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Introduction

“ Its light has already faded,” Captain Twijfels tells Lieutenant Goedaerd in “Bintang Jatuh”¹ by M. Iksaka Banu.² This is the code phrase Goedaerd must use when a man reveals himself by saying, “Falling star.”³ Goedaerd’s code phrase will identify him as a co-conspirator in the plot to assassinate Baron van Imhoff, one of the most powerful men in the Dutch East Indies. In the story, the most obvious falling star is the Dutch East India Company (VOC), plagued by corruption and competition within its ranks. The same falling star serves as an analogy for the end of the Suharto’s 32-year-long regime as well, which occurred in 1998 amid widespread discontent and unrest. Finally, the star with the fading light could also refer to the May 1998 riots that “Bintang Jatuh” addresses. Written in 2012, the story is already temporally removed from its topic. The riots have already faded within the minds of the public, but nevertheless still have an effect on the present.

“Bintang Jatuh” and “Pakarena” by Khrisna Pabichara (2010) both concern the riots of May 1998 that raged in Jakarta as well as several other cities throughout Indonesia. These riots, and particularly the rapes that occurred during the riots, were of an anti-Chinese nature.⁴ Written more than ten years after the May 1998 riots, both of these stories look back to highlight events

---

1 “Falling Star.”
3 Ibid., “Bintang jatuh.”
in the past and to call attention to ongoing violence toward the ethnic Chinese within Indonesia. Both of these stories also address the concept of truth: truth about what caused the riots and truth about what occurred during the riots. To approach the question of truth and meaning, however, the stories take very different routes.

In “Bintang Jatuh,” Lieutenant Goedaerd, a Dutch soldier living in Batavia, witnesses a massacre of Chinese that occurred within the city in 1740. The story, however, is as much about the events of May 1998 as it is the events of 1740. Banu uses historical analogy to connect the May 1998 riots to the 1740 massacre, masking one with the other and allowing both to occur simultaneously within the story. In this way, further truths about the 1998 riots are revealed.

“Pakarena,” on the other hand, deals with a personal story of the May 1998 violence. The story is narrated by a Makassarese man searching for the Chinese woman with whom he is in love. It is revealed at the end of the story, however, that the woman was raped and died during the riots: this is the truth which the narrator uncovers.

Both of these stories were published in newspapers—“Bintang Jatuh” in Koran Tempo in 2012 and “Pakarena” in Republika in 2010—before being anthologized in collections of the authors’ own works. The stories are both also accessible online, in a blog that compiles newspaper short stories and allows readers to rate and comment upon them.5 My commentary here references the versions accessible online as opposed to the anthologized versions, though both are provided in the bibliography. I have also translated the online versions of both stories.

Both “Bintang Jatuh” and “Pakarena” look back on the May 1998 riots while continuing and complicating a dialogue in literature about the place of Chinese Indonesians within the

---

5 The blog in question can be accessed at https://lakonhidup.wordpress.com/. There are several blogs that compile Indonesian short stories originally published in newspapers.
national imagination. These stories address not only the search for the reason the riots occurred but also the personal and political implications of continued prejudice against Chinese Indonesians. Because the stories are in dialogue not only with other works of Indonesian literature but also with the political, social, and economic factors concerning Chinese Indonesians, I will begin with an overview of the history of the Chinese in Indonesia since the colonial period before turning to an exploration of recent trends in Indonesian literature. I will then analyze the two stories in more detail. Following my analysis, I have included an explanation of the choices I made while translating as well as the translations themselves.

*The Chinese in Indonesia*

It is estimated that Chinese Indonesians make up about three percent of the Indonesian population, or number about six million. Nevertheless, because there can be incentives for Chinese Indonesians not to reveal their Chinese heritage, it is hard to determine a true population figure for the group.

Beginning in the colonial period and continuing to today, the Chinese have been treated as different from the “indigenous” population both through legislation and through prejudice and stereotypes. The legislation has played upon and reinforced prejudice within the general population. Doreen Lee, of Chinese Indonesian descent, writes how she has “internalized

‘Chineseness’ as the source of [her] otherness.”9 Other Indonesian Chinese have echoed her sentiment. Ien Ang writes about how she “was told stories about discrimination” but “also heard stories about how the Chinese exploited the indigenous Indonesians.”10 Her confusion concerning her place in society as a Chinese Indonesian is palpable in her words. Lan Fang also comments upon the othering that she felt on a daily basis, writing that though she socialized with students who were not Chinese, she nevertheless felt that she was looked upon as different from them.11

This difference in perception upon which Lan Fang remarks is reinforced through conceptions both of what it means to be Chinese in Indonesia and what it means to be pribumi,12 which are held both by the Chinese and the pribumi, to varying degrees. To be Chinese is to look Chinese13 (or at least to have features that the collective imagination assumes to be Chinese), to be wealthy,14 and to be of a different religion from the majority.15 Pribumi also often cite a trend among the Chinese toward exclusivity: living separately from other Indonesians and not participating in neighborhood activities.16 Chinese, on the other hand, often view the pribumi as untrustworthy, which, in some cases, only reinforces the trend toward exclusivity.17

As is often the case with stereotypes, all of these conceptions of the Chinese in Indonesia

---

10 Ang, “To Be or Not to Be Chinese,” 7.
12 Roughly “sons of the earth,” meaning “native” or “indigenous” Indonesians. In the popular conception of this term, ethnicities such as Javanese and Makassarese fall into this category, while “foreign” ethnicities such as Chinese do not, even if the individual has resided in Indonesia for generations. Compare to the Malaysian bumiputera.
are true, to a certain extent. In some communities, Chinese Indonesians do live in separate neighborhoods from *pribumi* and do send their children to separate schools.\(^{18}\) Similarly, there are extremely wealthy—and visible—Chinese businessmen, reinforcing the stereotype that all Chinese are wealthy. It is also true that prior to May 1998 Chinese businesses held approximately 80% of private corporate wealth within Indonesia.\(^{19}\) Nevertheless, on the opposite end of the spectrum, there are Indonesian Chinese who are quite poor,\(^{20}\) just as there are Indonesian Chinese who are integrated into their neighborhoods and Indonesian Chinese who are Muslim.

The perception of the Chinese as separate persists, however, in part because it has been—for many years and across regimes—encouraged by the state.\(^{21}\) Indeed, the problem of what to do about Chinese Indonesians has been described literally as a problem: the *masalah Cina*. Categorizing the existence of the Chinese within the nation, along with an ongoing debate concerning to what extent Chinese identity should be allowed to be maintained and to what extent Chinese Indonesians should assimilate into “Indonesian” culture, has ultimately led to a perceived and enforced separation of the Chinese from other members of Indonesian society.\(^{22}\) This separation has also, on occasion, resulted in violence. The reasons for this are complex and cannot be pinpointed as being merely economic or merely political.\(^{23}\) Nevertheless, it is true that politically-instigated categorizations have led, at the very least, to the current perception that the

---

Chinese are a separate group from *pribumi*. A pattern of prejudice and state legitimization of prejudice has persisted for the last several hundred years.

Permanent Chinese settlements appeared along the coast of Java during the Tang Dynasty (618-907 CE), attesting to the economic nature of the first Chinese settlers: they were involved in trade between the indigenous population of Java and China. After the arrival of the Dutch, the Chinese were placed into a separate group from others within the archipelago, because the Dutch feared that they would be threatened if the Chinese and the indigenous people joined forces. During the time of the Dutch East India Company, the population was divided by religion: Christians, Muslims, and “non-Christians,” or, to put it in the way the Dutch viewed it, Dutch, Muslim, and Chinese. It is then clear that these divisions worked by separating individuals based upon ethnicity. Later, when the Dutch government took control of the region, the divisions were legalized as racial divisions. Under this system, the Chinese were categorized as “foreign orientals” but were on a similar legal footing to “natives,” though with additional privileges as well as additional regulations applied specifically to them.

---

32 The “foreign oriental” category included Arabs, Indians, and Armenians. The Japanese, in contrast, were classified as having the legal status of Europeans.
The Dutch perpetuated the position of the Chinese as tradesmen, creating and perpetuating a system in which the Chinese acted as middlemen between the Dutch and the indigenous population.\(^{34}\) This system was maintained, in part, through a system of permits and prohibitions that encouraged the Chinese to act as traders; for example, their passage to farming areas was often restricted.\(^{35}\) A zoning system was also put in place that restricted the areas within cities in which the Chinese could live.\(^{36}\) This kept the Chinese separated from the indigenous population, fostering a sense of otherness between the two groups and preventing integration. This also fostered a trend in the Chinese population to turn toward the Dutch way of life rather than an indigenous way of life, with aspiring Chinese learning Dutch and sending their children to Dutch schools.\(^{37}\) The Chinese saw the Dutch, who were in power, as successful and strove to emulate them. This further widened the divide between the Chinese and the indigenous population, as well as leading to the possibility of distrust between the two groups. Ultimately, as Rush writes, “A Javanese of the late nineteenth century might well have said, ‘The Chinese are everywhere with us, but they are not of us.’”\(^{38}\) This separateness was thus compounded due to all the differences in legal status, appearance, occupation, wealth, and place of residence between the Chinese and members of the indigenous population.

After Indonesian independence, this sentiment endured. Indeed, it was perpetuated in part by the Dutch, who, while revolutionaries were working for independence, created the idea


\(^{35}\) “Introduction,” xi.


\(^{37}\) Ibid., 181.

that the Chinese were against independence, further alienating them from the indigenous population.\textsuperscript{39} The idea of the Chinese as outsiders also persisted for the simple fact that hundreds of years of prejudice and assumptions remained in place even when the regime had changed. Further, when the newly-independent country established its own government, some of the Dutch system remained in place.\textsuperscript{40} The Sukarno regime’s approach to the Chinese supported assimilation of the Chinese.\textsuperscript{41} At the same time, however, the Chinese were banned from trade in rural areas, resulting in an increase in the number of Chinese living in urban areas.\textsuperscript{42} Because of government policies, the Chinese continued to hold important economic positions, in part because the government, despite a speech Sukarno gave categorizing \textit{peranakan}\textsuperscript{43} Chinese as an Indonesian \textit{suku},\textsuperscript{44} remained wary of Chinese political power.\textsuperscript{45} During this period, conflict between the Chinese and \textit{pribumi} occurred more frequently than it had during the Dutch era and was often a result of discontent on the part of the \textit{pribumi} because of the place the Chinese had in society.\textsuperscript{46}

After an aborted “coup” in 1965 that was blamed on the Indonesian Communist Party and that led to the imprisonment or killing of several million Indonesians who were suspected of

\textsuperscript{40} Tim Lindsey, “Reconstituting the Ethnic Chinese in Post-Soeharto Indonesia: Law, Racial Discrimination, and Reform,” in \textit{Chinese Indonesians: Remembering, Distorting, Forgetting} ed. Tim Lindsey and Helen Pausacker (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 2005), 43.
\textsuperscript{43} The Chinese in Indonesia are generally broken down into two categories: \textit{totok} and \textit{peranakan}, with the \textit{peranakan} being people of mixed parentage who are sometimes Muslim and often do not speak Chinese.
\textsuperscript{44} Ethnic group in Indonesia.
being communists or “fellow travelers,” leadership of the Indonesian government was taken up by Suharto, who established the New Order regime.\textsuperscript{47} During Suharto’s New Order, much new legislation targeting the Chinese was put in to place as Chinese identity was seen as incompatible with an Indonesian national identity.\textsuperscript{48} Winarta estimates the number of regulations against the Chinese over the course of the New Order to be at least sixty-four.\textsuperscript{49} This legislation included a ban of the Chinese-language press and Chinese-language schools, a ban on Chinese socio-political associations, stringent restrictions on Chinese language use, and restrictions on Chinese festivals.\textsuperscript{50} There was also strong encouragement for Chinese names to be changed to more Indonesian-sounding names, as a way for the Chinese to declare their ‘loyalty’ to the nation.\textsuperscript{51} Though some Indonesians have since re-adopted Chinese names,\textsuperscript{52} many others continue to have Indonesian-sounding names. This, in some cases, can make it difficult to determine whether an Indonesian has Chinese heritage or not. Both Iksaka Banu and Khrisna Pabichara do not have Chinese names and do not appear to be of Chinese ethnicity. Nevertheless, today in Indonesia names are ambiguous it is impossible to tell from a name alone whether a person is of Chinese decent.

All of these policies concerning Chinese Indonesians were an effort to encourage integration of the Chinese into Indonesian society, because policy makers felt that the Chinese were too separate. For example, Chinese political organizations were banned, forcing the

\textsuperscript{48} Allen, “Deconstructing the Diaspora,” 129.
\textsuperscript{49} Winarta, “No More Discrimination Against the Chinese,” 62.
\textsuperscript{50} Suryadinata, \textit{The Culture of the Chinese Minority in Indonesia}, 199.
Chinese to join *pribumi*-dominated associations instead.\(^{53}\) The regulations against Chinese cultural symbols also had the effect of forcing, or at least strongly encouraging, the Chinese to adopt Indonesian symbols and education.\(^{54}\)

This project of assimilation, however, was by no means completely successful. Government regulations directed specifically at the Chinese had the added effect of setting them even further apart from the rest of Indonesian society: they were so different that they required special regulations to govern their actions.\(^{55}\) Moreover, the government continued to encourage Chinese economic dominance, which also set them further apart and caused more resentment.\(^{56}\) In particular, the state cultivated economic conglomerates. These conglomerates were mostly dominated by a few, highly prominent, Chinese Indonesians.\(^{57}\) In many ways, the policies enacted by the New Order government mirrored those of the Dutch: the Chinese—or, at least, a select few Chinese—were granted economic dominance while nevertheless being subjected to targeted regulations.

With the Chinese in Indonesia still perceived as separate from the rest of the population, and moreover perceived as controlling the nation’s wealth, they became easy scapegoats when resentment over the growing gap between rich and poor reached a boiling point.\(^{58}\) As Siegel observed, “An inborn quality keeps them ‘Chinese’...the state of being wealthy, even when they are in fact poor.”\(^{59}\) Violence against the Chinese during the New Order regime occurred

\(^{54}\) Suryadinata, *The Culture of the Chinese Minority in Indonesia*, 201.
sporadically in different regions of Indonesia.\textsuperscript{60} While the military kept the violence in check when it suited its purposes, this did not stop intermittent violence from occurring and, as Purdey observes, the government sometimes employed violence “as a problem-solving method.”\textsuperscript{61} Kusno further observes that violence against the Chinese as a means for venting resentment has been a pattern since the Dutch era and is now “so familiar that the reason(s) for anti-Chinese riots have never been clear even to those participating.”\textsuperscript{62}

In early 1998, economic problems including a significant rise in the price of necessary goods such as kerosene and rice, led to widespread protests.\textsuperscript{63} By May, these protests, coupled with anti-Chinese sentiment, spiraled into riots in several cities in Indonesia, including Medan, Solo, Surabaya, and Jakarta.\textsuperscript{64} Over the course of three days, beginning on May 13, more than 1000 people in Jakarta were killed and, depending on the source, at least 168 women were raped. Shops, other businesses, and shopping centers were also looted and burned.\textsuperscript{65} While many of the victims of these riots were Chinese Indonesians, many more were non-Chinese members of the lower classes, killed when shopping centers were set ablaze as they were being looted or at other times during the rioting.\textsuperscript{66} Thus, it can be argued that the violence was not aimed at a

\textsuperscript{60} Winarta, “No More Discrimination Against the Chinese,” 62.
single group but instead was meant to affect citizens of many different groups. Nevertheless, particularly in the case of the rapes, it was the Chinese community that was affected most strongly and, for many Chinese Indonesians, it constitutes a defining moment in their conception of their place within Indonesian society.

Immediately following the riots, some Chinese Indonesians with the means to travel relocated to countries such as Singapore, Malaysia, and Hong Kong. There was not, however, a mass flight of Chinese Indonesians from the country. In the end, many of those who did leave the country still identified with Indonesia and eventually returned.

After the fall of the New Order and particularly under the administration of Abdurrahman Wahid (1999-2001), new space for the exploration and expression of Chinese Indonesian identities began to open up. Chinese organizations and Chinese-language media and education were again permitted. Various other discriminatory policies against the Chinese were also revoked. Legislation, however, can only go so far, and a separation between pribumi and Chinese Indonesians remains in place in the minds of many Indonesians today. Though there is a certain expectation for Chinese Indonesians to integrate into the nation and though Chinese Indonesians have, in general, became more “Indonesianized” over time, there are still markers such as language and religion that set them apart. Further, violence toward the Chinese in

Indonesia, though not to the extent as occurred in May 1998, has continued despite the fall of the New Order, providing evidence that there is still tension between *pribumi* and Chinese Indonesians.75

*Chinese Indonesians in Contemporary Indonesian Literature*

Literature in Indonesia, it can be easily argued, does not hold the same place in terms of popularity or meaning as it does in the West. Literature in Indonesia is more ephemeral. Despite the fact that many novels are published each year and that the fact that there is a thriving writing community, a thriving reading community does not exist.76 Few volumes of any single novel are published in comparison to Western countries, and bestsellers come and go rapidly.77

While novels are not published in great numbers, poems and short stories enjoy broader circulation, particularly through newspapers and other periodicals.78 Newspapers have been an important source of literature since the early 1900’s, when they began to circulate in Malay.79 In the 1970’s, newspaper short stories became even more popular as newspapers became more widely available.80 Until today, many newspapers regularly publish short stories. *Kompas*, a widely-circulated newspaper in Indonesia, annually publishes a best short stories collection.


78 Ibid., 342.


80 Ibid., 420.
More recently, online communities for the posting of writing have also become popular, however newspapers still remain an important source of short stories.81

Writing in 1997, Heryanto noted a lack of works within the accepted Indonesian literary canon concerning the place of Chinese Indonesians within the nation.82 Though this gap is not necessarily due to state censorship, McGlynn does note a culture of, if not censorship, at least suppression and self-censorship, which began long before the New Order during the time of the Dutch.83 Direct censorship in Indonesia, however, existed as well, with more than 2,000 books banned by the government between 1965 and 2000.84

After the fall of the New Order, however, laws governing what could be published were relaxed and books on subjects that before could not have been accessed became available.85 Works addressing the subject of the Chinese in Indonesia have also emerged and become more accessible than they were during the New Order.86 Heryanto notes that it was not just the fall of the New Order that precipitated this increase in literature dealing with Chinese Indonesians, but instead that it was the May 1998 violence that precipitated a need to explore Chinese Indonesian identity within society and within literature.87

Writing in 2003, Allen finds that much of the literature about Chinese Indonesians focuses on the possibility of friendship between prihumi and Chinese Indonesians.88 This

81 Ibid., 421.
84 Ibid., 40.
87 Ibid., 71.
88 Pamela Allen, “Contemporary Literature from the Chinese ‘Diaspora’ in Indonesia,” Asian Ethnicity 4, no. 2
literature also revolves around the problem of how Chinese Indonesians can fit in to the Indonesian nation and the May 1998 riots. Allen also finds, however, that this literature still often stereotypes or essentializes what it means to be “Chinese” and what it means to be “pribumi.” For example, the idea that Chinese Indonesians have lighter colored skin, slanted eyes, and straight hair remains largely unquestioned.

_Bintang Jatuh_

“Bintang Jatuh” by M. Iksaka Banu tells a story about a massacre of the Chinese in Batavia that occurred in 1740. Thousands of Chinese were killed between October 9 and 11; one estimate puts this number at 10,000. The killings followed growing unrest caused by an influx of Chinese immigrants to the area. These immigrants had come to work in sugar factories. At the same time, however, the sugar market was experiencing a downturn, leaving many of these Chinese immigrants without employment. Some took to roaming the countryside around Batavia in groups of criminal gangs. On October 5, outright rebellion broke out beyond the city walls. Within the city, Chinese weapons were confiscated and house-to-house searches were carried out. Though it is not clear how the killing began, in this situation it was easy for the tension to spiral out of control.

---

89 Ibid., 398.
90 Ibid., 391, 395.
93 Ibid., 70.
Raised during Suharto’s New Order regime, much of Banu’s work, in particular his short story collection *Semua Untuk Hindia*, which includes “Bintang Jatuh,” is historical fiction concerning colonialism and Indonesian nationalism. Heryanto characterizes his work as providing a counter-narrative to the history still taught in schools and especially to the history with which Banu was brought up during the New Order regime. “Bintang Jatuh” fits within this framework. Though Banu dedicates it to the victims of the May 1998 tragedy, no direct reference to the present time is made at all. Nevertheless, Banu draws attention to parallels between the events of October 1740 and May 1998, using his historical framing to reflect upon the May riots and what caused them.

“Bintang Jatuh” tells the story of Lieutenant Goedaerd, a Dutch soldier stationed in Batavia. He is selected to be part of a secret mission to assassinate Gustaaf Willem van Imhoff, a member of the governing council of Batavia. Though Goedaerd does not want to take part in this assassination plan, he is threatened and bribed into agreeing to it. When it comes time to carry out the plan, however, the killing of the Chinese breaks out instead. The assassination does not take place, but Goedaerd is nevertheless incredibly shaken by the events that have unfolded.

Throughout the story, the question of who is to blame for the escalating violence between the Dutch and the Chinese is brought forward repeatedly. This begins with a conversation between Goedaerd and his commander, Captain Twijfels, after Goedaerd was summoned to be told of the part he is to play in the assassination attempt. Twijfels first says that he believes the Chinese captain might be to blame for the uprisings outside of the city. Indeed, historically,
blame did fall upon the Chinese captain.\textsuperscript{101} This captain, in the system the Dutch had established, was in charge of affairs within the Chinese community, including the registration of and the collection of tax from all the Chinese citizens in Batavia.\textsuperscript{102} Nevertheless, even as the Chinese population grew outside of the walls due to an increase in workers in the sugar factories, the Dutch were unwilling to grant the Chinese officers control over the Chinese living outside of the city walls.\textsuperscript{103} Thus, while it was possible that the Chinese captain did instigate the uprising, it is unlikely. In fact, it is more likely that if he had had more power the uprising would not have occurred. He was nevertheless tried by the Dutch for conspiracy, though he never confessed and was ultimately not held responsible.\textsuperscript{104}

Twijfels then alludes to the fact that, to a certain extent, the Dutch themselves are to blame. Speaking of the Chinese, he says, “We need them to turn the wheels of the economy, but of course our duty is also to rid the city of refuse.”\textsuperscript{105} Here, Twijfels notes not only how the Dutch use the Chinese for their own economic gain, but also refers to the Chinese as “refuse” that has to be gotten rid of when it becomes too much of a problem. Twijfels gives voice to one possible justification for the killing of the Chinese: they were out of control, so they needed to be eliminated. Twijfels also asks Goedaerd who he thinks is responsible for the current situation with the Chinese. At this point, the situation outside of the city walls has already turned violent, though violence has not yet broken out within the city. Goedaerd replies that “the top official in

\begin{itemize}
\item \textsuperscript{101} Heidhues, “1740 and the Chinese Massacre in Batavia: Some German Eyewitness Accounts,” 134.
\item \textsuperscript{104} Remmelink, “Expansion Without Design: The Snare of Javanese Politics,” 127.
\item \textsuperscript{105} Banu, “Bintang Jatuh,” 108. “Kita memerlukan mereka untuk memutar roda ekonomi, tetapi tentunya kewajiban kita juga untuk menyingkirkan sampah dari kota.”
\end{itemize}
the East Indies” is, of course, responsible. For Goedaerd it seems obvious that any problems are due to Dutch mismanagement of the situation.

Twijfels then reveals what has truly been happening, saying, “Lieutenant, we are in the middle of a battle between two giants.” He goes on to specify that these two giants are van Imhoff and the governor-general of the Dutch East Indies, Adriaan Valckenier, Goedaerd’s “top official in the East Indies.” It is then that he reveals the secret mission in which Goedaerd is to play a part. Twijfels explains that Valckenier and van Imhoff have been at odds for some time, the groups backing the two of them facing off against one another. All of this, however, has occurred secretly. Twijfels even explains some of the plots that have already taken place, including an attack outside the city walls in which cannons were stolen. Valckenier had organized this in order to make van Imhoff, who had been part of the group outside of the walls, appear negligent.

Goedaerd is surprised to hear these revelations about the power struggle between Valckenier and van Imhoff. He accepts this fact quickly, however, especially as the secret plot is also explained to him. While these behind-the-scenes power plays may seem fanciful, historically there was indeed a documented rivalry between Valckenier and van Imhoff. After the massacre, Valckenier had van Imhoff arrested as the responsible party and sent back to Europe as a prisoner. In Holland, however, van Imhoff accused Valckenier in turn of being responsible for the killings and convinced the VOC of the truth of his side of the story. Van

---

107 Ibid., 109. “Letnan, kita ada di tengah pertempuran dua raksasa.”
108 Ibid., 111.
109 Ibid., 70.
110 Ibid., 72.
Imhoff then replaced Valckenier as governor-general of the Dutch East Indies and Valckenier was sent back to Europe, where he died in prison before the case was closed. From these facts, it is not hard to imagine the conflict occurring behind the scenes of the VOC.

The function of highlighting this conflict within “Bintang Jatuh,” however, is not simply to speculate on what might have occurred in 1740. Instead, the personal conflict between these two people in power serves as an analogy for the behind-the-scenes conflict that seems to have precipitated the May 1998 riots. In the case of 1998, this conflict was between Lieutenant General Prabowo Subianto and General Wiranto. As with the conflict between van Imhoff and Valckenier, there is evidence for this rivalry, though direct, clear proof for either Prabowo or Wiranto ordering the May 1998 violence has not come to light. Nevertheless, hints of the involvement of one or both of them in training military personnel to instigate the violence are documented. Eyewitness accounts claim that members of the police or military set fire to buildings that were being looted and, off the record, individuals have stated that they were trained to take part in the riots by members of the military, including Prabowo or Wiranto.

In “Bintang Jatuh,” then, Banu brings to the foreground an obvious parallel between the 1740 massacre and the 1998 riots. Using members of the Dutch command to tell the story, he details the rivalry between van Imhoff and Valckenier and the plans made by both behind the scenes. The point of this detailing is not necessarily to describe the events of 1740, but instead to point out what might have happened in 1998. Utilizing clearly constructed parallels, Banu shows that in 1998 history really could have repeated itself.

112 Ibid., 81, 82.
114 Farid, “Political Economy of Violence and Victims in Indonesia,” 274.
115 Purdey, “Problematising the Place of Victims in Reformasi Indonesia,” 615.
In the story, the blame for the outbreak of killing is laid on Valckenier. The Dutchman with whom Goedaerd was supposed to meet in order to carry out their assassination plan informs him that their plan will have to be delayed and that Valckenier had ordered instead the immediate “execution” of the Chinese that Goedaerd was witnessing.\(^{116}\) It is not clear whether Valckenier is meant to correspond to Wiranto or Prabowo, but the implication is that one of them, as in 1740, gave the order for the Chinese in Jakarta—modern day Batavia—to be “executed.” This is the truth Banu’s story seeks to reveal: the riots were not a spontaneous act of the masses any more than they were a spontaneous act of the residents of Batavia. Instead, they were orchestrated from the upper echelons of the chain of command.

Nevertheless, at the same time, this truth is never directly stated. Only the dedication at the end of the story directly references the events of 1998. In this way, the truth is concealed even as it is revealed, following a technique employed by classical Javanese poets known as \textit{semu}.\(^{117}\) Florida writes that \textit{pasemon}, a cognate of \textit{semu}, is “a mask and a clue presenting itself to be read.”\(^{118}\) Banu employs a similar technique. His description of 1740 serves as a mask for the truths he seeks to reveal about 1998. Though it conceals, this mask also seeks to be read and understood so that both layers of meaning are revealed to the reader.

The effect of the power structure is illustrated through the sense of powerlessness that Goedaerd feels. At the beginning of the story, before the plan is even revealed to him, Goedaerd already feels a “tight feeling that pressed in from all directions.”\(^{119}\) Later, as Twijfels begins to

\(^{118}\) Ibid., 276.
\(^{119}\) Banu, “Bintang Jatuh,” 104. “Rasa sesak yang menekan dari segala arah.”
explain the assassination plan, Goedaerd feels like a trapped rat,\textsuperscript{120} even more enclosed and now forced into action. “They give the command,” Twijfels says, “We are their tools.”\textsuperscript{121} Throughout the story, Goedaerd and Twijfels are portrayed as having no say in the matter. They are trapped and must simply follow orders. Though he initially attempts to decline the part in the plan offered to him, Goedaerd ultimately finds himself resigned to completing his task.\textsuperscript{122} He feels as though he has no other options because his family has been threatened.

Nevertheless, despite the powerlessness that both Goedaerd and Twijfels feel, there are moments throughout the story when they could have worked against the power structure. Both men, for example, partake in arak that has been extorted from powerful members of the Chinese community or given as a bribe without a thought. The story, besides narrating the rivalry between van Imhoff and Valckenier (or between Wiranto and Prabowo), also brings to attention the problem of corruption within the ranks of those in control and being controlled. Indeed, in the late 1600’s and early 1700’s corruption was rife within the VOC. For example, though immigration quotas and higher taxes for the Chinese had been established in order to curb immigration, officials often went around these rules. Ship captains would also dock at other ports just outside the city to let passengers off without the need for permits.\textsuperscript{123}

In the story, references to corruption within the system are made in an off-hand manner. When Goedaerd arrives in Twijfels study, he asks if the offered arak\textsuperscript{124} had been extorted from

\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
  \item \textsuperscript{120} Ibid., 111.
  \item \textsuperscript{121} Ibid., 110. “Mereka memberi perintah. Kita alat mereka.”
  \item \textsuperscript{122} Ibid., 112.
  \item \textsuperscript{124} Arak is an alcoholic drink made from sugarcane. The arak distillation industry at the time was related to the sugar industry.
\end{itemize}
Later, Goedaerd states that government officials make money while the government does not, again referencing the corruption rampant within the system. Moreover, though Goedaerd does not appear to notice it, corruption exists not only within the system but directly within the lives of both Goedaerd and Twijfels. For his part in the assassination scheme, Goedaerd is told that he will receive a considerable sum of money. When Goedaerd reflects on this payment, he decides that it “might make up for [his] sins.” The money, along with threats of harm toward his wife and child, are enough for Goedaerd to agree to the plan, though it makes him feel “lower than a robber.” For Goedaerd, corruption has become so commonplace that he is not troubled by it and is instead only troubled by the murderous action he must undertake. Despite this, he makes no move to sabotage the assassination attempt, but carries out his orders to the best of his ability, even if he disagrees with them.

Similarly, Twijfels, who is praised highly by Goedaerd near the beginning of the story, has also been corrupted by his surroundings. When Goedaerd enters Twijfels’s study, he finds it in disarray: the captain’s uniform disheveled and his weapons strewn across the ground. These outward signs reflect how Twijfels has changed from the man Goedaerd once respected. He has been involved in these secret plans for some time, again due to coercion and bribery, and has now also become corrupted. Goedaerd, after hearing the full extent of what is to be done and what has already transpired finds that he has suddenly lost all his respect for Twijfels. Again, however, though Goedaerd is also upset with himself, it is because of his choice to become an
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assassin and not because of his acceptance of the money, an obvious symbol of corruption. This portrayal of corruption again also serves as a critique of corruption within the New Order regime, which was rampant.133

Finally, Banu also draws parallels between the situation of the Chinese in 1740 and the situation of the Chinese in 1998. Twijfels says that the Chinese dominate the economy and work in many different fields.134 This statement is akin to the persistent stereotype of the Chinese as rich. Though it may ring true with readers who maintain a belief in this stereotype, the clearly corrupted nature of Captain Twijfels calls his words into question. Are the Chinese truly economically dominant, or do they only appear to be so? It is also significant that the only Chinese Goedaerd encounters run a roadside food stall: they certainly are not wealthy.

Goedaerd makes similar statements about Chinese dominance of the economy, though he also points out the targeted taxes and restrictions that the Dutch have placed on the Chinese.135 Read as a critique of the New Order, this refers to the discriminatory legislation targeting the Chinese. The connection Goedaerd draws between the Chinese and the Dutch also implies the ways in which those in power—the Dutch or the New Order—are using the Chinese to their own advantage. Neither Twijfels nor Goedaerd deny that those in power within the VOC are making money, even if it is at the expense of the company.

Further, when Goedaerd goes out into the town to await the rendezvous with other members of the team selected to carry out the assassination, he observes the Chinese he meets in the city, noting the anxiety that they feel. He realizes that they exist in a terrible state: used and

---
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controlled by the Dutch and also unable to escape the situation because the state of the Chinese outside of the walls is no better. Ultimately, despite the discussions Twijfels and Goedaerd have condemning the Chinese captain or complaining about the success of the Chinese, in the story the Chinese community is clearly portrayed as being at the mercy of the Dutch and, moreover, as being a tool used by the Dutch. Indeed, they were killed simply because a Dutchman ordered it in order to satisfy his own game for power. As the whole story is meant to parallel the situation in 1998, these observations about the Chinese community also portray the situation of the Chinese community in 1998. Indeed, the Chinese were used economically by the New Order government, placed into positions of economic power and yet also heavily controlled.

Banu employs historical allegory to critique popular conceptions of the May 1998 violence. He masks the events of 1998 with the events of 1740, writing about 1740 while pointing out truths about the situation in 1998 in a way that can be more easily accepted. In a way, Banu anachronizes the events of 1998, displacing them temporally to 1740. Placing them in the remote past removes the reader, at least slightly, from the preconceived notions he or she may already hold about the truth of 1998. Because of this, Banu is able to complicate the narrative of the May 1998 violence. Banu’s description of the 1740 massacre serves as a mask that nevertheless reveals truths about the May 1998 violence because, in the rhetorical realm of the story, both events are occurring at the same time, one transposed on top of the other, both following the same contours. By setting the story in 1740, Banu is also able to more safely and possibly more comfortably make statements about the place of the Chinese in 1998 and who is to blame for the violence because these statements are not made directly—they are only implied. Nevertheless, the implication, and Banu’s view on what occurred in 1998, are clear.
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In contrast to the historical allegory that Banu employs to approach the truth of the May 1998 riots in “Bintang Jatuh,” in “Pakarena” Khrisna Pabichara takes a personal approach, focusing on two individuals affected by the riots. In this way, Pabichara approaches the events from a personal, close point of view. While the story focuses on a search for truth, it is not the large truth of what caused the May violence, but is instead a small, personal truth for two people affected by the riots.

Khrisna Pabichara was born in Makassar and, though, he now lives in West Java, much of his writing involves elements of Makassar’s culture. In “Pakarena,” he tells the story of a pribumi boy and a Chinese girl, both from Makassar, who fall in love. Because of disapproval from their families, however, they are separated, and the girl moves to Jakarta where she falls victim to the riots. The story focuses on the boy, now a man, as he travels to the city in China where the woman’s family was from in order to find out what happened to her. It is only at the end of the story that the man realizes the woman was raped and killed during the riots.

In the story, both characteristics of Makassarese culture and Chinese culture are employed in order to ground the story within its setting as well as shed light on the values and backgrounds of the characters. When the girl is introduced, the boy—who is narrating—is quick to point out that she is the first Chinese girl in their karawitan school. The story is also peppered with references to Makassar, including discussions of traditional music and traditional

138 Traditional regional music.
ceremonies.\textsuperscript{140} Besides references to Makassarese culture, however, much of the story revolves around how the narrator earns of Chinese culture, in particular a story about Chinese New Year. The narrator makes reference to elements of Chinese culture that he has picked up over the years, often without explaining them: he mentions his Chinese zodiac sign and what it means about his personality.\textsuperscript{141} There is also an extended passage discussing the Chinese almanac—a book kept in Chinese temples and used to determine the most auspicious days for events such as weddings as well as the most auspicious matches. Though this book is referenced in terms of God writing the fate of the two lovers, its applicability and centrality to Chinese tradition are not made clear in the text and would only be clear to a reader who already knows of this tradition. Indeed, Muslim readers might more readily recognize the Islamic concept of \textit{al-Lawh al-Mahfu\c{z}}, or “preserved” or “guarded” tablets on which it is believed God has written the destiny of all things.\textsuperscript{142} In the passage concerning the almanac, the two concepts are conflated, in a melding of Chinese and Islamic thought—a melding, however, that is only apparent to readers who are familiar with both traditions. Readers familiar with only one tradition will recognize only those elements within the story. In another section, the narrator mentions \textit{shou yue}\textsuperscript{143}, or grilling fish, without any explanation at all. These references serve not only to ground the story in Chinese traditional thought, but also to illustrate that the narrator has come to an understanding of Chinese culture even if it is not his own culture.

The narrator begins his story with a description of China as “desolate and foreign, \textsuperscript{140}Pabichara, “Gadis Pakarena,” 27.\textsuperscript{141} Ibid., 30.\textsuperscript{142} Cyril Glasse, \textit{The New Encyclopedia of Islam} (Walnut Creek: AltaMira Press, 2001), 275.\textsuperscript{143} Shāo yú (Pinyin).
covered in mysteries and puzzles.”144 This concept of the foreign returns throughout the story, both in reference to China as well as in reference to the narrator’s own feelings. This repetition of the concept of foreign serves to create a detached atmosphere within the story. The narrator feels detached from his surroundings—understandable, as he is in a foreign country—but the feeling goes deeper than that. He feels detached from his own feelings and his own memories.

Throughout the narration, words are piled on top of each other to create a feeling of detachment. “The memory I should have started the story with comes back again,”145 the narrator says, displacing himself: it was the memory that came back, not he himself that called back the memory. Later, he says, “That’s how the memory revealed itself,”146 again removing himself from the process of remembering and narrating memories. The memories emerge or reveal themselves; the narrator has no part in their composition. This reduces the agency of the narrator, putting him in a state of powerlessness: he is not in control of his own memories and emotions. At the same time, this also places a strong emphasis on the memories themselves, signaling that within the story memories of the past, including the narrator’s own memories, are of particular importance.

The atmosphere of loneliness and powerlessness is reinforced by the setting. Beyond the fact that China is a foreign country for the narrator, the descriptions of Wuhan, where the narration takes place, often serve to emphasize how alone and small the narrator feels. For example, the wind is described as unfriendly, penetrating the narrator’s body and filling up his heart.147 The narrator’s surroundings profoundly affect him in a physical way, emphasizing how
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lonely he feels. He also does not interact with any people while he is in China, making it seem as if he is utterly alone in this place.

These feelings of powerlessness and loneliness are a manifestation of the true powerlessness that the narrator feels toward his circumstances. Near the beginning of the story, he establishes that neither his family nor the girl’s family approved of their relationship because of their differences in ethnicity and religion. This disapproval leads to a loss of power on the part of the narrator: “But what can we do?” he asks. He feels that there is nothing to be done: fate was not in their favor—fate was keeping them apart—and they were powerless against it and, more immediately, against the wills of their families.

While in China, the narrator has a vision of the woman arriving and asking him to come back with her to her house. He does so, but when he wakes up he finds that he is alone: she had not truly appeared and now he is “Without [her], without [her] family. Without anyone.” The reference to her family here is important. Though it is not revealed within the narration, presumably when the narrator returned, in his imagination, to the woman’s house with her he also met her family, or at least her extended family who lived in China. This encounter, however, was only a vision; it represents not a true encounter but instead a meeting that the narrator wishes could have occurred: he wishes that her family could have accepted him. When he comes to his senses and finds himself alone again, the impossibility of this occurrence hits him all the more strongly.

This theme of the disapproval of their families ties into the overarching parallel between the couple’s story and the Romeo and Juliet story, played upon by Pabichara throughout the
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The narrator describes a play they put on at school in which he was cast as Romeo and the girl was cast as Juliet. Throughout the story, the narrator refers back to the fate of Romeo and Juliet: both that they love each other and that their families disapprove. At the end of the story, the narrator finally comes to the realization that the woman has already died, making their story even more like that of Romeo and Juliet’s. At the very end of the story, the narrator wonders if he will follow in Romeo’s steps as his love has already followed in Juliet’s.

The arc of the story works to come to the point when the narrator discovers that the woman had died in the May 1998 riots. Because he does not interact with anyone during the course of the story, he has already known this but has not consciously faced it. The story, then, functions not just as a narration of the man’s thoughts and recollections about how his life intersected with the woman’s, but also as a journey through which he comes to acknowledge consciously that she had died as well as how she died.

At the beginning of the story the narrator says, “I am trying to find you. But everything is useless.”¹⁵¹ Thus, the story begins already centered around the themes of finding the woman—or, at least, the truth about what has happened to the woman—and, at the same time, the uselessness of this search. On some level, the narrator acknowledges that what he is doing will not have a successful or satisfying end, but he nevertheless continues to search as his consciousness waits to acknowledge that the woman has died. In the same section of the story, the narrator also remarks that it is as if the lake in Wuhan “has swallowed your history.”¹⁵² Again, it is clear that there is something about the woman that the narrator is searching for, some truth about what has happened to her that he has not yet found. This truth is, of course, not

¹⁵² Ibid., 25. “Seolah menelan riwayatmu begitu saja.”
revealed until the end of the story, but from the very beginning it is referenced.

Part of the relationship between the narrator and the girl involved the Chinese legends that she told him. When discussing the origins of Chinese New Year, however, the girl at first told the narrator that he would have to figure it out for himself. This instruction to figure it out on his own foreshadows the journey the narrator will have to take on his own to China, the land where these legends originated, in order to figure out on his own what has become of his life and his love. On another occasion, the girl asked the narrator to tell her a legend, but he refused, saying that he was not eloquent enough. This refusal can be read also as a refusal to speak of the fact that she has died. Here, the legends serve as a metaphor for the truth that the narrator must find: he must find it on his own, and at first he is unwilling to speak of it.

The narrator has ambiguous feelings throughout the story on the matter of truth. “It isn’t necessary to look for the answer of whether I am right or wrong,” he says. It isn’t necessary because, to him, it does not matter if his actions have a purpose that can truly be achieved. His journey, whether he recognizes it consciously or not, is as much internal as external.

At the climax of the story, when the narrator comes to realize that the woman has died and is confronted with her headstone, his emotions are still as muddled as ever: he does not understand how he has come to the cemetery, nor does he understand why the vision of her family has disappeared or where the voice he hears in the cemetery has come from, whispering to him that the woman has died. Indeed, it is implied that he may never have actually journeyed to China, but that the entire journey to search for the woman occurred only within his
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mind. If this is the case, it would explain how he mysteriously found himself at her grave, especially as there is little reason for her to actually have been buried in China. The narrator, however, does not take this into consideration. Even at the end of the story, there are many things that he does not understand. He is also not seeking to understand these things—they simply are reality. Even his own fate at the end of the story is left as an unanswered question—will he take Romeo’s path like she has taken Juliet’s?  He does not know, but is not seeking to find the answers to these questions; he simply accepts them.

“Pakarena” presents a small story of two people affected by the May 1998 riots in Jakarta without touching upon the larger questions of why the violence occurred. Even regarding the question of why the violence affected these particular people, answers are also not truly given or sought. There is some talk on the part of the narrator of fate and of changing fate, which is also connected to the Romeo and Juliet theme. Thus, if anything is to blame for the woman’s rape and death, it is an unhappy fate, not the prejudice and racism that kept the two of them apart and was ultimately the reason that the woman was in Jakarta at all, as it was her family who sent her there. There is, however, no talk of the political, social, or economic factors behind the riots. These reasons are not important to the narrator and thus not important to the story.

In this way, “Pakarena” presents one way in which people could approach the problem of truth concerning the riots. As reports about the rapes that occurred during the riots began to circulate in the Indonesian public, a heated debate concerning their veracity emerged. Some claimed that the rapes were fabricated to shed a bad light on the Islamic community.
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Questions about why victims of the rapes would not speak up were raised. In July, the government organized a Joint Fact-Finding Team, the Tim Gabungan Pencari Fakta (TGPF), to investigate the violence of May 1998, to identify perpetrators, and to establish what truly occurred. This team’s report, however, was ultimately found largely lacking by the Indonesian public and by victims themselves: perpetrators were not clearly identified and the true number of victims was not quantified. As Purdey writes, the TGPF “presented not one simple truth regarding the identity and quantity of victims but rather multiple and highly contested truths.”

In “Pakarena,” the truths that the TGPF and that the Indonesian public sought regarding the May 1998 violence and the rapes, in particular, are not important. Instead, the simple truth of the single story is what is important. Two people were affected by the riots. The truth is that it occurred: the woman was raped; the woman died. For them, this is the only truth that matters. In this way, Pabichara calls upon the reader to empathize with their fate and to set aside lingering questions concerning the extent or even the legitimacy of the rapes and violence of 1998, because the truth is that real people were deeply and personally affected by the violence.

*Chinese Ethnicity in “Bintang Jatuh” and “Pakarena”*

In “Bintang Jatuh,” published in 2012, and “Pakarena,” published in 2010, Chinese Indonesian characters are portrayed in a sympathetic manner. In both stories, the Chinese Indonesian characters are victims of violence and in both stories it is easy for the reader to
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sympathize with their plight. In “Bintang Jatuh,” Goedaerd even speaks out on the victims’ behalf, protesting to a Dutchman that the Chinese food stall workers had just served him dinner and should not have been killed.163

These two stories, however, do fit into the general pattern that Allen outlined in 2003.164 In “Pakarena,” the Chinese character is portrayed in a sympathetic light; however, descriptors typical of Chinese characters in Indonesian literature are still employed, such as reference to her “slanted eyes.”165 Also following the characteristics outlined by Allen, the possibility of a friendship—and in this case a romantic relationship—between Chinese and pribumi is explored within “Pakarena.” The story, however, also complicates the narrative of Chinese Indonesians. A good deal of emphasis is put upon the fact that the two main characters cannot be together, because of both religious and cultural differences. Ultimately their families disapprove and the relationship cannot go forward. This portrayal of a relationship between Chinese and pribumi is not a new one, nor is the ultimate conclusion that they cannot be together.166 Nevertheless, in this story there is the possibility that—at least in the narrator’s mind—if the woman had not been a victim of the May 1998 violence, they could still have been together. The whole story concerns the narrator’s search for the woman because he still sees a future with her. In the story, however, that future is not to be. Despite what the narrator may wish, hope, or even plan for, Indonesian society is not yet ready to accept such a relationship. Yet there is a final layer to this portrayal: the story is set in the—albeit recent—past. Confronted with the impossibility the

narrator faces, readers may question whether it is still impossible in the present.

“Bintang Jatuh,” unlike “Pakarena,” deals with Chinese characters only briefly and, for the most part, only as nameless victims. Goedaerd, waiting to meet up with another member of the secret assassination group, decides to eat at a restaurant owned by a Chinese family. He observes an old Chinese woman and her son as they go about the business of running the shop, noting how afraid they seem. This is the only interaction Goedaerd has with any Chinese people in the story. Nevertheless, the story turns upon the idea of the place of Chinese within society. Though they may be economically successful, they are also exploited and, as Goedaerd sees at the restaurant, extraordinarily vulnerable. Instead of dealing with relationships on a personal level, Banu instead depicts relationships on a societal, even national, level.

Conclusion

“Bintang Jatuh” by M. Iksaka Banu and “Pakarena” by Khrisna Pabichara both center on the place of Chinese Indonesians within contemporary or near-contemporary Indonesian society and, more specifically, how the violence of May 1998 affected Chinese and non-Chinese individuals. Both stories also approach, in very different ways, aspects of the truth behind the riots.

“Bintang Jatuh,” using the story of the 1740 massacre in Batavia as an allegory, approaches the question of who was truly to blame for the 1998 riots. In this story, the cause of the violence is attributed to a rivalry between van Imhoff and Valckenier. This rivalry serves as a stand-in for the rivalry between Wiranto and Prabowo. Blame, however, is not placed solely upon these two individuals, but also falls upon those involved in the system of power and

corruption built by the establishment. Even the protagonist falls prey to corruption. The story also illustrates the place of the Chinese within the system, drawing parallels between the Dutch system and the New Order system. The story works to portray large forces that affect all of the population, Chinese and non-Chinese alike.

In contrast, “Pakarena” deals with the violence on a small scale, telling the story of two people, one of whom was raped and murdered during the riots. This story tells of the search for truth, in this case what happened to the woman in question. The narrator frames his search simply as a search for the woman, however, in truth, his search is more of a search for truth within himself. The woman has already died, and as this information is revealed to him in a vision, it is clear that he already knew this information, but had not yet consciously accepted it. Thus, this story is not a search for the overarching truth of the riots but instead a search for a single, personal truth about the riots. Much discussion, outrage, and uproar occurred in Indonesia concerning the veracity of the rapes. “Pakarena” presents one way in which to approach the search for truth: truth must be found on a personal level and all the facts about the May 1998 violence can never be uncovered.

Notes on the Translations

In *Outside in the Teaching Machine*, Spivak addresses the act of translating literature from a third world country into a language with more power, such as English. In cases such as this, the translator is in a position of power and thus bears a certain amount of responsibility when choosing what he or she translates. The act of translation, while separating a text from its original context, also allows the text to be accessed by a wider audience. Through translation,

aspects of a society foreign to the readers can be revealed, depending upon the choices the translator makes—first and foremost in choosing what pieces to translate.

I chose to translate “Bintang Jatuh” and “Pakarena” because of the ways in which both of these pieces address the concepts of foreignness and belonging within Indonesian society. Though both stories are about Chinese Indonesians and the complexities of this identity, neither are narrated by a Chinese Indonesian. The narrator in these stories acts as a mediator between the reader and what it really means to be Chinese Indonesian. There is already a separation in the original texts. The act of translation can make this separation even larger; one of the challenges I faced when translating these particular texts was in preserving a sense of what reading the original text would be like, in terms of structure, content, and complexity.

Venuti argues for a “foreignizing” of translation—for the creation of a translation that still keeps something of the original language, as opposed to a translation that reads fluently in the target language and is stripped of all foreign markers.\textsuperscript{169} Spivak also writes that the translator must be aware of the limits of the original text’s language.\textsuperscript{170} In translating these two stories, I have kept both of these principles in mind, striving to preserve the essential foreignness of the text as well as its quirks and limitations, while simultaneously creating something that is pleasurable to read. Maintaining the foreign nature of these texts is important in part because it emphasizes who the narrator is in relation to his audience: both are most likely not Chinese Indonesian, and the language used to communicate is Indonesian.

A major technique I have employed to convey the Indonesian nature of these texts is to

maintain Indonesian syntax when possible. I did not maintain the original construction of every sentence, but I chose to do so in sentences that I deemed particularly important. “That’s how the memory revealed itself,” the narrator says in Khrisna Pabichara’s “Pakarena.” This could just as easily be translated as, “That’s how I remember it,” creating a more fluid translation but losing some of the original meaning. It is not the narrator who remembers, but the memory that is causing itself to be remembered, a simple but essential difference.

When translating these stories, I attempted to recreate the experience an Indonesian would have when reading them—an Indonesian who may or may not be Chinese and who may or may not have familiarity with certain regional qualities mentioned within the stories. These stories are told in Indonesian, the language of the majority but also the language that most Chinese Indonesians speak. An aspect of the stories that more effectively demonstrates the various levels of foreignizing at play is the use of foreign words or ideas, particularly Chinese words. I have chosen not to translate Chinese and locale-specific words in “Pakarena” nor to translate Dutch words in Iksaka Banu’s “Bintang Jatuh.” Indonesian readers may or may not be familiar with these terms in the original versions of the story, just as English readers may or may not be familiar with them. One exception to this general rule is the word *Imlek* which, in “Pakarena,” I chose not to translate as “Chinese New Year,” but instead translated it within a footnote. In the context of the story, the non-Chinese narrator is retelling the story of Chinese New Year. In his re-telling, he chooses not to use a Chinese term for Chinese New Year but instead uses the common term in Indonesian, illustrating simultaneously his understanding of Chinese culture and his continued distance from it. This nuance would not be as clear had I translated the term.

Indonesian does not have tenses, instead employing phrases or words such as “in the past” or “tomorrow,” to convey when an action takes place. I chose to translate “Bintang Jatuh” in the past tense because it is a piece of historical fiction and the author does not employ any complexity in terms of the passage of time. “Pakarena,” however, is more complicated. I chose to translate it in the present tense, with memories conveyed in the past tense. However, there is the question of when the present is for the narrator. I chose the narrator’s present to be before he comes to the realization that the woman has died. Thus, in my translation, there is still the possibility that they could be together in the future, as well as the ever-present fact that their families disapprove. Because of this, I placed sentences such as, “Yes, my relatives hate Chinese people and your family see pribumi as insignificant,” in the present tense. These moments, however, could just as easily be placed in the past tense and it should be noted that there is an ambiguity in the original Indonesian that I was unable to fully convey in the translation.

A final challenge was deciding how best to translate the words Cina and Tionghoa. The word Cina was adopted early during Suharto’s regime and was used throughout legislation regulating Chinese Indonesians. Today, the term can have offensive connotations, particularly for the older generation, and Tionghoa is preferred when referring to people of Chinese descent. In his translation of Seno Gumira Ajidarma’s “Clara,” another short story about the 1998 riots, Bodden chooses to translate Cina as “chink” when it is used in a derogatory context. In the case of these stories, I translated both Cina and Tionghoa as “Chinese.” In neither of these stories is the word Cina used in a derogatory way. Indeed, Pabichara never uses
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Cina and only uses the term *Tionghoa* three times. Banu generally also uses the word *Tionghoa*, using *Cina* only to refer to the captain of the Chinese in Batavia\(^{176}\) and to the glass of “Chinese arak”\(^{177}\) that Captain Twijfels drinks. References to Chinese people whom the narrator encounters, including the rebel bands outside the city walls and the Chinese within the city all use the word *Tionghoa*. Given this, differentiation between the two in the story is unnecessary.

\(^{176}\) Banu, “Bintang Jatuh,” 105.
\(^{177}\) Ibid., 107.
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