
The subtitle of Dr. Irving's compact and useful book is somewhat misleading, for the book deals only marginally with American policy (pp. 98-107), focusing less on French policy as a whole than on the politics of one party, the *Mouvement Républicain Populaire* (MRP), a Christian Democratic Party born in the Resistance and bounded on the left by the Socialists and on the right by the Gaullist parties. Irving justifies his choice of the MRP by pointing out that in the early phases of the war (1946-1951), it was the largest or second largest party in the French National Assembly; it participated in 23 of the 27 governments that "controlled" the Indochina War; and for six of the seven and a half years the war lasted, MRP ministers held the portfolios for Indochina or such relevant ones as Foreign Affairs and Defence. The MRP had strong ties with the Catholic Church, and was particularly susceptible after 1947 to right-wing pressure.

Dr. Irving does not necessarily agree with Ho Chi Minh's statement of 1947 that "the key to the problem of Indochina is to be found in the domestic political situation in France" (p. 45), but by focusing on events in Paris rather than in Indochina, he highlights parts of the war that are blurred by historians focusing on other aspects of the story. Dr. Irving is especially good in discussing French policies at the beginning of the war (1945-1948), for it was in that arena, if anywhere, that developments might have been differently handled. He argues that the importance of retaining French prestige (symbolized by overseas possessions, and especially Indochina) outweighed sympathy for Vietnamese nationalism, or repugnance for the Communist character of the Viet Minh. In 1945-1946, all French political parties, including the Communists, agreed that France had a "mission" in Viet Nam, while the Vietnamese did not. To grant independence to Viet Nam (the word was not used in French documents about Indochina until late in 1947) would be to suffer an additional defeat. Unlike the victors of World War II, the French could not afford—and its leaders least of all—to be magnanimous, or, in American parlance, "soft,"
By locking themselves into an intransigent position, Dr. Irving argues, the French guaranteed the failure of their own political policy, the "Bao Dai solution" of 1948-1952. Furthermore, by retailing the notion that the Indochinese war was part of the "free world's" struggle with Communism rather than a colonial war, they gained U.S. support, at the price of losing their own leverage with the Vietnamese army and the Vietnamese elite. Step by step, the French war foreshadowed the American one. Optimism tinged with arrogance faded into half-hearted political "solutions" (that in turn were internationalized with parallel phases of "Vietnamization") before a combination of conferences and defeats. In fighting what Marshal de Lattre de Tassigny called the "most disinterested war since the Crusades" (p. 93—the book is a mine of fatuous pronouncements) the French gave little except their own and surrogates' lives. They learned even less; Algeria was the second "domino" to fall, followed by the Fourth Republic. French policy towards Indochina was marked by misreadings of the facts, and punctuated by summons to the flag. "When French forces are involved," one Prime Minister declared (p. 70), "it is not a question of reason, but of the national interest." Dr. Irving shows that French governments, floating on the unstable surface of the Fourth Republic, rarely were able to change Indochinese policies set in the late 1940s by officials on the spot and by ministers of the MRP. The shortcomings of these policies—and American ignorance of them—gave America the opportunity to repeat them, one by one.

The value of Dr. Irving's book lies in its compactness, the judiciousness of its judgments, and in its extensive use of interview material—although quotations from those valuable and pungent primary sources might often have been longer. But it cannot stand on its own, at least as it is titled, because it is Vietnamese history with the Vietnamese left out (and Indochinese history with Laos and Cambodia barely mentioned), because it limits itself to one strand of French policy, and treats American policy—such as it was, before 1954—only in a glancing fashion. There are other books, of course, that fill those particular gaps. None springs to mind that deals as succintly and as well with the particular problems Dr. Irving has chosen to discuss.

David P. Chandler

Monash University

Arjuna, the hero of the Javanese shadow play, had two wives: Sambrodro, who was meek, withdrawn and respectful, and Srikandi, who was tough, forthright and resolute. Sociologists have pointed out that this *wayang* personification reflects two types of Javanese (for which, *grosso modo*, read Indonesian) women. On this parallel Kartini could be said to have started as the latter and ended as the former. Her letters, written between 1899 and 1904 (the ages of 20 and 25), reflect the falling away of her ideals of independent womanhood and a return to conventionality.

The Kartini legend that sprang up after she died in childbirth in 1904, having accomplished almost nothing, is hard to disentangle from the facts, and it must be admitted that the present volume does not help the reader to do so. Onto the original English translation of 1921 published in New York, with Agnes Symmers' now dated introduction and a foreward by Louis Couperus, has been grafted a singularly unilluminating further introduction by Sartono Kartodirdjo, the professor of history at Gadjah Mada University, who uses the usual jargon about Kartini being a nationalist and a patriot, of Java being in a state of social ferment at the time she wrote her letters, and various other half-truths or untruths. But then, Kartini herself says the Javanese are known for their falsehoods.

Why Oxford University Press did not use the excellent introduction by Hildred Geertz (the wife of Clifford Geertz, whose volume *The Religion of Java* is a socio-anthropological classic, and who is herself a noted sociologist) to the 1964 Norton edition, also published in New York, is incomprehensible. Mrs. Geertz puts the letters and Kartini's social milieu completely in place—the new period of the ‘Ethical Policy’, her educated father and courtly and mystical foster-mother and the Dutch personalities who were to play so large a part in Kartini's formation. First came Mrs. Ovink-Soer, the wife of the new Assistant Resident in Japara, who was a fervent socialist and feminist, a writer and pamphleteer in *De Hollandsche Lelie*, a Dutch women’s magazine with a decidedly
modern outlook. Kartini took out a subscription and met through the small ads Stella Zeehandelaar, who was another radical feminist and corresponded frequently with Kartini, though they never met. Abendanon was Director of Native Education, Religion and Industry and so was in a position to help Kartini materially: he had heard about Kartini, gone to Japara and received her and her sisters in Batavia, introducing them to various intellectuals. It was through Stella Zeehandelaar that the head of the Social Democratic Party, H. van Kol, learned about Kartini and became a powerful supporter. He also visited her in Japara, accompanied by the editor of the progressive newspaper *De Locomotief*, published in Java, and also introduced her to spiritualistic seances. His wife cautioned Kartini in correspondence about tampering with the occult, and the two turned Kartini's thoughts in the direction of traditional Javanese mysticism.

Though Agnes Symmer's introduction covers the basic facts reasonably well, Hildred Geertz is more profound in analysing the causes of Kartini's changes of opinion and the influences on her. Her decision never to fall in love and her abhorrence of an arranged marriage undoubtedly come from the two Dutch feminists Kartini corresponded so frequently with. They and others encouraged her in her determination to go to study in Holland, preferably as a doctor, otherwise as a midwife. She planned to open a school for daughters of regents under the influence of Abendanon, but the conservative regents refused permission to their daughters to attend. Her father's increasing illnesses, interpreted in the Javanese way as being caused by an unruly child, pushed her more into mysticism and also in the direction of conformity. When van Kol finally obtained a Dutch Government scholarship for her to study in Holland, Kartini refused it, and stayed in Java to marry a widower some years older than herself, giving in to her father's wishes and an arranged marriage to someone of her own class but who had progressive ideas. She apparently gave in because of her belief that "a Javanese woman could act unconventionally only if she were married, all the more so if she had the support of a husband of both advanced ideas and high status" (Geertz).
As Kartini herself said, "we have not yet begun our work and yet we have seen our illusions dwindle away one by one" (April 1903). She did start a school for girls in Japara in June, but by August was engaged, and in November married in Rembang. Her last year was spent in looking after her husband's children, and preparing for the school she was to open after her own child came, but by September 1904 she was dead.

The letters would never have been written (and they were written in Dutch) if Kartini had not had intelligent and encouraging Dutch friends with whom to share her ideas. They would never have seen the light of day but for the same Dutch friends. It was Abendanon who collected them and published them in 1911. Curiously, they appeared in English even before they were translated into Indonesian by Armijn Pane in 1922. Kartini schools, supported by voluntary Dutch contributions, were opened and Kartini rapidly became the mother figure of modern Indonesian womanhood, taken up by the nationalists and turned into a Joan of Arc in kain and kebaya instead of shining armour.

She does not objectively deserve this. She was an intelligent aristocrat, chafing in her youth at the constraints society placed round her, who ended in total conformity. It cannot be said that she liberated Javanese, less still Indonesian, women, because the vast majority were relatively liberated anyway: abangan women (to use Clifford Geertz's famous divisions), who were overwhelmingly more numerous, did not subject themselves to seclusion from puberty to marriage. This was simply a prijaji practice 'demonstrating the high rank and pure blood of her family'. The seclusion was in Kartini's case not total and was indeed considerably relaxed. Apart from the various trips to the local beach, known touchingly as Klein Scheveningen, there was the trip to the Abendanons in Batavia, visits to Yogya, Semarang and various other parts of central Java. Her family also received a large number of visitors. She did resent the attention and care given to her brother (who was of the same mother) and here clearly and rightly saw injustice; but then in contemporary Indonesia the young male is still more likely
to be cosseted than the female in a household. Kartini has not changed that.

What is most striking about the letters is not how much has changed, but how little. Kartini was amazingly clairvoyant about her own people (as Indonesians today can be disarmingly frank about their shortcomings, while doing nothing to overcome them), referring to them as "these grown-up children", noting that "the most serious fault of our people is idleness", and lamenting "the Javanese who possesses no books except school books". She records Dutch opinions that "we Javanese are reproached as born liars, wholly untrustworthy, and we are called ingratitude personified." One of the advantages, she thought, of a training in Europe over that available locally was that it would make a great difference "to our indolent people with their exalted ideas". Even ideal Javanese ladylike behaviour which so riled her is unchanged—speaking "with a little whispering voice which can hardly be heard by an ant" and laughing so as not to expose one's teeth. The arranged marriage is still extremely common, even in the towns.

The other striking thing about the letters is the oddity of some of the remarks. She was so 'Dutchified' that she even found Dutch a "beautiful, musical language", which is an unusual view, to say the least. She thought the Koran was "too holy to be translated into any language whatever" and as no one spoke Arabic in Japara, no one understood. In 1902 she asked Mrs. Abendanon to ask a friend "if, among the Mohammedans, there were laws of majority, as among you" and added "how strange for me to ask! It makes me ashamed that we do not know ourselves". She found touching the simple faith of peasants who thought her presence, and that of her sister, caused their rain-making prayers to be answered; in this she is very much the paternalistic prijaji sure of his or her position in a changeless, ordered society.

But these oddities are to be expected. Although exposed to militant Dutch feminists and the like, she was certainly writing at a period when a consciousness of the outside world was only beginning, and she was still very young; as she says herself to Mrs. van Kol, most
probably not meaning to be taken at face value, "you must have other and more useful things to do than to read all this prattle from a 'sentimental' Javanese girl".

The present volume is not only infelicitous in its introductory material, but in its editing, which is anonymous. Perhaps indeed there was none. Judging by the typeface, the volume has been photographically reproduced from the 1921 edition, proofing errors and all. A vast number of terms need explanation for the general reader who knows neither Dutch nor Java (Moesje, dubbeltje, baboe, spada, kebaya, kwade, kampong and desa, Poeasa-Leberan Nieuwjaar), but they go unexplained in this edition (though Hildred Geertz’s 1964 edition is impeccably edited). Peculiarities in the original translation are kept, like taking “a little walk down a turnpike” (in Java in 1901!), referring to the Susunan of Solo as “the Emperor”, and such small slips of style, as “day before yesterday” and “year after next” without the definite article, or “my pen refused to go” instead of “refused to move”. Irritatingly the Dutch ‘oe’ for ‘u’ is kept throughout, so one has for example ‘Soerabaja’, and a peppering of ‘dj’s and ‘tj’s.

This volume is not going to procure many converts to the cult of Kartinism, and is well below the standard one has come to expect of the Kuala Lumpur branch of the Oxford University Press. When an excellent edition only a dozen years old exists, it seems inexplicable, unless royalties are cheaper, to reproduce an inferior edition dated by three-quarters of a century, when apparently people could not even count, as for no apparent reason letters 7 and 9 are totally omitted.

Michael Smithies

Gadjah Mada University
Yogyakarta

The 1976 issue of Visakha Puja continues the high standards that have come to be associated with that publication. Visakha Puja increasingly bears the imprint of its engaged, socially concerned and committed editor, Sulak Sivaraksa. The articles included are instructive in providing the reader with a better understanding of Buddhist philosophy, while at the same time indicating how to apply Buddhist principles to cope successfully with the problems of contemporary society and ultimately to conquer oneself. (“Conquest of the self is best. Why seek to conquer the multitudes?”) Each of the articles provides insight into the struggle to maintain the relevance of Buddhism to the social and religious concerns of its followers.

Of historical interest is the sermon of His Holiness Prince Vajirāṇāṇa instructing His Majesty King Rama VI on the rectitude of joining the Allies in World War I in defense of “right.” The learned exposition of the Maha Ch’at ceremony by the Italian scholar G.E. Gerini (Phra Sarasastra Balakhandha) will be of much value to cultural and literary historians as well as to scholars in the field of Buddhist studies.

The noted Vietnamese Buddhist philosopher and poet, Nhat Hanh, presents an exceptionally lucid discourse, entitled “The Miracle of Being Awake”, indicating how we can apply the truth of the “Sutra on Mindfulness” in our everyday lives, to each waking moment of our lives. There is a concise and penetrating analysis of the basic philosophical doctrines of Buddhism by the Thai Buddhist philosopher, Buddhadasa Bhikkhu, written under the deceptively simple title “Buddhism in 15 Minutes”. Editor Sulak has provided us with his own personal answer on the duty and task of a modern Buddhist in translating Buddhist principles into a struggle against environmental destruction and social injustice in his “Tasks for Modern Buddhists.”

Visakha Puja increasingly appeals to a widening cross-section of readership, and this present issue will provide much intellectual food for thought to Buddhist laymen as well as to scholars.

William J. Klausner

Thich Nhat Hanh may be called a monk of many parts: the poet, the social worker, the political activist. In *The Miracle of Being Awake*, we come to appreciate the penetrating and lucid mind of a Buddhist philosopher who can apply the truth of Buddhist teachings to our everyday actions. His exposition on the “Sutra of Mindfulness” provides the reader with ‘signposts’ that will guide him on the path towards recognition of the miracle of life, liberation from suffering, and peace.

Thich Nhat Hanh, through the simple yet effective technique of using examples from everyday life as commonplace as eating a tangerine or washing dishes, is able to make us focus on our inability to accept and appreciate the reality of a moment in time to wonder at the peace and joy which awareness of the present gives us. Thich Nhat Hanh carefully leads us to an understanding that mindfulness frees one from “forgetfulness and dispersion”, and makes it possible to “live each minute of life”.

The author subsequently outlines certain basic techniques to be used in reaching the exalted state of “mindfulness”, focusing on meditation. Nhat Hanh gives detailed instructions on breathing exercises which, if properly carried out, will lead toward mindfulness.

An accompanying guide outlines 32 exercises and methods in meditation exhorting the reader to choose the ones most appropriate to himself. The exercises vary in complexity from assuming a “half-smile when irritated” to “contemplation on your own skeleton”, “contemplation on emptiness” and “contemplation on detachment”.

The subtitle of this book is “A manual on meditation for the use of young activists”. Throughout the text, Thich Nhat Hanh refers to the need for the socially committed and involved social worker to carry out his duties in the spirit and context of mindfulness. Only through an acceptance of mindfulness and its practice can social service be meaningful and effective. However, the readership of this intellectually vital and socially relevant religious treatise should not be limited to social service activists. Each of us, scholar, civil servant, manual worker, or housewife can benefit from its wisdom, and hopefully achieve the “miracle of being awake”.

*William J. Klausner*

The Ven. Phra Rajavaramuni is known to readers of *JSS* only as a book reviewer, who has contributed to *JSS* since his appointment as a *Rajagīlā* with the title of Phra Srivisuddhimoli. But those who read the Siam Society’s Thai publication on วัฒนธรรมศิลป์ไทยยุคใหม่ (2513) must have noticed the name of Phra Maha Prayudh Payutto—that was his former name. In that seminar, which the Society organized in collaboration with the Buddhist Association of Thailand, the young monk articulately described to participants the constructive role which the monkhood had been performing in Thai society. Thai intellectuals, impressed by his brilliant arguments, modestly put forward, have looked forward to reading something more substantive from the author ever since. They were not disappointed to read his lecture on *Buddhadhamma*, which was delivered at Thammasat University Big Auditorium on H.R.H. Prince Wan Waithayakorn’s 80th birthday anniversary in 1971. In fact, this little booklet summaries the essential Teaching of the Buddha so succinctly that it has become a standard textbook in a number of colleges. It will hopefully be translated into English. Since then a collection of his Siamese articles has appeared in a volume entitled *Buddhist Philosophy of Education for the Thais* (Bangkok, Klett Thai Publication, 1975). He also writes regularly in Buddhist journals, and some of his articles have been published on special occasions.

The book under review, while basically written for the Thai public, should be of interest and value to foreign scholars who understand the Thai language. The Dictionary is divided into three parts. Part I deals with Dhamma in numerical groups, e.g. groups of two—“Kāma: A subjective sensuality ภิกษุ [and] an objective sensuality ภิกษุ” Theravada Buddhism tends to approach the Teaching of the Buddha from numerical aspects; and His late Holiness Prince Patriarch Vajiraṇāṇa-vorasa’s well-known *Navakovada* had a section on the topic. The technique is of particular value to teaching, as it enables people to learn more easily. In this book, our compiler has collected many more items and has given a brief explanation in Thai to each, as well as giving its
English translation. Each entry is given a cross-reference, and every single technical term could be traced back to the exact page in the Pali Canon and its commentaries. Obviously this is the work of a very serious scholar.

Part II deals with a Thai-English Buddhist dictionary. Part III is the English-Thai Section, plus an appendix on taking the Five Precepts, etc. Those two parts are not so extensive as the first one, yet they can familiarize students with exact Buddhist terminology, at least with terminology which Buddhist scholars tend to use, e.g. "vanity มหัศ" and "{} invitation."

Dictionaries like the latter two parts have been attempted before by other Thai scholars like Sujeep Bunyanupap of Maha Makut Buddhist University. Had our compiler had the time, he might have been able to do a more complete job.

When reading the book under review, the reader may not realize that the author received his formal education entirely within the traditional Pali system; having graduated from Maha Chulalongkorn Buddhist University, he became a lecturer there as well as its Assistant Secretary—General, besides being an abbot of his own monastery. With so much administrative work, a large teaching load and "priestly" duties, Chao Khun has yet managed to find the time to write such a scholarly work and compile such a dictionary. One cannot but admire him. With his present sabbatical leave at Swarthmore College, we can be assured that he will have more time at his disposal; hence his contribution to our understanding of Thai Buddhism will even be greater than before.

S. Sivaraksa
There seems to be little else in the world these days except revolution and name-calling—capitalists, imperialists, war-mongers, reactionaries, etc. Is there no other way to effect revolution other than through violence?

*Seeds of Peace* is a welcome relief. It deals with none other than revolution, but a revolution that is grounded in loving-kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity. It is a series of articles telling of the many efforts of individuals and groups made on behalf of peaceful revolution in Sri Lanka, Viet Nam and Thailand. The articles are inspiring and clearly show that there is a non-violent way to revolution, albeit a slower way, but perhaps most importantly a bloodless way. Included are a delightful Vietnamese folk story entitled “Princess Sita”, which shows loving-kindness and compassion and encourages their development; a poem called “Excerpt from Violent Lanka—The Day for Slaughter”; an interview with a Thai meditation master which is very uplifting; an article dealing with drug addicts at Wat Tham Krabok in Saraburi Province, among others. One article, “Bangkok Jottings” is rather out of place here, although it does have its purpose.

But why not let *Seeds of Peace* introduce itself?

“Many of us love to say: ‘Peace must take root in our own heart; if there is peace in our heart, there is peace in the world.’ While there is nothing wrong with this statement in the light of the Buddha’s Teaching, a number of us usually commit the error of merely repeating this statement in order to avoid participating in active peace work. Many of us do not even practice methods suggested by the Buddha to quiet our mind, tame our anger, develop our compassion and realize inner peace. If we neither participate in peace work nor practise Buddhist meditation, it is wrong to repeat all the time ‘Peace is in our heart’, because this statement is only a pretext for not doing anything recommended by the Buddha,
"Peace should be first of all peace with our own self. Man cannot be perfectly happy if he is still not at peace with himself. Craving, anger, prejudices, dispersion and forgetfulness create a permanent battle within us and carry us away like the torrent carries away a small cork. We can hardly be ourselves when we continue to let ourselves be assailed by these things. Buddhist meditation is to help us overcome these assailants, restore the peace and wholeness of our being to see things clearly in their own nature. Not only the bhikkhus should practise Buddhist meditation, but the Buddhist lay people should as well. In this respect we must realize the hard fact that simply making offering to the Buddha and to the Sangha is not enough to make us good Buddhists. We must learn to practise Buddhist meditation ourselves in order to become Buddhists in essence.

"Peace is a sane relationship between humans. Once we are capable of seeing things clearly with a serene mind, we shall realize that our life should be in harmony with the life of all sentient beings, especially other humans, so that people may live happily together. Such a kind of sane relationship between humans is called peace. This relationship is based on the principle of non-injury (ahimsā) to others. This is the essential base of life and peace.

"To observe the five precepts of Buddhism, for instance, is to prevent ourselves from harming people. But the five precepts are not easy to observe. Take, for instance, the first one: 'Do not kill'. To kill does not mean just to use a gun or knife to take the life of another living being. To live in luxury, to consume while millions of others are starving to death is also killing. Not preventing war when one is capable of doing something to prevent it is also killing. Investing in companies that pollute the environment and deny poor people the chance to survive is also killing. We have to learn and practise a great deal in order to really understand and observe this first Buddhist precept. The same applies to the other four precepts."
“Many efforts are being made by Buddhists everywhere to alleviate suffering, to promote social justice, to bring help to the poor and oppressed. These are concrete actions of peace in the social dimension which can’t really be separated from our inner life and peace. We should also learn about them and bring our support to these actions.

“Seed of Peace is a modest effort to provide us with the means to exchange views and experiences on both those aspects of peace life and peace work. There will not be long articles speculating on peace in here. There will be only concrete suggestions to help us live in peace and support peace works. Contributions from our readers on these two aspects of peace will be greatly appreciated. We look forward to these contributions with gratitude.”

More’s the pity that Seeds of Peace has not yet been translated into Thai for the benefit of the Thai people at large, especially students who are dedicated to the violent overthrow of everything old as being worthless to the new society. It is the Thai nation which is now faced with multiple problems and political ferment. Why only present such a valuable book to the English-speaking elite? Seeds of Peace can be exactly that, a spark to encourage the growth of a truly Buddhist revolution grounded in loving-kindness, compassion, sympathetic joy and equanimity.

Sommai Inganon

Mahamakut Rajavidyalai Buddhist University, Bangkok

Miss Brown's scholarly article, modestly called a "preliminary report", is an in-depth account of the ceramic finds from a Thai ship that sank in the Gulf of Siam in the latter part of the 15th century. The vessel was carrying a cargo of Thai and other export wares, and was probably destined for the Philippine or Indonesian archipelagos, then the great markets for Thai as well as Chinese and Annamese ceramic wares.

The vessel with its cargoes remained on the sea bottom on top of a submerged sandbar until a group of Thai fishermen dived to the seabed to untangle their nets in September 1974. When the divers surfaced they brought up several pieces of pottery and later recovered some 82 additional samples. They reportedly sold the lot of their underwater finds to a Bangkok businessman for the tidy sum of 30,000 *bath*, or about 650 Pounds sterling.

When news of the discoveries became known, great crowds of treasure-seekers flocked to the site, some 12 nautical miles southwest of the tiny island of Kôh Khram, itself some 170 kilometres south of Bangkok and near the Royal Thai Naval Base of Sattahip, and Pattaya, the recently developed seaside resort a short way to the north of the naval base.

In September 1974, however, the Thai Government's Department of Fine Arts investigated the finds and verified that the ceramic pieces were 500 to 600 years old. At the same time, the Department of Fine Arts took steps to prevent the wholesale looting of this important archaeological site, and borrowed 20 "frogmen" from the Royal Thai Navy to begin a systematic search of the underwater area.

Some 3,000 fragments of ceramic wares were subsequently collected, along with some fine whole specimens of the Thai Sukhothai and Sawankhalok wares of Thai 14th to 15th century kilns. All those items were carefully sorted and catalogued. Personnel of the
Department of Fine Arts have also been endeavoring to reassemble as many as possible of the vast numbers of ceramic fragments recovered at the Kôh Khram site.

Of special interest is the fact that the great bulk of the ceramics are of Thai provenance, coming from the 14th to 15th century Thai kilns in north-central Siam. The Sukhōthai pieces were principally painted-ware plates and bowls, many with the famous fish design painted on their centres so highly prized today by collectors of these wares. Also recovered was a large number of Sawankhalōk celadon glazed plates and bowls, many having incised underglazed floral decorations. Other types recovered were celadon and brown glazed globular jars with ring handles, along with a considerable number of those enormous Sawankhalōk water storage jars, some of which had become heavily encrusted with marine growth.

Two rather curious pieces were also found at the Kôh Khram site which deserve special mention here. One was a simple, bag-shaped earthenware rice-cooking pot similar to the present day earthenware mōh khao, which today can be found in almost every Thai household kitchen or be purchased for a few baht at any of Bangkok's numerous earthenware shops. Another curious piece was a small dish, some 16.2 centimetres in diameter, believed to be of Cham provenance. Although its Cham origin has not been fully established, it is interesting to note that the piece has what appears from a photograph accompanying Miss Brown's article to have a number of spur marks on its inner surface, like those found on most pieces of Sukhōthai painted ware. In that case, bowls and plates were fired in tall stacks within the kiln, each piece separated by a circular disc of fire clay having a number of projecting legs. The stands used at the Sukhōthai kilns all had five projecting legs, and hence left five spur marks on the inner surface of each plate or bowl, a kind of hallmark which proclaims the authenticity of those wares. Some Annamese pieces also show the spur marks made by such discs. The Annamese discs, however, had six legs. Such methods of firing in tall stacks were obviously meant to conserve fuel. They were also employed in China and Japan, the number of legs used on each disc varying.
Miss Brown believes that the unusual Cham piece most likely came from the recently discovered ancient Cham kilns in the southern part of Viet Nam. What is believed to be a piece of Vietnamese ware was also discovered at the Kôh Kham underwater site. It probably also came from the village of Go Sanh, some ten kilometres west of Qui Nho'n on the road to Pleiku.

The Kôh Khram finds open a new vista in the study of Thai and other Southeast Asian wares. They also demonstrate that Thai shipping played an extensive role in exporting Thai and other wares to the Philippines, Indonesia, and possibly other countries. In that connexion, the reviewer would like to cite an article he wrote entitled "Siam and the pottery trade of Asia", which was published in The Journal of the Siam Society, Vol. XLIV Part 2, August 1956, where among the half-tone plates the reviewer presented an illustration of a Thai ship in Nagasaki Harbour from a 16th century Japanese painting entitled "Shamu Sen" (Thai Ship), which the reviewer discovered some years ago in the Library of Congress in Washington, D.C.

Charles Nelson Spinks

St. Petersburg Beach, Florida


Mr. Griffing of the Honolulu Academy of Arts deserves high praise for his scholarly article on Annamese blue and white wares. It is a valuable addition to the very limited bibliography of works on the subject. His presentation is embellished with no less than 18 invaluable illustrations, all in colour. The article is further indicative of the growing interest on the part of scholars and collectors in this all too little-known body of Southeast Asian ceramics. The reviewer wishes very much that he had had access to Mr. Griffing's scholarly work prior to completion of his attempt to compose his own recent article, "A
reassessment of the Annamese wares", which appeared in the *Journal of the Siam Society*, Vol. 64 Part 1, January 1976, with 26 half-tone plates.

Mr. Griffings' unusual study is primarily an attempt to establish some kind of reliable dating of the Annamese blue and white wares about which so little has been written. In the matter of accurate and systematic dating, Mr. Griffing has provided students and collectors of these wares a most valuable service. Most of these attractive blue and white wares belong, according to Mr. Griffings' painstaking research, to the 14th century, particularly at that point when the Annamese potters began to move away from their dependence on Chinese tradition and began to experiment on their own. The happy result was a great flowering of the Annamese blue and whites, and a new spectrum to Far Eastern ceramics. Consequently, it is not surprising that there was a considerable export of that newly developed ware to the Philippines and Indonesia, where even today considerable quantities are to be found.

The great flowering of the Annamese wares tradition continued to the middle of the 15th century, when many of them were also exported to Siam where they exerted a considerable, if not determinate, influence on the Thai potters at the Sukhōthai kilns in central Siam. In fact, many of the Sukhōthai painted-ware plates and bowls exported to Indonesia can hardly be distinguished from similar types of Annamese painted-ware pieces of this period. In my above-cited article, I had expressed the belief that the Tzu-chou style of painted-ware decoration, so evident in the work of the Sukhōthai potters, may well have come from Annam, rather than through the Sukōthai Kingdom's rather erratic and intermittent diplomatic relations with the Yuan court of China, a view widely if erroneously held heretofore by students of Thai history.

*C. Nelson Spinks*

*St. Petersburg Beach, Florida*
COMMUNICATION


In response to Dr. Jeremy Kemp's review, let me say that it is an honour to have my book commented on by such a renowned scholar as himself. However, as in all intellectual discourses, agreements and disagreements cannot be avoided. The points in his review that I agree with are the following:

(a) On p. 414 Dr. Kemp stated that "the somewhat grandiose title of the work bears little relation to the empirical study contained within it". I certainly agree with this comment. But let me point out, however, that the title was intended to mean that the study is of the political attitudes of the bureaucratic elite (liberal/conservative), and the impact of their attitudes on the prospects and processes of modernization in Thailand. I don't think that the title matters as much as the fact that the linkage between the elite's attitudes and the prospects of modernization is not a tenuous one. The discussion of the role of the elite in the prospect of modernization is carried on by the hypothesis that the elite can bring about change, given the fact that there is a large number of liberal officials in Thailand. Here lies the weakness of the linkage.

(b) I could not agree with him more that there is a disadvantage to working with a small group (p. 414). But given the limited research budget and time, and taking into account the fact that co-operation from the bureaucratic elite is difficult to engage, the result of the findings should be of considerable value, at least as hypotheses for further studies. I must point out that in my later research on the sociological attributes of Special Grade and First Grade Officials of all ministries (excluding the Ministry of Defence), including the entire population of 2,160 members and a sample of 2,394 of higher civil servants of Thailand, my findings have confirmed my former study. (That point will be discussed later.) There is no question that in the next research project on this subject, a larger sample should be studied. However, Dr. Kemp has
emphasized mainly weak points (p. 415 first paragraph) without mentioning other significant figures, for example on places of origin of the elite.

(c) I agree that this type of research project will encounter methodological and hence analytical problems, but I have found it very challenging and believe that this type of research should be continued for reasons I shall seek to point out later.

(4) On p. 415 he commented that “the question of whether or not a high level of educational achievement, by which is usually meant a higher degree in the U.S. or a European country, takes place before or after gaining entry to government service is not mentioned. In other words, does mobility follow as a direct consequence of the American Ph.D., or rather is the requisite government scholarship the crucial factor, the sign that one is destined for the top so that the degree itself is in a sense a formality, the issue of a licence for success?”

This is a very good point. But his criticism has been rectified in my later study wherein a discussion along the lines he has mentioned was presented together with tables showing the numbers of elite members who continued their studies after gaining official positions, and a discussion on the differential time required for promotion in regard to different levels of educational achievement. (See กิจิ รีย์วิศ, “ทศวรรษ ที่เป็นการศึกษาจิตร์ศิลป์ไทย: การศึกษาในกลุ่มมุข(red)และการศึกษา และระดับ สวยงามการเลือกหนึ่ง” in สมบัติ จันทร์วงษ์ และ วิสิต ธรรมชาติ, วันพิษณุโลก [กรุงเทพ: โครงการจิตรสารคัมภีร์และมานุษยวิทยาศึกษา สมาคมสิ่งคุณภาพในประเทศไทย, พ.ศ. 2519] p. 144, table 11 and p. 148.

What I cannot accept are the following:

(a) On p. 413 Dr. Kemp alleged that the outline of the development of the Thai bureaucracy from 1237 A.D. to 1971 is “cursory and sometimes inaccurate”. It should be pointed out that the discussion of the development of the Thai bureaucracy is, as he himself pointed out, only an outline, and not the focus of the book. It is given here in order to provide historical continuity and a perspective on the development of bureaucratic organization, so that the following analysis could be better appreciated. It would be of great benefit to me and fair to the readers if he had
substantiated his allegations. Saying that something is inaccurate but failing to give specific and concrete examples is, in my opinion, a loose, sweeping and unjustified statement.

(b) On p. 415, regarding intergenerational mobility, he said to the effect that “knowledge of fathers’ positions is not an adequate indicator of mobility in a social system such as the Thai when kin links are important for sponsorship, educational support, etc. It is really necessary to know something of the status of grandparents and the siblings of both parents.” Ideally and theoretically, I would tend to agree with him. But as he may well know, there are certain subtle research barriers inherent to Thai society and Thai values, which would mitigate theoretical ambitions. In Thailand, discussion on family background, especially with those who are members of racial minorities, is a very sensitive issue, one verging upon taboo for the bureaucratic elite. Many officials resent the fact that they have to indicate in their application forms their father’s and mother’s names, since it would indirectly give away their ethnic roots. I was enlightened by an official at the Personnel Records Division, Civil Service Commission, that the requirement to write down parents’ names and occupations in the personal record may be dropped sometime in the future owing to the above consideration. Given such limitation, I firmly believe the information acquired has shed some light on social mobility in the Thai bureaucracy, and is definitely a step in the right direction.

(c) He stated on p. 415 that the appraisal of the second part of the questionnaire concerning the expression of attitudes reveals “a similar problem of superficiality”. Surprisingly, the treatment of this part is, to use his own words, “cursory and superficial.” And yet this is the focus of the study. Very little was mentioned about the correlation between liberalism, conservatism and level of education and age with the strength of relationship shown by statistical tests. This could hardly have been overlooked. Thus instead of striking at the crux of the matter, the review commented on the periphery. Even more surprising is the fact that no reference was mentioned of McClosky’s Conservative Scale (1958) or the Liberal-Conservative Scale (Kerr, 1952) as bases for
comparison. It would seem that the cursory treatment of the attitudinal part, and the weak comment which followed, suggest that there is either bias against this type of study or a lack of familiarity.

It should also be pointed out that he seemed to have misinterpreted or failed to understand the method of assessing internal consistency by which questions with low levels of discriminatory power were dropped. In the case of research on a larger group of population other than the elite, the process of screening out questions could be done by two steps. The first is by having a pretest. After the pretest, bad questions could be screened out by the method of internal consistency described in pp. 74-76 in my book. The remaining "good" questions are then used in the research. After the research was completed, for a double-check, one could again screen out bad questions by the same method. The remaining questions are then used for calculating and put on the scale. In my study, there was no pretest for obvious reasons. In the case of elite studies it is not feasible to have a pretest. To have one interview appointment is very difficult, if not impossible, let alone having two interviews. As a result, 12 out of 24 items were dropped. The 12 items could be considered technically sound, and are sufficient for constructing the scale. Some scholars, for example D.R. Matthews and J.W. Prothon, used only five items in their research on *Negroes and the New Southern Politics* (New York: 1966).

(d) As for the examples of questions on the elite's attitudes on foreign policy and tolerance toward unconventional ideas he cited on p. 416, I would suggest that he consult p. 76 of my book, which shows that regarding question No. 16 on foreign policy, the discriminatory power is 1.60, while question No. 22 on attitudes toward unconventional ideas has a discriminatory power of 1.75. The discriminatory powers of the two items are very high, showing that responses to those two questions did vary greatly. The wording of the questions may sound a bit inappropriate when translated into English. But at the time of the interviews when there were talks about having diplomatic relations with the People's Republic of China, and when wearing long hair for men had become a fad and talk of the day, opinions on those two issues did vary.
(e) On p. 416 in the concluding chapter on the ideal leadership, it should be pointed out that given the situation at the time of that writing, there were certain things the author could not put down on paper. One has to read between the lines. What I had in mind was a group of far-sighted modernizing elite of the Meiji Restoration type who consciously and with great effort laid down the foundation for the building of a new, strong and wealthy nation. In other words, a group of elite who, for their own survival as well as the country's survival, would show initiative and retard if not prevent the country from drifting into political turmoil as I have analysed. This is not meant to be a value-free statement. So, the comment which asks "why should any attempt be made to politicize the peasantry?" missed the point. His statement about my very traditional attitude in expecting the impetus for social and political change to come from the top shows a lack of sense of political and social realities on his part. Given the situation at that time and even after 14 October 1973, there is a need for reform initiated from the top and of course pushed from the bottom. I am for the interest of the masses and will always stand firm to support their demands. But I am also realistic enough to see that even the People's Republic of China, which puts a great emphasis on the proletariat and the mass line, is basically an elite-led revolutionary country. It is well-known that the economic and political powers in Thailand are in the hands of a small group of bureaucratic (military and civil) and business elite, and up to the moment the configuration of this power has not changed. I reject \textit{a priori} that the advent of civil war in Thailand is desirable. One way to avoid this is for the elite to launch rapid reforms in all aspects. Time is running out for peaceful and rational developmental evolution. Thus, I have advocated reforms in many of my articles for this very reason.

In conclusion, let me say that the overall picture I received from his review is composed as follows:

(a) There is a lack of balance. He has pointed out the weak points in the book, which in some cases are not warranted as I have pointed out. One gets the impression from reading his review that the book has no positive aspect, that there is little contribution.
(b) Reading the beginning of his review, especially the statement "moreover a number of basic methodological and analytical issues raises doubts to the real value of this type of research project", would seem to suggest that he is either biased against this type of behavioral science research or that there is a lack of familiarity on his part, as I have mentioned.

(c) With the weaknessness of his comments I have pointed out, I wonder if such words which he used as "cursory", "inaccurate", "superficial" could indeed boomerang.

The modest contributions contained in my book are as follows:

(a) The discussion on the sociological attributes of the contemporary bureaucratic elite of the three ministries has shed some light onto the penumbra of the bureaucracy in Thailand. At least, the findings could be taken as hypotheses which have heuristic value. In my later research on the sociological attributes of Special Grade Officials (N = 2,160) and First Grade Officials (20 per cent sample, N = 2,394), the results are as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Father's occupation</th>
<th>Special Grade</th>
<th>First Grade</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Government official</td>
<td>40.98%</td>
<td>32.79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Businessman</td>
<td>31.46%</td>
<td>27.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peasant</td>
<td>5.62%</td>
<td>10.47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>11.89%</td>
<td>18.42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>9.98%</td>
<td>10.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>99.97%</td>
<td>99.91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(N = 2,160) (N = 2,394)

The two Columns above show that officials with fathers in the bureaucracy still outnumbered other social groups, although a decline in the First Grade (32.97 per cent as against 40.93 per cent in the Special Grade) is noted. This should answer his comment on p. 415 whether there is a declining level of mobility, an issue raised by Evers and Brand. Although there is some difference in terms of the number, the patterns
of frequency distribution of the above two tables and the table given on p. 19 of my book (table 3.1) are similar. This indicates that the previous findings are confirmed by later research with a larger number of population and samples. The same holds true for other aspects such as the elite's places of origin.

(b) The Liberal-Conservative Scale based upon three components (i.e. attitudes toward change, egalitarian values and toleration of different ideas and behavior) could be further refined. It could also be used as a measuring instrument. One of my graduate students has used it to study political attitudes of the Members of Parliament with satisfactory results. He is using the findings for his M.A. thesis.

(c) This is a pioneering piece of work which has ventured into an uncharted terrain, and I was aware of the fact that this type of research would be susceptible to attack because of methodological problems. But the undertaking is a challenge, which would allow us to understand better the mentality of the members of the bureaucratic elite. Insight into their behavior or policy formulation could be glimpsed from the study. I have benefited a great deal from the responses to the individual items dealing with individual issues. Very few scholars have had the chance to probe the minds of this group of relatively well-educated people, methodological inadequacies notwithstanding. This is a start, and I am convinced it should be pursued further.

*Likhit Dhiravegin*

*Political Science Faculty,*  
*Thammasat University*
Dr. Jeremy Kemp replies:

I regret that you evidently consider my review of your monograph unfair and biased. What I hope you appreciate however are the constraints placed on me: in writing an of necessity brief comment in a journal like that of the Siam Society, I was certainly not conducting a detailed scholarly analysis. I also think that criticisms such as the small size of the sample, the limited number of questions and the inadequate criteria for assessing mobility are not countered by the fact that you have subsequently used a larger sample, that others have used even fewer questions, or that there are very real difficulties in obtaining information on family backgrounds, though I naturally appreciate all these points. Indeed I find your comments about intergenerational mobility fascinating for the light they throw on such issues as ethnic background, parental occupations, etc.

Where I can usefully expand upon a specific point is on the historical background. On pages 12 and 15 you indicate that members of the Royal Family were appointed to high government office in the early Bangkok period. Perhaps you regard the Bunnag family as royal, but what I consider very significant is the exclusion of the ‘true’ royalty (caw fa, phra ong caw, etc.) from effective government office. The point I think is important, because one can argue that the reforms of King Chulalongkorn and his appointment of royalty to the highest positions at least temporarily altered the basic elite structure of Thai society in undermining the power of the Khun nang and making the monarchy far more absolute than it had been formerly (cf. Akin Rabibhadana, 1969).

As for our underlying differences of opinion I think that these are not due to a lack of understanding or misinterpretation of the issues you mention. Rather my comments reflect my doubts about this type of research. Something which bothers me is the value of any ‘liberal-conservative scale’ for data collected in this way. What is the relation between the ‘attitudes’ derived from such questions as the ones asked, and the actual processes of decision-making? Are the answers to be taken at face value as indicating what the respondents think and how they act? In other words, this kind of research despite its rigorous
techniques ignores what for me are the main issues and problems in the study of the organisation of the bureaucratic elite. I of course appreciate that Gabriel Almond, for example, represents an important 'school' of political science. This school however is one of which political scientists in the U.K. especially are critical because of its perhaps over-simple positivist assumptions.

Jeremy H. Kemp

Eliot College,
University of Kent at Canterbury