



Revisiting Pram's *Bumi Manusia*: Between an Exile, Cosmopolitan Subject, and World Literature

Shofi Mahmudah Budi Utami¹, Muammar Kadafi²

¹Binghamton University, Binghamton, New York-USA

² Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Banyumas, Jawa Tengah-Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Article history:

Received 01-04-2026

Revised 02-05-2026

Accepted 02-05-2026

Keywords:

exile

cosmopolitan

world literature

Pramoedya

Bumi Manusia

This paper addresses complexity of Pram's identity (as an exile) and *Bumi Manusia* (as a product of exile), which relates to cosmopolitan subjects. It will be firstly focused on examining Pramoedya as the writer experiencing a life in exile. The discussion will, furthermore, connect to Minke, the central character in *Bumi Manusia*, which performs as if a cosmopolitan. This will draw a connection between these two subjects as they presumably reflect the opposites. Secondly, this paper intends to explore the term exile in order to extend the understanding on how 'exile' offers different realities to be construed through Pramoedya and *Bumi Manusia*; contrastively enough with the Indonesian's political situation, the book earned a worldwide readership. All the juxtapositions above will be approached with Cheah's concept temporalities which gives a clear understanding that literature "cannot be destroyed by normative forces", along with Beecroft's concept related with literature from the 'center' and 'periphery'. Based on the analysis, it is indicated that both Pramoedya and Minke in *Bumi Manusia*, although being confined, reflect what is understood as temporalities. With this potential of, in Cheah's concept, 'opening a new world', stories like *Bumi Manusia*, even though being regarded 'coming from periphery' does not have to be 'reactive', but instead it is able to offer an extension what in the actual world was.

Corresponding Author:

Name : Muammar Kadafi

Email : muammar.kadafi@outlook.com

INTRODUCTION

Pramoedya Ananta Toer, popularly known as Pramoedya or Pram, widely gained a huge acclaim from one of his influential novels, *Bumi Manusia*. Although this novel was translated into many different languages one of which is an English version, *This Earth of Mankind*, by Max Lane and has been circulated around the world, he only received national recognition for his works as "world literature" posthumously (GoGwilt, Writing to The World, 2007). *Bumi Manusia* is the first book of his tetralogy named *Buru Quartet*, chronicling the struggle of (pre)Indonesians against the Dutch colonial in the late 19th century. Recollecting the process of how this work is now of great renown, it is inevitable to dismiss the controversy on how *Bumi Manusia* was composed, written, and circulated.

Bumi Manusia was written when Pramoedya was imprisoned on Buru Island (a remote island in the east part of Indonesia) after he gained access to a pen, paper, and a typewriter in exile around 1973. Prior to his arrest in 1965, Pramoedya joined an art movement called LEKRA (Lembaga Kebudayaan Rakyat or the Institute of People's Culture), which was coordinated with



the Indonesian Socialist Party (Ikhwan, Yulianto, & Parahita, 2019). During political turmoil in the transition of power from Soekarno (the first president of Indonesia) to Soeharto (the next president), Indonesia had gone through a dark history of massacre known as the 30th of September movement or G30SPKI. This coup was outwardly aimed at dispersing the existence of Communism in Indonesia. Therefore, this affected many people who were allegedly affiliated with the Communist party, or Communist sympathizers who were arrested and exiled in or out of Indonesia (Chambert-Loir, 2016). One of those people accused was Pramoedya.

Considering Pram's identity as an exile and *Bumi Manusia* as a product from exile, it triggers a question on how exile literature, at the same time as a forbidden literary piece being read in Indonesia, has become world literature. However, the term 'exile' is complex and problematic to conceive. In a broad sense, exiles are not necessarily understood as those people imprisoned by certain power; rather, it signifies those who experienced a "loss" being deprived from their nationality or identity and whose actions caused this loss can be a voluntary choice by themselves or a forced/governmental power (Al Kaisy, 2018). In a narrow sense, though, exiles refer to political prisoners, usually under an authoritarian government, from whom they are accused of being 'wrongdoers' or against the government (GoGwilt, *The Linguistic-Literary Coordinates of English, Creole, and Indonesian Modernism*, 2010; Liukkonen, 2008). Interestingly, Henri Chambert-Loir refers the Indonesian exiles who actively wrote (or some also published works) as "wanderers" (Chambert-Loir, 2016). Even though Chambert-Loir does not propose a conceptual or theoretical basis within the term "wanderers", it provokes an intriguing discussion on exile whose movement signifies the juxtaposition of realities a 'restricted' and 'free' individual at the same time. Therefore, this paper will address this complexity as it also addresses its relation to cosmopolitan subjects.

It will be firstly focused on examining Pramoedya as the writer experiencing a life in exile. The discussion will, furthermore, connect to Minke, the central character in *Bumi Manusia*, which performs as if a cosmopolitan. I will draw a connection between these two subjects as they presumably reflect the opposites. Secondly, this paper intends to explore the term exile in order to extend the understanding on how 'exile' offers different realities to be construed through Pramoedya and *Bumi Manusia*; contrastively enough with the Indonesian's political situation, this book earned a worldwide readership. All the juxtapositions above will be approached with Cheah's concept temporalities which gives a clear understanding that literature "cannot be destroyed by normative forces" (Cheah, 2016). Along with this discussion, Beecroft's approach is also employed to identify that literature can thrive or be recognized not because of earning position or acknowledgement from the center (Beecroft, 2015, p. 19).

More importantly, this discussion on Pramoedya about his experience as a writer and an exile while his works were also widely acknowledged is not so much discussed. Most literature or critics merely view on his/its integral position in the modern Indonesian literature. If the discussion is related to his experience as an exile, rather than taking *Bumi Manusia* as the object of discussion, the study mostly reflects from his memoir, *The Mute's Soliloquy*. There has not been developed research viewing connection and juxtaposition of exile, with particularly reflecting on *Bumi Manusia*. For instance, the most recent discussion about *Bumi Manusia* is by Reno Surya on the Jakarta Post in 2021. He particularly wrote about the role of Pram's prison mate, Oei Hiem Hwie, who made the writing process of *Buru Quartet* and its publication became feasible. Another one is an academic publication in 2016 entitled "Locked Out: Literature of the Indonesian Exiles Post-1965" by Henri Chambert-Loir, which focused on Indonesian exile literature. This is not a sole research on particularly Pram's works, but rather a thorough one providing bibliographical lists of varieties of exile writings.

There has been a lack of research positioning Pram and Pram's works as a work of world literature; particularly viewing the juxtaposition of Pram as an exile and cosmopolitan subject using Cheah's and Beecroft concept. Therefore, this research focuses on seeing both Pram and his works by employs Cheah's temporality and Beecroft's world literature.

METHOD

This study employs a qualitative approach using a literary criticism and postcolonial framework to explore the complexities of exile and cosmopolitanism in Pramoedya Ananta Toer's *Bumi Manusia*. The main data sources are the novel *Bumi Manusia* including its English

translation, *This Earth of Mankind* and Pramoedya's memoir about his exile, *The Mute's Soliloquy*. Secondary sources include theoretical texts, primarily Pheng Cheah's concepts of "temporalities" and "worlding," and Alexander Beecroft's ecological approach to world literature, along with other scholarly articles discussing exile literature by Al Kaisy and Chambert-Loir.

The data collection depends on close reading and document analysis techniques. A purposive sampling method was used to select specific excerpts from the primary texts that clearly show the juxtaposition of restricted realities (exile) and free movement (cosmopolitanism). Specifically, the data focus on textual evidence highlighting Minke's European-style education and social interactions, as well as Pramoedya's experiences as a political prisoner on Buru Island, where he challenged confinement through oral storytelling and writing.

The data analysis technique follows a structured scientific process tailored to the complexities of the topic. The study first identifies and situates Pramoedya's acquired identity as an exile and a "wanderer" against Minke's positionality as a cosmopolitan subject navigating Dutch colonial systems and Javanese feudalism. These contrasting realities are then compared to analyze how Pramoedya, as a constrained author, expressed a "moving subject" through the character of Minke. The study also employs Cheah's concept of temporalities to examine how the novel goes beyond its normative historical limits, creating a "new world" rather than just reacting to the actual world of the author.

Finally, Beecroft's center-periphery framework is used to interpret how *Bumi Manusia The Earth of Mankind*, originating from a peripheral exile background, gained recognition and endurance to become part of world literature. This step-by-step analysis leads to the conclusion that the novel extends beyond actual realities and successfully transcends its physical and temporal boundaries.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Reflecting on Pramoedya and Minke as an Exile

In the context of 1965 Indonesia, Chambert-Loir implicitly identifies different terms to refer to Indonesian political prisoners. *Tapol* (tahanan politik or political prisoners) is understood to indicate those accused people imprisoned in Indonesia most were sent to remote islands including Buru Island. They were urged to cultivate paddy fields or work as free laborers during the day; and then they were called back to their confinement barracks in the evening (Hargyono, 2016). Unlike *tapol*, several people accused as a member of the Communist Party or became a Communist sympathizer staying abroad could not return to Indonesia and became exiles in those countries; therefore, they were generally known as an 'exile' (also interchangeably as *tapol*). Through historical and social process of being imprisoned and alleged political prisoners, the 'exile' identity was acquired; and interestingly, Chambert-Loir refers to these exiles as 'wanderers' (Chambert-Loir, 2016). To use the term 'wanderers' to address the exiles challenges the prevailing understanding about who exiles are, which concertedly suggests the opposite.

However, to locate a person as an 'exile' is not merely to restrict our understanding that they are constrained physically. I want to particularly situates that exile is also an embedded identity through a social or political process which these people are enforced to obtain. The attached identity exile does not need to be congruently validated with the proof of being dissident to the government. This identity rather signifies an acquired status of being "the accused" which will live with them forever. This is what happened in Indonesia during the putsch; both people affiliated with the Communist Party or related with Communist sympathizers were already attached with this identity which remained in themselves throughout their lives, and Pramoedya is a case in point. Even though he was finally released from prison, his books were still not permitted to be republished or circulated until around 2005 (Lane, 2015).

In addressing Pramoedya as an exile, I put attention to what Iman Al Kaisy discovered that there are two distinctive aspects to locate 'exile' to be viewed. According to him, first, 'exile' is translated as 'those belong to an oppositional party'; so, what follows is then a direct punishment such as an imprisonment, deprivation of employment, denial of travel, or it can use a coercive means which will affect the family of the exile (Al Kaisy, 2018). Second, if the 'exile' is particularly designated to a specific focus namely writers or artists, the consequence received by the exiles are commonly derived from subtle mechanisms; for instance, by eliminating their intellectual activity

and capacity (Al Kaisy, 2018). In this sense, Al Kaisy does not limit any specific condition including being threatened with the internment.

Among those exiles on Buru Island were primarily students, journalists, intellectuals, and writers. Pramoedya, who was a writer, became one of them and was imprisoned without trial. He was formerly a typist and a writer who joined anti-colonial movement during the revolution; and preceding his imprisonment on Buru, he joined an art movement with the Institute of People's Culture. Pramoedya was accused of a Communist sympathizer as the government associated the Institute of People's Culture heavily carrying communist ideologies. Soon he was arrested and became an exile for around fourteen years in addition to his prior imprisonments. He was exiled firstly by the colonial Dutch during independence revolution in 1945-1947 and secondly by the Sukarno's government in 1960 for one year (Liukkonen, 2008). With the Indonesian government pronouncing that Pramoedya's books threatened "national stability", shortly the Buru Quartet were ubiquitously confiscated from the national circulation.

Knowing that he was a writer, he was not allowed to write in prison. This practice of eliminating intellectual activity was aimed to stop Pramoedya to engage again with his world, writing. As it is mentioned above by Al Kaisy that this type of exile applied a subtle mechanism; instead of using coercive means, it limits the power of the exile's capacity. However, Pramoedya did not stop this way. He started to recite orally the story of Bumi Manusia, and with the contribution of his prison mates (from different barracks), he was supplied with access to 'writing tools'. Surya in his article describes that Oei Hiem Hwie provided dry leaves and cement sacks,

"Pramoedya often wrote on dry leaves or on old cement sacks. For ink, they used pigment from nearby indigo plants or charcoal from firewood. To outsmart the security guards, Hwie dug a hole made to look like an outhouse and placed a cement cover on top. In emergencies, the manuscripts were hidden in that hole"

(Surya, 2021)

In that condition, I argue Pramoedya was not constrained completely. He was a 'wanderer' with his mind. He strived to oppose his identity as an exile being in prison. He only acquired the status of being an exile but not completely removing his status as a writer. In this context, he is, what I refer to, as 'moving subject' through which literary work becomes a medium to transform his actual identity. Through a central character in *Bumi Manusia*, Minke, impersonates Pramoedya's life. However, what makes it thought-provoking is that Pramoedya presents Minke as a cosmopolitan subject, not an exile. Minke was a student at H.B.S (Hogere Burgerschool), a secondary school established by the Dutch colonial in Indonesia during 19th century. He was taught European knowledge and learned a European way. When he was introduced to Annelies's mom (who was also exposed to European culture because she was a concubine of a Dutch man), Minke told her that "Yes, mama, my teachers teach European civilization" (Toer, 1996, p. 32). Furthermore, Minke knew that he had acquired the European skill of note-taking.

"Ilmu dan pengetahuan, yang kudapatkan dari sekolah dan kusaksikan sendiri pernyataannya dalam hidup, telah membikin pribadiku menjadi agak berbeda dari sebangsaku pada umumnya."

"Menyalahi wujudku sebagai orang Jawa atau tidak aku pun tidak tahu. Dan justru pengalaman hidup sebagai orang Jawa berilmu pengetahuan Eropa yang mendorong aku suka mencatat-catat. Suatu kali akan berguna, seperti sekarang ini."

(Toer, 2005)

"This science and learning, which I had been taught at school and which I saw manifested in my life all around me, meant that I was rather different from the general run of my countrymen. I don't know. And that's how it was that I, Javanese, liked to make notes—because of my European training. One day the notes would be of use to me, as they are now."

(Toer, 1996)

He did not only attain this European education and skill, but he befriended with people from various backgrounds, such as Jean Marais, a Frenchman who used to be an enrolled Dutch Indies soldier and ended up being a furniture dealers; and Mr. and Mrs. Telinga, Minke's Dutch landlord. Also, he knew several people who worked with him like Ah Tjong, who has Chinese ancestry, and Darsam who was a Maduranese (one of ethnic tribes in Indonesia).

"Begitulah sore itu aku terpaksa bertanya pada Jean Marais. Suatu percakapan bersungguh-sungguh dengannya belum bisa diharapkan, sekali pun Bahasa Melayunya semakin hari semakin baik juga. Dia tak tahu Belanda. Itu sulitnya. Bahasa Melayunya terbatas. Bahasa Perancisnya sangat payah. Ia setengah mati menolak belajar Belanda, sekali pun lebih empat tahun jadi serdadu Kompeni, berperang di Aceh. Bahasa Belanda yang diketahuinya terbatas pada aba-aba militer.

Tapi dia sahabatku yang lebih tua, kompanyon dalam berusaha. Sudah sepatutnya aku bertanya padanya.

Para tukang di bengkel sedang merampungkan perabot kamar yang dipesan dengan nama Ah Tjong. Mungkin yang punya nama plesiran tetangga Nyai Ontosoroh. Hanya karena pesanan itu bergaya Eropa orang Tionghoa tidak memesan pada sebangsanya sendiri. Kuterima order itu melalui orang lain."

(Toer, 2005, p. 42)

"And so that afternoon I found myself compelled to go and ask Jean Marais. I could not yet hope for a really serious conversation with him, although his Malay was getting better every day. He didn't know Dutch. That was the difficulty. His Malay was limited. My French was pretty hopeless. He resisted learning Dutch with all his might, even though he had fought in Aceh with the Dutch Colonial Army for more than four years. His Dutch was confined with military terms.

But he was my oldest friend, my companion in business. It was only proper to ask him.

The workmen were finishing off furniture ordered by someone called Ah Tjong. I suspected that it was the one who owned the brothel next door to Nyai Ontosoroh's. Because the order was for European-style furniture, the Chinese hadn't gone to Chinese carpenter. I had received the order through someone else."

(Toer, 2005, p. 55)

Creating this character of Minke who was so connected with myriads cultures, Pramoedya was engaged with the idea of cosmopolitanism. Pramoedya reflects Minke as a 'moving subject', but in reality as the story goes, Minke was constrained with the judgements of his people and rights he could not acquire from the colonial power. He was confronted with the fear how his people, Javanese, would perceive himself as a native while he was in love with a mixblood, Annelies; and he could not have to right to make his marriage with Annelies being acknowledged by the state it was void according to the Dutch colonial government as these two coming from different class system. "[...] your young blood wants to have her for yourself, and you're afraid what all people will say" (Toer, *This Earth of Mankind* (M. Lane, Trans.), 1996, p. 56). The excerpt of Jean Marais's suggestion for Minke conveys the actual complexity of Minke being restricted of his existence in his own land, not merely from Dutch colonial system, but from his people imposed a colonial mind a class system enacted by the Dutch.

The above discussion presents the juxtaposition of Pramoedya as a real, actual exile, but he dynamically becomes a 'moving subject' as well, through the story he created. Meanwhile, Minke seemed to be a cosmopolitan figure, but this character implicitly signifies an 'exile' as he was confronted with the complexity of feudalism of his people and colonial power of the Dutch which constrained him. According to this analysis, the story in *Bumi Manusia* does not only contain provoking contestation of power relation and an allegory of colonial resistance, but also how the story allows the actual world to extend. This will refer to Cheah's concepts of worlding and temporalities.

B. Resituating Pramoedya and *Bumi Manusia* Within Different Temporalities

Pramoedya's works, especially *Bumi Manusia* and other books of the Buru Quartet, are situated in different "momentum" from the experience of its writing process. The story was set in the late 19th to the beginning of 20th Century Indonesia, where *Etische Politiek* (Dutch Ethical Policy) was enforced in the Dutch East Indies or present-day Indonesia. The pre-Indonesian nation were manipulated by the Dutch colonial with this policy where the Dutch had the moral responsibility after they made the native people suffered from colonialism. This agenda sounded like a compromising mission by having three principles including, education, irrigation, and transmigration. This policy, of which main importance was educational and administrative reforms, was commenced in 1901 (Van Klinken, 2003). Aside from the European modernity that was carried within this policy, with the administrative reforms as one of its importance, this allowed class systems to emerge. One of which was a decentralized government which distributed

authority to local-region level. Therefore, the creation of local ruler appointed by the Dutch was applied, such as a bupati a title given to a native Javanese official who was responsible to administer a region; and they were commonly regarded as noble people.

This was reflected within the life of Minke whose father was a *bupati* (regent). Minke, who was a young Javanese, lived in the colonized era during in the so called Dutch East Indies. Although he had privileges compared to other native Indonesians, he was in fact still confined with the political restriction. Minke had access to Dutch school and privileges to a decent life. However, he was marginalized by the Dutch colonial power, which made him have injustice in their own land, for example his marriage with a mixblood woman, Annelies, was not acknowledged by the Dutch.

Through this Minke character, Pramoedya awakened the nation and provoked them to arrive at this "important moment" to start a revolution against this shadow of Dutch civilizing mission. Meanwhile, Pramoedya, in the actual reality, lived a different life with all the restrictions he had in the exile. At this point, the story intersects with the critical "momentum" that Pramoedya had to fight against the unfairness by the power of authoritarian government after the putsch. Although it is slightly different with Minke (along with his privileges), both Minke and Pramoedya had constraints, just like an exile. To return to Minke's condition, he was restricted by this pseudo privilege under the colonization to which it excluded him from other natives in Java; and Pramoedya was confined with the attached label of being a threat to the nation as he identified as a Communist sympathizer. In this sense, they are both exiles in two distinct moments, but the root is the same being subjected as an exile, as they were conditioned to be restricted.

Reflecting on this issue about Minke, particularly when he is marginalized in his own land, it explicable that Minke is a peripheral subject formed and conditioned by different occurrences being imposed by Dutch educational system and being rejected by the Javanese social-caste scheme, which was also rigidly systemized by the colonial Dutch. Regardless of being confined with the colonial restrictive policies and Javanese feudalism which maintained administrative nobility, Minke is perceived to own cosmopolitan ways of thinking in this interplay of existing power:

"Ilmu dan pengetahuan, yang kudapatkan dari sekolah dan kusaksikan sendiri pernyataannya dalam hidup, telah membikin pribadiku menjadi agak berbeda dari sebangsaku pada umumnya."

"Menyalahi wujudku sebagai orang Jawa atau tidak aku pun tidak tahu. Dan justru pengalaman hidup sebagai orang Jawa berilmu pengetahuan Eropa yang mendorong aku suka mencatat-catat. Suatu kali akan berguna, seperti sekarang ini."

(Toer, 2005, pp. 3-4)

This science and learning, which I had been taught at school and which I saw manifested in my life all around me, meant that I was rather different from the general run of my countrymen. I don't know. And that's how it was that I, Javanese, liked to make notes—because of my European training. One day the notes would be of use to me, as they are now.

(Toer, 1996, pp. 16-17)

This positionality draws on how Minke was indoctrinated with European-style education. Minke with his privilege in acquiring education in H.B.S school was often being mocked as native Javanese by Robert Suurhof (Minke's classmate), Annelies's (to whom Minke then fell in love with) brother and father who was a Dutch. According to the excerpt and the treatment from those people of mix-blood, often called Indo, and Dutch, Minke is situated in two distinct situations which he tried to make sense of. Therefore, it is clear enough to refer to Minke as the peripheral subject despite his privilege as a descendant of noble man and as having a cosmopolitan. Also, not to neglect the creation of Minke character, it is central to understand Pramoedya as an individual and as a writer; and most importantly why his works are pivotal to the Indonesian literature.

During his imprisonment, Pramoedya's world seemed to be bordered with such physical look of the walls of the camp; he was restricted to be outside of this structure of building of the prison unless it was the time for him to cultivate the paddy fields. He was given limited access to whom he could speak to and had no access to read or write. However, with this exile situation on Buru did not confine him to recall all his childhood memories where stories his mother told always

accompanied him (GoGwilt, *The Linguistic-Literary Coordinates of English, Creole, and Indonesian Modernism*, 2010). Other than *Bumi Manusia* or books compiled in *Buru Quartet*, *Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu* or translated as *The Mute's Soliloquy* a collection of his prison notes is more like a memoir. In his writing, he explicated that he grew up with hearing stories from her mother at night; and through this childhood experience, knowing Western stories as well as Javanese legendary stories became essential in understanding how Pramoedya formed himself as an individual and as a writer. Referring to his memoir written in prison, Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu revisits parts of his childhood memory that is intriguing to examine:

Ibuku seorang yang suka membaca majalah dan buku: Jawa, selama tidak berhuruf Jawa, Melayu dan Belanda. Ia setiap hari mengikuti koran, baik dari Surabaya maupun Semarang, yang dikirimkan cuma-cuma pada alamat kami. Buku dan majalah juga dikirimkan pada ayahku dengan cuma-cuma. Dari bacaan itu ia suka bercerita. Ia seorang pencerita yang baik dan selalu memikat. Kadang ia bercerita di malam hari sambil duduk dalam kerumunan anak-anaknya. Tidak jarang anak-anak titipan mendengarkan juga dari sesuatu jarak. Kadang ia bercerita sambil tiduran menyusui bayinya. Ia dapat bercerita bersambung-sambung sampai beberapa malam tentang cerita berangkai Amir Hamzah, yang dalam terjemahan Jawa jadi Bagindo Ambyah, Angling Darmo, atau cerita lain dari Almanak Balai Pustaka, atau cerita-cerita Eropa: Klein Duimpje, Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver, Putri Genoveva (yang semua ini kemudian aku baca sendiri), dan banyak yang lain, dan tentu akan membosankan bila disebut semua.

(Toer, 1995, p. 50)

My mother liked to read and could understand Javanese in Roman script, as well as Malay and Dutch. She kept up with the Surabaya and Semarang daily papers and all the books and magazines that we received. (My father, as the principal of a school, was given numerous publications free of charge.) At night, when encircled by her children, or sometimes when lying down and nursing the youngest child, she'd weave for us stories based on the materials she had read. She was a brilliant storyteller, able to entwine us in her spell. Over a series of nights she might relate the story of Angling Darmo and her favorite hero, Amir Hamzah. Or one of the many stories published by Balai Pustaka. [Or European stories: Klein Duimpje, Robinson Crusoe, Gulliver's Travels, Putri Genoveva (all of which I would later read myself), and many more besides, although for sure it would be boring to mention them all.]

(Toer & Samuels, 1999)

A series of stories he recalled during his childhood has created its own repertoire in his mind, which undoubtedly influence him as a writer. To view him as an individual, it also relates with how he conceives a resistance toward the injustice power manifested through literary works. Beecroft correlates "[...] the existence of a body of texts (oral or written) that legitimate certain linguistic forms at the expense of others does a great deal to establish that set of forms as constituting a "language" rather than a "dialect" (Beecroft, 2015, p. 8). When the story comes in the set of 1920's period, Pramoedya provoked this idea of asserting the importance of using Bahasa Indonesia, through Minke's role, to fight against the Dutch colonial. It did not end up there, but this awareness brought into the actual world of 1970's; it was to bring Indonesia back to its "roots", which GoGwilt mentions as "writing back to Indonesian people with its polyphony and heterogeneity which constitute the turning point of Indonesian literary modernism" (GoGwilt, *The Linguistic-Literary Coordinates of English, Creole, and Indonesian Modernism*, 2010). Language becomes Pramoedya's literary coordinate to intersect with what he understood as modernism and nationalism. Modernism here is interpreted as the importance of Bahasa Indonesia which brought pivotal point in the unification multi-ethnics (pre)Indonesian society during 1920's-1940's.

With all of these constituted aspects, the acquired identity, being an exile confined with borders, but on the other hand he potentially embodies a "moving subject" through which this creation and the spirit of *Bumi Manusia* contemplated two types of modernism using Indonesian language as the starting point of literary modernism Indonesia, and also the modernism brought by the colonialization through the civilizing mission. Those sorts affected inspiration by the historical experience that Pram had, and through the manifestation of his childhood repertoire did not necessarily 'exile' him. Being imprisoned also did not stop him to produce influential works that simultaneously voice the voiceless through which he conceived nationalism. It is viable enough to also look at the main issue, on how he also perceived himself, in the voice of the narrator in his book, and through the character of Minke, which personifies a 'moving' subject; also, on

how *Bumi Manusia* transgressed 'temporality' in the context of pre-independent Indonesia. Based on the above excerpt, it is clear how he was still able to connect with all this stories, which I believe it has shaped him to become an individual who is always moving. In tracing this incorporated influence towards being a cosmopolitan, Pramoedya is viewed as the subject who is always moving.

The Buru Quartet plays a significant role in Indonesian literature and *Sastra Eksil* (Exile literature) as the turning point of modern Indonesian literature (GoGwilt, *The Linguistic-Literary Coordinates of English, Creole, and Indonesian Modernism*, 2010). Not only did Pramoedya's awaken this anti-colonial nationalism, but also his works construed the contextual history of (pre)Indonesia, which seems extensive to what the actual world was it is reflected on the coup which displaced many alleged political prisoners and other victims of the 30th of September movement. To locate Pramoedya's work in this context is to see that literature is not a 'reactive' manifestation of the world, which is aligned with Cheah's argument on how literature is able to, instead, 'remake' the world (Cheah, 2016). This connects to what Cheah means as 'temporality', which rejects the ideal reality as the end immanence in humanities literature is viewed as a process of 'worlding' which opens to every new possibility. With the acknowledgement of inequalities in Pramoedya's story, Pramoedya and *Bumi Manusia* can transcend its temporality given that it had been also conditioned by the power dynamics (or Cheah's normativity) and offers to opening a 'new world' instead of being a 'reactive' to the actual world. Pramoedya through *Bumi Manusia* did not intend to create the opposite world which is far better from the one he experienced with all constraints he faced. Instead, he created an extension to what he encountered in the actual world. He presented the injustice and the actuality along with possibility to fight back even though he was failed. This parallel, instead of imagining a better world, he presented possibility of "fighting back" the Dutch colonial power in *Bumi Manusia* this is what I pointed out as 'transcending temporality'.

Furthermore, this book is considered peripheral as an exile literature which access to it was not easy. With these given contexts, Pramoedya's work has gone through, what Beecroft argues as "the process of recognition and survival", which definitely owned a distinctive way to thrive—"[...] literature thrive in a wide variety of ways, rather than there being the single adaptive strategy" (Beecroft, 2015). With its short time in a national circulation from 1979-1980, it was brought to a world circulation after Max Lane were able to publish the translation version "This Earth of Mankind" shortly after being removed from his position at the Australian Embassy, Indonesia (Toer, *This Earth of Mankind* (M. Lane, Trans.), 1996). Also, Carl Niekerk observes on how Pramoedya's work, including a memoir implicates, according to Cheah, different temporalities; in this sense, it denotes understanding that a work literature can emerge as a world literature does not necessarily come from the center, or being acknowledged by the center (Niekerk, 2018).

According to this understanding and relating to what is stated by Beecroft that the recognition is not always from the center to be able to complete as a work of world literature; but conversely, how this difference into its recognition and survival makes sense by acknowledging that there is an intersection between 'milieus' taken into consideration. Interestingly, this also follows the question on whether peripheral subjects, namely an exile writer and the works produced in the exile, matter to this literature to thrive. It is also intriguing to position his works as the colonial periphery as they had a short time to be in national circulation before the ban.

CONCLUSION

Both Pramoedya and Minke in *Bumi Manusia*, although being confined, reflect what is understood as temporalities, that they imply a "moving subject" potentially opening a 'new world'. In this sense, Pramoedya opens possibility with his being an exile, but through literary works, he presents nationalism spirit (pre)Indonesia context by acknowledging the multi-ethnic and multi-lingual Indonesia to arrive in such world called modern Indonesia. Also in parallel to it, Minke in the story of *Bumi Manusia* was able to be the "moving subject" to fight the unfairness of the colonial Dutch. Being constraint with the Dutch colonial system, Minke's spirit awakens other native people to 'self-return' to their own roots and this process is meant by Cheah as a process of 'worlding'. Therefore, stories like *Bumi Manusia*, even though regarded that it is 'coming from periphery' a story does not always to be 'reactive' which according to Cheah this literary works

only acknowledge the aesthetic part and therefore deny inequalities existing in the actual world. Instead, Bumi Manusia offers as an extension what in the actual world was.

REFERENCES

- Al Kaisy, I. (2018). Writer and Exile: Abd al-Rahman Munif (S. Mejcher-Atassi, Trans.). *Journal of world Literature*, 3, 497-511. <https://scholarworks.aub.edu.lb/server/api/core/bitstreams/09caad6a-d64b-4979-b67c-7331194ca4ba/content>
- Beecroft, A. (2015). *An Ecology of world Literature: from Antiquity to The Present Day*. London & New York: Verso.
- Chambert-Loir, H. (2016). Locked Out: Literature of the Indonesian Exiles Post-1965. *Archipel*, 119-145.
- Cheah, P. (2016). *What is a world? : on postcolonial literature as world literature*. Duke University Press.
- GoGwilt, C. (2007, July 14). *Writing to The World*. Retrieved from Inside Indonesia: www.insideindonesia.org/editions/edition-8819/writing-to-the-world
- GoGwilt, C. (2010). The Linguistic-Literary Coordinates of English, Creole, and Indonesian Modernism. In C. GoGwilt, *The Passage of Literature: Genealogies of Conrad, Rhys, and Pramoedya*. Oxford: The Oxford University Press.
- Hargyono, S. (2016, May 14). *Equality Development and Globalisation Studies*. Retrieved December 2023, from Northwestern Buffet Institute for Global Affairs: <https://www.edgs.northwestern.edu/documents/working-papers/buru-island.pdf>
- Ikhwan, H., Yulianto, V. I., & Parahita, G. D. (2019). The Contestation of Social Memory in the New Media: A Case Study of the 1965 Killings in Indonesia. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies / Österreichische Zeitschrift Für Südostasienwissenschaft*, 12(1), 3-16.
- Lane, M. (2015, January 12). *Why you should read 'This Earth of Mankind'*. Retrieved from Marxist Left Review: <https://marxistleftreview.org/articles/why-you-should-read-this-earth-of-mankind/>
- Liukkonen, P. (2008). *Pramoedya Ananta Toer (1925-2006)*. Retrieved from Authorscalendar: <http://authorscalendar.info/pram.htm>
- Mejcher-Atassi, S., & Al Kaisy, I. (2018). Writer and Exile : 'Abd al-Rahman Munif. *Journal of World Literature*, 497-511.
- Niekerk, C. (2018). World Literature without Goethe: On Pramoedya Ananta Toer's Labour Camp Memoirs The Mute's Soliloquy. *A Journal of Germanic Studies*.
- Pokrivčák, A., & Zelenka, M. (2023). Transcending the national: on worlding the peripheral literatures. *Neohelicon*.
- Surya, R. (2021, September 21). *Oei Hiem Hwie: The guardian of Pramoedya Ananta Toer's banned literary tetralogy* This article was published in thejakartapost.com with the title "Oei Hiem Hwie: The guardian of Pramoedya Ananta Toer's banned literary tetralogy". Click to read: <https://www.thejakartapost.com/life/2021/09/21/oei-hiem-hwie-the-guardian-of-pramoedya-ananta-toers-banned-literary-tetralogy.html>
- Toer, P. A. (1995). *Nyayi Sunyi Seorang Bisu*. Lentera.
- Toer, P. A. (1996). *This Earth of Mankind* (M. Lane, Trans.). Penguin Books.
- Toer, P. A. (2005). *Bumi Manusia*. Lentera Depantra.
- Toer, P. A., & Samuels, W. (1999). *The mute's soliloquy : a memoir (1st ed.)*. Hyperion.
- Van Klinken, G. (2003). Indonesian Politics in outline, 1902-1942. In G. Van Klinken, *Minorities, Modernity, and the Emergin Nation* (pp. 27-49). Leiden: KITLV Press.
- YouTube. (2013, July 17). A Reading from "Nyanyi Sunyi Seorang Bisu", A Memoir [Video]. Center for Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan.