

*M.C. Sithiporn Kridakara Memorial Volume* (อนุสรณ์ ม.จ. สิทธิพร กฤดากร : บทความของและเกี่ยวกับ ม.จ. สิทธิพร กฤดากร), The Social Science Association Press of Thailand, 1971, illus., 429 pp.

By the time of his death in June 1971 at the age of 88, *Mom Chao* Sithiporn Kridakara had achieved universal recognition as the patriarch of modern Thai agriculture. The outlines of his extraordinary career are well known: born into a family that combined rank and talent he was educated in England from an early age, and then like most of those of his generation educated abroad he returned to enter the government bureaucracy. His official career was marked by his rapid rise to high position, but was otherwise in the conventional pattern. Having reached the rank of Director-General while still in his 30's, Prince Sithiporn shocked family and friends by abandoning his government career to take up farming, in which he had no experience of formal training, in the southern peninsula. The remaining fifty years of his life were singularly devoted to the advancement of Thai agriculture and the Thai farmer. Although he served briefly in the cabinet and the National Assembly, his major work was outside the government, and indeed he was for decades the leading critic of Thai Government agricultural policies. Through United Nations' agencies he was active in agricultural affairs throughout Asia, and his service to both Thailand and the region were recognized when he received the 1967 Magsaysay Award for Public Service. To the time of his death he remained an active and outspoken champion of the Thai farmer.

This memorial volume brings together more than fifty articles by or about Prince Sithiporn, the works of Prince Sithiporn himself making up about half of the total. His writings cover a period of more than forty years and are divided into works on agriculture, on politics, and on education, although the division is somewhat artificial since whatever his avowed subject Prince Sithiporn's real theme was always the Thai farmer. In addition there are two works in English, which might better have been incorporated in their appropriate places in the three given categories.

Many of the articles on agriculture are technical in nature, dealing with such topics as fertilizers, the government export tax on rice (the much debated rice 'premium'), or the relative merits of animal versus mechanical power in farming. They illustrate Prince Sithiporn's belief that argument should be based on experience and supported by statistical data, a principle that might well be applied to the current discussion of land reform. The political articles are largely devoted to the role of political parties in a constitutional system, and particularly to the program and merits of a farmer-oriented party which Prince Sithiporn headed. There are also two essays interpreting Western political concepts. The works on education deal primarily with elementary education, for Prince Sithiporn repeatedly made the point that the average farmer does not study beyond the Prathom 4 level, and hence progress in agriculture is dependent on making basic education relevant and adequate to the contemporary needs of the farmer. The talk on vocational education, given only a week before his death, shows in undiminished strength his characteristic talent for incisive, constructive criticism.

Preceding and following the long section of Prince Sithiporn's own works are articles and tributes by both Thai and foreign associates, including *Mom Sriprohma*, his wife and life long partner in agricultural work. These include a brief biography; an interesting article on the founding of the agricultural journal *Kasikorn* (which includes passages apparently lifted verbatim from an article of Prince Sithiporn also included in the volume—cf. pp. 19-20 and 109-111); the Magsaysay Award citation and the longer Magsaysay background statement (both in English, although the former is given in Thai in a modified form on pp. 351-4); and details of the fertilizer project that was one of Prince Sithiporn's consuming interests in the last years of his life. There are impassioned attacks on the rice premium, which for disciples of Prince Sithiporn is as much a moral as an economic issue; while there is much to be said for this view, it has resulted in an unfortunate tendency to ignore the considerable economic, and even moral, arguments which can be made in support of the premium. There is an interview with one of Prince Sithiporn's fellow prisoners from the years in jail following the



Bowaradej rebellion. And we are given such minutia as the plans of a simple house Prince Sithiporn was planning to build at the time of his death. The concluding article is a long piece by Sulak Sivaraksa on 'Prince Sithiporn as I Knew Him'. This deals largely with the last few years of Prince Sithiporn's life, and particularly his efforts to awaken Thai urban intellectuals to the problems of the farmer. Sulak also recalls some points of Prince Sithiporn's early career, though it is hard to see the relevance of his mention of Lt. N. Nen Talalakshamana (p. 391), since the lieutenant and his group were arrested early in 1939 and had no connection with Prince Sithiporn or the Bowaradej rebellion.

An appendix includes the draft articles of the Sithiporn Kridakara Foundation, established to carry on the prince's work, and a translation of the whole lengthy text of the United Nations' Universal Declaration of Human Rights, apparently included on the rather tenuous grounds that Prince Sithiporn once asked Sulak if the Declaration could be used as the basis for an attack on government agricultural policy.

Throughout the book are a large number of excellent illustrations.

\* \* \*

Memorial volumes by their nature are prone to certain weaknesses and this one is no exception. With a multitude of authors, the result is a book that is uneven, loosely structured, and often repetitive. But perhaps the greatest criticism that can be made is the failure to provide a substantial and accurate biography of the principal figure. The biography in Thai is very short, while most of the articles cover only one facet or one period of Prince Sithiporn's career. The exceptions are the two Magsaysay pieces. However the citation itself is brief and inaccurate, and has been the source of much misinformation about Prince Sithiporn, as for example in the obituary in the *Journal of the Siam Society*, January 1972. The background statement is much more detailed, and somewhat more accurate about Prince Sithiporn himself, but woefully inadequate in its account of recent Thai history.

Prince Sithiporn's active career in agriculture began when he left Bangkok for the farm at Bangberd in 1921. The happy years at Bangberd in the '20's, so well illustrated at the recent Siam Society

exhibition of photographs, were a time of research and experimentation with new crops and agricultural methods, and the many important technical advances made then are described in detail in the memorial volume. Prince Sithiporn's career after the Second World War is also fairly thoroughly covered, for all of the contributors were personally acquainted with Prince Sithiporn and his work in his later years. The major gap is the period between the appearance of *Kasikorn*, when Prince Sithiporn began to achieve a national influence, and the war. In most accounts this period is presented inaccurately, as in the Magsaysay statement, or virtually ignored, as in the biography in the Sithiporn memorial issue of *Warasan Withayasat Kaset* (September 1972) or Hermann Hatzfeldt's biography in the preface to *Some Aspects of Rice Farming in Siam*, Prince Sithiporn's book attacking the rice premium. This neglect is unfortunate, for the period was an important one in the development of Thai agriculture.

The proposal to establish an agricultural journal did not originate with Prince Sithiporn, but he willingly joined the founding group and accepted the editorship. The first issue of *Kasikorn* appeared in April 1927. It was a private publication but received invaluable support from King Prajadhipok who, despite the fact that *Kasikorn's* editorial policy was extremely critical of government agricultural work, underwrote the cost of 1000 copies. In the pages of *Kasikorn* Prince Sithiporn reported on his experiments at Bangberd and repeatedly attacked the *laissez faire* attitude that had characterized traditional government policy toward agriculture, in which interest was largely limited to rice and activity limited to irrigation works. Prince Sithiporn advocated a program of government supported agricultural research, aimed particularly at ending Siam's traditional dependence on a single crop. Although *Kasikorn* was his main forum, he also campaigned for scientific agriculture in other journals and papers, and he found time for such unglamorous but essential work as translating American farm implement catalogues into Thai.

For several years Prince Sithiporn's efforts were largely ignored. But by 1930 the effects of the world economic depression had reached Siam, and the price of rice began a sharp decline. As the economic



situation worsened, *Kasikorn* stepped up its attacks on government policy. In the spring of 1931 the government capitulated; a new agricultural policy was proclaimed and an existing department reorganized as the Krom Truat Kasikam, in English called the Department of Agricultural Research, and the new department was transferred from its logical place in the staid Ministry of Agriculture to the Ministry of Communications, headed by the dynamic Prince Purachatra. Prince Sithiporn himself became an adviser to the government. In May he announced that *Kasikorn*, which was having financial problems, had accomplished its purpose in securing a change in government policy and would cease publication.

The debate over agricultural policy continued, taking its most public form in a series of three talks given before the influential Rotary Club of Bangkok in the summer of 1931. The first speaker was Carle Zimmerman, the American agricultural economist and author of the 1930-31 Rural Economic Survey. Zimmerman, reflecting the orthodoxy of the day, catalogued the troubles of Thai agriculture and blamed them on poor technique, inefficiency on the farm, and inefficient economic organization. Zimmerman was followed by Morden Carthew, an adviser to the government, who contended on the contrary that the Thai farmer led a happy idyllic existence, although his situation would be even better if the exploitation of Chinese middlemen could be curbed. Prince Sithiporn was the final speaker, and he disagreed with both of the foreign experts. He argued that the Thai farmer, far from being the satisfied amaterialistic man Carthew pictured, was on the verge of economic ruin, but that on the other hand Thai farming practice, representing the collective wisdom of generations, was rational and efficient within the existing system. The Chinese middlemen, he believed, were more useful than exploitive, and he accurately foresaw that the program of rural credit cooperatives—the only previous substantial government effort to develop agriculture, with the exception of limited irrigation projects—was destined to fail because of a lack of management ability in the countryside. Prince Sithiporn held that only a radical change in the agricultural system, led by the government and based on an extensive program of agricultural research, could break the

cycle of rural poverty in Siam. Forty years later these conclusions would all be commonplace among agricultural economists, but in 1931 they represented a remarkably original approach to agriculture.

Prince Sithiporn's views were soon dominant. *Kasikorn* reappeared as an official publication of the Department of Agricultural Research. In the spring of 1932 the government budget reflected the new policy; while retrenchment was the order of the day and expenditures were being slashed in every way possible, funds for agricultural research were increased more than five-fold. In April Prince Sithiporn himself was appointed Director-General of the Department of Agricultural Research.

Prince Sithiporn was in large measure personally responsible for the change in government agricultural policy in 1931-32. (His own account of how this was accomplished was given in a speech he wrote in 1963, printed in the memorial volume, especially pp. 108-113, and p. 121, where he particularly praises the role of King Prajadhipok.) It is remarkable that although outside the government he should almost single-handedly bring about a major change in government policy. It is doubly remarkable that forty years later, already in his 80's, he could do the same thing again with regard to the rice premium.

Contrary to frequent assertions, Prince Sithiporn was not removed from office by the June 1932 *coup* which ended the absolute monarchy. He remained Director-General of Agricultural Research for a year and a half, and the technical progress in agriculture made during his tenure is discussed in detail in the memorial volume. Prince Sithiporn's departure from the government was a consequence of the October 1933 rebellion led by his elder brother *Phra Ong Chao* Bowaradej, a former Minister of War, against the government of *Phya* Bahl. Prince Sithiporn was in Korat with his brother when the rebellion broke out. He traveled with the rebel troops down to Don Muang, and when the rebellion collapsed he was arrested. In court Prince Sithiporn claimed that he had been in Korat on official business, and had come to Bangkok only to look after his family. He admitted having given a talk to rebel officers at Don Muang but saw no harm in it. The government charged that Prince Sithiporn had known of his brother's plans, and had stayed with the rebels at Don Muang and aided their cause. Early in 1934 a



Special Court sentenced Prince Sithiporn to life imprisonment. Years later, when Sulak asked him why he had been arrested, he replied with typical candor: "They said I was a rebel, which I was." (p. 394). In one of his 'prison songs', printed in the memorial volume (p. 257), Prince Sithiporn wrote that he and the other prisoners of 1933 were "here for merely/Doing our duty to Country and King."

Prince Sithiporn remained in prison for eleven years. The first six years were spent at Bang Kwang prison in Nontaburi, and then in the fall of 1939 the government transferred a number of political prisoners to a new penal colony on Tarutao Island, off the coast of Satun. The choice of Tarutao for a penal colony seems strange, for it is near the mainland, near other islands, and, above all, near the Malay border. Soon after the prisoners arrived a group of five, led by Phya Surabandh Seni (In Bunnag), escaped by boat to Malaya. In an interview in *Sangkomsat Parithat* (June 1968), Prince Sithiporn recalled that after this incident treatment of the remaining prisoners became much more strict (p. 59). Several years later the war led the government to move the prisoners to another island off Surat Thani, where conditions were even worse and malaria rampant. During the long years in confinement, Prince Sithiporn continued to write on agriculture and correspond with his wife on farm matters. His companions in prison included a number of notable figures, several of whom were later to become well-known in the Thai literary world.

In July 1944 the National Assembly rejected two government bills calling for the construction of an immense Buddhist city at Saraburi and a new capital at Petchabun, and the Phibul government resigned. Pridi became sole Regent and Khuang Aphaiwong was appointed Prime Minister. In September, on the occasion of the birthday of King Ananda, an amnesty for political prisoners was proclaimed, and in October the political prisoners from the South returned to a tumultuous welcome in Bangkok. It is characteristic that one prisoner was not with them: Prince Sithiporn had left the train in Prachuab to return to his beloved Bangberd.

Three years later Prince Sithiporn returned to the government as Minister of Agriculture, and his subsequent career is well known. The memorial volume is particularly thorough in covering his later years, down to a detailed account of his last illness (pp. 410-11).

The volume as a whole is a deserved tribute to one of the truly great figures of modern Thai history. It is a record of selfless devotion to a cause, and indifference to honors or financial rewards. (Prince Sithiporn once declined an honorary degree with the remark, "Those are for politicians," and he repeatedly depleted his personal finances to support agricultural projects.) He was associated with virtually every innovation in Thai agriculture in the past fifty years. But as important as his contributions to agricultural policy and technology were, his greatest achievement was to dispel the traditional attitude of condescending neglect and to demonstrate, by his own life and in his writings, the importance of agriculture and the dignity of the Thai farmer.

*Benjamin A. Batson*

*Cornell University*



**Behind Khmer Smiles :  
Prospero's Adventures in Cambodia**

The Cambodian *coup d'état* deposing Prince Norodom Sihanouk caught most of the world by surprise. Sihanouk, with his dynamic personality, assertive foreign policy and royal legitimacy, had convinced friends and foes alike that his regime was progressive and smooth-running, a veritable oasis of peace and tranquillity in a turbulent Southeast Asia. This was not the case. In *Derrière le Sourire Khmer*, one of Sihanouk's closest associates assesses the inner workings and problems of the regime during its final years.\* A certain, marvellous Cambodia had disappeared, Charles Meyer asserts. Sihanouk, failing to find original solutions to problems of decolonization was forced to fall back on the spirit of monarchy and neo-traditional "Buddhist Socialism" as the ideal road to development. This approach had little chance for success, according to Meyer, and the idea seemed to obscure from Sihanouk's view the threat posed by new political forces including an emerging class of "greedy and impatient" profiteers, peasant revolts, revolutionary organization in the countryside and conspiracies aided by American intelligence agencies. Sihanouk's "brutal awakening" was the *coup d'état* followed by massive American and Vietnamese invasions which provoked Khmer civil war. Unfortunately, Meyer believes this realization was, in some sense, too late. More than a decade of benign neglect, incompetent economic administration and increasingly authoritarian politics had taken its heavy toll on the morale and energy of Khmer society. Meyer forecasts a "very somber future" for Cambodia, particularly for its young people and its peasants whose interests he claims to defend. In fact, the very survival of Khmer civilization rests in the balance, he concludes, a situation reminiscent of the state of affairs in the mid-19th century when the French "rescued" the Khmer kingdom from absorption into the Thai and Vietnamese empires.

*Derrière le Sourire Khmer* is a subtle and complex book, subtle because it confounds the personal experience of Charles Meyer with Cambodian history under the pretense of objectivity. It is revealing that Meyer fails to discuss his personal relationship with Sihanouk and his own contribution to the events, policies and extravagances for which he

---

\* Charles Meyer, *Derrière le Sourire Khmer* (Paris, Librairie Plon, 1971), 414 pp. Photographs, Map.

now criticizes the deposed Chief of State. Sihanouk's regime was noted for its large contingent of French administrators, advisors and businessmen, a neo-colonial presence which irritated important segments of the Khmer intelligentsia and became an issue of some importance in the coup. Meyer was without doubt the most prominent of these Frenchmen because of his enormous influence in all areas of foreign and domestic policy making and notably in domestic economic planning. Called to his vocation from love of adventure rather than professional training, he arrived on foot in Phnom Penh in 1955 and requested employment in Sihanouk's personal secretariat. His energy, intelligence and personal commitment to Sihanouk were recognized by the Prince, and Meyer was rewarded in the form of increasing power and responsibility. By 1961, it was widely acknowledged that he was almost as powerful as Sihanouk: His word or decision was tantamount to the Prince's own.

Sihanouk's decline signals Meyer's own. Meyer points with considerable disapproval to the increasing influence of Sihanouk's third wife, Monique, and the rise of her clique after 1966; to Sihanouk's increasing neglect of internal economic crises; and to his contrived efforts to attain a rapprochement and economic aid from the United States as a means of alleviating domestic political and economic pressures on his regime. Sihanouk, refusing to reduce court expenditures or to curb the appetites of corrupt bureaucrats, ignored the advice of "Cambodian specialists and foreign experts" (i.e. Meyer) who advocated austerity measures, elimination of prestige expenditures and extensive development of the agricultural sector. Other references to being ignored are less opaque. Meyer's remarks about unnamed ladies of the court influencing important decisions, his dismissal of "specialists and experts" of other ideological persuasions as swindlers and opportunists and his backbiting compliments to Sihanouk "in his moments of lucidity" betray a certain arrogance and smugness. His competitiveness denotes a certain apprehension over his increasing isolation from Sihanouk's inner circle. Thus, much of his criticism of Sihanouk's character and behavior during these years seems to reflect personal resentment of a patron who has betrayed him rather than disinterested analysis of the social forces which slowly drained Sihanouk's regime of its real political and economic power. It is this subtle confusion of political history with personal experience which



explains in part why Cambodians of all political groups are confused by and unhappy with this book. If the *coup d'état* was a "brutal awakening" for Sihanouk, the demise of Sihanouk's regime was no less painful for Charles Meyer who was no longer a hero or an "expert" in his adopted land and simply forgotten in his native France.

#### Paradise Lost

In addition to this confusion of perspectives, *Derrière le Sourire Khmer* is complex because of the wide variety of psychological, social, economic and political data Meyer brings to bear on the central theme of the book. He is embarked on a search for the nature and fate of Khmer civilization which seems to him to suffer under the sheer weight of its glorious past, merely enduring and surviving neo-Angkorian tyrannies (including Sihanouk's), yearning for but never achieving renaissance. This theme and the strikingly asocial and romantic way in which it is developed, immediately bring to mind the "white man's burden" *genre* of colonial literature which, for all its peculiarities and fantasizing, might have important things to say about the psycho-cultural aspects of decolonization in Cambodia. For example, while most scholars of international relations discuss Sihanouk's policy of neutrality in terms of the economic aid it secured from both communist and capitalist powers or in terms of its political expediency vis-à-vis the problem of hostile, pro-American neighbors, Meyer emphasizes its importance in the accumulation of international sympathy, capital which is "indispensable" for the well-being of the ruling elite. This observation and others remind the reader of the difference between an externally-oriented elite and inner-directed nationalist leaders in other countries who reject outside assistance and sympathy along with the cultural and social penetration which they imply. In an oblique way, this observation reveals the persistence of a colonial dependence mentality among Khmer bureaucrats and values which contradict their nationalism.

In a less satisfactory way, Meyer also challenges the myth of the passive, lazy and politically uninvolved Buddhist. In appearance, Meyer writes, the peasants are very respectful of authority but, in fact, they have resisted all attempts at central organization which they perceive as restricting their natural liberty. This liberty also entails a certain

vagabondage and social banditry in traditional rural life. Meyer sees the passivity of the peasant before authority and his penchant for rebellion and violence as complementary manifestations of self-pride, a desire to be admired, and competitiveness. Travelers visiting Khmer villages receive extraordinary hospitality and attention even from the poorest of families. Nevertheless, the peasant is totally unpredictable in his behavior, particularly in his emotional reactions. "His patience and prudence might be exhausted without warning and he then becomes capable of all excess." Collective mob violence often assumes the aspect of a ritual feast; unpremeditated murders or atrocities can be committed in a moment of folly similar to the chaotic, mindless behavior of the Malay *amok*. In reality, Meyer writes, the Cambodian has a depth of cruelty which emerges on the first occasion.

In spite of some of the qualities he attributes to them, Meyer finds Khmer peasants "very engaging with all their contradictions, prisoners of tradition and impervious in their reactions." The essence of their nature is summed up for him by the indefinable, inscrutable Khmer smile, the half-smile which floats on the stone lips of the gods of Angkor:

"Dans toute l'Asie extrême-orientale le sourire est le masque de la politesse derrière lequel on s'observe, on se congratule ou on se bat. Mais au Cambodge ce masque est plus souvent une barrière d'indifférence, ambiguë et aimable, que l'on dresse entre soi et les autres. Il ne faut jamais considérer le sourire comme une invitation au dialogue mais bien au contraire comme la marque d'une certaine inquiétude et d'un embarras devant un intrus, comme l'indication que l'on n'a l'intention ni de répondre à des questions indiscretes ni d'en poser. Sourire c'est signifier à l'autre, à l'étranger: "pas d'ingérence dans mon domaine". Souvent même on aura le sentiment que l'écran du sourire en vient à cacher un vide intérieur créé comme une défense absolue contre un éventuel viol de la pensée." p. 33.

Thus, Prospero meets his Caliban or Robinson Crusoe confronts his Friday's society. Meyer copes with people whom he finds both reassuring and terrifying by stripping them of humanity. Caliban in the guise of Khmer peasant is portrayed as both slavish and incorrigible. Disquieting feelings articulated by Meyer in the presence of men he



perceives to be primitive ("Khmer peasant life has not changed for a thousand years") and indomitable if not savage in their mindlessness, approach racialism particularly as this assumes personal significance in the physical characteristic of the smile, images of which permeated the French language and French-directed press of Sihanouk's regime. His uneasiness manifests itself in the fantasy of paternalistic virtue and dominance, fantasy because no real relationship exists between him and these elusive, depersonalized distant beings. These are, in fact, his own creations and not real Khmer peasants. It is not coincidental that identical peasant personalities have been attributed to "natives" in other colonial societies with indigenous social structures and cultures radically different from those of the Khmer.\* Even Meyer comes close to acknowledging his own stereotyping and racial projection when he mentions in passing a baffling quality of the Khmers "to assume the image projected upon them by others."\*\*

Meyer's fantasies about peasant life explain a discontinuity between the first third of his book and the sections dealing with Phnom Penh politics and Sihanouk's demise. The falseness of his characterization of peasants is revealed by his inability to place them in any meaningful social context. Although he exposes the myths of Cambodia's natural richness by pointing to the poorness of soils and irrigation systems, the absence of mineral resources, the low yield from forest lands and the twin hazards of flood and drought in the monsoon zone, and discusses the natural push of demographic forces resulting in overpopulation, parcellization of landholdings and uncontrollable emigration to the capital city of Phnom Penh, he is unable to link these facts to politics in Phnom Penh and relate them to the rise of the new urban bourgeoisie. From where, then, did this new class emerge? Meyer suggests, in another example of his racialism, that these are descendants of Chinese immigrants, simultaneously stripping them of any links with Cambodia's rural heritage (as he sees it) and avoiding any implication of French colonialism! In still another

\* O. Mannoni, *Psychologie de la Colonisation* (Paris, Editions du Seuil, 1950), *passim*, or its English translation, *Prospero and Caliban* (New York, Praeger, Inc., 1956).

\*\* Readers with an interest in Cambodian peasant life and society should consult May M. Ebihara, *Svay, A Khmer Village in Cambodia* (Ann Arbor, University Microfilms, 1971), and Jean Delvert, *Le Paysan Cambodgien* (Paris, Mouton & Co., 1961).

paradox, he accuses bureaucrats in this "new bourgeoisie" of being more overtly aggressive and exploitative in their relations with the peasants than traditional aristocratic and feudal patrons had been while repeatedly denying that the depletion of rural resources and increasing rural poverty changed peasant life. A popular movement against Sihanouk was inconceivable because of the "apathy" of a people used to enduring ("*faire le gros dos*") the exactions of royal mandarins through the ages. He explains away the serious increase in crime and banditry, which officials in Phnom Penh sought to conceal, by suggesting that the violent, indomitable and unorganizable half of the Khmer peasant personality (his imaginary one) has been brought into play, and then, apparently forgetting he has denied the presence of social change, he laments the disappearance of a certain natural honesty and simplicity from rural life.

For Meyer, Cambodian society is held together in rather strict hierarchal and mechanical ways. He evinces no understanding (as distinct from knowledge) of the cultural and social institutions which make up the warp and woof of Khmer society, which define role networks and the ways Khmers relate to each other as individuals or as groups. He opts for the colonial explanation. Problems of disorder are problems with men, not institutions. His psychologizing of essentially social phenomena prevents him from fully understanding the emergence of leftist movements because lateral forces (class consciousness, ideologies), social contexts (interstices of rural-urban "gap"), and cultural-organic strains (religious-secular tension, rural Khmerness vs urban, foreign materialism) cannot be conceptualized in a colonial, hierarchal world view. Meyer talks about leftist *leaders* but his inability to perceive social linkages and discontinuities and his portrayal of peasants as social isolates prevents him from recognizing their organizational and political potential. Consequently, he mistakenly dismisses the Khmer left as weak and ephemeral although he has sympathy for them since they (also) defend peasant interests. Thus, he reduces Cambodian politics to a zero-sum contest between Sihanouk and right-wing urban elites. His reference to the honest, orderly bureaucracy bequeathed to Sihanouk by the French and his persistent invocation of the chaotic circumstances under which France entered Cambodia in 1863, betray his yearning for the return of order, colonial order. Sihanouk fell from power, in Meyer's analysis, because



he was a bad administrator, because he failed to curtail the greed of his civil servants and his entourage, and to coopt his opponents and young people.

### **The Sihanouk Regime**

The last sections of Meyer's book discuss the urban world and elite competition for political power. Here Meyer's discussion is more coherent and contains some interesting bits of information but there is not as much historical data as one would expect from a man with 15 years of participation and experience in the regime. Once again this points to Meyer's overwhelming preoccupation with his own desires and ambitions as distinct from genuine concern for Cambodians. In the interests of brevity and clarity, I think it is useful to summarize these sections in light of what is already known about the period to draw out the contrast between more conventional interpretations of the Sihanouk regime and Meyer's very particular view.

Meyer correctly sets the stage for the urban power struggle by discussing the disorder which characterized Cambodian politics in the immediate aftermath of its independence from France in 1953. The countryside was economically devastated by the extensive military activity of the final years of the first Indochina war. In Phnom Penh, elite cleavages were sharp and well-defined after several years of French-sponsored parliamentary rule and democratic elections. The monarchy itself was under serious challenge by young, "modernist" civil servants who made up the Democratic party. At one and the same time, Meyer reports, King Sihanouk was compelled to find a solution to the economic crisis, to fulfill election requirements laid down by the Geneva Accords on Indochina and to weld together a regime which would engender support in the countryside and unite elite factions in the dual cause of national independence and development. After an initial attempt to impose direct monarchical rule was vetoed by his advisers and representatives of the International Control Commission, Sihanouk hit upon the formulas which were to characterize his regime from 1955 until 1970.

Abandoning formal pretenses to monarchical rule, Sihanouk announced the *rassemblement* of all parties and individuals in a mass move-

ment called the Sangkum Reastr Niyum which received immediate support of conservative parties representing the old aristocratic and mandarinal families. These parties shared with Sihanouk the desire to suppress the anti-monarchist Democratic Party. Sihanouk abdicated the throne in favour of his father and personally campaigned in all subsequent elections on behalf of Sangkum candidates. The Democratic Party, lacking strong leadership, party discipline and financial resources was overwhelmed by the Sangkum at the polls and was gradually absorbed into the movement. The small, well-organized Pracheachon group, an association of former Khmer resistance fighters of socialist persuasion, was similarly pushed out of public, electoral politics but acknowledging the essentially conservative character of the Sangkum, it refused collaboration and went underground in 1963.

The resulting unity and harmony within the Sangkum and Cambodian politics was more apparent than real. Meyer feels on the basis of his colonial perspective that things fell apart for essentially administrative and economic reasons. This explanation is much too simplistic and mechanical. It obscures more subtle and interesting aspects of the dynamics of power and Khmer politics. Sihanouk wielded the symbols of traditional monarchal authority side by side with those of European socialism. The result was a curious Buddhist Socialism characterized by the rapprochement of social classes rather than class struggle and the enhancement of mutual aid and self-help in this life in contrast to the other-worldliness of orthodox Buddhism. While these distinctions were apparent to committed socialists and devout clerics, such ideological fabrications were generally acceptable to traditional Khmer elites; more modern, upwardly mobile French-trained administrative elites; and the bulk of the rural peasantry. Such ideological abstraction offered something to everyone and meant the retention of existing social structures, their expansion and their enhancement. Failures in attempts at modern organization and industrialization as well as traditional inequities in wealth, power and social status were all "papered over" by imaginative verbal constructs invoking the prestige of Buddhism and socialism. The euphoria and mystique of Sihanoukism, never too profound on the elite level, began to fade when revenues from foreign aid and domestic agriculture declined and the costs of central administration increased.



### **The End of an Era**

Under economic pressure throughout the 1960's, Sihanouk's regime gradually assumed the attributes of direct monarchical rule which he had unsuccessfully advocated in early 1955. Nevertheless, Meyer argues, Khmer society was plunging into total disarray. Sihanouk, to Meyer's dismay, didn't seem interested in a rational administration along colonial lines. The idea that Sihanouk might have decided such administration was impossible or undesirable never occurs to Meyer. Post-colonial elite cleavages of republicans opposed to monarchists and revolutionaries opposed to both had deepened under economic pressures created by population increase, decline in world market prices for rice and natural rubber, bad harvests, inadequate organization and funding of rural credit, black market rice sales to NVA and NLF forces, financial speculation in commerce and housing, and administrative corruption. Sihanouk's commendable expansion of public education facilities had generated an excess supply of intellectuals and technicians for the limited number of openings available in the civil service and the struggling industrial sector. The army and the police were particularly hard hit by the scarcity of economic resources lacking the means to replace or update their equipment. Corruption, speculation and anxiety fed upon each other; tension and competition among families, cliques and ministries were uncontrollable. Indeed the situation was so bad that attempts to straighten things out threatened total collapse as a few anti-corruption campaigns demonstrated. In this type of situation, foreign colonial power and administration cannot be equated to or used as a model for national politics and administration.

Sihanouk, the civil service, and the army, all lacking the commitment to and the courage for reform, looked to the resumption of American foreign aid as the principal way out of their grim situation, according to Meyer. Between 1967 and 1970, Sihanouk maneuvered for a rapprochement with the Americans on his terms, which included recognition of Cambodia's neutrality and territorial integrity within its present frontiers. Meanwhile a military clique led by Lon Nol, in alliance with commercial-cum-parliamentary groups led by Sirik Matak and In Tam with the support of an irredentist organization of Khmers born in the former French colony of Cochinchina, sought to eliminate

Sihanouk and his entourage in the process of changing Cambodia's foreign policy posture. Pressures to step down led Sihanouk to restrict democratic liberties. Press and mail censorship were imposed in the mid-1960's. Anti-Sihanoukists on the right and the left were kept under surveillance by military and civilian police forces. All private newspapers and associations were dissolved in 1967; "official" newspapers and government-sponsored associations were created to replace them. Restrictions were placed on foreign travel and study in an attempt to control the flow of foreign ideologies among urban intellectuals. An expanding ambience of fear and desperation was deepened by armed repression of peasant uprisings and student organizations in 1967-68 and of upland Brao and Tampuan tribesmen in 1968-69. Leftist insurgency and banditry spread in the countryside. General social anxiety was reflected in urban centers by an increase in delinquency, prostitution, astrological and magical practices, gambling and crime.

Could Sihanouk have prevented the coup? Meyer says yes, but this would have entailed recognition on Sihanouk's part of the necessity for urgent reform as distinct from repression. Instead, he argues, Sihanouk gave the conspirators precisely the issue they needed in order to disguise their selfish elite, economic motivations as Khmer nationalism. According to Meyer, the anti-Vietnamese propaganda campaign was actually conceived by Sihanouk in 1968 as a means of simultaneously blackmailing the Soviet Union, China and the United States for diplomatic and economic assistance while safeguarding Cambodian neutrality. The coup group, through their links with Son Ngoc Thanh's Khmer Serei organization which was at that time an important group in the US Special Forces Civilian Irregular Defense Groups in South Vietnam, apparently let the Americans know they were more sympathetic with the US war effort in South Vietnam than Sihanouk would be in the event of renewal of diplomatic relations. Meyer cites compelling evidence that Americans knew about and supported the coup. Members of Son Ngoc Thanh's Khmer Serei organization who were often used in reconnaissance missions in Cambodia after 1966 were infiltrated into Lon Nol's army throughout 1969 and 1970. In retrospect, foreign support and Sihanouk's absence from Phnom Penh appear to have been essential for the success of the coup as only ephemeral success was



achieved by the conspirators in convincing the urban population that Sihanouk was responsible for the Vietnamese presence. Meyer points out, for example, that some demonstrators got their cues mixed up and began chanting, "Vive Samdech Sihanouk."

Once in Peking, Sihanouk, refusing to lend legal credibility to the coup, dissolved the Lon Nol cabinet and the National Assembly, formed a new government in exile and organized a national liberation movement in a united front with many underground groups which had previously challenged his regime. In Phnom Penh, the coup group in turn abolished the monarchy and proclaimed a republic. Meyer believes the coup group has been unable to reorganize the Republican administration or army into viable political or military forces because of their lack of national commitment and their generally opportunistic and naive attitudes towards international politics. Corruption, a serious problem under Sihanouk, is rampant in the newly named Khmer Republic. American aid, once perceived as the panacea for elite unhappiness, is consumed by war profiteers, army officers and inflation. Americans are criticized for not helping enough now that Cambodia has joined "the free world," a phrase consistently invoked by pro-Lon Nol Cambodians because it entails for them the right to the explicit, *public* economic and ideological support associated with American foreign policy in the 1950's. Support for the coup in Phnom Penh declined sharply when the United States failed to come forth with "indispensable" moral aid and the coup group split into rival factions. One realizes finally that Meyer feels the Phnom Penh elite is just as unorganizable as his stereotyped peasants. Only when all remnants of colonial order have disappeared (and Frenchmen are back in France) does Meyer in his distorted way acknowledge a common unity and khmerness to people who have only one home.

In the meantime, as the war rages on and the American government shuns its burden, Meyer sees no hope for his lost paradise. In conclusion he writes; Khmers kill Khmers and Cambodia is doomed to destruction by American airpower.

"... les paysans trouvent refuge dans des campements forestiers et conservent leur sourire et leur humour, mais ajout-t-on, il est difficile d'imaginer l'intensité de leur haine à l'endroit de ceux qui anéantissent leurs villages et leurs biens.

Peut-être faut-il rappeler que les Cambodgiens ont la réputation méritée d'être le peuple le plus rancunier et vindictif de tout le Sud-Est asiatique, et ceci devrait tout de même retenir l'attention du président Nixon.

En fait, il apparaît dès à présent que, lorsque leur rage de destruction aura pris fin, le Cambodge se retrouvera à peu près en l'état dans lequel les Français le découvrirent vers 1860. Et le sourire khmer risque alors d'avoir disparu à jamais de notre univers vivant. pp. 405-6.

It is unclear for whom Prospero weeps, but the fact of the situation begs both compassion and understanding.

### **On Historiography and Politics**

*Derrière le Sourire Khmer* draws attention to the pressing need for a serious study of the impact of French colonialism in Cambodia. (Only nine pages in this extremely long book are devoted to Cambodia's colonial heritage). Such a study might deal with some of the issues I have raised above, particularly in regard to social mobility and the growing interdependency between rural and urban life as a result of international commerce, the development of internal communication and transportation networks, the shift from a barter to a cash system, the creation of private property and land registration, and the nature of rural credit and production systems. Certainly in economic terms, the urban-rural "gap" is one of the most glaring misnomers perpetuated by social science. The epistemological and metaphorical connotations of this phrase embody, I believe, a colonial perspective on developing social systems not altogether different from Charles Meyer's.

In addition, a good history of the consequences of French colonialism in Cambodia would, I believe, place the Sihanouk regime in its proper historical perspective as the decolonization phase of Cambodian politics and avoid the oversimplified explanation of administrative failure as the reason for the collapse of 1969-70. In this regard, histories readily available in French or English are generally more confusing than illuminating because of the absence of sociological insight into Khmer stratification systems before and after the French entry into Khmer politics. The French correctly recognized the provincial mandarins as the real threat to their power in Cambodia, not



the enigmatic King Norodom or his small court. Using the monarchy to legitimize their "reforms", the French systematically stripped the traditional provincial elites of their powers of taxation, adjudication and ultimately of administration. A new class of administrators arose adjacent to the court, a corps composed of marginal men of largely non-royal status who owed their opportunities for influence and advancement to the French. The transfer of political power from old mandarins to new bureaucrats under the guise of modern administration was represented in the phenomenal career patterns of men like Thioum who became, in one French colonial's description, king in everything but name towards the end of Norodom's reign. This class gave birth to the modern civil service and, to a lesser extent, the modern Khmer left.

Two observations can be extracted from this historically unprecedented emergence of a non-royal administrative class. First, Norodom as inheritor of the post-Angkorian kingdom was a weak king with limited temporal control over his kingdom, a loosely integrated system of patrimonial estates. To develop the protectorate, the French had to recreate a temporal political center for Khmer society, a center which had been dislocated by the fall of Angkor and totally fragmented by the Thai victory at Lovak in the 16th century. Popular images of Khmer civilization with a highly developed center after this time are, I would suggest, a confusion of a philosophical ideal-type with historical reality in all its richness and diversity. Second, the class of French-selected and French-trained administrators in Phnom Penh had no antecedents in Theravada Buddhist culture and society comparable to the Confucian administrative tradition in Vietnam or China. This raises the question of legitimacy in the eyes of the peasant masses in the event of the removal of French power. Unlike the French, this class did not act in the name of the King but in the name of the protectorate. Emerging as it did from marginal, often half-Khmer ethnic origins, it simply lacked the genuine cultural nationalism which characterized, for example, the Meiji oligarchy. The honesty and efficiency which Meyer attributes to these administrators is simply his acknowledgment albeit naive of their loyalty to France. This fundamental change in Khmer social stratification was further complicated by the organization and separate adminis-

tration of *congregations* of Chinese and Vietnamese residents in Cambodia.

Sihanouk was an exceptional king in the post-Angkorian tradition in that he wanted to rule as well as to reign. In theory, this required dismantling the colonially created civil service and transferring power to the court. In fact, this was impossible because the court was financially dependent upon the administration and the French had taken the precaution of setting up multi-national financial and commercial arrangements throughout the late 1940's as a means of protecting their interests and the most trustworthy of their proteges. Sihanouk's genius lies in his perception that politics was a domain separate from administration, and that the distribution of rewards and services in Khmer society was a question to be re-opened for public debate. The origins of elite antimonarchism in Cambodia seem to rest in the realization that the King, not the traditional rural elites, was the principal threat to administrative power as well as the recognition that traditional Buddhist notions of state and kingship precluded development into international modern society. Sihanouk, however, was in fact prepared to play royal politics with new ground rules. Ironically, it was the presumably modern, French-created administration which he successfully penetrated and dominated with his Sangkum party which couldn't function in the new national state.

Cut off from their central referent in the Metropole, the civil service, the only social group in Khmer society which based its coherence and identity on principles of vertical hierarchy and dominance, literally disintegrated. Though its claims to nationalism were and are genuine in the sense that the nation is defined by its central administration, the absence of French power left no basis for cooperation and communal action. The structure provided by the American aid program of the late 1950's was only a temporary respite. The civil servant's sense of being cut adrift was aggravated by peasant refusal to pay taxes after independence. The peasants believed taxes were a French invention and independence meant they no longer had to be paid. Without its colonial referent, under assault by the court and denied legitimate authority by the peasants, the Cambodian civil



service sought only to resist proletarianization, slipping back to the social positions their families held when their fathers were first made interpreters, secretaries or chauffeurs to the French. Their frustrated aspirations and expectations seem to have been displaced onto their children who are encouraged to obtain a good education as a guarantee of the security and livelihood which seemed so vulnerable to their parents after independence. The enlargement of the civil service and increasing corruption in the absence of any serious effort to develop a self-sustaining, nationally coherent economy (a conception which dominates the analyses of progressive politicians) resulted in the nearly total exhaustion of state resources by 1969.

For survival, *les fonctionnaires* required organizational coherence, outside support and foreign aid to provide financial underpinnings for the state they were no longer able to sustain or, more appropriately, which was no longer able to sustain them. Sihanouk, discouraged and overwhelmed (I believe), by the general social and economic chaos after 1966, was prepared to yield on all three points and to retire from the fray by reascending the throne. In 1969, diplomatic relations with the United States were re-established and General Lon Nol, Commander in Chief of the Army, was made Prime Minister. This opened up the possibility of securing American economic aid. The prospect of military rule was also in one sense a welcome one for the civil service because the principles of military command and organization are comparable to those of colonial hierarchy. Sihanouk, in a profoundly appropriate way, dubbed Lon Nol's cabinet, the government of salvation (*le gouvernement de sauvetage*).

Despite these concessions on Sihanouk's part, the plans for the *coup d'état* were under way during the summer of 1969 even while the Salvation Government was being formed. The coup was to serve the dual purpose of stripping Sihanouk and his entourage of their political and economic power and of forcing the United States into a large military aid program. The success of the coup measured against its political objectives has yet to be determined but the costs of the adventure have been and continue to be very high. If the coup is viewed as a critical event in the process of decolonization, it must be pointed out that only Sihanouk and a few of his close associates, among

all the Phnompenghois (including Charles Meyer) who made up the Sihanouk Regime, have escaped from the structural confines of a colonially-determined world. The disjunction between culturally determined Khmer conceptions of statecraft and legitimate authority, and modern, foreign-imposed administration is dramatized by Sihanouk's alliance with well-organized revolutionary forces with deep roots in Khmer history and peasant culture. Thus, the basis for nationalist revolution is laid. Sihanouk at the head of the liberation forces embodies the paradoxical promise of still another revolutionary restratification of Cambodian society in defense of traditional Khmer values. In all of this, there is indeed a large amount of tragedy as the coup regime in Phnom Penh which lacks the capacity to protect its citizenry from its allies even lacks the autonomy required for defeat. The outcome of the Khmer decolonization crisis and civil war is apt to be determined within an international context by forces totally ignorant of or unsympathetic to Cambodia's developmental experience.

In conclusion, I cannot in good conscience recommend *Derrière le Sourire Khmer* to the general reader. Although it is rich in anecdotal data, occasionally eloquent in description and touching in its romance, the author's colonial bias is all-pervasive and, as I have attempted to demonstrate, this has a decisive and alarming effect on the analysis and conclusions of his book. Though I have suggested some alternative ways of interpreting the post-independence period in Cambodia, this discussion should be regarded as a preliminary, interim analysis. It is probably too early to comprehend fully the meaning and the significance of the Sihanouk era in modern Cambodian history. In the final analysis, it is necessary to await the assessments of Cambodian scholars; if they, too, sense the inadequacies and biases of Meyer's study, I would hope this discussion might provoke a long and informative dialogue.\*

Laura Summers

Cornell University

---

\* I would like to express my appreciation to Lorna Amarasingham, Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, Charnvit Kasetsiri and Jon Wiant for their comments on an earlier draft of this manuscript while emphasizing that the responsibility for the content of this essay is that of the author alone.



## REVIEWS

J.R.E. Waddell, *An Introduction to Southeast Asian Politics* (John Wiley & Sons Australasia Ltd., Sydney, 1972), pp. 305.

A considerable amount of work needs to go into a book such as this, dealing with ten very different countries, five of which are involved in one way or another with one of the most bitter and fateful conflicts in the world. Yet this book, while it has solid merits, is uneven both in scope and quality. The simplest way to illustrate this is to take a look at the length of the various chapters. They range from 12 pages on Thailand (the least adequately treated) to 61 pages on Malaysia and Singapore. In sum, the book provides a good introduction to politics in Malaysia, Indonesia and the Philippines—the archipelago and island states—and an insufficient one to mainland Southeast Asia.

The structure of the country chapters is fairly uniform, giving a short historical background, an analysis of constitutions, government and administration, and the political process, as well as an assessment of features specific to the country, such as the role of external forces in Laos, the question of North Vietnamese intervention in South Vietnam (there is curiously little about the far greater intervention by the United States in Vietnam). The mainland chapters, as I have said, are not too satisfactory: many of the sections are so brief as to be misleading. Moreover, the author's awareness of major issues is rather lacking—in contrast to his obvious understanding of Malaysian and Indonesian politics. It results in a scissors-and-paste approach: snippets of facts glued together without much consideration for the social forces underlying them.

It was a good idea to point out "common factors", "mainland and maritime", and village society, in the first part of the book, and the role of ideologies and of the military in the concluding part, but in practice the result is disappointing. These sections are all too brief and the themes are insufficiently thought out.

Now for the plus side. The author's well-informed and sympathetic assessment of Malaysian and Indonesian problems includes an effective analysis of the various social and ethnic groupings. (See, for example, his description of the *santri*, *abangan* and *prijaji* on pages 210-211). If he can bring his chapters on mainland countries and on common themes up to the standard of those on Indonesia and Malaysia, then the author will have provided in a hoped-for revised edition a worthwhile addition to the literature.

*J.L.S. Girling*

*Australian National University*

Norman Jacobs, *Modernization without Development, Thailand as an Asian Case Study* (Praeger Publishers, Inc., New York, 1971), pp. 420.

The title of this book strikes a ring of nomenclative innovation wherein arises the question of knowledge and methodology, though not necessarily in the sense of a non-Asian writing about things Asian or of the incompatibility of "insider's" parochialism vs. "outsider's" universalism (Chapter 13 : Epilogue). Professor Norman Jacobs deserves, first of all, to be commended for this scholarly attempt at walking, so to speak, "the intellectual tightrope" on the rather tricky and unsettled subject of change and development which, to this reviewer's mind as a student of politics, had better not be left to political scientists alone. The definitional framework of "political" development has over the years been proliferating unceasingly (one has only to witness ten varieties in Pye's *Aspects of Political Development*, as well as Huntington's second thoughts on the subject in his *Political Development and Political Decay*). Above all else, development, as a concept, has been heavily beset with various sorts of teleological lopsidedness and, in many an instance, has tended to be swayed and cowed by the deterministic myth of "stages of economic growth".

Professor Jacobs' approach has done away with the "Western" unilinear view of development (pp. 6-7, 327) and, instead, focuses specific attention on the nature of the changes itself. This of course may not cast the limelight on the grandiose scheme of things, but certainly involves insightful and more relevant explanatory and comparative analysis—though, unfortunately in this particular case-study, somewhat lacking in conceptual dimension.

In place of the over-used dichotomy of "traditional" and "modern", Professor Jacobs proposes another of "patrimonial" and "feudal" as "model descriptions of societies" (p. 5). Accordingly, a clear distinction is being made, not merely in degree but fundamentally in kind, between two types of social changes: quantitative and qualitative, entitled modernization and development respectively. The theoretical source is mainly that of Max Weber and some other sociological thinkers together with terminological coinage from Eric Wolf (pp. 4-5). Patrimonial and feudal models, though not mutually exclusive in many respects, are



"functionally" and thus qualitatively two different kinds of societies divergent in their primary goals that "propel" them in different developmental directions". The models are not meant to be representative of but to provide understanding for relevant reality and to answer the "vital question" as to "Why have the societies of Asia, with the notable exception of Japan, in spite of tremendous changes and despite the considerable advisory and material aid which they have received, especially in recent decades, *not developed?* . . ." (Introduction p. 3, reviewer's italics). These opening remarks sound rather as though there is a foregone conclusion already. "And, on the other hand, we have built a model of the potentially modernized *but to date* undeveloped, patrimonial, Asian society against which to judge the Thai experience . . ." (p. 9, reviewer's italics). The conditional phrase, "but to date", incidentally cannot but impair the hypothesis implicit in the author's own postulate that "neither the patrimonial nor the feudal should be considered as either the prior or subsequent stage of the other in terms of a universal, unilinear, evolutionary model . . ." (p. 6). After this apparently minor but dampening ambivalence, there follows the call to "define and contrast modernization and development"; both, quite legitimately, are purported to "denote the maximization of the potential of the society"—meaning, true to all human societies, they are susceptible to and capable of change and innovation. There is a crucial difference, however. Modernization, being a quantitative type of change, belongs to the patrimonial and closed system, i.e., "within the *limits* set by the goals and the fundamental structure (of forms) of the society . . . is stimulated by novel, recently revealed ways of accomplishing tasks which offer improved, more successful ways to cope with the *existing, traditional environment* . . . this is a *continuous* process . . ." (p. 9, reviewer's italics). Development, on the other hand, being a qualitative type of change, belongs to the feudal and open system, i.e. "regardless of any limits currently set by the goals or fundamental structure of the society . . . is an open-ended commitment to productive change, no matter what the consequences might be on existing goals or existing ways of doing things . . ." (*ibid.*)

One may note here the usage of the terms "goals", "structures", and even "environment"—all in apparent equivalence. Are they just the things that are or used to be ("past structures"), "existing" or "currently

set", no matter what kind or content? Is the difference between patrimonialism and feudalism, simply that between "within" and "regardless of" the limits set by the goals or fundamental structure?

The distinctive features of the "patrimonial" model are formulated in terms of power and "prebends" and their relation to public office, bureaucratic structure, personal allegiance, and the centralized nation state's sovereign (p. 4). An extensive "institutional, sociological analysis" is elaborated over the various relevant social institutions, seven in all: authority structure, economy, occupations, stratification, kinship and descent, religion, and order and change (pp. 12-31). All these itemized institutions (equivalent also to "pattern" or "structure") are treated and discussed at great, and admirably resourceful, length for the Thai case in this voluminous piece of work (Chapters (2-12).

To be sure, the book presents quite a picturesque description of Thai society, filtered through an historical narrative and interpretation, not without dubiousness, in a vast multitude of case patterns of social behaviour and inter-personal relationship. On the other hand, one could find it long-winded and wearily detailed—to the point where it becomes less and less sure as to what are characteristically indigenous Thai and what are qualitatively attributable to things dubbed "patrimonial". More precisely, while there is little, if any, to find fault with factually, it seems increasingly, as one goes along, doubtful conceptually as to the meaningfulness and even helpfulness of the proposed models. The contrast, to begin with, between personal and contractual relationship in the authority structure (p. 13), which is used throughout to cast light on the "institutional" behaviour, is historically and sociologically over-strained and is extremely thin as a model. Although of course it is substantially true that in Thai society and politics there exist the following: a confusion between public and private access to the state funds (pp. 107-110), government supervision over and intervention (at will) into economic activities (p. 15) by "patrimonial" (i.e. moral-intellectual as well as bureaucratic) leadership (pp. 14, 116-117, 126), leaders-followers class division, the latter also including "commercialists" and industrialists (pp. 192-193, 201, 203) corresponding to primary ("statecraft") and secondary occupations respectively (p. 16), secondary occupations are denied the right to organize (p. 17) and hence the non-existence of autonomous corporate groupings even in the economy's private sector as well as the religious order (pp. 14, 194-197, 224, 230), national political



independence remains primary goals of Thai material progress and innovation (pp. 316-319), and the national centre has been and is dominating the peripheries (pp. 14, 36-61, 67-79).

As is obvious to all, there is a vast divergence between Thailand and Japan, cited above as the author's starting point, and for that matter, between Thailand and China which also comes under the "patrimonial" category according to Professor Jacobs' schema. But what of exemplary "feudal" Japan where are still strongly retained such characteristics as personalism, dominant bureaucracy, leaders-followers factionalism, nationalism, and predominant Tokyo as the national centre? At the same time, what distinctively characterizes Japanese social structure, i.e. competing and autonomous corporate groupings vis-à-vis governmental and bureaucratic leadership, is also beginning to be detectable at least in the Thai private sector's "commercialists", industrialists, and significantly, one might add, bankers and financiers. That is why the so-called traditional occupational preference (pp. 16-17, 170-185) is no longer simply true to-day. As for the patron-client pattern of interpersonal relationship, it is admittedly operating in full force in closed, "patrimonial" Thailand, but it also abounds in open-ended, "feudal" Japan.

Hopefully, all these comments will not be read as an argument in semantics. It is essentially prompted by a positive urge to look for more light where it is needed especially from fellow disciplines like sociology and anthropology which have undeniably been contributing a good deal to the social and political body of knowledge and understanding. It is only that the "intellectual tightrope" between "patrimonialism" and "feudalism" is bound to be too thin and overstretched to be conceptually of analytical use. And a rather unclearly delineated bifurcation can end like this:

"Let us recapitulate. On one hand, Thai as individuals are flexible and receptive to innovation, including modern innovation. On the other hand, the society's goals, defined by its decisionmakers as independence and patrimonialism *are constants*. Hence, in terms of its development potential, the Thai social system is not an open-ended system in the sense that the innovation spirit of any number of individual Thais will *not necessarily* lead, directly or latently, to those social changes which *the society's decisionmakers* consider unacceptable according to their standard of political independence (-cum-cultural integrity) and patrimonialism. This

contrasts with Japan where individual, innovative potential did lead to development in spite of the fact that Japanese decisionmakers too were political oligarchs whose weight was felt in the society until most recently and in spite of the fact that they were as nervous as their Thai counterparts about the threat of foreign control. Hence, the Japanese tried as valiantly to circumscribe innovation to insure the preservation of the indigenous culture amidst rapid modernization. But unlike the Thais, Japanese decisionmakers had no *need to preserve patrimonialism, perhaps for no other reason* than that Japanese society at that time was not patrimonial but feudal although, . . . *not unimportantly*, it had a number of patrimonial forms to it. Hence, *perhaps fortunately*, independence through development and not (merely) independence through modernization could become and was considered to be the proper Japanese innovative goals" (p. 320, reviewer's italics).

The "constants" here surely hinges heavily on "the society's decisionmakers" which by no means remains constant in the course of structural change and differentiation in Thai society. And yet, unfortunately, such obvious and "not unimportant" variable dimension seems simply lost in the "patrimonial" model's perspective. It tries to tell so much and yet takes little, if any, trouble to ask the question why, especially as to the underlying forces in the societies in question.

On the other hand, though, there certainly is great validity in the quantitative-qualitative approach and analysis which is real and in fact implicit throughout Professor Jacobs' line of thinking. But this could do well, probably far better and more objectively, without the "patrimonialism" vs. "feudalism" dichotomy with its implied rigidity of "closed" and "open-ended" processes of change. The point is to set an appropriate strategy of inquiry in terms of relevant problems and operative institutions (patterns or structures) such as social stratification and mobility, which still need to be looked into more thoroughly by, of course, both Thai and Westerners alike, and which appear, to this reviewer at any rate, to raise an epistemological problem beyond "models" serving as (p. 5) "purely artificial creations".

*Saneh Chamarik*

*Faculty of Political Science,  
Thammasat University*



Joyce Nakahara and Ronald A. Witton. *Development & Conflict in Thailand* (Cornell Thailand Project Interim Reports Series Number Fourteen, 1971). pp. 80.

This is a very well-written and thought-provoking account of an important new strategy in the study of social change and its outcome. In this study, social change is seen in the light of the so-called "structural differentiation". The higher the degree of differentiation of a social system the greater the magnitude of change or development. The country of Thailand is treated as a social system, of which 69 provinces constitute its subsystems. Each province has its position in the total communication structure, relative to that of every other—the subsystem's relative centrality. An increase in a province's structural differentiation will not automatically result in a shift in its relative centrality ("position gain"). The central government in Bangkok must do something to signal such a shift. Had the latter failed to do so, there is a strong tendency on the part of the former to demand for it through whatever legitimate means it may possess. However, should such an attempt prove unsuccessful, the subsystem is most likely to resort to socio-political conflict as a major way of getting out of such a predicament. This outcome is the focus of the authors' analysis and interpretation.

Since the work demonstrates the worth as well as the limitations of a novel approach to the understanding of Thailand in the present stage of turmoil, it must be taken seriously, at least as a model and target for criticism. The authors, Nakahara and Witton, display a tenacity of devotion to the classic scientific insistence on deriving hypotheses from theory, constructing empirical referents for concepts, and predicting the outcome before running the test. They do not offer speculative reasons for what they find, but their primary purpose—to test a significant hypothesis under a variety of conditions—has been well accomplished.

The strengths of the study under review lie in the authors' powerful conceptual scheme and methodological strategies. With the use of a highly sophisticated theoretical framework, they were able to see the process of development within the broad social context of a total nation and to conceive of some important social structural variables as properties of the total social system—Thailand in this case. These variables

altogether provide a vivid picture of the ongoing process of increasing institutional complexity from which appropriate empirical referents can be drawn. The latter, in turn, suggest the kind of quantitative measurement they finally chose. At this point, there are two things that deserve special appraisal. On the one hand, the investigators not only made successful use of one of the most sophisticated methodological tools—the Guttman scale—but were able to avoid difficulties that would have arisen had they chosen to explain development in economic terms and to assess it by means of aggregative measures. On the other hand, they by-pass such methodological problems as confidence in the representativeness of the sample units, justifying the extrapolation of findings to other parts of the same social system.

As a valuable contribution to the present store of knowledge in the study of social change, the authors can legitimately claim that their findings are closely related or comparable to those of any other area studies using the same or a similar conceptual framework and hence are most likely to lead to a cumulative growth in scientific knowledge. In this sense, the study “may prove useful to students of countries which are at about the same stage of development”. To me, this research report should be of great help to our graduate students or those beginners who wish to arm themselves with strong theoretical and methodological tools. They will surely learn much more from this study than they are likely to pick up even from a good textbook on research methodology.

However, any study of an exploratory nature like this one is likely to be far from perfection. This study is, of course, no exception. In the first place, one may wonder whether the investigators’ objectives are best served by using the notion of structural differentiation as a basis for measuring development. In view of its diffuse nature, it would seem more appropriate to treat development as consisting of several interrelated and separately measurable dimensions. See, for example, this kind of conceptualization in a series of studies undertaken by Shannon (1959), Sawyer (1967), and Olsen (1968).

Although it can be shown that the process of development has a cumulative and unidimensional quality and that Thai provinces can be ordered on the basis of degrees of institutional complexity, the authors’



actual measurements fell short of exploring the gamut of the phenomenon. The contention that development is systematic and that social, economic, and political indices can be used interchangeably was not fully illustrated by means of empirical testing. What the authors actually did was to construct a number of scales, all but one of which measured only one sphere of public life, namely, the economic one. It was, therefore, not difficult for them to show that no matter which scale or index was used at any given time period, the provinces tended to be ranked the same. They were prevented from making a full test of rank correlations between occupations and combined institutions (Table 7) by the fact that the two indices were based on two different time periods of measurement.

At this point, I would like to argue that it is one thing to combine different kinds of institutions (in *different* spheres of life) into one single scale (Table 7) and show that all tap one dimension, but it is quite another thing to construct a number of scales for measuring institutional complexity in *each* sphere of life (social, economic, and political) and then show that they can be used interchangeably. It is unfortunate that the authors were able to construct a seemingly powerful unidimensional scales (Table 7), but did not use it to order the provinces along that line. Therefore, their decision to use the occupational scale, apparently the least reliable one, should be regarded as unsound. I wonder whether a quite different result (the ranking of 69 provinces along a low-high development continuum) could have been obtained under the following conditions: (1) with the use of the combined institutions scale (Table 7); (2) with the use of the conventional classification of occupations—an unskilled labor-professional continuum; (3) with the use of all unidimensional scales constructed for measuring all spheres of social activities, plus the same techniques described by the authors to obtain the total scores for each province in each time period and compare their relative change in social rank; or (4) with the use of aggregative data dealing with the different dimensions of structural growth—for example, the model exemplified in Olsen's study (*ASR*, Oct., 1968 Vol. 33) on the relationship between socioeconomic modernization and political development.

It is also worth noting that while the authors' chosen scale taps the institutional complexity directly, it does so superficially. This is the case, because the presence of only one relevant institutional unit of each sphere of public life was considered sufficient in their attempt to ascertain the degrees of elaboration. I am not here arguing against the legitimacy of taking a great variety of "sophisticated" institutions as a measure of a higher level of structural differentiation. Instead, I am trying to point to the possibility of missing something of real value for assessing the magnitude of development. The authors may rightfully say that it makes no difference whether there are one or ten persons in a particular occupation, but it does make a lot of differences between *having and not having* one practitioner. This is plausible insofar as the number does not manifest certain degrees of elaboration within the internal structure of an occupation. But with respect to the number of persons in the same type of occupation but with some important differences in the levels of their education and training (i.e. persons in the medical and teaching professions) or the number of such establishments as hotels and hospitals which may differ from one another in terms of organizational structure and practices, it becomes a matter of differences in the diversity of activities. Differences in the number of persons in a particular occupation or in the number of establishments of the same type, therefore, may convey some important hidden meanings for constructing scalograms. Keeping this in mind, it seems plausible that some provinces should be on *different* levels or scale steps, despite their identical scores in the scalograms.

Turning to the second part of the paper, there is apparently a discrepancy between what the authors described as the processes whereby the dynamics of structural growth might end up producing political conflict and their actual empirical testing of the hypothesis. In the first place, it was postulated that a disjunction between the level of development that a province attains and its share in the national system of information would result in an attempt on the part of the province to unite in order to increase its "relative centrality" or "to better its position with regard to access to the information flows within the regional or national system." The authors, while keeping to the original



framework of thought, do not take into consideration the states of mind of the provincial communication leaders who recognize this disturbing situation and try to do something about it. As a result, they do not bother to seek direct evidence concerning the views of provincial leaders but jump over to indirect empirical evidence of a "solidarity movement". Again, when they obtain a series of relatively low correlations between growth rates and the solidarity movement, they suggest four alternative explanations, which could have been omitted had they measured an increase in subsystem relative centrality after development had occurred.

In the second place, while it is tenable to say that Bangkok has resisted subsystem demands for a bigger role in national affairs, the authors do not produce first-hand information to support their claim. They rely solely on other researchers' findings, which give only a partial picture of the whole situation. As they did not produce any evidence of a struggle on the part of the fast-growing provinces to better their position, one may wonder about the true meaning of Bangkok's alleged resistance. One might as well think of Bangkok's resistance as something inherent in the nature of our highly centralized system of government. It is not something new but rather has been in existence throughout the history of modern Thailand. One might, for example, think of regional demands during the parliamentary period as reflections of a desire on the part of elected representatives to please their electorates, in order to assure reelection in the future. Politicians tend to have their own ways of gaining popularity which may have little connection with any sort of consolidated or united political movement. This is likely to be true regardless of their political affiliation. Therefore, one can hardly speak of their words and deeds in the light of what was postulated in the theory.

It is of some interest to note that in Thailand the incumbents of provincial public offices dominate all spheres of public life. These officials are appointed by the central authorities and bound by the law to display "civil obedience". Non-official members of the local elites have never been able to organize themselves into any sort of powerful pressure groups for the purpose under consideration, to say nothing of the courage needed to challenge the national capital. Only the furor

over Communist subversion has received serious attention from Bangkok. As a consequence, different kinds of community development programs were conceived and put into operation, but they were never especially effective in coping with the problem.

Third, the authors produce no evidence to show that socio-political conflict was generated and controlled by those who became disturbed by the structural bind or rigidity of Bangkok's control over information flows. Neither do they show that the rebellious groups received direct or indirect support from the dissident elite. It is doubtful whether the province or region could or would readily avail itself of an "illegitimate opportunity" to relieve itself of the structural bind. To me, this is not likely to be the case, particularly with respect to the use of socio-political conflict, in the absence of a strong sense of dedication to the public interest on the part of the local elite. To my knowledge, it is known that those who organized different forms of guerrilla activities were drawn almost exclusively from the non-elite members of the region and their followers were ex-officials (rural teachers) of lower ranks and some village folk. Most, if not all, of these leading personnel were known to have minority status—the Lao-speaking Northeasterners, the North Vietnamese refugees, the Thai-Muslims in the South, or the hilltribesmen. Hence, it is likely that their background and experiences are far removed from the center of provincial public life. Viewed in this perspective, the genesis of conflict seems to lie in some idiosyncratic factors. There is no need here to go into greater detail, since the authors themselves cite some of these factors (pp. 48-49).

The authors' analysis and interpretation, it seems to me, must be challenged on a number of grounds. Since the effect of the *absence* of minorities on the association between the rate of structural growth and terrorism is much greater than the effect of their presence (it reduces the relationship right down to the point of "no significant difference"), we should say that minorities *are* (not "might be") particularly sensitive to the existing authoritarian rule and that rapid structural growth eventually produces conflict, but only or especially with the presence of minorities. At any rate, one must have a clear and adequate definition of the term "minority" before making use of it as a controlling variable. Moreover, close inspection reveals that over 70 per cent of the provinces'



never occur unless there are "poor" areas as well as "poor" people to be exploited. We must therefore seek other contributory conditions, such as those which I have already specified, to help explain the problem.

The last point I want to discuss here is the most challenging one, because it could have invalidated the authors' whole conceptual scheme. It is a question of temporal order inherent in the hypothesized causal relationship between structural growth and the occurrence of terrorism. What was reported by the press and taken as evidence of the problem seems to support the hypothesis. But to my knowledge, as a former deputy district officer, during the early phase of Sarit's regime (1958-60), the Thai Government was well aware of the likelihood that Communist agitators, already infiltrating from across the borders, were able to recruit their followers from some dissident leading personalities of the "target" areas, as well as from some segments of our rural population. Different kinds of projects and plans were then conceived and carried out in an effort to improve rural standards of living and to win the people's loyalty to Bangkok. These new patterns of distribution of national resources could have been expected to result in rapid structural growth in these "sensitive areas", several of which happen to be the same fast-growing provinces reported in the findings. Probably because of age-old practices of some local government officials and their lack of understanding, the problem, instead of diminishing, became more serious during the mid-sixties. In other words, it is quite probable that the terrorist problem was already there before the growth occurred. However, this idea needs to be verified by more careful and comprehensive future investigations.

On the whole, it seems to me, the authors could have done a much better job had they paid more attention to the social accompaniments of structural growth and sought more direct and adequate evidence bearing on those phenomena that intervene between the presumed cause and its effect. Nevertheless, this volume is a very good concerted effort to raise the level of information and understanding of social change. It should be on the shelf of everyone who imagines himself reasonably well-trained in sociological research.

*Serin Punnahtanon*

*Department of Social Studies,  
Chulalongkorn University*

Pholakul Angkinan, *The Role of the Chinese in the Reign of King Chulalongkorn* (บทบาทชาวจีนในประเทศไทยในรัชสมัยพระบาทสมเด็จพระจุลจอมเกล้าเจ้าอยู่หัว) (Bangkok, 2514), 172 pp., appendices, bibliography.

Mr. Pholakul's study was originally written as the second of some nine Master's theses in History which have been completed within the past two years by graduate students at the Prasanmitr branch of the College of Education. All of these have been based primarily on government documents contained in the National Archives and the National Library. Along with their fellow graduate students at Chulalongkorn University, the College of Education students are using the increasing numbers of documents being made available by the Fine Arts Department to make significant contributions to the historiography of the Bangkok period.

The nature of his sources—all of his original contributions being based on documents in the Archives—necessarily influences the perspective of Mr. Pholakul's work. It is, thus, less a history of the social and economic development of the Chinese community during this period than a study of, first, the manner in which the Chinese community was perceived by the Thai government, and, second, the policies conceived and enacted by the government to minimize frictions with the Chinese community and to maintain an enviable record of interaction and assimilation. A thorough social history of the Chinese in Thailand, on the order of Wickberg's work on a parallel period in Philippine history,<sup>1</sup> still remains to be written.

In Chapter Three, for instance, in which he discusses the Chinese community generally in terms of its demographic, economic, social, and political characteristics, Mr. Pholakul relies largely on secondary sources, and adds little to our knowledge of developments internal to the Chinese community in the fifth reign. To cite one specific example, with regard to the important question of the relatively high rate of assimilation of Chinese into Thai society, Mr. Pholakul follows numerous others in emphasizing the importance of racial and cultural similarities between

1) Edgar Wickberg, *The Chinese in Philippine Life, 1850-1898* (New Haven, Conn., 1965), and the same author's "The Chinese Mestizo in Philippine History," *Journal of Southeast Asian History* V : 1 (March, 1964), 62-100.



the two peoples. These were doubtless necessary conditions for a high rate of assimilation, insofar as their absence would have provided serious obstacles to the free entrance of Chinese into Thai society. At the same time, however, a more positive cause for the high rate of assimilation in Thailand as opposed to that in her colonized Southeast Asian neighbors may well have been, as Skinner has suggested,<sup>2</sup> the air of cultural confidence exuded by the independent Thai elite. Thai royalty and nobility, not a Western colonial administration, constituted the society's highest stratum, and it was towards assimilation into this group that status conscious, upwardly mobile Chinese focused their ambitions. Skinner posed this argument in a largely speculative manner, and it might have been appropriate in a book such as Pholakul's to attempt to deal with it in light of the documentary sources at his disposal.

This is not to say that Mr. Pholakul completely neglects the internal growth and dynamics of the Chinese community. He does, for instance, follow trends in the make-up and function of Chinese Secret Societies, and he attempts to relate awakening Chinese nationalism, efforts to establish trade associations and to achieve Consular representation, and the strike of 1910. Yet in so doing, the author's emphasis is always on these phenomena as problems to be dealt with by the Thai government.

The bulk of the book, and its real contribution, is contained in Chapters Four through Seven, each devoted to one development and the efforts of the Thai to control it. Chapter Four deals with the Secret Societies and the development of Thai policy towards them from the period of *Caophraya* Srisuriyawong's regency to the Royal Edict controlling the societies in 1897. Chapter Five focuses on Chinese registration as subjects of foreign powers in order to avoid Thai taxes and legal restrictions. The author analyzes the motivations of both individual Chinese and the Western powers, the friction between the government and the Western consuls over Thai attempts to maximize

2) G. William Skinner, "Change and Persistence in Chinese Culture Overseas: A Comparison of Thailand and Java," *Journal of the South Seas Society*, XVI: 1-2 (1960), 86-100.

their legal authority over the Chinese, and the treaty revision which placed Asian residents under Thai jurisdiction in the latter years of the reign.

In Chapter Six, Mr. Pholakul traces the efforts of the Chinese community to establish trade associations, and, more interestingly, finds in his sources considerable evidence—or, at least, suspicion on the part of Thai authorities—of underlying political motivations of both the Chinese government and the Chinese in Thailand. The former, reflecting the internal impetus towards reform and reacting to the growing anti-Manchu activity among overseas Chinese, sought to improve its image as protector of all Chinese; the latter, denied the sanctuary of registration as subjects of Western powers, were eager to secure for themselves an institutionalized means of representing themselves as a distinct community. The Thai government, after several parries designed to ward off Chinese requests and demands for permission to form such associations, found it necessary to submit to them by the end of the reign. It retained, however, a clear awareness of the associations' political potential and a dedication to limiting them to sanctioned economic spheres of activity.

Finally, in Chapter Seven, Mr. Pholakul discusses the strike of 1910, which witnessed the closing of most Chinese shops and businesses employing Chinese labor for three days but which, in the end, failed to achieve its objectives. Again, the author finds reason to suspect that more than objections to the increased capitation tax lay behind the strike. He argues that the strike was, at least partially, staged to provide the Chinese government with an opportunity to press its demand for the establishment of a Consulate to represent the interests of the Chinese community. Whatever the goals, they were not achieved. The tax remained, a Consulate was not established, and the leaders were discredited. More important, in the long run, Mr. Pholakul views the strike as the culmination of a series of frictions in Thai-Chinese relations which led to increasing dissatisfaction and distrust on both sides: the Chinese looking more and more to the Chinese government for protection, the Thai adopting a more rigid, at times hostile, stance towards the Chinese.



At a general level, I would make two related points with regard to Mr. Pholakul's approach and the nature of his sources. First, he tends at times to accept his sources uncritically; what one receives, therefore, is largely a contemporary government view of the situation. As an example of this tendency, one may examine his analysis of the motivation behind the strike of 1910. Mr. Pholakul practically discards the strikers' stated aim of protesting the decision to collect the triennial capitation tax on a yearly basis. Rather, he accepts the suspicions of Thai officials at the time that the strike was motivated by Chinese political ambitions; that is it was designed to create an opportunity for the Chinese government to demand Consular representation in order to protect the rights of its overseas subjects. In support of this theory, Mr. Pholakul points out that the relatively prosperous shopowners who cooperated with the strike would not have been seriously affected by the tax increase. This is probably true, and Mr. Pholakul's evidence for political factors behind the strike is generally impressive. Yet, according to Ingram,<sup>3</sup> the position of Chinese labor at this time may have been, relative to that of the general Thai population, economically a declining one. The tax increase may, in fact, have been a heavy burden for the striking laborers; they may, in fact, have been motivated largely by economic factors. If this is accepted as a possibility, and if we examine it in the context of a Chinese community of generally increasing self-awareness and even nationalism, as Pholakul suggests we should, then perhaps one can see the shopowners' cooperation as a gesture of sympathy for their less fortunate countrymen. Mr. Pholakul, accepting the Thai government view, fails to investigate such grievances as may have existed, and thereby neglects the possibility that government suspicions were either unfounded or exaggerated.

Furthermore, if one agrees with Mr. Pholakul that political factors motivated the strikers, he is forced to accept a rather tortuous logic: the Chinese were not really protesting their economic "oppression" but were rather feigning such a protest in order to obtain an institutionalized political means of representing themselves to the Thai government in

3) James C. Ingram, "Thailand's Rice Trade and the Allocation of Resources," in C.D. Cowan, ed., *The Economic Development of South-East Asia* (London, 1964), 102-126.

order to achieve ends that were, it turns out, largely economic in themselves. It would seem more likely that the strike was in fact motivated by a combination of political and economic factors. Mr. Pholakul's acceptance of the government view requires him to stress the former at the expense of the latter, and the resulting interpretation has important implications for one's view not only of the legitimacy of the strikers' actions but also of the whole of Thai-Chinese relations in the fifth reign.

The second general point has to do with historical sources and is closely related to the above. Because he relies so heavily on the Archives, Mr. Pholakul is deprived of alternative perspectives which might deepen his analysis. The author, in short, has been faced with the general source problem confronted by all historians of modern, not to mention pre-modern Thailand: the Archival materials are incomplete and fragmentary, and other sources are scarce and often unreliable. In this regard, one is tempted to point out that oral history is virtually an untapped source in Thailand, and that, while in 1973 one can still hope to find people who have personal recollections of such events as the strike of 1910, in but a few years this potentially valuable source will be lost as far as the fifth reign is concerned. One might hope that Mr. Pholakul and other young Thai historians will attempt to use interviews to supplement their written sources.

It will be noted that the above points apply more directly to what the book is not than to what it is. It is not, perhaps unfortunately, a study of Chinese society, and it would be with regard to such a study that more critical analysis and a broader range of sources would be most desirable. Rather, it is a well-executed study of government policy towards the Chinese community. One might wish to see it expanded to include additional sources and perspectives relating to the context of that policy, but as it stands Mr. Pholakul's book is a significant addition to the list of works dealing with administration and reform in the fifth reign.

*David B. Johnston*

*Yale University*



K.S.R. Kulap (pseud.) *Anam Sayam Yut* (The Annam-Siam Wars) (Bangkok, Phrae Pittaya, B.E. 2514), 2 vols., pp. 1104.

*Anam Sayam Yut* was first published in Bangkok in 1904, in an edition of a thousand copies, to commemorate the seventieth anniversary of its compiler, K.S.R. Kulap whose contributions to Thai historiography are frequently the subject of controversy. Very few copies of the original edition, apparently, have survived, and the standard works in English and Thai that deal with the Third Reign (including those by Professor Vella, Dr. Akin Rabibhadana, and Mr. Thanom Anamwat) do not refer to it. The book's failure to make an impression on subsequent scholarship probably stems in part from K.S.R. Kulap's spotty reputation. As the unsigned preface to this edition reminds us (page 12) K.S.R. Kulap was often accused in his lifetime of inventing his sources and of falsifying the historical record. Certainly, as far as *Anam Sayam Yut* is concerned, he was not as rigorous with hearsay evidence as later scholars have usually been, and his failure to name his sources, except in the most general way, makes his book difficult for other historians to use. But these are faults which K.S.R. Kulap shares with many Thai pioneer historians, including Prince Damrong. More importantly, at those points where a spot-check against original sources can be made, the general charge turns out to be exaggerated, and probably false. K.S.R. Kulap has been faithful to the manuscripts he has used (some of which were printed in full after his book appeared); in fact, he occasionally quotes from them—without indicating when he does so—more accurately than his predecessor, the chronicler of the Third Reign, *Chaophraya* Thipakarawong.

His book is divided into two unequal parts. The first, covering 170 pages, is a collective biography of *Chaophraya* Bodin Decha (Sing Singhaseni, 1779-1848), the most important Thai military figure in the Third Reign, and his immediate descendants. The second part of the book, which takes up over eight hundred pages, recounts *Chaophraya* Bodin's military exploits in Laos, Cambodia and Vietnam. For the biographic portion, K.S.R. Kulap refers to "hearsay" (คำรณถัส) the sources for which are not identifiable. His treatment is rich in genealogical and circumstantial detail, for he carries the Singhaseni family story forward from the Ayudhya Period, when the family first became prominent, into the Fifth Reign. These pages are a valuable source of information for students of Thai

family politics, for the Singhasenis, like the Bunnags, with whom they intermarried, were powerful in the bureaucratic elite for over a century and a half. Unlike later biographers of *Chaophraya* Bodin, Kulap is not concerned with tidying up the General for posterity. He goes into considerable detail, for example, when he discusses (pp. 87 ff.) the unseemly charges and counter-charges that flew between *Chao Phraya* Bodin and other factions at Rama III's court following the Thai military defeat in Vietnam in 1833.

The remainder of the book, divided into three undifferentiated chapters (corresponding, presumably, to volumes in the original edition) deal with the wars that punctuated Thai relations with Vietnam throughout the Third Reign, in which *Chaophraya* Bodin, the Thai generalissimo, played such an important part. Kulap claims that his source for these pages were fifty-five folded note-books (สมุดไทยพับ) written in gambodge (yellow) ink, and consisting of official correspondence about *Chaophraya* Bodin's campaigns, prepared at his behest. Although they are not catalogued separately, these notebooks apparently now form part of the holdings of *chotmai het* (official correspondence) from the Third Reign in the National Library in Bangkok. Some of them have been printed in documentary collections (e.g. in the 1930s as volumes 67 and 68 of the *Prachum Phongsawadan*, or Collected Chronicles); others appear in the appendix to Mr. Thanom Anamwat's recent monograph on Thai-Khmer-Vietnamese relations; still others, in manuscript form, served as the basis for Mr. Thanom's research, and for my own, in 1970-1971. Of this collection (which includes many documents which probably never found their way into the notebooks cited by Kulap), several important ones, especially those that deal with political developments in Cambodia in 1840-1841, are not now available to scholars. Where their contents can be inferred from printed collections, from their titles, or from Thipakarawong's chronicle history, these documents appear to deal primarily with Thai military shortcomings and with Cambodian resistance to the Thai.

Happily for students of this period, it seems likely that K.S.R. Kulap had access to many of these documents, as did Thipakarawong and the compilers of Volumes 67 and 68 of the *Prachum Phongsawadan*. K.S.R. Kulap's fidelity to the *chotmai het* in general, when it can be verified,



is such that when he makes statements—especially about events in 1840-1841, but also for the years 1842-1847,—that cannot be traced, he may well be referring to the *chotmai het* that are not open for consultation at the moment. On page 853, for example, *Chaophraya* Bodin is quoted as saying that the Thai troops at his disposal in 1841 are “sloppy, clumsy, and repulsive” (เรื่อง ๆ ราว ๆ น่าเกลียด)—the kind of vivid phrase that fits into what we know from other sources (but not his biographers) about *Chaophraya* Bodin’s rough-and-ready character. On page 1020, K.S.R. Kulap goes into greater detail to describe the success of a Cambodian prince, Im, in organizing resistance to the Thai in 1844 than other sources do. Examples of this kind could be multiplied—regarding Vietnamese political maneuvers in Cambodia (page 936 ff.) and the role of the Sino-Vietnamese in the rebellion in Saigon in 1833 (page 471 ff.), to name only two.

I have not dealt with K.S.R. Kulap’s treatment of *Chao* Anu’s Vientiane rebellion in the 1820s, although this occupies most of the first volume of the new edition, because I am unfamiliar with the sources.

In closing, I have two small complaints. The first is that in resetting the type of the 1904 edition, the present editors have adhered too closely to the format of the original book and have failed to break it down into topical chapters, to provide headings, or to compose a table of contents. The book would be much easier to consult if these improvements were made, although presumably questions of relative cost affected the editors’ decision. My second objection is that the editors did not enlist the services of a contemporary scholar to write a thorough-going biographical and bibliographical introduction to these volumes, instead of the brief, unsigned one which now appears. A longer introduction would have placed K.S.R. Kulap more firmly in the context of his times, and the Thai historiographical tradition, and would also have related *Anam Sayam Yut* to other records concerning *Chaophraya* Bodin in particular and the Third Reign as a whole. But even without these improvements, it should be emphasized that *Anam Sayam Yut* is an extremely important source-book for students of the Third Reign, and Phrae Pittaya, in reprinting it, have performed a valuable service.

David P. Chandler

Monash University

*The Chiangmai Chronicle* (ตำนานพื้นเมืองเชียงใหม่ จากต้นฉบับใบลาน อักษรไทยยวน), (Bangkok, Commission for the Publication of Historical Documents, 1971), ก-ง, 150 pp., 7 plates, index.

A genuine anomaly in the historiography of Thailand for the past forty years is the fact that a critically important text bearing on the history of the North (Chiangmai, Lanna Thai) has been available only in French translation. This is the "Chiangmai Chronicle," published in 1932 as the third volume of Camille Notton's *Annales du Siam*. The same chronicle has been known to Thai readers only indirectly through Phrayā Prachākitkṛachak's *Phongsāwadān Yonok*, large portions of which are based on the Chiangmai chronicle. The volume under review here presents the full text of the chronicle translated by Notton and utilized by Phrayā Prachākit. Its publication now is important because it enables us to check Notton's translation and Phrayā Prachākit's use of his source, and also simply because it is in itself an extremely important source for the history of the North.

This particular version of the Chiangmai chronicle was written in eight bundles (or books, ๗๐) or palm leaves, probably in or around 1827/28, the last date mentioned in the text. The compiler at that time unquestionably simply expanded upon a version written earlier, as this version is virtually identical to that utilized by Notton for events up to 1805, where Notton's version abruptly ends in what amounts to the middle of a sentence which appears in this version eight lines from the bottom of page 115.

The eight books of this version vary in length, but they are divided exactly as in Notton's version. *Book I* (pp. 1-18, equivalent to Notton's [N] pp. 3-37) performs the function of connecting the history Lanna Thai with Buddhist time and space, and its rulers with past defenders of the faith in the Buddhist world, from early rulers of Benares and Kapilavastu through Aśoka to Cāmadevī and early rulers of the Chieng-saen line, culminating finally in the early career of King Mangrai. It includes a lengthy section on Mangrai's relations with King Ngam Müang of Phayao and King Ramkhamhaeng of Sukhothai. *Book II* (pp. 19-31, N pp. 41-65) covers the closing years of the thirteenth century, Mangrai's capture of Haribhūñjaya, his relations with Pegu and Pagān-Ava, and his foundation of Chiangmai. *Book III* (pp. 32-46, N pp. 69-96) covers virtually the whole of the fourteenth century, from Mangrai's later wars through his death in 1317 to his successors as late as 1401/02.



*Book IV* (pp. 47-60, N pp. 99-126) begins with much warfare at the beginning of the century and covers the reign of the great King Tilokarat down to the 1460's. *Book V* (pp. 61-79, N pp. 129-167) covers the glories and decline of Lanna Thai in the succeeding century, from the 1460's down to the fall of Chiengmai to the Burmese in the 1560's in the course of which a complex web of foreign relations is covered, including relations with the Burmese, Ayudhya, the Shans, China, the Lavā, Keng Tung, Hsenwi, and Lan Xang. *Book VI* (pp. 80-97, N pp. 171-209) moves very quickly across the next two centuries, from 1581 to 1781, a large proportion of which does no more than list dates and notable events. *Book VII* (pp. 98-119, N pp. 213-241) covers the period from 1782 to 1806, a period of considerable warfare and the reconstruction of Chiengmai in a new relationship with the Bangkok monarchy. The concluding *Book VIII* (pp. 120-138, not covered in N) continues to deal with this reconstruction and restoration, particularly in terms of religious foundations, for the period from 1806 down to 1827.

As can be seen, the span of time covered by the chronicle is extensive. Many aspects of its subject have been studied but poorly, yet its importance is undeniable. Lanna Thai was a state of major importance in its own right for many centuries, particularly in its period of maximum independence from the end of the thirteenth century to the middle of the sixteenth, when its international relations involved China and all the major powers of the Southeast Asian mainland at that time (except Cambodia), and it was a cultural center of primary importance. As the chief account of this history, the Chingmai chronicle certainly will do more than just (as its editors suggest) "be of benefit to historians of the Ayudhya period" (p. ๓) or "provide knowledge of the past of the Kingdom of Lanna which was involved with the Kingdoms of Sukhothai, Ayudhya, Thonburi, and Bangkok." (p. ๔).

It is unfortunate that a text as important as this certainly has not been accorded the sort of editorial attention it deserves. (Indeed, this reviewer cannot recall a single major Thai text which has ever been properly edited, with proper account being taken of variation between different manuscripts, problem words and phrases being explained, cross-references being given to related texts and contradictions and confirmations being noted, and helpful maps and indices being provided.) In its defense, it should be noted that the Commission for the Publication of Historical Documents has gone to some lengths to point out that it

contracted with *nai* Sa-nguan Chotisukharat of Chiangmai simply to provide them with a transliterated Thai version of this text, the original of which was written in Northern Thai language and script, and that they simply have published what he provided them, no doubt in the interest of making the text available as quickly as possible to an audience which, for the most part, has no need of such critical refinements as might be required by the scholar. Criticism of the edition thus is, on the whole, somewhat in the manner of wishful thinking.

To begin with, the text of the chronicle is *not* printed exactly as it was written, assertions to the contrary notwithstanding (footnote, page 1). Instead, it is printed exactly as *nāi* Sa-nguan transcribed it, which involves numerous changes of spelling from Northern Thai to Central Thai. (Compare any one of the plates, and the transcription printed below them, with the corresponding passages in the text.) Furthermore, there would appear to be many typographical errors in the text, usually involving the vowel (ū) <sub>u</sub>. (There is one such error at the end of the 9th line of the first page of the forward, and, for example, complete inconsistency in the rendering of the word *an* on pages 2, 5, 7, 8, and 10.) There are only seven explanatory footnotes in the entire volume, although it certainly requires more, more even than the editor has inserted parenthetically in the text. Finally, a careful check of the first Book required 26 additions and 2 corrections to the listings of proper names in the index.

The Foreword to this volume initially leads the reader to expect that he holds in his hands an edition of a long-lost text of great importance, rescued from obscurity in the North; an impression encouraged by the fact that we have gone so many years without a real Thai edition of the text which Notton translated. The reader understandably is surprised subsequently to learn that the Commission checked one particular phrase which bothered them in Sa-nguan's edition against *three* other manuscript versions of the identical text in the National Library. Clearly the material does exist for a good critical edition of this important text. Is anyone willing to undertake it? Until such an edition does appear, the serious student of history will have to use the present edition in conjunction with Notton's translation, which does include the beginnings of a critical apparatus.

*David K. Wyatt*

*Cornell University*



*Ru'ang song tang chao prathetsarat krung ratankosint rachakan thi 1* (Accounts of the Appointments of Vassal Princes in the First Reign of the Bangkok Period), *เรื่องทรงตั้งเจ้าประเทศราชกรุงรัตนโกสินทร์ รัชกาลที่ ๑* Khana-kammakan chat phim ekasan thang pravatsat vathanatham lae boranakhadi samnak nayok rathamontri (Commission for the Publication of Historical, Cultural and Archeological Records, Office of the Prime Minister), 2514, ก-ฉ. ก-ข. 54 pp. 22 plates.

The collection under consideration here is a small volume which falls into the Commission's short-term program and which contains copies of a number of the gold plates with which Thai kings granted rank or position to their vassals and subjects. They are thus, four centuries removed, the same sort of document as the six plates I discussed in JSS July 1972 in connection with the *Prachum chatmai*. In this case all the documents concern rulers of surrounding principalities such as Chiang Mai, the eastern Lao states and Cambodia. Although the whole collection purports to be plates granted by Rama I, we shall see that this is not quite true.

As the editors' introduction mentions, the gold plates themselves were sent to the vassals to be conserved at their own court, and the present documents are records of these grants. More precisely they are later copies of the original records. For example, nos. 1-11, dated between 1143 and 1175 are all from a single "black book" (สมุดไทยดำ). Number 12 from another book and numbers 13 and 14, both dated 1164, from still a third book, might be true originals, but nos. 15-18 from a fourth book show dates which, as we shall see, indicate copies made long after the dates of the original documents.

One thing for which the editors are to be congratulated is the inclusion of legible plates of all but the last two documents, but it would be helpful if the plates, and all of the pages too, were numbered.

The collection includes five documents relating to Lao princes, eight to Khmer, three to a prince of Chiang Mai and two to a prince of Suvannaphum, in present-day Roi Et province, which in the early 19th century was one of "the two most important" states between Battambang and Luang Prabang.<sup>1</sup>

1) Pallegoix, *Description du Royaume Thai ou Siam*, Vol. I, p. 50.

Some of the documents are not simply copies of the gold plates but also describe in some detail the ceremonial of granting the plate and the circumstances in which it was given. The first nine also have a notation along the left-hand margin that a fee was paid, in the first eight cases 5 *taṃlu'ñ* and in the ninth four.

In form they differ considerably both among themselves and from the gold plates of the 15th-16th centuries. There is no longer a name along the left-hand edge and the dates are placed sometimes at the beginning and sometimes at the end. The old Khmer expression [*mī*] *braḥ rājaoṅkāra mān braḥ pandūl* has become a part of Thai royal vocabulary and occurs in many of the plates.

There is little of startling historical import, for nearly all of the dates and events are recent enough to have been well attested by other documents, but a few points are worth mention.

The official names of the Lao capitals, Luang Prabang and Vientiane, have been the object of some scholarly discussion and the documents give evidence concerning their use in the late 18th century. Thus in 1143 (1781) Vientiane was known to the Thai court as *braḥ nagara viaṅ cāṇḍapurī* (doc. no. 1,) but in 1157 (1795) it was called *kruṇ cāṇḍapurīy śrī sātaṇṇāganahuta visuddhi utama parama rātana rājadhānī śrī mahā sthāna* (no. 7). Between these two dates, in 1153 (1791), Luang Prabang was entitled *braḥ nagara hlvaṅ ba pang rājadhānī śrī sātanāga-ṇaḥḥutamah rātanapurī* (no. 2), showing that around the end of the 18th century the name “Śrī Satanāganahuta” could be used for both cities.

At first sight there appears to be an error in the dates of document no. 1, the plate given to *cau nāṇdasena* of Vientiane. The year date is 1143, which agrees with the chronicular sources, but this is followed by the words “year of the hare have been 15 years” (ปีเถาะได้ 15 ปี, ได้ being often used for ได้ in old documents). The editor assumed that “hare year” referred to 1143 and noted that the latter year was really a bull year. I should like to suggest, however, that at some point in the copying process a break between documents was made at the wrong place and the phrase ปีเถาะได้ 15 ปี was intended as a transition to a following text with the sense, “in the hare year, after 15 years”. The hare year in question would have been 1157 (1795)—correct addition by traditional arithmetic—which, according to document no. 7, was the date



at which *nandasena's* brother and successor *cau in* was appointed ruler of Vientiane. These two documents may possibly provide the means of dating the two reigns more precisely. According to Boulanger's *Histoire du Laos Français*, pp. 157-8, "Chao-Nan" reigned from 1782-1792 and "Chao-In" from 1792-1805. David K. Wyatt, in his careful study of Lao and Thai sources for the period, gives 1781 for the enthronement of "Nanthasen", but indicates that his sources were not precise about the accession date of "Chao Inthavong", placing it "At about this time", sometime after 1794.<sup>2</sup>

The documents in the present collection seem to show that the true date was 1795.

Numbers 3, 6, and 12 should be read together, for they concern related appointments in the northeast. The first part of no. 12 is a record of the appointment, in 1153 (1791), of two vassal princes, *cāv hnā* in Champassak and *cāv uparāja* in *mu'añ suvaṇabhūm rājapurīy*, now Amphoe Suvannaphum in Roi Et Province. It combines the texts of the two gold plates and gives some detail of the ceremonies. No. 3, from another collection of records, gives the text of the gold plate issued to *cāv hnā*. The second part of no. 12, dated 1157 (1795), describes the issuing of a second gold plate to *cāv uparāja* because his first one had been destroyed by fire, and no. 6 is the text of this plate.

One more document concerning the northeast is no. 4 which records the appointment of a prince in Ubol in 1154 (1792).

All three of the documents pertaining to Chiang Mai, nos. 8, 13, and 14, are in connection with the appointment, in 1802, of the Prince of Chiang Mai whose personal name, according to Camille Notton (*Annales du Siam* III, p. 234), was *Kāmp'ēng Kēo*. No. 8 and the first part of no. 13 are of exactly the same date. The former gives a brief description of the ceremonial, the size and weight of the plate, and the text of the plate, while the latter is only the text. Interestingly, there are many inconsistencies in the spelling of the two copies of the text of the plate, perhaps indicating copies made at different times. The second part of no. 13 is dated two days earlier and states that while the king was in the elephant stables inspecting a female elephant his *samuhanāyaka* brought the draft of the text of the gold plate for his approval. No. 14, a much longer text, is dated 6 days after the gold plate itself and is a

2) "Siam and Laos, 1767-1827", *Journal of Southeast Asian History* vol. 4(2), September 1963, pp. 13-32. See pp. 24-25.

copy of a letter from the Thai *cau bañā cakkru* (cakrī) to officials in Chiang Mai advising them of the new appointment, setting forth the attributes of the Chiang Mai officials, and giving instructions for governing the northern region—altogether a very interesting document for historians.

The texts relating to Cambodia include three purportedly concerning Ang Eng, two concerning Ang Chan, one giving appointments to Chan's brothers Snguon and Im and two granting titles to princes named *udaiya*.

The Ang Eng documents show some confusion in dating and presentation. Number 5 is very long, describes the ceremonial in detail, is dated 1156 (1794) in agreement with the other sources concerning Ang Eng, and contains the expected titles, *braḥ nārāyan rājādhirāja rāmādhpati*, etc. There is no problem here. Then we have no. 15, which also purports to record the appointment of Ang Eng as ruler of Cambodia, but it is not the true text of a gold plate for there are no royal titles. The date is also very confusing, for it appears to be 1166, bull year, tenth of the decade. Now 1166 (1804) is a rat year—the true bull year was 1167 (1805)—a bull year is never tenth of the decade except in very special circumstances which occur for a few days every 60 years and which had previously occurred in 1130, Ang Eng had died in 1796, and no Cambodian prince was appointed in either 1804 or 1805. It seems that a good bit of scribal error is involved, but students of the period may find some other explanation.

Number 16 is presented with the editor's title, "Draft (ร่าง) of a gold plate appointing a vassal ruler in *cula* era 1166". Indeed the date in the text is 1166 (1804), but it is called "tiger year", whereas it was really a rat year, and the prince in question is again Ang Eng who died in 1796. Here the copyist's error in the year date is easily discernible. Ang Eng was appointed in a true tiger year, 1156, which has been mis-copied as 1166 in the present record. However, there are still other problems. The titles are not those which were finally attributed to Ang Eng (see doc. no. 5) and no. 16 cannot have been a draft superseded by no. 5, for it is dated in the seventh month and Ang Eng, according to no. 5 and to the chronicles, received his gold plate in the sixth month. Again specialists in this period may discover a satisfactory explanation.



The texts concerning the Khmer princes Chan, Snguon and Im, nos. 9, 11, and 10 respectively, record the expected events at the expected dates, namely: Chan's coronation in 1806, renewal of his titles from the Thai side in 1813 after a struggle with the Vietnamese, and the appointments of Snguon and Im as *braḥ mahā upayorāja* and *braḥ mahā uparāja* in 1810.

The documents which present the greatest problems, and the only ones not accompanied by plates of the original texts are nos. 17 and 18, the last two of the collection. They both concern a Cambodian prince *udaiya* who was given the kingly titles *nārāyan rājādhirāja rāmādhīpati braḥ srī suriyobhārah*, etc. The editor's heading for both says this took place in the rat year 1166 (1804), although the date expressed in no. 17 is 169 *saṃrddhiśaka*, year of the rat and that in no. 18 is 1169, rat year.

Now the titles in question are easily identifiable. They belong to Ang Eng's father whose pre-coronation name was *udaiya* (usually written Outey in European works), and whose reign, according to the Cambodian chronicles, was from 1758 to 1775. The editors have apparently confused him with the later ruler whose pre-coronation name was Chan and who in 1806 received the titles, *udaiyādhirāja*, etc. The dates in these copies of older records, 169 and 1169 (1807), encouraged this confusion.

The first date, 169, is followed by *saṃrddhiśaka* which indicates the 10th year of the decade and means that the last figure of the date should be zero. Thus one should read 1690, an apparent *śaka* era date, which seems to work out well because 1690 *śaka* era was a true rat year. It is interesting to note that this is the only text in the collection dated in the *śaka* era which remained the official era of Cambodia up to the reign of Norodom.

If we look at the text we see that it begins with the words, "now the Pali text (𑖀𑖦) says", while no. 18 begins with, "the Thai text says". Further comparison shows that both are versions of a single original.

This helps explain the date of no. 18, 1169 rat year, which is patently wrong, for 1169 was a hare year. It appears that a Thai copyist reading the original of no. 17 assumed 169 to be a date in the familiar Siamese *cula* era and emended it to 1169 falling within the reign of another king who had used the name *udaiya*.

A final point to note concerning these two documents is that they date from 1690 (1768), ten years after the beginning of the reign in question and they do not contain any mention of a Thai king. Instead the documents emanate from the *brah mahā saṅgharāja*, the *purohita*, the members of the royal family and the "high and low officials", all, it would seem to me, on the Cambodian side. The information given in the chronicles of this period does not enable us to say exactly what these documents signify. At the time Siam was still in disorder resulting from the recent Burmese invasion and King Taksin was in the process of consolidating his power. The Cambodian chronicles assert that their king rather insolently refused to acknowledge Taksin as the new Siamese ruler because he was not of royal birth. Do these documents, then, show an attempt by the Cambodians, after the fall of Ayutthaya, to assert greater independence by reconfirming alone the titles which had been given to their king ten years earlier by the Thai court? Specialists of the period may perhaps provide the answer.

Historians should be grateful for this collection of documents and it is to be hoped that the Commission will soon publish more like it. Not only do they permit the determination of certain dates with greater precision, but they also illustrate the ease with which serious errors crept into official records in the process of filing and re-copying and consequently the necessity for students of Thai and Cambodian history to examine every purportedly original document with great care before using it in a work of synthesis.

As for presentation, I would prefer to see the texts grouped by subject and to have a detailed introductory note concerning the collections from which they were taken, in this case the *čhotmai het rachakan thi 1*, volumes 1, 2, 4, and 5. Does the present collection exhaust the contents of these volumes or does it represent a selection? In the latter case what other materials are in the same records? Is the date of compilation anywhere indicated? Such information would make the present volume more valuable and would obviate the necessity for a student desiring to use these materials for a thesis to run to the National Library in Bangkok to check the old black books themselves.

*Michael Vickery*

*Yale University*



Norodom Sihanouk, *L'Indochine Vue de Peking. Entretiens avec Jean Lacouture* (Editions du Seuil, Paris), 1972. pp. 170 + documentary appendix.

In July, 1971, Prince Sihanouk of Cambodia allowed himself to be interviewed in Peking and North Korea by his old friend, the French contemporary historian Jean Lacouture. Gathered into a book, the interviews give us a portrait, in Lacouture's words, of *un homme et sa vérité*. Most of the book is a relatively skillful brief in Sihanouk's defense. The only useful parts, for an historian or a biographer, are the first seventy pages or so, where Sihanouk describes his odd, lonely childhood and his early years as king. His parents seem to have been incompatible. They allowed Sihanouk to be raised by his great-grandmother, and sent him off to boarding school in Saigon when he was sixteen. The prince was an excellent student, but he had few friends his own age, and passed his holidays bicycling off to the movies and learning to play the clarinet. These pages help to explain the craving for approval that has colored so much of Sihanouk's political life. They also include a delightful vignette of Sihanouk's grandfather, King Sisowath Monivong (r. 1927-1941) frowning with annoyance as official papers are brought in to him to sign; some perceptive comments about the two rival branches of the Cambodian royal family, the Norodoms and the Sisowaths, and an account of a meeting in 1946 with General de Gaulle ("the man I venerate most, after the Buddha," Sihanouk tells Lacouture) where the General lectured the young king, over tea at Colombey, on the importance of national unity.

Sihanouk's memories are selective, and tend to sweep other actors from the stage. On one occasion, he falsifies the record. The passage refers to an important event, and Lacouture lets Sihanouk's version pass without comment.

It occurs on page 42. In Sihanouk's words, the year 1941 (*sic*) was marked by several "tragi-comic events";

One of our monks, named Chieu, became a sort of a hero by picking a fight with the chief of the French police... using his umbrella. The Frenchman was knocked about by the umbrella... and had the monk arrested. He was sent to the penal island of Poulo Condore, where he died, poor man. Prison for a few blows with an umbrella! You'll have to admit it was a little strong...

Sihanouk is referring here, it seems, to the anti-French demonstration of July 20, 1942 in Phnom Penh, which was organized to protest the arrest of a Buddhist monk, Hem Chieu, for preaching anti-French sermons to the Cambodian militia.<sup>1</sup> The demonstration involved over a thousand people, mostly monks, and was engineered by Cambodia's anti-French, anti-monarchic *elite*, led by Pach Chhoeun and Son Ngoc Thanh. In 1945, the third anniversary of the demonstration was celebrated as a holiday in Phnom Penh, and young King Sihanouk made a brief, enthusiastic speech.<sup>2</sup>

Why did Sihanouk choose to demean the demonstration in talking to Lacouture? Probably because, shouldered aside by Chhoeun and Thanh for several months in 1945, opposed by them and by their followers in the Democratic Party for most of the 1940s and 1950s and, in a sense, overthrown by them in 1970 (Chhoeun and Thanh are elder statesmen in the Khmer Republic) his incapacity to forgive has clouded his willingness to remember. Sihanouk's opposition to these men, and the republican sympathies they held, was the *leitmotif* of his domestic policies for nearly thirty years.

Throughout the book, Sihanouk demeans the motives of people who disagree with him, and praises those who have joined him in exile

1) See Bunchhan Mul, *Kuk Niyobay* (Political Prison) Phnom Penh, 1971, 49-62, and Claude Fillieux, *Merveilleux Cambodge* Paris, 1961, 166.

2) *Pongsavadar . . . preah bat norodom seihanu* (Chronicle of H.R.H. Norodom Sihanouk), ms. in the archives of the former Royal Palace, Phnom Penh, Vol. 6, 248 (entry for July 20, 1945).



in Peking. Although at one point he claims to be incapable of mistaking his country's national interests, at another he brushes aside Lacouture's suggestion that his regime might have done more than it did to punish corrupt officials, against whom the *coup* of 1970 was (albeit unsuccessfully) directed. Sihanouk's contempt for the people who oppose him slides past the fact that nearly all of them owe their positions to Sihanouk himself.

The last part of the book sets forth Sihanouk's ideas about the future, insofar as he had formulated them in July, 1971. He visualizes a very limited role for himself, once his name is cleared, and proposes an "Indochinese framework" (i.e. some form of Vietnamese control) over Cambodian affairs. While remarking that Peking is "not exactly the same as the Cote d'Azur", Sihanouk accepts the rightness and inevitability of a revolutionary rearrangement of power and property in Cambodia when the war is over. These pages are more restrained and statesmanlike than the earlier ones. They are padded out with a good deal of ephemeral material (such as speculations about Cambodia's future relationship to France, and about President Nixon's visit to Peking). They are also more painful to read. This is partly because of Sihanouk's own perception—a very costly one, in personal terms—that his hour as Cambodia's leader has passed, along with Cambodia's hour as his fief. His reflections, too, are clouded over by the war that has engulfed his country almost from the moment he fell from power. What else might have happened? He seems to be asking, looking from Peking at his war-torn land.

*David P. Chandler*

*Monash University*

D.B. Bradley, *Dictionary of Siamese Language* (หนังสือ อักษรวิธานศัพท์) (first published, Bangkok, 1873, reproduced photographically by Kurusapa Press, Bangkok, 1971), pp. 828.

It is remarkable that Dr. Bradley's *Dictionary of the Siamese Language*, first published in 1873, did not attract the attention it deserved. In vain have I searched for references to it in what I thought would be likely places, namely the *Bangkok Calender 1873*, Dr. McFarland's *Historical Sketch of Protestant Missions in Siam 1828-1928*, and the *Collected Chronicles* (ประชุมพงศาวดาร) Parts 12 & 31. Indeed the only place I have found this work mentioned is the foreword to Dr. McFarland's *Thai-English Dictionary*, first published in 1937, in the third paragraph which reads: "I have derived great additional help from Pallegoix and from the *Siamese Vernacular Dictionary* by Dr. Dan Bradley printed in 1874 which is full of Siamese idioms." (The inaccurate title and date here, I think, are of some significance.) It was not until Kurusapa Press brought out this new edition of Dr. Bradley's *Dictionary of the Siamese Language* that its importance as the first Siamese dictionary became acknowledged—in the words of Mrs. Maenmas Chavalit, Director of the National Museum, who wrote the preface to the new edition.

To my mind this lack of proper recognition of the academic and historical importance of the dictionary throws an interesting light on the history of the development of Siamese lexicography. From Mrs. Maenmas Chavalit's Preface and from Dr. McFarland's Foreword to his *Thai-English Dictionary* we learn that before the appearance of Dr. Bradley's, attempts to compile Siamese dictionaries have been confined to the bilingual (and in the case of Pallegoix's, quadrilingual) type. Now, if we take into account the successive introduction of the three principles of lexicography adopted in western countries (and it is surely legitimate here to do so in view of the fact that our earliest lexicographers were all *farang*), namely the line of the old glossaries followed by the earliest dictionary-makers directing attention to difficult words likely to be unfamiliar to ordinary men, the principle of general inclusion, and finally the principle of historical illustration, which



culminated in the O.E.D., then we see clearly that Dr. Bradley's work is in a quite different category of lexicography from those of earlier dictionary compilers. To the first principle belong such dictionaries as the *Dictionarium Latinum Thai ad usum missionis Siamensis ex typographia Collegii Assumptionis B.M.V.* and the Pallegoix, works which were efforts to meet the problems confronting foreigners learning the Siamese language, but Dr. Bradley was not motivated by any such practical aims, and he, though how far he succeeded is another matter, definitely based his scheme on the second principle—that of general inclusion.

Since the eighteenth century it has been generally accepted that the true function of lexicography is to record usage, and viewed in this light Dr. Bradley's Dictionary of the Siamese Language must surely be considered the first real item in the development of Siamese lexicography, and as such its importance can hardly be exaggerated. Unfortunately the author's reticence makes it rather difficult to make an appraisal of its value in definite terms. His "Notice" (แจ้งความ) or preface, which runs to four and a half lines in the original, may be translated roughly as follows: "This dictionary is a collection of Siamese words explained fully in the Siamese language. In compiling it, Dr. Bradley, got Acharn Tat to help copy, translate and supply detailed signification in Siamese. The printing was done at the printing press near the fort at the mouth of Klong Bangkokyai behind H.R.H. Prince Chaturonrasmee's Palace, and was completed on Tuesday, October 21st, 1873." One wishes in vain that he had been more communicative and told us what sentiment inspired him to undertake this huge, time-consuming task; what method, or what combination of methods, of making the word-list he used; who was Acharn Tat (อาจารย์ทัต) and how exactly was the work shared between them. Lacking information I myself like to think that it must have been his love of the language and his academic interest in and high regard for it that inspired Dr. Bradley to make it a lasting present of a proper dictionary.

In the West the 17th and 18th centuries was a great period of national language consciousness, and vernacular dictionary making was one of the major academic activities of the time. After the publication of *Vocabulario degli Accademia della Crusca* in 1612, with subsequent editions, and the French dictionary of the Academie Francaise in 1694, a lot of noises was made in England where national honour on this front was saved by the appearance of Dr. Samuel Johnson's great dictionary in 1755. It would appear, then, a right and proper thing for every respectable civilized language to have its own vernacular dictionary, which as far as possible should exhibit its entire vocabulary and usage. This, I am quite certain, was the thought Dr. Bradley had in mind.

However, since he chose to tell us nothing about his aims and methods, we can but rely on internal evidence, and browsing through the volume one must conclude that Dr. Bradley's intention was to record the Siamese language, as fully as possible, as it was spoken and written at that time. It is obvious that in making his word-list he did not confine himself to difficult or unfamiliar words but followed the principle of general inclusion. As Mrs. Maenmas Chavalit points out in her preface, his collection of some 40,000 words include common words and idioms, literary vocabulary, legal terminology, Buddhist terms, technical vocabulary, proper nouns, place names, names of plants and animals etc., and his numerous lists of compound words are particularly impressive. Fascinated by his thirty-five kinds of snakes I looked up "น", expecting to enjoy a similar feast, but only to be disappointed because only fifteen kinds of "น" were listed. Perhaps on account of his evangelical vocation it would not be too seemly to take too much notice of the animistic element in the Thai culture?

The treatment of each word comprises the signification and the illustration. No attempts are made to include the identification (the pronunciation, the grammatical designation or part of speech etc.) or the morphology, except in a few isolated cases where etymology is



offered, e.g. in the word “โอรส”. The signification is on the whole clear, direct and to the point. The illustrations are not quotations from extant written works but phrases or sentences made up in simple everyday common speech, often (such as those ending “นั่น”) with a quaint, charm-like ring to it which is very pleasant to read. The orthography exhibited is very different from the standard orthography of today and makes an interesting study. On pages 382-385, for example, there is a whole list of words spelt with the simple initial consonant “ป” where the correct modern spelling would require the consonant cluster “ปร”. It is fascinating, too, to find that our expletive “หนอยหนะ” in fact has come from “น้อยจนนะ”.

Judged by modern standards it must be admitted that Dr. Bradley's *Dictionary of the Siamese Language* is inadequate. Obviously it is not of much practical use to students of the Thai language or Thai philologists, mainly because of its antiquated orthography and the omission of identification and morphology in the treatment of vocabulary. However, the fact that ten years after its publication the Department of Education took steps to compile a government Siamese dictionary is, I think, a proof of its influence on the development of Thai lexicography.

Kurusapa Press which brought out the new edition of Dr. Bradley's Dictionary, a handsomely produced tome which should add much dignity as well as pleasure value to any book-shelf, is greatly to be commended. Not only have they made available to the public in general and Thai studies specialists in particular this most important landmark in Thai lexicography, but they have also paid the long overdue tribute to Dr. Dan Beach Bradley for yet another service of his to this country, a service which hitherto has not been sufficiently recognised.

*Napa Bhongbhihbat*

*Ministry of Education*

D.G. Collins, *An English Laos Dictionary* (2nd edition, originally published by Mission Press, Chiang Mai, 1906, and reprinted by Gregg International Publishers Limited, Westmead, Farnborough, Hants., England, 1972), 237 pages.

When I first began to study the Myang language (Northern Thai) ten years ago, a friend allowed me to borrow his copy of Reverend D.G. Collins' old *English Laos Dictionary* (ELD). That was the beginning of my contact with the book which has been both pleasant and linguistically profitable over the years. I was pleased, therefore, to be asked to review this reprinted edition, since it afforded an opportunity to renew an old acquaintance.

The available information on Reverend D.G. Collins is scanty. He and his wife arrived in Chiangmai in 1886 as missionaries under the Presbyterian Laos Mission.<sup>1</sup> The following year they organized the first school for boys in northern Thailand outside of the monasteries. This school later developed into The Prince Royal's College in Chiangmai.<sup>2</sup>

In 1892, Reverend D.G. Collins set in operation the Mission Press, using a font of Myang type which had been brought to Chiangmai earlier that year by Dr. S.C. Peoples. Mr. Collins evidently divided his time between the press and the school until 1899, when he was relieved of his educational responsibilities and was able to devote full time to the press. He remained manager of Mission Press until his death in 1917, after which Mrs. Collins assumed the responsibility. The Mission Press prospered for several decades, producing an ever-increasing amount of material in Myang, until public education in Standard Thai began to spread throughout the northern area and brought an end to the need for written Myang outside of the monasteries.

---

1) When Protestant missionaries began work in northern Thailand over one hundred years ago, the people and language of the northern area were called 'Lao' or 'Laos' by both the Siamese and the foreign community (not by the people themselves, however), hence the name 'Laos Mission'. William C. Dodd, *The Tai Race*, The Torch Press, 1923, p. 250.

2) Kenneth E. Wells, *History of Protestant Work in Thailand: 1828-1958*, Church of Christ in Thailand, 1958, p. 77.



The first Myang publication of the Mission Press was the *Gospel of Matthew*, translated by Mrs. Daniel McGilvary, wife of the famous pioneer missionary in the north. The list of publications grew to include Bibles, hymnals, Christian literature, literacy primers and readers, a monthly magazine *Sirikitisap* and Mr. Collins' own dictionary. Over two million pages came through the press in 1919.<sup>3</sup> Wells records, "In its heyday the Lao Mission press employed thirty-six men and printed over seven million pages per year."<sup>4</sup> By 1928, however, instruction in Myang script had been discontinued by both the Mission and the government, and the press went into decline.

Collins' *ELD*, went through several editions. I have been unable to discover how many editions appeared, but there were at least three. I recollect having seen the dates 1903 and 1915 on the title pages of various copies I have looked at.

The second edition of the *ELD*, of which the present volume is a reprint, contains about five thousand English entries and perhaps three times as many Myang equivalents. In some ways the book is more of a glossary than a proper dictionary since it lacks sense discrimination and illustrative phrases or sentences for most of the entries. This is probably not a serious defect, however, since most users of *ELD* will already have some knowledge of Myang or a related language (Thai, Lao, Shan, . . .). The dictionary is of interest primarily to those engaged in comparative studies of the Tai language family and those students of Myang who are able to handle the Myang script. The most important considerations, therefore, are coverage and accuracy.

*ELD* is one of five reasonably extensive dictionaries of Myang.<sup>5</sup> Each contains a fair number of entries not found in the others, though

3) Dodd, *op. cit.*, p. 255.

4) Wells, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

5) Meth Ratanaprasith, (เมธ รัตนประสิทธิ์), *Phótànaanúkrom Thai Yuan-Thai-Aykrít* Bangkok, 1965; Phra Dhamma rāachaanúwát, (พระธรรมราชาญัตถ์), *Lák Phaasǎa Thai Phayáp*, The Royal Institute and The Asia Foundation, 1959; Sangǔan Chotisúkharát, (สงวน โชติสุขรัตน์), *U Kham Myang*, Odeon Store, 1963; and Herbert C. Purnell, *A Short Northern Thai-English Dictionary*, Overseas Missionary Fellowship, 1963.

all share a very similar core vocabulary. The coverage in *ELD* is good. A few omissions, however, are 'across, side' /lääj/, 'grandfather' /pôô ʔúj/, 'grandmother' /mêê ʔúj/, 'many' /pəələʔ/, 'peppery' /phet/, 'pull out' /lok/, the question words /kôô/, and /bôô/, and 'sticklac' /khii khāaŋ/.<sup>6</sup>

*ELD* is also accurate in the transcription of Myang words. The use of Myang script enabled Collins to indicate all six phonemic tones adequately, unlike most Myang dictionaries and glossaries which use the Thai script. The Thai script has provision for indicating only five tones, thus two Myang tones must be indicated with the identical Thai tone mark.<sup>7</sup> The resulting conflation can be very confusing for the users of such works.

The *ELD* transcription of vowels is very interesting. Long and short vowels contrast in syllables ending with /p t k/. In syllables having no written final consonant, both long and short vowels occur, short vowels pronounced with a final glottal stop /ʔ/. In syllables ending with /m n ŋ w j/, however, the only vowels which preserve the long-short contrast appear to be /a/ and /o/. All other vowels are written with the particular long symbol only. Thus, for example, 'older uncle' /luuŋ/ is written with the same vowel symbol as for 'afterwards' /mŷa luun/, 'ascend' /khŷyn/ with the same vowel as 'night' /khyyn/, and 'pinchers' /kiim/ with the same vowel as 'eat' /kiin/. The absence of a vowel shortening symbol in the Myang script results in the apparent lack of distinction between long and short /e ɛ ə ɔ/. Long and short /o/ contrast in several pairs of words, among them 'sharp' /khom/ and 'lantern' /khoom/, 'poor' /côn/ and 'thief' /cōon/, and 'low, as of land' /hōŋ/ and 'sag' /hōoŋ/. Examples of contrasting long and short /a/ are numerous.

6) The romanisation of Myang words is adapted from E.R. Hope and Herbert C. Purnell, *A Colorful Colloquial*, Overseas Missionary Fellowship, (2nd mimeo edition) 1965.

7) The only one to avoid this pitfall is Meth, referred to in note 5 above. Meth underlines words with the sixth tone.



Collins provided no preface for his dictionary, so we do not know which dialect(s) of Myang the entries represent. It is likely that the Chiangmai dialect was the main one. Several entries represent full, older, or variant forms of present-day Myang words. For example, 'how' /cýadaj/, is now /cadaj/, 'will' /cak/ is /ca-/, 'they' /pýan/ is now /pən/ following a widespread pattern of reducing /ia ya ua/ to /e ə o/, 'again' /thěem/ is often just /hěm/, and 'what' /ʔasǎŋ/ is now either /ʔañǎŋ/ or /ʔajǎŋ/. The words for human males and females are /pôɔ caaj/ and /mêɛ nĩŋ/; *ELD* has /phũu caaj/ and /phũu nĩŋ/.

Most Myang words which correspond to Thai words with consonant clusters having /l/ as the second member are written without the /l/, as indeed they are pronounced (e.g., fish, fear, banana, crawl, salt). Five words, however, are written with /l/ beneath the initial consonant (brave, far, middle, near, speak) and four words have /l/ after the initial consonant (canal, scent, song, translate). With only minor differences, the spellings found in *ELD* are much the same as those in Davis' *A Northern Thai Reader*.<sup>8</sup>

The Gregg reprint of *ELD* has an attractive and sturdy cover, though the binding tends to crack along the inner spine. The price is high, however, thereby reducing the book's availability to many individuals who might otherwise have purchased it. It is unfortunate that the publishers chose to reprint Collins' second edition rather than a later one. One of the later editions, for instance, has 291 pages and roughly 6,000 English entries, an increase of about twenty per cent over that of the present reprinted edition.

*Herbert C. Parnell Jr.*

*Cornell Yao Project,  
Chiangmai*

8) Richard Davis, *A Northern Thai Reader* (The Siam Society, Bangkok, 1970).

C.F.W. Higham & R.H. Parker, *Prehistoric Investigations in N.E. Thailand 1969-70 : Preliminary Report*, with an appendix by Nai Pote Keakoon. N.p., n.d. 57 pp., 2 maps.

The custom of producing this kind of stencilled preliminary excavation report, prevalent nowadays in countries with high printing costs, such as the United States, Australia, or New Zealand, may be regretted by those who are nostalgic about the good old times when an archaeological excavation was bound to be followed, sooner or later, by an exquisitely printed and illustrated report on glossy paper. But as not only printing costs but also delays in printing increase, these "processed" preliminary reports, meant to be the forerunners of the glossy ones, have at least, or are supposed to have, the advantage of bringing to the notice of the public excavation results quicker than by any other means.

The trouble is, however, that, not going through the ordinary channels of distribution of a commercial publisher, the public they reach is necessarily a rather restricted one. In other words, one has to be lucky to come across one of these reports. In the case of *Prehistoric Investigations in N.E. Thailand, 1969-70*, one wonders whether it would not have been preferable to publish it in a scholarly periodical with a large readership and fairly short printing delays such as the one in which this review appears. This would also have had the advantage of allowing the inclusion of a few photographs or illustrations which enhance the value of any archaeological report, be it only a preliminary one, while the text itself would probably have taken only about half the number of pages of the stencilled report.

In *Prehistoric Investigations in N.E. Thailand 1969-70* neither the publisher nor the place or date of publication are given, although one can easily guess that the University to which the authors belong (Otago University, Dunedin, New Zealand) acted as publisher, and that the year of publication must be the one following the excavations, thus 1971. The reviewer happens to know that this volume is indeed one in a series of *Studies in Prehistoric Anthropology* of Otago University (other volume published so far ; *Non Nok Tha : the 1968 Excavation*, by D.T. Bayard, being volume 4, and more in preparation), but this is nowhere stated.



However, the report under review is a highly significant one, and the names of its authors—one, the Head of the Department of Anthropology of Otago University, and the other, Lecturer in the same Department, and a very able and experienced excavator—are the guarantee for its quality. But it is also one which is rather difficult to review as it is said (in the introduction) that “this report is preliminary only, and will certainly be modified in due course”. Moreover, the materials recovered had not, at the time of writing, reached New Zealand yet, and “much of what follows is, therefore, based on field impressions only” (ibid.). Thus the reviewer can critically assess neither the opinions expressed, as they are likely to be modified any way, nor the interpretation of the evidence, as the latter is not presented. His rôle is therefore practically limited to the summarizing of the main features of the report and to making some comments on them.

*Prehistoric Investigations in N.E. Thailand 1969-70* deals with surface surveys and test excavations in two areas of North-East Thailand: Roi Et Province, and Amphoe Phu Wiang of Khon Kaen Province, part of the latter area to be flooded under the Mekong Scheme. It comprises the following sections: I. “Surface Survey, Amphoe Suwanaphum, Roi Et Province”, in which archaeological sites concentrating along the margins of an extensive salt pan north of Ban Tha Nen are discussed. The party then moved to Phu Wiang, in Khon Kaen Province, and the reasons why future work should concentrate on the area inside this remarkable ring mountain, rather than on sites in Roi Et Province are set out; one of them is, of course, that it is to be flooded soon. Other main reasons include that “the compact nature of the Phu Wiang area and its ecological diversity pose an interesting range of problems within a restricted and sharply defined area”, and that proper investigation of the very rich sites of Roi Et Province may simply be too costly. This being admitted, it might be appropriate nevertheless to point out here that the latter sites still remain, archaeologically and historically, if not prehistorically speaking, extremely desirable areas of investigation. And that is mainly on two accounts: because of their situation nearer to the centres of some early Indianized kingdoms, and of the possibility they seem to offer to find out more about protohistoric salt-production, a so far sadly neglected aspect of archaeological research in Southeast Asia,

the importance of which for a better understanding of the early cultural and economic development of the area still has to be fully recognized.

Section II, "Test excavations at Bọ Phan Khan", deals again with the above-mentioned salt pan about 1 km. northeast (not north as previously stated) of the village of Tha Nen, its present exploitation, and the result of two test-cuttings conducted at its rim. The sequence of layers (going to a depth of 530 cm. below the surface) and events are discussed and the archaeological possibilities assessed. "Without any doubt, Bọ Phan Khan is a site, or rather a very extensive cluster of sites, of considerable interest and importance", and the conclusion is reached that "clearly a much more extended testing of this site is demanded". One could argue that it is not any more the testing but the excavation itself of the site which is demanded.

In Section III, "Test Excavation, Non Dũa-Ban Tha Nen", the preliminary results of a test excavation of a site to the north-east of Ban Tha Nen, seemingly connected with the nearby salt pan, are related. The high archaeological importance of the site is stressed and its extensive excavation advocated.

Section IV, "Test Excavation, Dọn Tha Pan", relates the stratigraphical results of a test excavation undertaken by Professor Higham in the mound of Dọn Tha Pan, ca. 3 km. to the east of Ban Tha Nen, and going down to level 46 (!) at 585 cm. below surface where ground water stopped further excavations. Without doubt the most interesting result from these tests is the discovery "that rice chaff was used as a tempering material in the pottery from the earliest levels", a fact which is "of direct relevance to the prehistory of rice farming in South-East Asia".

Section V, "Phu Wiang, Changwat Khon Kaen", deals with the ring mountain of Phu Wiang, its archaeological potential, and the archaeological work undertaken in the area (test excavations and surface surveys), thus substantiating some of the claims made in Section I.

Section VI gives a very short account of the "Surface Survey of Phu Wiang" conducted by Professor Higham and Mr. Marsh. The twelve sites thus discovered are described in Appendix III. They yielded large amounts of potsherds, fragments of clay pipes thought to date from ca. 15th/17th centuries, two iron axes from the "early iron period" found by local residents some years ago and now acquired by the National Museum, human bone, and Buddhist cultural remains such as the brick foundations of a stūpa and Buddha images.



One of these sites (Ban Pho No. 8, situated at the outskirts of Ban Nong Bua) is a bit of a mystery to the reviewer. Mention is only made of the statement of the Abbot of a Wat at Phu Wiang town that a burial had been found near the Wat of Nong Bua village and that he had seen a stone adze said to have come from this burial. Has the site actually been visited, and has anything else been found by the surveying party, or heard of? The same Abbot is also quoted as saying that in the grounds of the Wat of Ban Nong Bua there are sandstone blocks inscribed in Khmer script. Does that imply that either the Abbot or the authors of the report see a connection between the burial and the inscribed stone blocks, as both are lumped together in the same site, or is it merely suggested that this proves a continuous occupation of the site from Neolithic into historic times, just as it is said of a neighbouring site, this one test-excavated (Døn Sawan, see below), that its sequence "probably spans the whole of the critical and little-known period from the introduction of iron to the rise of fully developed local Indianized principalities"? Be this as it may, doubts are expressed that this inscription is really in Khmer script: "A Khmer inscription would be surprising from this locality, and it is likely that the inscription is actually in Lao. Early Lao script (*Tua Tham*) looks very like Khmer to anyone unfamiliar with the two scripts". Now, this statement, as right as it may be in itself, clearly asks for a rejoinder in two parts: one is that, although (and without necessarily entering the controversy with regard to the origin of Early Lao script) it need not be proved any further that Early Lao script is indeed very similar to Old Khmer script, it seems somewhat preposterous to insinuate that, of all people, the Abbot of a local monastery who presumably spent most of his life studying Pali, Lao, Thai, and Khmer texts, should be a person less familiar with these scripts than the authors of this report. The other is that one simply cannot have it both ways. Either one accepts the possibility, as the authors seem to have done, that this area was under Khmer domination for a long time which is borne out by evidence too numerous to mention here (including the Khmer inscription dated 1186 found at Sai Fong, on the Mekong barely 100 km to the north of Phu Wiang), or one does not. In the former case doubts about the authenticity of a Khmer inscription in Phu Wiang seem less justified than in the latter. Stone inscriptions in Early Lao script, moreover, are fairly rare. Only very few are known, from further to the

north, and these from a time (sixteenth century) when there were no Khmer inscriptions any more at all and particularly not in North-Eastern Thailand. It would thus be even more surprising to find a stone inscription in Early Lao than one in Khmer in this place. As this matter is of the greatest interest to historians of Southeast Asia, a more detailed description, a photograph, copy, or rubbing of this inscription would have been most welcome, even in the preliminary report.

Section VII, "Test Excavations, Phu Wiang", is divided into four parts: A. Non Nong Chik; B. Dôn Sawan; C. Dôn Wat Kao, and D. Dôn Khok, giving for each site information on stratigraphy, finds, and archaeological potential. Non Nong Chik is qualified as a "bronze-iron period burial site of considerable interest"; Dôn Sawan as "a major site of considerable potential", the occupation of which ranged from the early iron period to the Indianized principalities in the area; Dôn Wat Kao is said to date from between the fourteenth and seventeenth centuries A.D.; and for Dôn Khok no suggestions as to a date are made. This site, however, is of particular interest in as much as it shows evidence of early iron smelting—a topic of considerable importance (recognized by the authors) for the current re-appraisal of the history of early technology of mainland Southeast Asia as compared to China and India. This being so, a little more information could have been given about this matter even at this stage, than that a few pieces of iron and some iron slag were found in a layer closely above lateritic rock and that the smelting of this laterite on the site was thus surmized. In particular some indications as to a possible date might have been given.

Then follow a Thai summary and the Appendices: I. "The Wat Phra That Phan Khan, Khmer Ruins at the Village of Bô Phan Khan", by Pote Keakoon. This is a very useful short article describing the Khmer ruins found only about  $1\frac{1}{2}$  km from the salt-working area dealt with in Section II. Here again some illustrations or at least a rough plan of these ruins would have very well supplemented Nai Pote's competent description, and it is hoped that in the final report this section in particular will be amply illustrated. These ruins are said to probably date from between the eleventh and thirteenth centuries, and attention is drawn to the interesting fact that a nearby mound may have served as an atelier for the manufacture of lingam pedestals. Some of Nai Pote's statements regarding, for instance, the Funan period, although of course



perfectly correct in themselves, may seem a trifle superfluous in view of the fact that this information is readily available in print elsewhere. Appendix II, "Sites in Roi Et Province", describes briefly eight sites in Amphoe Suwannaphum, mentioning as the only finds potsherds of different types; but apart from saying that some of them imply "some antiquity" no dating is attempted. Appendix III, "Sites in Khon Kaen Province", has already been commented upon (see above).

The two unnumbered maps, one of which is referred to once in the text as "figure 2", appear to have been interchanged, unless the reference is wrong. The reference is made in the first paragraph of Section I, where a salt pan is said to be "lying to the north of Ban Tha Nen", and the "Lam Siao Yai" is mentioned. No such names are to be found on the second map, while a "B. Tha Nen" and a "Lam Siao Noi" appear on the first. Unfortunately the north point is not indicated on these maps, but it appears that the salt pan mentioned must be lying to the east and the north-east of Ban Tha Nen, rather than to the north. Unfortunately, too, none of the names mentioned in Section III can be found on this map either.

Also, if the use of diacritical marks in the rendering of Thai words is of any value (which the reviewer thinks it is), then there should be consistency in this regard, and one should not see on the same map (second map, possibly meant to be first) a "Nam Phong", a "Nam Phong Reservoir", and a plain "Phong", unless these are different words. The same is true for the text where Khon Kaen and Khon Kaen, Province and Changwat, Ban and Village alternate. A short explanatory note of the use of Thai terms would have helped here.

But these are, of course, only details which should not detract from recognizing the immense value of this preliminary report. All those interested in the pre- or early history of Southeast Asia are looking forward to seeing soon the full report of these most interesting and worthwhile excavations, if possible published by a commercial publisher (including a University Press.)

*H.H.E. Loofs*

*Australian National University*

Mubin Sheppard, *Taman Indera, Malay Decorative Arts and Pastimes* (Kuala Lumpur, Oxford University Press, 1972), 207 pp., 83 color photographs, 65 black and white photographs, 35 line drawings, index.

Located between and influenced by the cultures of both Thailand and Java, the cultural forms of the Southern Malay Peninsula have long been generally overlooked by both Asians and Westerners outside of a small number of colonial administrators and scholars writing near the turn of the century. The near-fantasy world of such Malay pastimes as the making and flying of large and elaborately decorated kites, competitive top spinning and shadow plays is at last brought to light in *Taman Indera, Malay Decorative Arts and Pastimes*, by Mubin Sheppard. Sheppard is a British citizen who has made his home in Malaya since 1928, and whose name is well-known to most educated Malaysians due to a few previous books and articles on Malay history and culture.

For the general reading public, this book is a good introduction to, and stimulus to learn more about, the arts and dramatic forms of the peninsular Malay people. It includes chapters on dances, dramatic forms, kites, carving, weaving, and various manufacturing processes. Richly illustrated with photographs and drawings, Sheppard's text also treats several past and present ceremonies, and includes many elaborate descriptions.

Actually, some of the descriptions may well be more elaborate than the layman would find necessary, such as when he devotes four solid paragraphs to a description of a musical instrument illustrated on the same page. One feels that a better balance between text and illustrations could have been struck. The reader should be cautioned, moreover, that many of the descriptions have been drawn as much from hearsay and the author's imagination as from documented fact. Indeed, much of the information about which Sheppard writes as if it were fact is either questionable or simply untrue.

Among the many statements the author makes which might be true but which he has not documented and which are open to serious question, the following stand out: that the ancient kingdom of Langkasuka (2nd-12th cent.) "had long been known locally as Patani," that the Malay dance-drama, *Mayong*, originated in Patani, and that certain royal drums



also originated there.<sup>1</sup> In fact, Mr. Sheppard's claims occasionally border on the ludicrous for lack of evidence, such as when he says that the Malays were adept dancers long before the Malacca sultanate (15th cent.).

Other statements are categorically false, among them: that Malays no longer chew betel (one would be hard pressed to find a more common household item in most rural areas), that circumcision processions in which the boys are carried on huge model birds no longer take place (they do),<sup>2</sup> that there is no connection between *Mayong* and the Thai *Manora* (the reviewers know of at least one *Mayong* troupe which uses a mask of the hunter identical to that used in *Manora*), and that a particular mosque is over 300 years old (the date carved over the door shows it to be exactly 148 years old.)

The question of the cultural importance of Patani occurs again and again in Sheppard's book. But Sheppard has approached his subject matter not as social scientist but as a somewhat nostalgic admirer of a Malay culture which he feels is passing out of existence. Thus, he laments the demise of Patani (where "almost all traces of . . . past splendor have been lost"), without attempting to determine to what extent vestiges of the old culture still remain. Mention of several important cultural forms extant in Patani is completely absent from Sheppard's supposedly inclusive treatment of Malay culture. Decorative painting and carving on fishing boats has received brief treatment as it exists in the East Coast state of Trengganu, but no treatment at all in its more plentiful and elaborate forms in Patani. The Javanese type of shadow play is dismissed in a few sentences as nearly extinct, when in fact at least eight puppeteers still perform on the Thai side of the border as well as the two in Kelantan whom Sheppard did mention. Sheppard has not given us a single illustration of these sometimes exquisite Javanese style puppets.

1) Patani was formerly a great Malay kingdom and is now a province in Thailand (spelled Pattani). The reviewers recently completed a three-year residence in this region.

2) In Pattani, not only are such birds still used, but occasionally as many as nine elephants are also used.

Given the close contact which the Malays of the northern states have had with the Thais for centuries, one can almost assume that cultural influences have been exchanged between them. It is curious, then, that Mr. Sheppard prefers to go all the way to Cambodia to locate the source (for he is a man concerned with origins as much as with current conditions) of the use of bell cymbals in certain Malay music, when they are a very common instrument (known as *ching*) among Thais all along the border. It is clear throughout the book that Mr. Sheppard is not very knowledgeable about Thai language or culture. At one point he refers to a Queen Nang Chayang who supposedly ruled Patani in 1725. "Nang Chayang" is not a name but a title. It is the Standard Malay version of the Patani Malay "Nae Chaiyae", derived from the Thai "Pra Nang Chao Ying," loosely translated as "female monarch", and used by three 17th century queens. It was not used by the only 18th century queen of Patani, Raja Devi, who ruled from 1710-1719 and was known as "Pra Chao".<sup>3</sup>

How, then, can a book so full of errors be a good introduction to Malay arts and pastimes for the general public? Because it does, in fact, contain chapters on all of the major cultural forms of the peninsular Malays. Unfortunately, none of these chapters comprises an in-depth study of its subject, but the many good illustrations are often the first of their kind to appear in a publication of potentially wide circulation. While we regret the influence Mr. Sheppard himself has had on his subject matter, such as by dressing all the members of a shadow play orchestra in Western suits for the picture, and a few careless reproductions, such as when three shadow puppets appear stuck into, of all things, loaves of bread for the picture, the fact remains that we can get a vivid impression of the richness and scope of Malay culture from *Taman Indera*. Perhaps Mr. Sheppard's unique contribution has come from his acquaintance and contact with contemporary Malay royalty, through whom he obtained both photographs and information which otherwise could not have been made available.

Bonnie and Derek Brereton

Prince of Songkhla University

3) Mr. Sheppard here contradicts one of his own sources. A. Teeuw and D.K. Wyatt's *Hikayat Patani* (Bibliotheca Indonesinica, The Hague, 1970), p. 277. Incredibly, he has sited only seven sources, omitting even his own earlier works in which many of the same subjects are treated.



Jan Fontein, R. Soekmono and Satyawati Suleiman, *Ancient Indonesian Art of the Central and Eastern Javanese Periods*, The Asia Society Inc., New York, 1971, pp. 160, illustrated.

This book is a well-published catalogue of 111 Indonesian art objects of both the Central and Eastern Javanese Periods. The art objects were borrowed in 1971 from 4 museums in Indonesia and were sent to be displayed in 4 American museums: Asia House Gallery, New York City; Los Angeles County Museum of Art, Los Angeles, California; Nelson-Atkins Gallery of Art, Kansas City, Missouri; and the Center of Asian Art and Culture, San Francisco, California.

The book begins with acknowledgements by Mr. Lionel Landry, Executive Vice-President of the Asia Society, New York, thanking those who helped the exhibition succeed, though at certain periods total failure was in sight. The preface by Mr. Mohammad Amir Sutarga, Director of Museums in Indonesia, is somewhat tinted with nationalism.

The first part of the book contains descriptions of ancient Indonesian art. The first section is "Notes on the Monuments of Ancient Indonesia" by Mr. R. Soekmono, Director of the National Archaeological Institute of Indonesia, who describes not only architecture but also its related sculptures. This section is illustrated by many photographs of ancient monuments in Java. Next comes a map of the island of Java indicating the site of many ancient monuments and an article on Ancient Indonesian Art by Mr. Jan Fontein, Curator of the Department of Asiatic Art, Museum of Fine Arts, Boston. Mr. Fontein describes briefly the history of Central Java (about 8th-10th century A.D.) and that of the Eastern part of the island (11th-15th century). He then continues with discussions of the influence of Indian culture and of Javanese sculptures in general including designs and minor arts. The author explains that Indonesian art differs from its Indian prototypes not only because of the genius of the Indonesian artist but also because the Indonesian artist was an eclectic who drew on different aspects of Indian culture.

The next part of the book contains photographs of the 111 ancient art objects. Unfortunately the photographs are not printed in numerical order and it is sometimes confusing to try to find them. After the photographs are descriptions of each object by Mr. Fontein and Mrs.,

Satyawati Suleiman. First the authors excuse themselves for their uncertainty of the dates of many objects except those that are inscribed.

The descriptions beginning with the stone sculptures, of each object, are detailed and interesting. Some of them are quite informative. For instance, No. 4 says that "at Tjandi Sewu an inscribed stone, dated in accordance with 792 A.D., was found among the ruins of the site. This suggests that the construction of this gigantic ensemble of temples may have begun towards the end of the eight century." Number 6 says that "the crescent-shaped ornament appearing behind the right shoulder is an attribute most often associated with the Bodhisattva Manjusri or Kuvera". Number 12 informs that "whereas Indian sculpture usually represented Parvati as a person much smaller than her husband, the Javanese often rendered them as persons of equal height". However, in some parts, such as the description of the abduction of Mrigavati by Garuda, the story should have been explained in more detail. For the description of Borobudur accompanying object No. 3, the authors still cling to the old idea that the statues in vitarka-mudra are Vairocana and those in dharmacakramudra are Vajrasattva.

For bronze objects, No. 22 is dated by the authors "ca. eighth century" which might be too late. No. 23 is classified as belonging to the Dvaravati Period in Thailand though such attitudes have never been found in Dvaravati sculptures. No. 25 is reckoned as Srivijaya style. No. 30 contains the interesting information that "the urna in the forehead and the lower lip are inlaid with gold, a technique reminiscent of the North Indian Nalanda bronze". One cannot help wondering whether this image might not be better identified than just "seated Tara". It should be here noted that the Javanese bronzes are seated both in crossed-leg and folded-leg fashions. The seated posture with the right leg hanging down is also fashionable. There exist as well many beautiful bronze images of Siva. These bronzes were mostly cast during the Central and early Eastern Javanese periods.

The description section continues with bronze utensils such as bells and lamps which are profusely decorated and can be grouped among religious articles. They were made during both the Central and Eastern Javanese epochs but most of them belong to the latter period. Nos. 63



and 85 have a strong resemblance to those which are usually labelled Lopburi art in Thailand and therefore some of these objects found in Thailand might originally belong to the Srivijaya school. After the bronze utensils are descriptions of bronze finials in various forms such as *naga* or dragons, discs (of Vishnu) and weapons etc., two terracotta figurines and valuable objects in gold and silver. No. 98, which the authors consider to be a Thai statue, belongs, according to the reviewer's idea, to southern Indian art instead. The descriptions conclude with a gold mask, silhouettes of a human body, which were found in stone caskets buried under the mortuary statues of kings, ornaments, utensils and delicate ear-rings. There is a selected bibliography at the end of the book.

This book should be consulted by everybody who is interested in classical Indonesian art, including the Srivijaya school.

*Subhadradis Diskul*

*Silpakorn University*

Marie Jeanne Adams, *System and Meaning in East Sumba Textile Design: A Study in Traditional Indonesian Art* (Cultural Report Series No. 16, Yale University, Southeast Asia Studies, New Haven, Connecticut, 1969), pp. 248, 71 figs.

Handwoven textiles with traditional designs continue to be made by Thai-, Lao-, and Cambodian-speaking peoples in a number of places in Siam, and the recent upsurge of interest in such textiles in Bangkok appears to assure that production will not cease in the immediate future. Of particular fascination are the fabrics decorated according to the technique generally known by the Malay word *ikat*: the design is created on the warp or the weft before weaving by binding strands of yarn together and dyeing them one or more times. This technique, which was known in ancient China, was brought to a remarkable degree of technical perfection on the island of Sumba in Indonesia. Anyone wishing to undertake the much-needed study of Thai *ikat* techniques and designs—or indeed anyone interested in Southeast Asian textiles in general—would do well to look at Marie Jeanne Adams's thorough monograph on the marvelous textiles made on this island,

*System and Meaning in East Sumba Textile Design* is based primarily on the European ethnographic literature and on the collections in European museums. It has eight chapters, which are entitled as follows: I, Cultural Setting; II, Goals and Complementary Concepts (*i.e.*, "the invisible world" and masculine-feminine polarity); III, Gift Exchange System; IV, Techniques and Types of Decorated Textiles; V, Formal Analysis of the Design System; VI, Identification of Motifs; VII, Decorated Textiles as Costume; VIII, Conclusions. Miss Adams provides a great deal of information about the cultural background of the textiles as well as about their design and the methods by which they were made. Unfortunately the dependency on printed sources robs her account of immediacy, and the thread of her argument is frequently buried by her thoroughness.

This argument is most clearly set forth in the closing pages of the book. Miss Adams points out that in funerary observances the decorated textiles serve to identify the deceased member of the royal class and to protect him against uncontrollable forces. A number of the designs on the textiles, furthermore, may help guide the spirit of the dead one to the other world; beasts and aquatic creatures serve as a means of transport or passage, and plant forms are "ladders to go above or to go below." Another of Miss Adams's conclusions is that "Basic patterning, such as the division of the surface of the textiles into two and four mirror-image parts and the dyadic-triadic alignment of the design fields, reflect formal preferences equally evident in social groupings, such as the organization of the district and the relationships within the connubial set." This point is one which raises larger questions and about which there might be more argument. When similarities are observed in any two distinct cultural phenomena, it is frequently customary to postulate a third entity on which the two phenomena depend. This entity might be an Hegelian world-spirit, a universal like the structure of the brain or of the perceptual apparatus, or a material first cause, such as the relationship of groups of people to the means of production. For Miss Adams it is "a basic structural consciousness." If this primal entity exists at all, perhaps the fieldwork the author has carried out since the publication of this book and the contemplation of her fresh experiences have revealed more about it.

*Hiram W. Woodward Jr.*

*Michigan University*



William Willetts, *Ceramic Art of Southeast Asia* (Southeast Asian Ceramic Society, Singapore, 1971), pp. 194, ill. 4 color pls. 1 map.

The catalogue by William Willetts for an exhibition of Southeast Asian ceramics held at the University of Singapore in 1971 marks a new stage in the study of early ceramics made in Cambodia, Thailand, and Vietnam. For the first time the known facts regarding these wares, limited though they may be, have been reliably sifted and separated from the wealth of collector's and dealer's jargon and traditional lore so long and widely employed in describing them. Like the ceramics of Japan and Korea, these Southeast Asian wares owe their existence in all likelihood to the region's geographical proximity to China. Although the Japanese have appreciated the simple and relatively crude Southeast Asian wares for centuries, appealing as they do to an inherent strain in Japanese taste, the west has been slow to recognize their quality. Willetts' own summary of this is apt when he writes: "it would be silly to pretend that the Southeast Asian wares represent any particular consummation in the history of ceramic art. But the qualities they manifest are not skin deep, nor likely to prove transitory in their appeal... as pots they are good pots—some of them indeed totally convincing as ultimate artistic entities."

Knowledge of the history of Southeast Asia suggests that the Cambodian wares must predate the Thai and Vietnamese wares. The very distinctive group of Cambodian ceramics, predominantly with a dark brown glaze, has been almost entirely ignored up to the present time. Willetts characterizes their unique qualities both effectively and eloquently, pinpointing their special "air of latency or withdrawal." His treatment of their chronology however is limited to the rather tenuous classification and dates proposed by French scholars, presumably based upon sherd finds at the archaeological sites of the Angkor region.

The varied Thai stonewares produced at Sukhothai and Sawankhalok (also spelled Sawankaloke, Svargaloka, and Sankalok) are attributed to the late thirteenth to the fifteenth centuries. A clear termination of production at these kilns seems likely in view of the sharp decline of the Sukhothai kingdom in favour of stronger Thai states in Ayutthaya,

Chiangmai, and Nan. A major advance by Willetts in understanding the ceramics of this period is his clear recognition of the group of brown glazed Thai wares as part and parcel of the main Sawankhalok production. The brown glazed Thai wares were formerly attributed to Chaliang, site of the Khmer town which preceded the Thai capitals of Sawankhalok and Si Satchanalai in the same area. They were considered to form a distinct group which was labelled Chaliang ware. The tendency to limit the attribution of particular ceramic types to specific places on the basis of their discovery there is widespread and understandable when such labels create convenient type categories, but a close survey of actual kiln sites usually reveals a variety of wares in production rather than single types. At Chaliang in fact there are no known kiln sites at all.

Two groups do stand clearly distinct from each other in the early Thai stonewares, Sukhothai and Sawankhalok, although their chronology and origins are still questionable. The idea that Chinese potters set up the original Thai kilns is a reasonable one in the light of many points of similarity between the celadons and painted stonewares of the two regions dating presumably from the fourteenth century and slightly later. At the same time the Thai ceramic tradition must be recognized as distinctive and wholly independent in its development from the Chinese. Detailed study is needed to establish the sources and inspiration of painted Thai ceramics. The traditional assertion that a band of potters from Tz'u-chou in northern China set up the Sukhothai production of wares decorated over a slip ground is not at all convincing. It overlooks the fact that Tz'u-chou type wares were widely produced in southern China in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries, and, perhaps equally to the point, in Vietnam. As Willetts clearly illustrates, there are close links between certain painted examples from Sukhothai and pieces of Tz'u-chou type but unquestionably of Vietnamese manufacture. Spur marks on the interior of both these types further link them together. When considering the Sawankhalok wares painted in underglaze black (presumably iron), links with blue and white pieces from Vietnam are equally striking. With lesser frequency Sawankhalok painted wares reflect decoration on Chinese fourteenth century blue and white, but this



may be indirect reflection, descending through the intermediary of Vietnamese blue and white models. Although the Sawankhalok potters never seem to have employed cobalt which is necessary to obtain an underglaze blue color, many of their painted decorations in underglaze iron black clearly derive from Chinese or Vietnamese styles, although their development is uniquely Thai. The curious multi-faceted pieces of painted Sawankhalok ware (nos. 207 and 209 in the catalogue; better examples in Spinks's *The Ceramic Wares of Siam*, plates 22 and 26) may also trace their source back to Chinese blue and white of the fourteenth century, again possibly through the intermediary of Vietnam (nos. 48, 72 and 84 in the catalogue).

This catalogue is outstanding for the good quality illustrations of each piece in the exhibition, and for the detailed and carefully considered catalogue entries.

*Henry D. Ginsburg*

*British Museum*