

University of Canberra

Patrick Mullins

Quick books, quick manoeuvres: Disentangling the dangers and opportunities of the quickie political biography

Abstract:

The publication of the biography of the political leader is de rigeur in the Australian electoral cycle. Characterised by their haste of production, by their regurgitation of already-published articles, and by a liberal use of quotes attributed and not, such books are often ephemeral confections, destined for the dustbin whether their subject is successful or not (Blewett, 2007).

But the political quickie is, on closer inspection, a mix of competing opportunities and dangers that belie its negative description. When considered, the quickie is revealing of the uses of biographical writing to perform, connect, and manoeuvre within a political context.

Biographical note:

Patrick Mullins is a PhD candidate at the University of Canberra.

Keywords:

Biography – Life Writing – Political Subject – Journalism

Two biographies of Kevin Rudd were commissioned within days of his becoming leader of the Australian Labor Party in December 2006. Upon their near-simultaneous publication in June 2007, Neal Blewett characterised the texts as the latest examples in a long line of ‘quickies’:

They have roughly the shelf life of homogenised cheese and are almost certainly destined for that knacker’s yard for books – the remainder store – regardless of whether their subject is successful or not [...] These books are hastily compiled confections: a regurgitation of published articles on the subject’s career [...] plus a dollop of his speeches and writings, mixed together with a heady collection of quotes from colleagues and associates, frequently unattributed. (Blewett 2007, p: . 8)

Such books have been a consistent feature of the Australian electoral cycle for a number of years, but unexplained is the worth of these books when they are so apparently ephemeral and easily disregarded. Using the biographies of Kevin Rudd and Tony Abbott¹ as a case study, this paper argues that the worth of the quickie may be found in an examination of the opportunities and dangers that the biography of the contemporary political figure brings. These opportunities and dangers, overlapping and entangling, characterise the genre and, this paper suggests, reveal much about the potential of biographical writing to manoeuvre, connect and interpret within the Australian political and public spheres.

Characteristics

For purpose of clarity, the characteristics of the ‘quickie’ political biography are outlined below. These include, but are not limited to:

- Publisher-driven;
- Are produced on a short timetable (usually counted in months) and published with specific time currency, to engage with cultural, social, or political debate;
- Are often reliant on oral material (attributed and not) and publicly available information;
- Are shaped by a narrative of (usually) either the ‘coming man’ or the ‘bitter end’ at the expense of theoretical or contextual analysis;
- Depict politics as a drama;
- Feature interplay between the writer and subject/s;
- Focus on prominent subjects such as party leaders or high-ranking ministers;
- Are of variable length and form, often crossing boundaries between forms of political history, essay, profile and biography;
- Are usually authored by journalists;

This list is informed by the characteristics noted by Blewett (2007), Loveday (1985), MacIntyre (in Dickenson 2010: 116), by in-text and paratextual descriptions of the case study texts, and by descriptions offered by the biographers of the case study texts in interviews with the author. The author suggests that the *Quarterly Essays* produced on Kevin Rudd and Tony Abbott – the latter republished in an expanded edition as a stand-alone book; that text then republished in a single volume with the *Quarterly Essay* on Kevin Rudd as *Rudd v Abbott* (2013) - should be viewed as quickies: as is

shown in this paper, they are substantive works produced on contemporary political figures that display biographical traits which were published to engage with a specific time currency. Although not the focus of this paper, I will further suggest that there is substantial crossover between the biography and profile forms (including history, technique, length, opportunities and dangers) that make delineation between the two arbitrary, inconsistent, and problematic.

The Subject

For the political leader, the production of a quickie biography offers opportunity for manoeuvre and connection. An account that favourably describes the life of a politician can help situate him or her in an electorally advantageous position. The reward of such a biography, John Corner writes, enables a politician to move from a sphere of ‘political institutions and processes’ and into one of the ‘public and popular’, where ‘the identity of the politician as a *person of qualities* is most emphatically and strategically put forward’ (2000, : 393). The prime characteristic of this opportunity is in the potential of the text to frame a subject’s story in a way that promotes identification and affective attachment. Sidonie Smith argues that ‘the personal fable projected to the public can embody in an individual the fables of the national imaginary, and through the intimacy of acts of telling, the reader or audience can imagine sharing the same fable’ (2010: ix). According to Mark Hearn and Harry Knowles, the typical orthodoxy of biographies of Labor Party politicians echoes Smith’s point:

These diverse biographies reflect a common theme: how Labor created a place for the working class within the nation-state, and often formed the national government [...] Biographers are inclined to impose a symmetry of progress on their subjects, recounting the story of a life unfulfilled, a commitment vindicated. (Hearn & Knowles 2011: 128)

Robert Macklin’s *Kevin Rudd: The Biography* (2007) arguably presents its subject in engagement with both Smith’s ‘fable of the national imaginary’ (2010: ix) and Hearn and Knowles’ ‘symmetry of progress’ (2011: 128). The biography highlights Rudd’s convict ancestry, his World War II veteran-turned-farmer father, his attendance at university through the policies of the Whitlam Government, his hiking of the Kokoda Trail, and his progression through the ranks of the diplomatic services and Parliamentary Labor Party to the position of leader and potential-Prime Minister. In doing so, the text positions Rudd in accordance with the public image he cultivated - as the man who can take the public:

[...] back to the bedrock of their legends, their values and their dreams – to a country which has never really existed and probably never will, but which is the Australia to which they want to belong. (MacCallum 2009: 67)

The connections that Macklin’s text makes between Rudd and the Australia that Mungo MacCallum highlights helped to position Rudd, at the time of the biography’s release, in a context of Smith’s ‘national imaginary’ (2010: ix). A similar idea was prominent in Michael Duffy’s *Latham and Abbott* (2004). Abbott, Duffy argues,

‘owes his position to his ability with words and stories [...] His success has lain in his ability to articulate and communicate values’ (2004: 4). Although he notes that Abbott’s personal story is ‘an exotic species’ (4), Duffy suggests that Abbott and Latham can ‘not only tell a good story, they are one’ (3). The use of story – in a fable of the national imaginary and in the communication of values and character – is prominent in these texts and is indicative of the opportunities that a quickie biography can offer.

But just as there is opportunity for the subject, so too is there danger. The possibility that the quickie will be a “hatchet job” hangs over the entire enterprise. The investment of the subject with what James Walter calls their ‘life myth’ (2006: 29) complicates their interactions with the biographer. Concerned with their image, with posterity, and public perceptions, a biographical subject can be sensitive to the knowledge that their agenda and desires are only one of a myriad that will shape the final product. As Walter writes:

It will not be in the interests of image maintenance to have that [certain image] probed and possibly stripped away to reveal the human frailty underneath [...] It must be recognized that the preservation of image is not shaped simply by the demands of the public persona, but maybe also unrecognized imperatives of the psyche. (Walter 1984: 60)

Perhaps mirroring these concerns, Kevin Rudd refused to co-operate with Nicholas Stuart and his *Kevin Rudd: An Unauthorised Political Biography* (2007). Having already extended co-operation to Robert Macklin for his competing biography, Rudd additionally attempted to dissuade sources from talking with Stuart:

‘Listen mate, you’re not going to get very much because everyone’s been lent on pretty heavily,’ says a person who knew Rudd at this time and who refuses to speak to me further. ‘You know, for the good of the party. Just shut up. Don’t say anything. That sort of thing. The Rudd machine has gone to work.’ (Stuart 2007: 86)

But for the subject who does co-operate with a biographer, evaluating the dangers and opportunities influences the extent and conditions of their co-operation. For his 2010 *Quarterly Essay* ‘Power Trip’, for example, David Marr was granted an interview with Kevin Rudd with time for on-the-record and off-the-record discussions. But for his 2012 *Quarterly Essay* ‘Political Animal’, Marr was granted one interview with Tony Abbott that was, with exception for one comment, entirely off the record. The subject’s evaluation of the dangers and opportunities of co-operating with a biography will influence the extent and conditions of their co-operation.

Outside of the hatchet job, a risk of co-operating with a biography is the conflation of the personal identity with the political. Lachlan Harris, Rudd’s former senior press secretary (2006-2010), argues that the biography of a contemporary political figure cuts both ways. Although it can successfully facilitate the transition between political and public spheres, a biography also ‘personalises the [public] introduction and experience’ of a subject – a particular problem if the subject is unknown. Such a biography ‘inherently runs risks later on that all of your personal life becomes challengeable’ (author’s interview, 20 May 2012). Coupled with what Judith Brett describes as the ‘personalizing of politics, the dealignment of politics from party and

with the increasing focus on leadership, and this idea that prime ministers are central to government' (cited in Haigh 2013: 53), there is danger in the contemporary biography's explication and conflation of the private subject with that of the public politician.

The Biographer

The opportunities and dangers for the quickie biographer are similarly complex. As Dickenson (2010) notes, the common background of the quickie biographer is journalism. This should not be surprising. As Steve Weinberg suggests:

The top journalists-turned-biographers bring ready-made to the craft traits that tend to come less naturally to specialized academics: they know how to obtain hard-to-find, previously private information on a variety of subjects from government agencies and private repositories; how to convince reluctant sources to talk; how to write clearly for readers of all levels rather than other holders of doctorates; how to compose at the word processor before the deadline is long past. (Weinberg 1992: 3)

It is not surprising, then, to see that the biographers of Rudd and Abbott – Michael Duffy, Susan Mitchell, Robert Macklin, Nicholas Stuart, and David Marr – have all worked as journalists. But navigating the dangers and opportunities that this common background offers is central to the final product and demonstrative of the dangers and opportunities the quickie biographer faces. The knowledge and relationships that the journalist-turned biographer brings can work against them.

To begin, the objective description of a political subject for the benefit of an informed public is often the justification and goal for the writing of a quickie. Writing that he 'made no attempt to wipe away the blemishes, but [that] neither is this some sort of demolition job', Nicholas Stuart argued that his subject 'is standing for election today [...] We need to know about Rudd now. That's why this book has been written (2007: 1). But this justification and goal is susceptible to advocacy and demolition. In *Kevin Rudd: The Biography* (2007), Robert Macklin admits that 'any attempt' on his part 'to provide a balanced appraisal' of Rudd had been 'overwhelmed' (2007: 201). Susan Mitchell's *Tony Abbott: A Man's Man* (2011) justifies its production on grounds that greater awareness of its subject's views on women is required:

Why would I want to write a book about Tony Abbott? The reason is simple. Of all the men who have held or sought to hold the office of prime minister, I believe he is the most dangerous. (Mitchell 2011: 1)

But by making clear her distrust of the veracity of Abbott's public images – Mitchell writes that her book is an attempt to 'see behind the masks, the political rhetoric, and the media-managed profiles' (2011: 6) – the work was characterised as a hatchet job. Like Macklin's biography of Rudd, the overt subjectivity compromised the account and allowed it to be dismissed (Fitzgerald, 2011).

The opportunity for personal gain is also influential on the quickie biographer. Scalmer and Dickenson argue that 'the process of commodification' of the journalist-

biographer embraces ‘the writer himself’ (2010: 2). In reference to the work of Paul Kelly, they argue that:

His journalism and histories each support the other: Kelly’s major works of history elevate his prestige and underlie his authority as a weekly sage; at the same time, the daily round of reportage provides a storehouse of copy, an opportunity to develop interpretations and a public recognition. (Scalmer & Dickenson 2010: 2)

The process that Scalmer and Dickenson note is present in the work of most quickie biographers. Marr’s *Quarterly Essays* on Rudd and Abbott were re-published with rhetoric that commodified Marr and stated the definitiveness of his work: *Rudd v Abbott* contained the ‘definitive portraits by Australia’s pre-eminent biographer and investigative journalist’ (2013(b), dust jacket). The link is of a commercial nature predicated on reputation, with the previous work of the writer reinforcing the prestige of his or her future work. The ‘publisher-driven’ convention of the quickie that Scalmer and Dickenson identify (2010) demonstrates that the quickie is commissioned with the edge and urgency of the electoral cycle in mind: to create and maximise a commercial opportunity in the fulfillment of a civic desire to know more or to advocate or demolish a politician fighting for election. The use of review copies and provision of extracts in metropolitan newspapers ahead of publication² are evidence of the commercial nature of the quickie political biography.

Another point of opportunity and danger in the quickie biography is the use of label. Terms such *authorised*, *official*, *unauthorised*, *political*, *personal*, and *portrait* litter the covers of biographies yet lack consistent application. Marr’s volume of essays on Rudd and Abbott are called ‘portraits’ (2013(b), dust-jacket), yet so too is Don Watson’s *Recollections of a Bleeding Heart: A Portrait of Paul Keating* (2002). Although there are surely explanations for the artistic license that *portrait* connotes, there are none could be reasonably applied with consistency across these two very different works of biography. Frank Bongiorno writes that use of the *unauthorised* label promises much:

Critical distance; something other than the tiresome diet served up by spin doctors; perhaps even a revealing detail or two that has hitherto been successfully hidden from journalistic-blood-hounds. (Bongiorno 2007)

But the reasoning for its use is often more pedestrian. Stuart’s biography, for example, was explicitly retitled following news that its subject would not co-operate:

We would call our book ‘an unauthorized political biography’ [...] We had to make a virtue of necessity. We had to prevent any perception taking hold that our book might be inadequate by comparison because it lacked first-person quotes from Rudd, and we had to take the initiative by making it clear that our book was spin-free, neither endorsed nor supported by Rudd. (Rosenblom 2007)

Robert Macklin did not have to make such a virtue. While he writes that *Kevin Rudd: The Biography* is not ‘authorized’, the title states a definitiveness that Stuart’s does not. Macklin’s note that ‘with the most minor exception, they [Rudd] sought no control over its contents’ (2007: v) leaves the reader no clearer to the conditions or extent of co-operation or authorization, and his description of himself as the ‘official

biographer' of Rudd (personal website, 2013) further confuses the specific meaning of the labels. From Rosenblom's statement and the confusion surrounding Macklin and his biography, it is arguably the case that these labels are determined as much by the marketability of their connotations as they are by the technique and form of the work itself.

The timeliness of the quickie brings opportunity and danger to the enterprise. Commissioned with an eye to engaging with the zeitgeist of an imminent election or an existing political debate, the opportunity is self-evident. Ricketson (2004a) suggests that the profile writer finds:

[...] not only what is new but what is interesting; they are alive to issues that are on people's minds now, and the role their subject plays in them. All these elements give the world of profile-writers an edge and an urgency that is absent in historical biographies. (Ricketson 2004 (a): 3)

This argument easily extends to the quickie biographer. In offering insight to the political subject, the quickie biographer wields power: their ability to shape perception and news feeds into a political context. The publication of Marr's *Quarterly Essay* on Rudd made headlines because of the newsworthy information it contained. So too with Marr's essay on Abbott: 'Weeks of gaffes by Abbott and his men meant that even before my *Quarterly Essay* [...] appeared in early September 2012, Abbott's problem with women was back on the political agenda'. Allegations of a punch thrown in 1977 meant that 'the punch became the essay' (2013 (a): 169-70). But just as this ability to engage with topical subjects presents opportunity, so too does it present danger. The short time period given to the production of a quickie – four, five and three months apiece for Macklin (2007: v), Stuart (author's interview, 9 February 2012), and Marr (author's interview, 20 April 2012), in their works on Rudd – can determine the nature of sources and ability to include information that emerges later. The mid-2007 emergence of news that Rudd had undergone heart surgery is missed by both Stuart's and Macklin's books and is demonstrative of the danger of the quickie biographer missing important information; the exclusion or inclusion of which can undermine the credibility of their work.

The use of oral history instead of documentary evidence is another danger and opportunity of the quickie biography. Because of the short time periods in which quickies are often produced, the use of oral testimony from colleagues, relatives, friends and enemies is pronounced: Macklin's biography of Rudd, for example, cites ten documented sources and quotes twenty-seven people, while Stuart's biography is replete with oral testimony. The use of such material offers the opportunity to surmount restrictions of privacy and the confidentiality of documentary material but is problematic for the assessment of veracity. The political context in which the quickie is produced means that accurately evaluating ulterior motives of sources and testimony is near impossible. Although the quickie biographer can include multiple perspectives (as Nicholas Stuart writes that he does: 3) and attempt to guard against distortion by the 'weighting, sifting and evaluating' (Hocking 2009: 148) of information, the use of such material leaves the quickie biographer hostage to their sources.

The acceptance of unattributed source material – as evident in the Rudd biographies by Marr (2010: 26-31, 33-4, 40-3, 45-7, 69, 78), Macklin (2007: 88, 111, 186, 192) and Stuart (2007, throughout) – is another danger and opportunity of the quickie biography. For although anonymity can encourage frankness, Jenny Hocking argues that the use of unattributed sources is fundamentally irreconcilable with the craft of biography. They are, she suggests:

[...] the stuff of pulp journalism, the pseudonymous interviewee with the pixelated features [who] belongs in *The National Enquirer* where we would treat their claims with the appropriate skepticism. (Hocking 2009: 148)

The use of unattributed source material presents a fundamental contradiction to Bernard Crick's argument that 'a biographer has a duty to show how he reaches his conclusions, not to pretend to omniscience; and he should share things that are moot, problematic and uncertain with the reader' (1980: x). When paired with rhetoric of a quickie's definitiveness, the use of unattributed material 'elevates the journalist [quickie biographer] and the politician', as Scalmer and Dickenson argue (2010). It implies delineation between public images and private realities, and thereby positions the reader and 'voter as a perpetual outsider, sending the message that there is a separate political sphere of which they are not, and can never be, a part' (Scalmer & Dickenson, 2010). The imperative to be accessible and alive to issues of concern to the general reader makes dangerous the use of unattributed material in a quickie biography.

One of the key differences between the journalist-authored quickie and the academic produced biography is the emphasis that is placed on narrative. Reflection on methodology in the quickie is often slight: the time pressures of the form meant that Stuart, for example, would never have 'any opportunity to place this [sic] biography in an academic genre' (author's interview, 9 February 2012). Macklin's view that 'the object of the exercise was the man revealing himself' occluded a theoretical or overtly methodological approach in his biography (author's interview, 5 December 2011). Marr's comment that 'the task of researching that *Quarterly Essay* was exactly the same as researching a substantial biographical feature for *Good Weekend*' (author's interview, 20 April 2012) makes explicit the emphasis on narrative. 'Journalists are storytellers' Ricketson (2004 (b): 228) argues, again in reference to profile writers, and this conception of the journalist's role is central to the quickie biography - written as they often are by journalists. The use of accessible prose, the emphasis on character and the interaction of personalities above that of historical or theoretical analysis are part and parcel of telling that story and simultaneously appealing to a broad and popular audience. The use of literary references, such as in Marr's essay (56); the inclusion of the biographer's journey (Macklin, 2007: 208-9); or the use of a climactic opening (Stuart, 2007 'Challenge': 5-18) is similarly demonstrative of this emphasis. The interaction of the biographer and the subject – evident in all three of the Rudd biographies – is also a common characteristic of the quickie. The opportunities are many. It is immediate and interesting; makes for newspaper-friendly extracts; is accessible to a broad audience; and can bring the identity of the political subject to the sphere of a public and popular as Corner argues (2000: 393). The danger is that in foregoing a theoretical or methodological approach, once the 'edge and urgency' of

production and publication has passed, the quickie is often judged on whether it is ‘a deliberate attempt to define the growth of a person in a cultural milieu and to make theoretical sense of it’, as Dollard has prescribed biography try to be (cited by Davies 1972: 110). But the negative reception of quickies within the academy (see Walter 2009: 104 for discussion of the quickie biographies of Mark Latham and Kevin Rudd) and the ‘continued failure of academic writing to be taken seriously’ in the genre, as John Warhurst argues it is (2012), makes it unlikely that the quickie will fulfil Dollard’s prescription.

Conclusion

That it is often poorly received within critical circles and the academy has not slowed the proliferation of quickie political biographies. The opportunities for the subject, biographer, publisher and public appear to still outweigh the dangers associated with it. But disentangling those opportunities and dangers reveals that the quickie is more complex than Blewett’s description and offers some idea of the worth it may have. Within the context of its publication, a quickie can make real the opportunities and dangers associated with it. As the subject of three very different quickies – Kevin Rudd – has said:

Biography is the fulfilment of a duty owed by every generation to those who have gone before us, and able to be claimed against those yet to be born. A duty to capture, to preserve and to transmit the stories – the legacy of each generation. (Rudd, ‘Launch of first volume of Tom Keneally’s *Australians: Origins to Eureka*’, 2009)

Whether the stories captured in a quickie will be of interest to those yet to be born is a question unanswered: what is known is that they will be captured for as long as the opportunities associated with it continue to outweigh the dangers.

Endnotes

¹ These texts are: Michael Duffy’s *Latham and Abbott* (2004); Robert Macklin’s *Kevin Rudd: The Biography* (2007); Nicholas Stuart’s *Kevin Rudd: An Unauthorised Political Biography* (2007); David Marr’s *Quarterly Essay* no. 38, ‘Power Trip: The Political Journey of Kevin Rudd’ (2010); Susan Mitchell’s *Tony Abbott: A Man’s Man* (2011); and David Marr’s *Quarterly Essay* no. 47, ‘Political Animal: The Making of Tony Abbott’ (2012). Marr’s essay on Abbott was republished in April 2013 as a standalone and expanded text entitled *Political Animal: The Making of Tony Abbott*. In July 2013, following Rudd’s return to the Prime Ministership, Marr’s *Quarterly Essay* on Rudd was republished with the 2013 text of *Political Animal* in a single volume entitled *Rudd v. Abbott* (2013).

² For example, extracts of Marr’s *Quarterly Essay* on Kevin Rudd ran in *The Sydney Morning Herald* (‘We have to talk about Kevin’, 5 June 2010), and articles discussing extracts of the essay appeared in *The Australian* (‘Rage Powering Kevin Rudd on his journey’, 5 June 2010) and other newspapers at the same time. Promotional appearances by Marr included *The 7:30 Report* (7 June 2010), ABC Radio National *Breakfast* (7 June 2010) and *Q&A* (14 June 2010).

List of works cited

- Blewett, Neal 2007, 'Quickie Kevins', *Australian Book Review*, July/August, 8-9
- Bongiorno, Frank 2007, 'Kind, but a grind: the unauthorized Rudd', *Australian Review*, August 2007, <http://www.australianreview.net/digest/2007/08/bongiorno.html>, (accessed 27 February 2013)
- Corner, John 2000, 'Mediated Persona and Political Culture: Dimensions of Structure and Process' *European Journal of Cultural Studies*, 3: 3, 386-402
- Crick, Bernard 1980, *George Orwell: A Life*, London: Secker and Warburg
- Davies, Alan 1972, *Essays in Political Sociology*, Melbourne: Cheshire
- Dickenson, Jackie 2010, 'Journalists writing political history', *Australian Journal of Politics and History* 56: 1, 105-119
- Duffy, Michael 2004, *Latham and Abbott: The Lives and Rivalry of the Two Finest Politicians of their Generation*, Australia: Random House
- Haigh, Gideon 2013, 'The Rise and Rise of the Prime Minister', *Meanjin*, 72:1, 40-61
- Hearn, Mark & Knowles, Harry 2011, 'Representative Lives? Biography and Labour History' *Labour History* 100, 127-143
- Hocking, Jenny 2009, 'Marketing Frank Hardy: The Revival of Biography As Scandal', *Journal of Australian Studies* 25:68, 146-153
- Loveday, Peter 1985, 'Political History and Political Biography', in D Aitkin (ed) *Surveys of Australian Political Science*, Sydney: George Allen & Unwin, 86-118
- MacCallum, Mungo 2009, 'Australian Story: Kevin Rudd and the Lucky Country', *Quarterly Essay*, 36, Melbourne: Black Inc
- MacIntyre, Stuart 2009, 'Political History', in R Rhodes (ed) *The Australian Study of Politics*, London: Palgrave MacMillan, 84-96
- Macklin, Robert 2007, *Kevin Rudd: The Biography*, Sydney: Viking
- 2012, 'Kevin Rudd', 25 April, at www.robertmacklin.com/kevin-rudd/, (accessed 30 August 2013)
- Marr, David 2010, 'Power Trip: The Political Journey of Kevin Rudd', *Quarterly Essay* 38, Melbourne: Black Inc
- 2012, 'Political Animal: The Making of Tony Abbott', *Quarterly Essay* 47, Melbourne: Black Inc
- 2013 (a), *Political Animal: The Making of Tony Abbott*, Melbourne: Black Inc
- 2013 (b), *Rudd v Abbott*, Melbourne: Black Inc
- Mitchell, Susan 2011, *Tony Abbott: A Man's Man*, Melbourne: Scribe
- Ricketson, Matthew 2004 (a), 'Introduction', *Best Australian Profiles*, Melbourne: Black Inc, 2-3
- 2004 (b), *Writing Feature Stories: How to Research and Write Newspaper and Magazine Articles*, NSW: Allen & Unwin
- Rosenblom, Henry 2007, 'We Need to Read About Kevin (Twice)', 25 June, at <http://scribepublications.com.au/news-and-events/post/we-need-to-talk-about-kevin-twice/>, (accessed 9 November 2012)

- Rudd, Kevin 2009, 'Launch of first volume of Tom Keneally's *Australia: Origins to Eureka*,' 27 August 2009, National Library of Australia, at <http://pmrudd.archive.dpnc.gov.au/taxonomy/term/102aa6.html?page=9&%24Version=1&%24Path=%2F>, (accessed 30 October 2012)
- Scalmer, Sean 2010, 'The Rise of the Insider: Memoirs and Diaries in Recent Australian Political History', *Australian Journal of Politics and History*, 56:1, 82-104
- Scalmer, Sean & Dickenson, Jackie 2010, 'The March of the Insider', *Overland*, 199, at <http://overland.org.au/previous-issues/issue-199/feature-sean-scalmer-and-jackie-dickenson/>, (accessed 2 April 2013)
- Smith, Sidonie 2010, 'Autobiographical Discourse in the Theaters of Politics', *Biography*, 33:1, v-xxvi
- Stuart, Nicholas 2007, *Kevin Rudd: An Unauthorised Political Biography*, Melbourne: Scribe
- Walter, James 1984, 'The Biography of a Contemporary Figure and Its Pitfalls', in J Walter & R Nugent-Nathan (eds) *Biographers At Work*, 59-62
- 2006, 'The 'Life Myth', 'Short Lives' and Dealing with Live Subjects in Political Biography', in T Arklay, J Nethercote & J Wanna (eds) *Australian Political Lives: Chronicling Political Careers and Administrative Histories*, Canberra: ANU E-Press, 29-34
- 2009, 'Political Biography', in R Rhodes (ed) *The Australian Study of Politics*, London: Palgrave MacMillan, 97-106
- Warhurst, John 2012, 'Much ado Abbott nothing: Marr's Quarterly Essay misses the mark', *The Conversation*, 18 September, at www.theconversation.com/much-ado-abbott-nothing-marrs-quarterly-essay-misses-the-mark-9627, (accessed 31 August 2013)
- Watson, Don 2002/2012, *Recollections of a Bleeding Heart*, Australia: Random House
- Weinburg, Steve 1992, *Telling The Untold Story: How Investigative Reporters Are Changing The Craft of Biography*, Columbia: University of Missouri Press