, although the basic personality changes little through life, a person's psychological make-up does not remain entirely static and may develop or even regress in unexpected ways depending on the challenges and stresses the person experiences.³⁷

Although we may feel some confidence that "human beings could be subjected to almost scientific analysis",³⁸ psychology and biography remain in "uneasy alliance"³⁹ because of the many uncertainties involved, and the evident impossibility of one person ever gaining a complete understanding of another. But in the present work I unavoidably refer regularly to Hamengku Buwono's presumed or (at times) stated motivations for his actions, and endeavour to analyse the reasons for these, without any pretence at psychoanalysis.

Modern ideas about biography have branched out in many directions since the emergence of the New Biography in the 1920s, not least under

the influence of postmodern theory. A vast number of subgenres have been identified, including literary biography, political biography, royal biography, feminist biography, and many others. The first two subcategories are the most numerous.⁴⁰ What is clear is that the whole genre is thriving, and theoretical study of it, although overshadowed by the greater attention given to autobiography, is also more active than it was.

Postmodern⁴¹ approaches using the insights of thinkers like Foucault have cast doubt on earlier scholars' claims to empiricism in all the social sciences, whether in history, anthropology, politics, biography, or any form of written literature. The postmodernists say that biographers deceive themselves if they believe that an objective presentation of cold hard fact about a person is possible, or even desirable. All writers transform available information (records, interviews, photographs) into a narrative of figurative language, into which they inevitably obtrude their own discourse. Available historical facts are also already selected by chance or the biases of the earliest recorders of events (as E.H. Carr noted many years ago).⁴² Applying this to biography, a postmodernist would argue that there will be as many widely differing biographies as there are biographers. Different strings of facts could be (and have been) selected by different writers to provide varying accounts of the same subject. Although this is plausible, a crucial question is whether one account is better than another, and what criteria can help us to decide this. On this issue, I do not find postmodern critiques of much practical assistance.

Critiques of traditional biography claim that it usually contains several features of which the biographer may be unaware. One is the extent to which biography can be self-description, as a form of conscious or unconscious autobiography.⁴³ In another sense, biography can be the appropriation of another person's life, in other words an assertion of power, and it can even consciously or (more often) unconsciously support and justify a particular ideology.

It is unclear how far biography can be described as self-description. It is true that — with varying degrees of self-revelation — biographers describe themselves in describing their subject. Any judgements they make, either negative or positive, about their subjects' actions or personalities invariably imply that they, the biographers, would have done something respectively different or similar. From this, one can deduce something about the writer's moral values and political standpoint. Even the selection of facts and episodes in a subject's life can subtly reveal what the biographer

likes or thinks is important. But there has to be a limit to this. A biography necessarily relates to the subject at hand, and a different type of distortion will arise if the biographer's own identity obtrudes itself. Perhaps indeed, as asserted with increasing frequency in recent times, writers must be aware of their own biases and preoccupations and even honestly reveal them from the start, but ideally they should then step back. The further question is whether they can and do detach themselves, and it has to be conceded that complete detachment remains an ideal which by its nature may well be unattainable; it could also be argued that total detachment would be undesirable, in that the writer must also be engaged closely with the subject. There may be no definitive solution to this dilemma; the best a biographer may hope for is to find a suitable balance.

A great deal has also been written, in Foucauldian vein, about biography (or any history) as an assertion of power in some sense. In writing about another person, we are acquiring knowledge and expertise about them and about the period in which they lived. This also means to at least some extent asserting ownership of the subject's life, or what they represented. "The act of writing ... remakes the life."⁴⁴ But while we may value the reminder that all human relationships include an important power element, a criticism of the more extreme statements along these lines is that if power is everywhere, then such an explanation can lose its explanatory force.⁴⁵ The statement that a biography is an assertion of power where all relationships are assertions of power is a useful reminder, but does it add much to our knowledge?

The argument that a biography — or any writing — consciously or unconsciously supports an ideology is cognate with the previous claim, and we have already referred to it in discussing the Great Man genre. If the claim is true, it would presumably be best if writers were aware of what they were doing and therefore even stated what ideology they were advocating. In fact, while in self-reflexive vein many now state their background, attitudes and perspectives, few would concede that they are advocating a particular ideology.

Susan Tridgell⁴⁶ argues that we should welcome a variety of different versions of the same biographical subject, and not regard it as a problem or weakness of the genre. "One of the main conclusions which this dissertation comes to is that of the need for competing approaches to biography: something which, it is argued, the genre is well-qualified to fulfil. The proliferation of differing biographies of the same subject (often seen as

a weakness of the genre) is instead seen as a strength."⁴⁷ This appears perfectly valid, but the question again arises as to whether one version is better than another and how to decide this. The issue is discussed a little later in this chapter.

Another way of analysing biography is as text. The debate about biography as text (i.e., language) forms part of the postmodernist challenge to history in the broad sense, leading to this style of critique being described as "the linguistic turn". Since history is written language, it can ultimately be analysed as literature. "The emphasis now is less on history as a process of objective discovery and report but, rather, [it] accepts its unavoidably fictive nature, that is, its literary constructedness."⁴⁸ The idea that language did not represent reality but in fact constructed it problematized historians' efforts to portray the past in any theoretically acceptable way. The thinking derived ultimately from a pioneer in the theory of language structure, Ferdinand de Saussure, whose work led on to both structuralism and semiotics, and influenced such well-known figures as Derrida and Foucault, although the latter were also critical of several of de Saussure's key assumptions.

These challenges to historiography have led to fierce debate which can only be covered in fairly brief terms here. With varying degrees of reluctance, most historians have accepted a much broader definition of history writing than before, partly as a result of the emergence of postmodern theories, including more attention to social groups and methods of representation which were previously overlooked. Postmodernist theory has helped to potentiate and inspire a variety of new modes of thinking and writing, such as the postcolonial school, subaltern studies, gender history, and new approaches to social and cultural history.

Nevertheless, traditionally minded historians have strongly disputed the more extreme assertions of some postmodernists, for example their claims that history is no different from fiction or poetry⁴⁹ or that history merely presents bourgeois ideology in disguised form.⁵⁰ They have continued to insist on the ultimate reality of what they are dealing with, and have accused the postmodernists of "hyper-relativism". Hobsbawm called for the maintenance of the "absolutely central distinction between establishable fact and fiction, between historical statements based on evidence and those which are not".⁵¹ The debate about Richard J. Evans' 1997 book *In Defence of History* raised many of these questions in sharp form. While acknowledging the positive factors arising from postmodernism, including a much greater plurality of the discipline, Evans argued against

Jenkins' (and others') claims about the supposed impossibility of inferring past events, situations, beliefs and actions from documentary evidence. He concluded "the past ... really happened, and we really can, if we are very scrupulous and careful and self-critical, find out how it happened and reach some tenable though always less than final conclusions about what it all meant".⁵² This may be an excessively simple credo, but it seems the more convincing line of thought, and I regard it as unacceptable to equate history (and biography) with fiction. It is true that literary theory and history theory are now much more entangled with each other than ever before; historical biography may share many features and conventions with literature; it may *be* — or aspire to be — literature; biographers may in some ways be likened to novelists, and often are;⁵³ but biography cannot be equated with literary fiction, if the word "fiction" is to retain any meaning at all.

In the context of the theory of biography, it is relevant to consider what a postmodern biography might be like. Lambert declared that postmodernism could allow "the possibility of breaking out of the traditional, totalising mode of inscribing a life and into new techniques of life-narration.... The postmodern 'decentred self' has been shaped ideologically by its relationships with important others".⁵⁴ Pointing to Simon Schama's work, she suggested that "postmodern biography could include techniques of fragmentation, echoes, variation of narrative perspectives, parodies and pastiches".⁵⁵ This suggests a number of imaginative, fresh and even adventurous approaches to biography through using literary devices more familiar in fiction, although it is not entirely clear what is meant by some of these categories. For example, what is meant in practice by "echoes" and "fragmentation"? A very few examples of postmodern biography seem to have appeared to date,⁵⁶ although few modern biographies would remain uninfluenced by the current theoretical climate.

An important related point is the extent to which a biographer can legitimately use his or her imagination, and even more contentiously, whether it is legitimate to invent material. Perhaps echoing Strachey, Ira Nadel asks provocatively "To what extent is fact necessary in a biography? To what extent does the biographer alter fact to fit his theme and pattern?"⁵⁷ Lambert notes that Schama admitted fabricating some material in his account of the death of General Wolfe in the work earlier referred to.⁵⁸

The well-known biographer Holroyd, who refuses to subscribe to any theory, seems to take a middle position on the point, favouring the

imaginative use of sources and arguing that while “the biographer may not invent dialogue” (or by implication anything else), “quotations from letters and diaries” may be used to simulate dialogue.⁵⁹ Yet it seems repugnant to the historian’s normal approach to go so far as to fabricate material, even where the material arguably conveys a psychologically accurate picture of the reality under discussion.⁶⁰ It may be legitimate and even desirable to draw judiciously upon fictional accounts if they aptly reflect the mood or atmosphere of the scene which the biographer is describing, but I would argue that the biographer must keep faith with the reader by making clear what material is being drawn on, and how it is being used. “A biographer is a writer who is on oath”,⁶¹ and the biographer fails if readers have cause to believe they have been deliberately misled.

One claim made by the subaltern studies school and others is that biography is elitist,⁶² concentrating too much on leaders and prominent figures, and that important historical insights can be gained by shifting the focus to lesser known personalities or groups. Thus, we have biographies of “the people”, or of the poor, or of minor figures associated with major ones.⁶³ Some social scientists’ dislike of explanations of history based on individuals is understandable, especially if they wish to emphasize the importance of the broad historical trends which seem to occur from time to time.⁶⁴ Did the hour produce the person, or did the person produce the hour? What *difference* did an individual make to history, and can an individual make a difference? If the leader — such as Napoleon, Julius Caesar, Catherine the Great — had not been there, would events have turned out much the same? The issue is in essence unsolvable because the leader *was* there, the events *did* happen as they did and not another way. We cannot know an alternative course of events, because it did not happen. But it is intuitively hard to believe that, for example, France would have been as important and powerful in Europe in the years 1800–15 without the presence of Napoleon, or Germany during 1932–45 without Hitler.⁶⁵

One answer to the claim of elitism is that political biographies normally concentrate on leaders because — although we cannot be sure what difference they actually did make — their lives can usefully illuminate the great events through which they lived and can at times be used to make sense of broad historical trends. Biography provides one perspective through which wider events can be explained. In the present case, biographical treatments of modern Indonesian history have naturally concentrated on the two first presidents, but new insights may well be

gained from an examination of the perspectives of lesser-known figures like Hamengku Buwono. This argument may be related to claims by Tridgell and others for the illumination provided by a diversity of perspectives.

Alexander⁶⁶ argues that biography's advantages outweigh the disadvantages. These include that biography, by isolating one element (a person) in a historical process, helps to illuminate the relationships surrounding it, and that biographies can be "centrally linking texts, uniting disparate elements in an increasingly fragmented world".⁶⁷ All good biographies will describe and illustrate the context of the subject's life.⁶⁸ At its best, biography can become "'sociography', speaking of entire societies through individuals".⁶⁹ Alexander quotes Boswell's boast of having "Johnsonised" his age, describing seventeenth-century London through his account of the great man's life.⁷⁰ It is presumably only the exceptional biography for which such a claim can be credibly made.

A number of problems have been identified in biography, although not definitively settled. One, paradoxically, is the danger of coherence.⁷¹ A biography can give an artificial unity to a person's life when in fact it was merely a part of chaotic, unplanned, and fractured reality.⁷² A person's life, even the life of people who are regarded as unusually successful, is often characterized by changing fortunes, serious challenges, and temporary or even long-lasting setbacks. A famous example of an apparently disappointing career, even to late in life, was Winston Churchill, who became Prime Minister in 1940 at the age of sixty-five. In the current case, around 1957, Hamengku Buwono might have been plausibly seen as a political failure, at least at the national level. The perhaps unavoidable danger is that the biographer will establish a spurious tone of order and even inevitability in describing a life which, when lived, may have seemed defective, chaotic and unfocused.⁷³ The biographer can point out the times of doubt and uncertainty in a subject's life, but it might be argued that a biography which tries to represent a life fully in all the detail of its vagaries and vicissitudes would be almost unreadable. Again, a balance must be struck.

A further risk is that sources may mislead the writer in some way, or even that "all sources can mislead".⁷⁴ Carr warned that the weight of the sources may push the historian in the wrong direction (or *a* wrong direction).⁷⁵ In this study, probably the most interesting period of Hamengku Buwono's career was the Indonesian Revolution. Within the available corpus of the sources for this period, the weight of Dutch sources, compared

with Indonesian sources and others, is disproportionately large, and it imposes a certain bias which may or may not mislead. Dutch sources tended to exaggerate (the occasionally very real) disunity in the Republican camp, including the extent to which Hamengku Buwono had his own independent aims separate from the other leaders. As will appear, I have concluded that many Dutch accounts were misleading in this respect and that Hamengku Buwono stuck loyally to the Sukarno/Hatta leadership. But the lack of frank and critical inside accounts from the Indonesian side does leave the possibility that some episode occurred where Hamengku Buwono deviated from absolute loyalty, or where his supporters did; and that this was subsequently ignored in Indonesian sources. In such cases, the writer can only rely on what the sources reveal, while pointing out the ambiguities or lacunae.

ASIAN PERSPECTIVES

Comparatively little seems to have been written about the theoretical questions raised by what might loosely be called "cross-cultural biography", by contrast with biography in general. The type of questions which might be asked would include: to what extent, if at all, does a biography written by, say, a non-Indonesian about an Indonesian, necessarily differ from one written by a fellow Indonesian? Should there be any difference? Does the writing of cross-cultural biography raise any issues different from biography in general?

David Chandler,⁷⁶ the biographer of Pol Pot, put forward (while by implication disowning) what he called a possible Orientalist version of the man's life, depicting him as "an empowered warrior prince", emerging from the forest in 1975 to govern his kingdom. But are biographers "Orientalist" if they refer to the subject's mystical inclinations or cultural environment, which are surely part of their life-experience? Such an interpretation of a politician's life is not the only possible one, but it adds a dimension to the picture which may be valuable. In writing about Sukarno, for example, Dahm (and Legge to some extent) drew attention to the influence of Javanese mysticism in Sukarno's life, especially the wayang shadow play.⁷⁷ Javanese mysticism had a role in the life of Suharto, although Elson for one concluded that its role was not as significant as popularly believed.⁷⁸ In Hamengku Buwono's case, I refer at times to the ways in which his behaviour seemed to mirror ideal Javanese conduct. This aspect could be

seen as another analytical tool; it is not to be over-used, but also should not be neglected in illuminating the subject's career.

David Hill, who wrote about the celebrated Indonesian journalist Mochtar Lubis, described his "puzzling, often tense relationship" with his subject.⁷⁹ Reacting to postmodernist critiques of biography and admitting the parallels with modes of literary fiction, Hill grappled with the "real Mochtar" and the "textual Mochtar", recognizing that his version of the textual Mochtar would inevitably differ from the real one and that the real one was — and always would be — ungraspable. "What I endeavoured to do was to present a detailed, reasoned and thoughtful view of Mochtar Lubis within the context of his society, having due regard to his achievements, but not shrinking from the responsibility of criticism."⁸⁰ This is an aspiration that any biographer might hold, although it represents something of a counsel of perfection.

Hill also referred to the problem of "explaining one culture in the language of another",⁸¹ and the epistemological issues this raised. Although he did not go into detail on this crucial aspect, his account referred to the assumption by a group of prominent Indonesians that biography meant eulogy, though admittedly they were assembling a festschrift for Mochtar's seventieth birthday;⁸² that his initial admiration of Mochtar had to be tempered by the criticism he heard from a variety of sources; and that the living subject "far from being passive, continually modifies his behaviour according to the behaviour of the observer".⁸³ Again, none of these points seem to differ from the problems faced by a non-cross-cultural biographer.

For the purposes of this study, one obvious difference is that the biographer cannot have a personal relationship with a dead subject, but the existence of the subject's family or associates poses its own potential problems and ambiguities, as well as constructive opportunities. A biographer who emphasizes (or merely uncovers) negative aspects of the subject's life runs the risk of offending the subject's family and friends, or even shocking them with family secrets of which they were unaware.⁸⁴ The sensitivities may become even greater where the subject is of royal status and regarded as a national hero. On the other hand, a biographer may be fortunate enough to reveal the true virtues and merits of the subject by stripping away myths and misunderstandings. It is at least arguable that a subject is all the more a hero if he or she overcomes mistakes or character flaws in registering great achievements.

In the same set of essays as the essay by Hill quoted above, Angus McIntyre identified two problems with biographical approaches to Indonesian — and especially Javanese — subjects. The first was cultural relativism in the sense of excessive reliance on cultural explanations for the subject's actions, and a failure to investigate the biographer–subject relationship in any depth.⁸⁵ He criticized Dahm for failing to carry through convincingly the culturally based explanations of Sukarno's motivations which he at first highlighted as having great explanatory power. On cultural relativism more generally, the biographer must indeed be wary both of uncritical acceptance of "exotic" social norms which might infringe universal social rights, but must also avoid the Orientalist idea that a "Western" normality exists against which the other is judged and found wanting, perhaps merely through being unfamiliar.

On the biographer–subject relationship, McIntyre found common ground with Hill in drawing attention to the perils of excessive identification with the subject on one hand and excessive negativism on the other. This would depend on the degree of objective sympathy, however dangerous or slippery such a term might be, which the biographer might feel towards a historical figure. It would be easier to identify with figures like Gandhi or William the Silent than with Hitler or Idi Amin. Perhaps the terminology needs to be refined, and we might say that the biographer has the task of finding some *empathy* with the subject, even a repellent subject, while maintaining also a degree of detachment.

More generally, a biographer who writes, especially debunkingly or even merely realistically, about a hero from another country will run the risk of being told "you do not understand our culture, our country or our people", or even facing allegations of slander or cultural contempt. As Hill found, it appears difficult or perhaps impossible to avoid this, because the foreigner will inevitably hold attitudes and make judgements, especially where these are negative, which some locals will dislike. This factor may be a deterrent, but it cannot become a pretext for non-action. Asian subjects are at least as deserving of biography and explication as Western ones, perhaps more so. The existence of a cultural gap calls out for mediation and explanation, rather than avoidance.

Some Asian writers admitted that biography in at least some parts of Asia, as in the premodern West or even nineteenth-century England, was synonymous with hagiography. A Thai writer linked this phenomenon to Buddhist beliefs.⁸⁶ On biography in China, Twitchett noted that "the purpose

of biography was essentially commemorative ... designed for a didactic purpose...".⁸⁷ Two Chinese writers said that "in Chinese society, writing about a person is tantamount to extolling that person and building up his [*sic*] image".⁸⁸ Similarly, the nationalist tone of much biographical writing in Indonesia looks excessively simplistic and hagiographic to an outsider, despite the evident importance of nationalism to the identity of many Indonesians.⁸⁹ Van Klinken criticized the "one-dimensional" biographies of historical figures too often produced in Indonesia,⁹⁰ whose sole objective seems to be to reinforce the Indonesian nationalist discourse.

Is the rejection of these "one-dimensional biographies" an Orientalist attitude? Is the nationalist discourse equally valid with that provided by a supposedly more realistic, sceptical, and dispassionate historian? Suhartoist versions of Indonesian history are now being increasingly contested within Indonesia,⁹¹ but the new revisionism generally has a limited political focus and ignores wider theoretical and methodological questions. The probably overdue re-examination of conventional nationalist versions of Indonesian history may be starting, but there are only a few tentative signs of this as yet.⁹² The main reasons for dissatisfaction with nationalist versions of history in general, and (of course) not just Indonesian ones, are that they are limited and often shallow, that they usually ignore alternative propositions and overlook minority and "loser" stories,⁹³ and that they characteristically portray local leaders in unrealistically heroic terms. "Getting history wrong is an essential part of being a nation."⁹⁴ Biographer/historians may well carry conscious or unconscious biases and ideologies into their writings, but they might hope to avoid any innate motivation to get the history wrong.

We might conclude from the rather scattered writings on this topic that the problems and issues of cross-cultural biography differ little from those of biography broadly, apart from the need to be sensitive to the subject's different (sometimes very different) cultural background. But the cultural differences do not seem to differ in kind, merely in degree, from differences which any biographer would have with any subject. A Westerner writing a biography of fellow-Westerner Goering might have more difficulty summoning up the necessary empathy for the subject than he or she would have in writing a biography of the culturally different Nelson Mandela or the Dalai Lama.

Finally, in this study, I have tried to bear in mind Pieter Geyl's dictum — "it is a historian's task to demolish myth".⁹⁵ Historians cannot escape

the period in which they live, and this particular period in Indonesia, characterized by emerging democracy and thus reassessment of many unquestioned attitudes and judgements of the Suharto period, is an appropriate time to re-examine standard accounts of important political figures during the first half-century or so of Indonesia's existence.

I also tried to recall, and to avoid the dangers of, Edward Said's warning:

Can one divide human reality, as indeed human reality seems to be genuinely divided, into clearly different cultures, histories, traditions, societies, even races, and survive the consequences humanly? By surviving the consequences humanly, I mean to ask whether there is any way of avoiding the hostility expressed by the division, say, of men into "us" (westerners) and "they" (Orientals).⁹⁶

Any Westerner attempting to write about an Asian may be subject to the charge of "Orientalism", and such an effort should be accompanied by the necessary awareness of one's own perspectives and biases, to the extent possible. But Said's question seems unduly pessimistic, in that no hostility necessarily exists in attempts to identify and explain cultural differences. The Other is simply the Other, and not the Enemy. The difficulty — which surely can be avoided with care — is to refrain from treating the Other as inherently inferior, according to the biographer's normative, cultural or moral prejudices or ideology.

METHODOLOGY

From the available theories discussed earlier, we may conclude that different and even competing approaches to a particular subject can be equally informative. The issue is what versions can be ruled out and on what grounds, and, unfortunately, available literature tells us little about this. Theorists have been so concerned to combat and question traditional ideas of historical truth, objectivity, and empiricism that they have paid much less attention to that issue. But some notion of what a good biography might be, and some practical advice on life writing does emerge.

In discussing biographies of Bertrand Russell, Tridgell⁹⁷ contrasts one biography which presented the subject as "the autonomous, high-achieving, isolated and triumphant male self", with another more satisfactory "relational" approach. Her preferred approach was to identify

and explain the self in the context of relations with other selves, rather than seeing the subject in isolation. Thus, Hamengku Buwono might most beneficially be seen in relation with other important Indonesian historical figures, especially Sukarno and Suharto, but also Nasution, Malik and the New Order technocrats. Nevertheless, this seems to be an argument about emphasis rather than an either/or choice. As noted earlier, a biography has to present both the individual self and its context. As always, the need is to balance the central story with due references to context (including relational aspects) and wider issues.

Lucy Townsend, referring to the biographer “as sleuth”,⁹⁸ outlines what she calls the “concentric circles method”, where the researcher studies first the subject’s own origins, family and career, then the subject’s milieu, then the larger context (in her case, the American education system in the nineteenth century), and then the wider American society of the period. Similarly, as a way of visualizing Hamengku Buwono’s life, we could postulate a series of circles, not necessarily concentric but overlapping, which would be of fluctuating size and centrality as Hamengku Buwono’s career advanced. We might see him first in the narrow context of the Yogyakarta kraton, then in colonial contexts (both Dutch and Japanese), and then in the wider context of Indonesian national politics. After 1950, the kraton circle, while in some ways central to his life during the Revolution, would move off-centre and be almost swallowed up by the “national politics” circle.⁹⁹ The New Order period would show a large national-politics circle, a fairly large international circle surrounding it, and a small overlapping kraton circle to one side. I have not directly adopted this methodology but it has been an influence in thinking about Hamengku Buwono’s life.

The method adopted here is empirically based historical narrative, with attempts to place Hamengku Buwono in his historical and political context, and with the occasional digression to outline points of theoretical interest, to refer to different modes of observing him, to attempt to explain his actions or motivations, and to explore his interactions with other important figures. The chronology is the conventional one, proceeding from Hamengku Buwono’s birth up to the end of his political career. Although this may be a banal and routine approach, and a few historians have preferred to smash “the chronological idol”,¹⁰⁰ in this case, each period usefully underpins and helps to explain subsequent events in the subject’s life. The chronological approach can also reveal “connections

between activities, energies, and interests that might otherwise seem to have nothing to do with one another".¹⁰¹

Notes

1. Some might argue also for Roeslan Abdulgani, but the wily Roeslan, although incredibly adaptable and durable, did not serve at very senior levels for quite as long as the Sultan and Malik.
2. For example, Kutoyo, *Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono*, p. 165, Moh Roem in *Tahta untuk Rakyat* (henceforth *TUR*), p. 141; and Mohammad Natsir in *TUR*, p. 197.
3. A.J.P. Taylor, *Origins of the Second World War*, 2nd ed., pp. 133–34.
4. *Tahta untuk Rakyat*, p. 152, in the brief commentary provided by T.K. Critchley.
5. See the Dutch Governor's note that the young Prince Dorojatun had told him that he accepted the position of Sultan "purely from a feeling of duty". Mail reports (Mailrapporten), MR 279 geh /40, Governor's letter of 18 February 1940.
6. The column by Herry Komar in *Tempo*, 15 October 1988, indicates it was a common opinion that he intended to be the last Sultan. The idea that he was "the last Sultan" was common among outside observers, e.g., Ivan Southall, *Indonesian Journey*, p. 75.
7. Westerling, *Challenge to Terror*, p. 226.
8. Woolcott, *The Hot Seat*, p. 132.
9. Sujatmoko, quoted in Nursam, *Pergumulan Seorang Intelektual* [The Struggle of an Intellectual], p. 193.
10. Adam Malik, *Mengabdikan Republik* (Serving the Republic), vol. 1, p. 37.
11. Brackman, in *TUR*, p. 242.
12. Ruth McVey, "The Case of the Disappearing Decade". In Bouchier and Legge, eds., *Democracy in Indonesia, 1950s and 1990s*, p. 9.
13. See Jolly, *Encyclopedia of Life Writing*.
14. For example, several biographies of Mao Tse Tung have appeared, also several about Sukarno (by Legge, Dahm, et al.), scores on Gandhi and at least a dozen about Nehru. Other leaders like Lee Kuan Yew, Mahathir, and Marcos have attracted Western biographical attention. For Indonesia, biographies have appeared of figures like Hatta, Nasution, Syahrir, and Suharto.
15. Sutrisno Kutoyo (*Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX, Riwayat Hidup dan Perjuangan*) and Sudarisman Purwokusumo (*Sultan Hamengku Buwono IX*). The latter work seems out of print and unobtainable.
16. Herbert Feith, *Decline of Constitutional Democracy*, p. 33.
17. *Ibid.*

18. I have found only two references to “Allah”, and two to “Tuhan” — his radio address on 15 August 1946, celebrating the first anniversary of the Proclamation, mentions Allah. *Patriot*, 14 September 1946. He refers to “Tuhan yang Rahman dan Rahim”, in a message of 1 July 1944 (*SM* of that date); and a reference to “Tuhan” in a message about defence measures in Java in *SM* of 15 June 1944. I have found only one such reference (to Allah) in the New Order period, in his statement of 22 October 1965 — see Chapter 8 — and none at all after that.
19. I prefer the term Revolution to describe this period (*Revolusi* or even *Revolusi fisik* in Indonesian). During the Soeharto period, the term *perang kemerdekaan* was often used, which is an almost direct translation of the American term “War of Independence”. The only discussion I have seen of these changes in terminology occurs in Reid’s instructive treatment of the concept of “revolution” as it applies to Indonesia in *An Indonesian Frontier, Acehnese and Other Histories of Sumatra*, pp. 321–24.
20. Kahin, p. 176.
21. Eric Hornberger and John Charmley, eds., *The Troubled Face of Biography* (Macmillan, 1989), p. 14.
22. Philip Holden, “Lee Kuan Yew, A Man and an Island: Gender and Nation in Lee Kuan Yew’s ‘The Singapore Story’”, *Biography* 24, no. 2 (Spring 2002): 401.
23. Elton, *The Practice of History*, p. 123.
24. I.B. Nadel, *Biography: Fact, Fiction and Form*, p. 17.
25. Quoted by Carr, *What is History?*, p. 43.
26. Examples include G.B. Smith, *General Gordon the Christian Soldier and Hero*, 1898, *The Life and Correspondence of Thomas Arnold*, by A.P. Stanley, 1846, and Samuel Smiles, *Lives of the Engineers*, 1861.
27. D.K. Merrill, *American Biography*, p. 208.
28. “Strachey’s influence was almost entirely pernicious” (because of his cavalier attitude to truth). P.F. Alexander, “Biography: A Case for the Defence”. In *National Biographies and National Identity, a Critical Approach to Theory and Editorial Practice*, edited by McCalman et al., p. 79 and p. 81.
29. Glendinning, op. cit., p. 55.
30. *Ibid.*
31. Such as Janet Browne’s two volumes on Darwin.
32. Nadel, op cit., p. 111.
33. The American biographer and theorist Leon Edel was influential in advocating the virtues of psycho-biography. See the anonymous obituary in *Biography* 21, no. 2 (Spring 1997): 151.
34. Quoted by Weiland in Epstein, ed., *Contesting the Subject, Essays in the Post-modern Theory and Practice of Biography and Biographical Criticism*, p. 205.

35. Peter Gay quoted by Walter Phillips, "Historians, Biography and History", in *Tracing Past Lives*, p. 7.
36. Carr, op. cit., p. 18.
37. Clendinnen, Inga, "In Search of the Actual Man Underneath", public lecture, ANU, 4 May 2004.
38. Alexander, op. cit., p. 89.
39. A. Lieblich, op. cit., pp. 264–65.
40. Jolly, *Encyclopedia of Life Writing*.
41. Even the use of the term "postmodern" is of course an oversimplification; I use it here to denote the (very) broad school of thought which can be broken down into "postmodernism", post-structuralism", "deconstructionism", etc.
42. Carr, op. cit., p. 4. Carr noted that every known historical fact was already the result of a process of selection and interpretation before the historian gathered it.
43. "Biographers are all autobiographers, although the pretensions of their profession won't allow them to recognise it or even see it." Fish, quoted by Susan Tridgell, p. 156, PhD thesis ANU, *Understanding Selves through Modern Western Biography: Insight, Illusion or Particularity?*, 2002.
44. Nadel, op. cit., p. 207.
45. See Champion's review ("A Humanistic Response to High Theory in Literature", nd) of Miller and Freadman, *Rethinking Theory*, where he quotes "The result of this undifferentiated and ubiquitous conception is that the notion of power loses all explanatory force since on this account there is nothing that is not power", p. 173 <http://www.the-rathouse.com/RC_FreadmanMiller.html> (accessed 12 July 2005).
46. Tridgell, op. cit., p. vi.
47. Ibid.
48. Alan Munslow, "What History Is", *History in Focus: The Nature of History*, October 2001.
49. Berkhofer "fails to see much, if anything, in the distinction drawn between fact and fiction". Quoted by Keith Jenkins in his introduction, Jenkins, ed., *The Postmodernist History Reader*, p. 16.
50. Jenkins, *ibid.*, p. 7, "on my reading, lower case history ... is bourgeois ideology".
51. Hobsbawm, *On History*, p. viii. Note also "... most sociologists make bad historians: they don't want to take the time to find out", p. 278.
52. R.J. Evans, *In Defence of History*, p. 154. The main targets of Evans' criticisms were postmodernist theorists of history like Hayden White, Keith Jenkins, Ankersmit, and Munslow. He said his main target was "postmodernist literary theorists who adopt jargon in order to seem scientific".
53. O'Connor, *Biographers and the Art of Biography*, p. 17.

54. C.J. Lambert, "Post-Modern Biography", *Biography* 18, no. 4 (Fall 1994): 305.
55. *Ibid.*, p. 310.
56. We have mentioned Schama's work (*Dead Certainties*) as described by Lambert. For a broad outline of postmodern historiography, see Evans' *In Defence of History*, pp. 244–48.
57. Nadel, *op. cit.*, p. 5.
58. Lambert, p. 308.
59. Holroyd, *loc. cit.*
60. Hobsbawm, *On History*, "we cannot invent our facts", p. 7.
61. Desmond McCarthy, quoted by Ulick O'Connor, *op. cit.*, p. 34.
62. Philips in Broome, ed., *Tracing Past Lives, the Writing of Historical Biography*, p. 3.
63. Alexander, *op. cit.*, p. 92, instancing biographies of Nora Barnacle, James Joyce's wife, and the mother of Henry Lawson.
64. See for example Hobsbawm's reference to "Kondratieff waves", *op. cit.*, pp. 66–67.
65. Hobsbawm takes a middle view on the question — "individuals do not always make all that much difference in history" but "sometimes they do make a difference", p. 324. Many historians have ruminated on these questions — Benda referred to "the irreducible importance of the individual actor in history". Quoted by McIntyre in McIntyre, ed., *Indonesian Political Biography: In Search of Cross-Cultural Understanding*, p. 292.
66. Alexander, *op. cit.*, p. 88.
67. *Ibid.*, p. 91.
68. *Ibid.*
69. *Ibid.*, p. 92. The word "sociography" is Donald Horne's.
70. *Ibid.*
71. Nadel, *op. cit.*, p. 155. "Elemental to biography is the sense of coherence".
72. Lambert, *ibid.*, p. 311.
73. "The imposition of order on life is untruthful and a distortion." Alexander, *op. cit.*, p. 80.
74. Victoria Glendinning, "Lies and Silences", in Hornberger and Charmley, eds., *op. cit.*, p. 51. See also Kenneth Silverman, review of Mark Kinkaid-Weekes' contribution ("Writing Lives Forwards") to *Mapping Lives: The Uses of Biography*, in *Biography* 27, no. 3 (Summer 2004): 597. Kinkead-Weekes was the author of volume two of the Cambridge biography of D.H. Lawrence.
75. Carr, p. 8.
76. David Chandler, "Writing a Biography of Pol Pot", in *Tracing Past Lives, the Writing of Historical Biography*, edited by Broome, p. 78.
77. Legge, *Sukarno*, pp. 22–24, 43–44, 47–48. Dahm, pp. 24–29 and *passim*.

78. Elson, *Suharto*, p. 302.
79. David Hill, "Objectifying Mochtar Lubis: Personalising the Process of Biography", edited by McIntyre, *op. cit.*, pp. 265–85. This is not a feature peculiar to biographies of living Asian subjects.
80. Hill, *ibid.*, p. 273.
81. *Ibid.*, p. 278.
82. *Ibid.*, p. 282.
83. Ferrarotti, quoted by Hill, *ibid.*, p. 275.
84. One example is the many (almost all negative) revelations in J.D.F. Jones' biography of Lauren van der Post, *Storyteller, The Many Lives of Laurens van der Post*.
85. Angus McIntyre, "Foreign Biographical Studies of Indonesian Subjects: Obstacles and Shortcomings" (pp. 291–315) edited by McIntyre, *ibid.*, p. 294 and p. 307.
86. Sulak, "Biography and Buddhism in Thailand", *Biography* 17 (Winter 1994): 11.
87. Quoted by Wang Gungwu, "The Rebel-Reformer and Modern Chinese Biography". In *Self and Biography, Essays on the Individual and Society in Asia*, edited by Wang Gungwu, p. 186.
88. Di Feng and Shao Dang Fang, "Life Writing in China", *Biography* 17 (Winter 1994).
89. See Watson, *Of Self and Nation*.
90. G. Van Klinken, "The Battle for History after Suharto", *Critical Asian Studies* 33, no. 3 (2001): 323–50.
91. See van Klinken, *ibid.*
92. See the illuminating article by Rommel Curaming, "Towards Reinventing Indonesian Nationalist Historiography", *Kyoto Review*, March 2003 <<http://kyotoreview.cseas.kyoto-u.ac.jp/issue>> (accessed 15 June 2005).
93. "Elton was right in demanding ... a full and fair dealing with history's losers". Evans, *In Defence of History*, p. 230.
94. Renan quoted by Hobsbawm, *op. cit.*, p. 35.
95. Pieter Geyl, *Encounters in History*, p. 413.
96. Said, *Orientalism* (London: Penguin, 1995), p. 45.
97. Tridgell, "Doing Justice to the Generations: Ray Monk's *Bertrand Russell*", Paper at International Conference on Life-Writing, 15–19 July, 2002, La Trobe University, Melbourne.
98. Lucy Townsend, "The Biographer as Sleuth: Using the Concentric Circle Method", *Biography* 16, no. 1 (1993): 19 et seq. In the writings I have explored on these subjects, especially in *Biography* magazine, this is the only article which actually highlighted the word "method".
99. Some biographers have looked at their subjects through geometrical metaphors,

cf. the circles metaphor quoted above. J.D.F. Jones, the biographer of the writer Laurens van der Post, noted the various “boxes” in which the subject kept different parts of his life (and different friends). J.D.F. Jones, *op. cit.*, p. 378.

100. Evans, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

101. Kinkead–Weekes, *loc. cit.*