

Australasian Contributions to the Historiography of Southeast Asia*

Martin Stuart-Fox

When the late Professor D. P. Singhal was asked in 1978 to survey the state of Asian history in Australia, he did so in the compass of a few pages.¹ This would now be impossible. The 1980s have been a productive decade for Asian Studies in general in Australia and New Zealand, and for history in particular, as both countries have become increasingly aware that their national destinies are indissolubly tied to the Asian region. In Australia this recognition was given concrete expression by the end of the decade in the form of the new priorities accorded teaching and research in Asian studies and languages at both school and university levels.

Asian history in Australasia is now too vast a field for even a dedicated Asianist to survey. At the very least it must be broken down into regional groupings — the histories of South Asia, Southeast Asia and East Asia. Even within each region growing output and specialisation make for reluctance to venture beyond one's established area of expertise. Indonesianists think twice before reviewing books on mainland Southeast Asia, unless there are some clear thematic comparisons that can be drawn. This trend is understandable, if regrettable. It is increasingly difficult to keep the larger picture in focus.

The post-World War II growth in Asian Studies, and by inclusion Asian history, in Australasia has been marked by a series of institutional initiatives: establishment of the Research School in Pacific and Asian Studies at the Australian National University in Canberra; establishment of departments of Indonesian and Malaysian studies at the University of Sydney, and Indian and Indonesian Studies at Melbourne; inclusion of faculties, or departments, or centres of Asian and/or Southeast Asian studies particularly at new universities, such as Monash, La Trobe, Flinders, Griffith, Murdoch, and James Cook; and the inclusion of Asian historians in established history departments at other, older universities. Thus the framework for the study of Southeast Asian history now exists, if underfunded. How productive has it been, in terms of teaching and research?

Success in teaching is hard to quantify. The relatively large number of Honours and postgraduate research theses on Southeast Asian history produced in Australasian universities provides one measure of the effectiveness of teaching in generating interest among students. Another is class size in undergraduate courses specifically devoted to Southeast Asian history. Over the past decade tens of thousands of students in Australasia have taken one or more courses in Southeast Asian history. Whether this makes them to any extent "Asia literate" is another matter, however. It is to be hoped that it has generated some awareness, some degree of understanding, some sympathy — or at least sufficient interest to place Southeast Asia on the list of possible places to visit on the next overseas holiday.

* I thank Dr Robert Cribb for reading and commenting on this paper.

Success in research is more easy to assess in terms of the quality and quantity of publications produced in our universities. Each year the Review of the Asian Studies Association of Australia lists publications of the previous year by Australian scholars and any scholars from overseas working temporarily in Australian universities. And each year the lists get longer, and the range of subjects covered more diverse. In the field of history some of the best work is published in the form of articles in leading international journals. Unfortunately space prevents a discussion of these. All that we can hope to do in this brief survey is to mention some of the more important books published for the most part over the past fifteen years, and to indicate some of the more significant and interesting historiographical developments over that period.

From an Australian perspective, Southeast Asia as a region tends to be dominated by the looming presence of Indonesia as our near northern neighbour. The sheer size, diversity and fascination of Indonesia would be enough to concentrate the attention of scholars, but its geographical proximity, the common border between West Irian and Papua New Guinea, and Australian defence and security concerns have all served to reinforce this natural interest to the point where Indonesia has at times bulked so large in Australian minds as all but to obscure the rest of Southeast Asia. This was certainly true in the 1950s and early 1960s, tempered only by an extension of interest to include Malaysia where Australian defence forces were stationed. Then came the Vietnam war, and belated recognition that other areas were also of importance to Australia, and worthy of study and research. Only in the early 1970s did interest develop in the history not only of Indochina, but also of Thailand and the Philippines. Even so Thai studies have been slow to develop, though Thailand's recent promotion to the status of a NIC (Newly Industrialising Country) has stimulated growing Australian interest. Burma (Myanmar), alas, still remains all but ignored.

The preponderance of Indonesia in Australian scholarship on Southeast Asia has been to a large extent self-perpetuating. Australian historians specialising in Indonesia have built enviable international reputations. Many of our best and brightest students gravitate or are steered into Indonesian studies. Positions falling vacant in Southeast Asian history tend to be filled by Indonesianists. Even if the courses they teach include the mainland states, their research interests and output continue to be confined almost entirely to Indonesia. This emphasis on Indonesia, in history as in other disciplines, carries with it the danger that we shall underestimate the importance of other Southeast Asian states and thus fail to appreciate the historical dynamics of their interaction, both with each other and with major powers outside the region. Given the likelihood that a future regional grouping (in which Australia too may eventually be included) will extend beyond the present membership of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), it is essential for Australian scholarship to cover all of Southeast Asia, not just certain parts.

To some extent it must be said the 1980s have partially redressed the balance in Southeast Asian history. Important work has been done in Australian universities by Australian, American, and Southeast Asian scholars on the Philippines, the three states of Indochina, Thailand, and even Burma. If the volume of historical studies still remains small compared with the quantity produced on Indonesia, quality has been high. The best of Australian historiography on other regions has been equal, if not superior, to anything produced elsewhere. Of this we may legitimately be proud.

There is no room, however, for complacency. The number of historians of Southeast Asia working in Australian universities, institutes and research centres is certainly greater than in any European country, and compares very favourably with the situation in the

United States, given that country's declining interest in the region since the end of the Vietnam war. But that does not mean that all is well in the discipline of Southeast Asian historiography in Australia. In 1984, one observer summed up what he saw as the handicaps then confronting historians of Southeast Asia in this country: "lack of regular scholarly contacts [within Australia] ... poorly funded and haphazardly compiled library collections ... one-shot scholarly convocations that lead nowhere (in terms of sustained and well-financed research programmes); non-existent funding for post-graduate study; and perhaps most egregious of all, vague, intermittent contact with Southeast Asianists from the region itself ..."² Few would want to maintain that these shortcomings have significantly improved since, though the decision of the Asian Studies Association to hold its "off-year" conference in Singapore in 1989 and Hong Kong in 1991 did do something to encourage contact between Australian and Asian scholars.

Given these continuing problems, plus the burden of increased teaching loads, patchy availability of research resources, and limited funding (despite the welcome emphasis to be given to Asian studies in the 1990s), perhaps it is surprising that work on the region has been as innovative and productive as it has. Path-breaking studies have appeared in several areas, including regional history, especially of Indonesia and Malaysia, urban history, labour history and social history. A start has been made on histories of medicine and disease, of science and the environment, of religious movements and social classes.

These developments have not meant that orthodox political and economic history has been ignored, or that general histories have been neglected. The latter are particularly important if the history of Southeast Asia is to gain the wider readership so essential if Australians are to become "Asia literate". Most worthy of note in this category have been Milton Osborne's acclaimed introductory history of the whole region which has gone through several editions and gained illustrations since first being published in 1979,³ and the introductory history covering both East and Southeast Asia recently edited by Colin Mackerras.⁴ Nicholas Tarling has taken a similarly broad approach in his study of the decline of Britain in the region, and in the new *Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*, which he edited and to which a disproportionate number of Australians have contributed.⁵ Then there is Anthony Reid's ambitious survey of "the lands below the winds".⁶ Reid's thematic approach evokes echoes of both Braudel and Burckhardt — the former in its attempt to reveal historical connections within the region as a whole; and the latter in the way detail is piled up to create a rich impression of place and period. Fine country studies have been written by Merle Ricklefs, David Chandler and the Andayas in which specialist knowledge and interests have been extended to produce broad synthetic histories of Indonesia, Cambodia, and Malaysia respectively.⁷ All three are valuable both as undergraduate texts, and to inform a wider interested readership. Rather more specialised in its approach, but just as broad in its scope, is Robert Taylor's interpretation of the role of the state in the history of Burma,⁸ much of which was developed while he was teaching at the University of Sydney.

Studies of contemporary history and politics may also be said to fall into the category of general works, even though the historical dimension may provide little more than a background for current events. Examples are contributions to the Marxist Regimes series published by Frances Pinter, all three of which on the countries of Indochina were written by Australian-based authors.⁹ Even books written to argue an ideological or polemical position may make a substantial contribution to contemporary history.¹⁰ The narrow divide between politics and history is easily straddled, not only by studies providing the background to recent events, but also of political movements, ruling regimes, or social

classes. The work of Harold Crouch and Ulf Sundhaussen on the military in Indonesia,¹¹ and of Richard Robison and Kevin Hewison on the bourgeoisie in Indonesia and Thailand¹² contain much valuable history, and have contributed to the historiographical debate on the post-independence histories of these states.

One of the most notable developments that has taken place in Southeast Asian studies over the last decade has been the productive interaction between history and other social sciences. This has been a two-way process: social scientists have increasingly come to recognise the value of history in moving away from purely structural or functional approaches, while historians have recognised the importance of techniques for the analysis of evidence derived not only from disciplines such as political science and economics, but also from sociology and anthropology, social psychology, and even literary theory. An outstanding example of what can be achieved by bringing together history and anthropology, for example, is the work of James Fox on the Indonesian island of Roti.¹³ The productive interaction of history and sociology is evident in the work of Charles Coppel on the Chinese in Indonesia and Grant Evans on the peasant response to socialism in Laos;¹⁴ while social psychology has been applied in a wonderfully revealing way by Ray Ileto in his fascinating study of Filipino Christian *mentalité*.¹⁵

New historical studies based on new modes of analysis of a variety of historical and non-historical texts have been produced by a small group of historians influenced by literary and philosophical hermeneutics and the theories of Derrida and Foucault. Craig Reynolds, for example, has examined the content, context and response to radical historiography in Thailand to throw light on the way in which Thai history is written, socially appropriated, and assimilated into differing cultural traditions.¹⁶ Adrian Vickers, on the other hand, has used literary sources to examine the European definition of Bali and its culture from the seventeenth to the twentieth century.¹⁷

Work within what might be called the methodologically orthodox mainstream of Southeast Asian history has been innovative more in terms of what has been studied and from what perspectives than in its theoretical borrowing. New evidence has been used, and new questions asked of previously available sources to make important contributions both in new fields such as regional history and social history, and in such well worked areas as the history of nationalist movements and responses to colonialism. These studies mark a major shift in perspective from earlier work on colonial policy and practice which drew heavily on colonial archival sources and produced history often with a strong Eurocentric bias. In this regard, the collection of papers on the writing of Southeast Asian history edited by Anthony Reid and David Marr was significant as marking the change that had occurred, and in setting a new agenda in Southeast Asian historiography from an indigenous perspective.¹⁸

Regional history is clearly a field that invites research. All too often generalisations have been made about historical developments as these were perceived and recorded at the central level of government without due appreciation of regional differences. A start has been made in the study of regional history, though much more needs to be done, especially for countries as ethnically and culturally diverse as Indonesia or Burma where great care needs to be exercised in making general statements about conditions pertaining across diverse regions or different islands. Major regional studies have been produced by the Andayas on two Malay states and south Sulawesi,¹⁹ by Christine Dobbin and Taufik Abdullah on Sumatra and Merle Ricklefs on Java,²⁰ by Virginia Matheson in her articles on the Riau archipelago and James Warren on Sulu,²¹ by Ian Black on Sabah,²² by Alfons van der Kraan on Lombok,²³ and by Glenn May, Howard Fry and Norman Owen on the

Philippines.²⁴ Susan Blackburn's history of Jakarta²⁵ is both regional and urban history, an area which has hardly been touched for most of Southeast Asia. The Indonesian revolution has also been the focus for regional studies by a new generation of Indonesian scholars interested in local manifestations of national events.²⁶

Turning to labour and social history, Indonesian and Malaysian historians again lead the way. John Ingleson's work on the Indonesian union movement,²⁷ Bob Elson's on the Javanese sugar industry,²⁸ Lea Jellinck's study of an impoverished community in Jakarta,²⁹ James Warren's history of Singapore,³⁰ and Yen Ching-Hwang's social history of the Chinese community in Malaysia and Singapore³¹ are all valuable contributions. All throw light on the broader subject of the historical interaction between colonised and coloniser. The impact of colonialism on traditional societies is another area that has attracted scholars. Anthony Reid and Heather Sutherland have examined responses to colonialism in Indonesia,³² while A. C. Milner and John Butcher have looked at the situation in Malaya just prior to and subsequent to the arrival of the British respectively.³³ The nationalist response to colonialism has been examined by Anthony Reid and John Ingleson for Indonesia and Glenn May for the Philippines,³⁴ while a particularly outstanding contribution in the same area has been David Marr's two-volume study on the Vietnamese response to the French in Indochina, the second volume of which draws on a wide variety of literary and cultural sources in Vietnamese not previously utilised by other scholars.³⁵ Several biographical and family studies also provide a social historical dimension.³⁶

Special mention should perhaps be made of the pioneering Australian contribution to the history of two of the least understood and studied countries in Southeast Asia — Cambodia and Laos. Most of what we know about the origins of communism and communist parties in these countries has been due to the painstaking research of Australian-based scholars. Between them David Chandler, Ben Kiernan, Chantou Boua and Michael Vickery have revealed almost all that we now know about the Khmer Rouge and their brutal revolution,³⁷ while Geoffrey Gunn and Martin Stuart-Fox have done the same for the Pathet Lao revolution and its aftermath in Laos.³⁸ Nor should contributions to the history of revolution in Vietnam by Greg Lockhart and Carl Thayer be forgotten.³⁹ David Chandler and Milton Osborne have written on the pre-colonial and colonial periods in Cambodia, while Michael Vickery and Ian Mabbett have added to our understanding of the Angkorian empire.⁴⁰

With the early Angkorian empire we are already approaching that hazy divide between history and prehistory, between history and archaeology. To survey Australasian contributions to the archaeology and prehistory of Southeast Asia is beyond the scope of this article, but mention must be made of two recent overviews which are of particular value to historians working in the area. These are Peter Bellwood's *Prehistory of the Indo-Malaysian Archipelago*⁴¹ and Charles Higham's *The Archaeology of Mainland Southeast Asia*.⁴² Both are finely written, comprehensive syntheses of the state of knowledge in the broad areas they cover.

Another rather specialised area not surveyed here is that of economic history, an area where again much fine work has been done on Southeast Asia, especially in Canberra and Sydney. But again special mention must be made of the current project under the guidance of Anthony Reid and Anne Booth to produce a multi-volume series on the economic history of Southeast Asia both thematic and by region, an Australian initiative which promises to be a landmark in scholarship on the region.

Finally there are three rather different categories which could be developed further — aids to historical research, thematic collections of papers, and annotated translations of historical documents. Australian scholars have contributed to the series of Asian historical dictionaries⁴³ and to bibliographical compilations on the region.⁴⁴ Some fine collections of articles have been edited and published — for example, by David Marr and A. C. Milner on Southeast Asia from the ninth to the fourteenth centuries, by Anthony Reid on slavery, bondage and dependency, and on early modern Southeast Asia, by John Butcher and Howard Dick on tax farming, by Norman Owen on death and disease, by Jim Fox and others on Australian views of Indonesia, by Robert Cribb on the Indonesian massacres, and by Al McCoy and E. de Jesus on Philippine social history.⁴⁵ The list should be extended to include two recent *festschriften*.⁴⁶ With the advent of desk-top publishing, the opportunity is now available to concentrate attention on a specific conference theme and publish the proceedings as a collection summing up the actual state of the discipline in that field, and we can anticipate more such publications in the future.

Another area where much more needs to be done is in the translation and annotation of documents, memoirs, and other primary historical sources, which are urgently needed for the teaching of advanced undergraduate courses, where students still lack the language skills essential for postgraduate research. Not that the field has been entirely neglected. We need more translations of texts such as the *Tuhfat al-Nafis* by Virginia Matheson and Barbara Andaya, and collections like the one Chris Penders edited of documents on the Dutch period in Indonesia.⁴⁷ The need is just as great when we come to the modern period. David Marr has edited *Reflections from Captivity*, the prison writings of Phan Boi Chau and Ho Chi Minh, and *The Red Earth* about life on a Vietnamese colonial rubber plantation;⁴⁸ Robert Taylor has translated Thein Pe Myint's Burmese wartime memoirs;⁴⁹ and Anthony Reid and Akira Oki have collected Japanese wartime memoirs from Indonesia.⁵⁰ David Chandler, Ben Kiernan and Chantou Boua have provided a fascinating insight into the thinking of Pol Pot and his cronies in their translations of "leadership documents" from Democratic Kampuchea.⁵¹ Other possibilities are legion.

A final category which requires mention is Australia's military involvement in Southeast Asia. This has naturally focused more on Vietnam than on Australia's role in the Malayan emergency or Malaysia's "Confrontation" with Indonesia. The first volume of the official history of Australia's involvement in "Southeast Asian conflicts" has now appeared.⁵² The Vietnam war meanwhile has produced its own literature, including histories, memoirs and accounts of the effect of the war on Australian society.⁵³

In summing up the state of Southeast Asian historiography in Australasia, one can only be impressed by what has been achieved. The field is wide open, and much imaginative and innovative work is being produced. It is only when Southeast Asian historiography is compared with, say, that of Europe that one begins to see how poorly developed it really is, how meagre its results are to date, and how much more needs to be done. Southeast Asian history is in its infancy, here as elsewhere. It is a field, however, where Australasian scholarship is making, and can and must continue to make, a substantial contribution. It is also one that will do much to facilitate our future relations with a region that is vital to our own national interests.

NOTES

- 1 D. P. Singh, "Asian History in Australia", in J. A. Moses, ed., *Historical Disciplines and Culture in Australasia: An Assessment* (St Lucia, 1979), pp. 148-58.
- 2 Tony Day writing in the *ASAA Review*, 8, 2 (1984): 8.
- 3 Milton Osborne, *Southeast Asia: An Introductory History* (Sydney, 1979; 5th ed. (illustrated) 1990).
- 4 Colin Mackerras, ed., *Eastern Asia: An Introductory History* (Melbourne, 1992).
- 5 Nicholas Tarling, *The Fall of Imperial Britain in South-East Asia* (Singapore, 1993); and Nicholas Tarling, ed., *The Cambridge History of Southeast Asia*, 2 vols (Cambridge, 1992); an additional volume is to follow.
- 6 Anthony Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450-1680. Volume one: The Lands Below the Winds* (New Haven, 1988).
- 7 M. C. Ricklefs, *A History of Modern Indonesia, c1300 to the present* (London, 1981; 2nd ed. 1993); David Chandler, *A History of Cambodia* (Boulder, 1983; 2nd ed. 1993); and *idem*, *The Tragedy of Cambodian History: Politics, War, and Revolution Since 1945* (New Haven, 1991); Barbara Andaya and Leonard Andaya, *A History of Malaysia* (London, 1982). To appear soon are Robert Cribb and Colin Brown, *Modern Indonesia* and Martin Stuart-Fox, *A History of Laos*.
- 8 Robert H. Taylor, *The State in Burma* (London, 1987).
- 9 Melanie Beresford, *Vietnam: Politics, Economics and Society* (London, 1988); Michael Vickery, *Kampuchea: Politics, Economics and Society* (London, 1986); Martin Stuart-Fox, *Laos: Politics, Economics and Society* (London, 1986). Another example is John Girling, *Thailand: Society and Politics* (Ithaca, 1981).
- 10 As, for example, did Michael Vickery, *Cambodia: 1975-1982* (Sydney, 1984).
- 11 Harold Crouch, *The Army and Politics in Indonesia* (Ithaca, 1978); Ulf Sundhaussen, *The Road to Power: Indonesian Military Politics, 1945-1967* (Kuala Lumpur, 1982).
- 12 Richard Robison, *Indonesia: The Rise of Capitalism* (Sydney, 1986); Kevin Hewison, *The Development of Capitalism and the Role of the State in Thailand* (New Haven, 1989).
- 13 J. J. Fox, *Harvest of the Palms: Ecological Changes in Eastern Indonesia* (Cambridge, 1977).
- 14 Charles Coppel, *Indonesian Chinese in Crisis* (Kuala Lumpur, 1983); Grant Evans, *Lao Peasants Under Socialism* (New Haven, 1990).
- 15 Reynaldo C. Ileto, *Pasyon and Revolution: Popular Movements in the Philippines* (Quezon City, 1979).
- 16 Craig J. Reynolds, *Thai Radical Discourse: The Real Face of Thai Feudalism Today* (Ithaca, 1987).
- 17 Adrian Vickers, *Bali: A Paradise Created* (Ringwood, Vic. 1989).
- 18 Anthony Reid and David Mart, eds, *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia* (Singapore, 1979).
- 19 Leonard Y. Andaya, *The Kingdom of Johore, 1641-1728* (Kuala Lumpur, 1975); *idem*, *The Heritage of Arung Palakka: A History of South Sulawesi (Celebes) in the Seventeenth Century* (The Hague, 1981); *idem*, *The World of Maluku: Eastern Indonesia in the Early Modern Period* (Honolulu, 1993); Barbara Andaya, *Perak, the Abode of Grace: A Study of an Eighteenth-century Malay State* (Kuala Lumpur, 1979).
- 20 Christine Dobbin and Taufik Abdullah, *Islamic Revivalism in a Changing Peasant Economy: Central Sumatra, 1784-1847* (London, 1983); M. C. Ricklefs, *Jogjakarta under Sultan Mangkubumi, 1749-1792: A History of the Division of Java* (London, 1974).
- 21 James Warren, *The Sulu Zone, 1768-1898: The Dynamics of External Trade, Slavery and Ethnicity in the Transformation of a Southeast Asian Maritime State* (Singapore, 1981).
- 22 Ian Black, *A Gambling Style of Government: The Establishment of the Chartered Company's Rule in Sabah, 1878-1915* (Kuala Lumpur, 1983).
- 23 Alfons van der Kraan, *Lombok: Conquest, Colonization, and Underdevelopment, 1870-1940* (Singapore, 1980).
- 24 G. A. May, *Battle for Batangas: A Philippine Province at War* (New Haven, 1991); Howard Fry, *A History of the Mountain Province* (Quezon City, 1983); Norman G. Owen, *Prosperity Without Progress: Manila Hemp and Material Life in the Colonial Philippines* (Berkeley, 1984).
- 25 Susan Blackburn, *Jakarta: A History* (Singapore, 1970). Cf. also the work of Larry Sternstein on Bangkok.
- 26 For example, Robert Cribb, *Gangsters and Revolutionaries: The Jakarta People's Militia and the Indonesian Revolution, 1945-1949* (Sydney, 1991); Anton Lucas, *One Soul, One Struggle: Region and Revolution in Indonesia* (Sydney, 1990).
- 27 John Ingleson, *In Search of Justice: Workers and Unions in Colonial Java, 1908-1926* (Singapore, 1986).
- 28 R. E. Elson, *Javanese Peasants in the Colonial Sugar Industry: Impact and Change in an East Java Residency, 1830-1940* (Singapore, 1984).
- 29 Lea Jellinck, *The Wheel of Fortune: The History of a Poor Community in Jakarta* (Sydney, 1990).
- 30 James Warren, *Rickshaw Coolie: A People's History of Singapore, 1880-1940* (Singapore, 1986); and *idem*, *Ah Ku and Karayuki-san: Prostitution in Singapore (1870-1940)* (Singapore, 1991). And in the same mould Peter J. Rimmer and Lisa M. Allan, eds, *The Underside of Malaysian History: Pullers, Prostitutes, Plantation Workers* (Singapore, 1990).

31 Yen Ching-Hwang, *A Social History of the Chinese in Singapore and Malaya, 1800-1911* (Singapore, 1986).

32 Anthony Reid, *The Blood of the People: Revolution and the End of Traditional Rule in Northern Sumatra* (Kuala Lumpur, 1979); Heather Sutherland, *The Making of a Bureaucratic Elite: The Colonial Transformation of the Javanese Priyayi* (Singapore: Heinemann, 1979).

33 A. C. Milner, *Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule* (Tuscon, 1982); John Butcher, *The British in Malaya, 1880-1941: The Social History of a European Community in Colonial Southeast Asia* (Kuala Lumpur, 1929). Butcher's study of tax farming in Malaya is forthcoming.

34 Anthony Reid, *The Indonesian National Revolution, 1945-1950* (Hawthorn, 1974); John Ingleson, *Road to Exile: The Indonesian Nationalist Movement, 1927-1934* (Singapore, 1979); G. A. May, *Social Engineering in the Philippines: The Aims, Execution and Impact of American Colonial Policy, 1900-1913* (Westport, 1980). See also, G. A. May, *A Past Recovered* (Manila, 1987).

35 David G. Marr, *Vietnamese Anticolonialism, 1885-1925* (Berkeley, 1971), and *Vietnamese Tradition on Trial, 1920-1945* (Berkeley, 1981). Marr has also examined events in Vietnam leading up to the crucial year of 1945 in *Vietnam: The Quest for Power*, forthcoming.

36 For example, C. F. Yong, *Tan Kah-Kee: The Making of an Overseas Chinese Legend* (Singapore, 1987); Jennifer W. Cushman, *Family and State: The Formation of a Sino-Thai Tin Mining Dynasty 1797-1932* edited by Craig J. Reynolds (Singapore, 1991); Nicholas Tarling, *The Burthen, the Risk, and the Glory: A Biography of Sir James Brooke* (Kuala Lumpur, 1982). Cf also David P. Chandler, *Brother Number One: A Political Biography of Pol Pot* (Sydney, 1993); Martin Stuart-Fox, *The Murderous Revolution: Life and Death in Pol Pot's Kampuchea. Based on the Personal Experiences of Bunheang Ung* (Sydney, 1985).

37 In, for example, Ben Kiernan, *How Pol Pot Came to Power: A History of Communism in Kampuchea, 1930-1975* (London, 1985); Ben Kiernan and Chantou Boua, eds, *Peasants and Politics in Kampuchea, 1942-1981* (London, 1982); Ben Kiernan and David Chandler, eds, *Revolution and Its Aftermath in Kampuchea: Eight Essays* (New Haven, 1983); Michael Vickery, *Cambodia 1975-1982* (Sydney, 1982), not to mention numerous articles.

38 Geoffrey Gunn, *Political Struggles in Laos (1930-1954)* (Bangkok, 1988), and *Rebellion in Laos: Peasant and Politics in a Colonial Backwater* (Boulder, 1990); and Martin Stuart-Fox, ed. *Contemporary Laos: Studies in the Politics and Society of the Lao People's Democratic Republic* (St Lucia, 1982), plus numerous articles.

39 Greg Lockhart, *Nation in Arms: The Origins of the People's Army of Vietnam* (Sydney, 1989); Carlyle Thayer, *War by Other Means: National Liberation and Revolution in Viet-Nam 1954-1960* (Sydney, 1989).

40 All in articles too numerous to list, but cf. Osborne's fine study on *The French Presence in Cochinchina and Cambodia: Rule and Response (1859-1905)* (Ithaca, NY, 1969).

41 (Sydney, 1985). Also Ian Mabbett, ed., *Patterns of Kingship and Authority in Traditional Asia* (London, 1985). But cf. Osborne's fine study on *The French Presence in Cochinchina and Cambodia: Rule and Response (1859-1905)* (Ithaca, NY, 1969).

42 (Cambridge, 1989).

43 For example, Robert Cribb, *Historical Dictionary of Indonesia* (Metuchen, N.J., 1993); Martin Stuart-Fox and Mary Kooyman, *Historical Dictionary of Laos* (Metuchen, N.J., 1992); and Amarjit Kaur, *Historical Dictionary of Malaysia* and David Chandler, *Historical Dictionary of Cambodia*, both forthcoming in the same series.

44 Among several publications should be mentioned David J. Stuart-Fox's massive and erudite *Bibliography of Bali: Publications from 1920-1990* (Leiden, 1992).

45 David Marr and A. C. Milner, eds., *Southeast Asia in the 9th to 14th Centuries* (Singapore, 1986); A. J. S. Reid, ed., *Slavery, Bondage and Dependency in Southeast Asia* (St Lucia, 1983); *idem*, *Southeast Asia in the Early Modern Era: Trade, Power, and Belief* (Ithaca, N.Y., 1993); John Butcher and Howard Dick, eds, *The Rise and Fall of Revenue Farming: Burmese Elites and the Emergence of the Modern State in Southeast Asia* (New York, 1993); N. G. Owen, ed., *Death and Disease in Southeast Asia* (Singapore, 1987); Robert Cribb, ed., *The Indonesian Killings of 1965-1966: Studies for Java and Bali* (Clayton, Vic., 1996). J. J. Fox, et al, *Indonesia: Australian Perspectives* (Canberra, 1980); Alfred McCoy and E. de Jesus, eds., *Philippine Social History: Global Trade and Local Transformations* (Quezon City, 1982).

46 D. P. Chandler and M. Ricklefs, eds, *Nineteenth and Twentieth Century Indonesia: Essays in Honour of Professor J. D. Legge* (Clayton, 1986); and Gehan Wijeyewardene and E. C. Chapman, eds, *Patterns and Illusions: Thai History and Thought — In Memory of Richard B. Davis* (Canberra, 1992).

47 Virginia Matheson and Barbara Andaya, *The Precious Gift (Tuhfat al-Nafis)* (Kuala Lumpur, 1982); C. L. M. Penders, *Indonesia: Selected Documents on Colonialism and Nationalism, 1830-1942* (St Lucia, 1977).

48 David Marr, ed., *Red Earth: A Vietnamese Memoire of Life on a Colonial Rubber Plantation* (Athens, 1985); and *idem*, ed., *Reflections from Captivity* (Athens, 1978).

49 R. H. Taylor, *Marxism and Resistance in Burma, 1942-1945: Thein Pe Myint's Wartime Traveller* (Athens, 1984).

50 Anthony Reid and Oki Akira, eds, *The Japanese Experience in Indonesia: Selected Memoirs of 1942-1945* (Athens, 1986).

51 David P. Chandler, Ben Kiernan, and Chantou Boua, editors and translators, *Pol Pot Plans the Future: Confidential Leadership Documents from Democratic Kampuchea, 1976-1977* (New Haven, 1988).

52 Ian McNeill, *To Long Tan: The Australian Army and the Vietnam War, 1950-1966* (Sydney, 1993).

53 For example, Frank Frost, *Australia's War in Vietnam* (Sydney, 1987); Terry Burstall, *The Soldier's Story: The Battle of Xa Long Tan, Vietnam, 18 August 1966* (St Lucia, 1986); Lex McAuley, *The Battle of Long Tan* (Hawthorne, 1986); Hugh Lunn, *Vietnam: A Reporter's War* (St Lucia, 1985); Siobhan McHugh, *Minefields and Miniskirts: Australian Women and the Vietnam War* (Sydney, 1993); Peter King, ed., *Australia's Vietnam: Australia in the Second Indochina War* (Sydney, 1983).