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This volume contains 12 previously published essays accompanied by a brief biography and complete bibliography of the author. Dang Nghiem Van is a Russian-trained ethnologist, who was, for many years, the Director of the Institute for Religious Studies of the National Center for Social Sciences and the Humanities of Vietnam. He has conducted field research among many of Vietnam’s ethnic groups and is noted for being one of the most insightful social scientists in contemporary Vietnam. His writings offer a valuable window into the world of Vietnamese ethnology, and his research concerns are generally representative of the principal interests of Vietnamese ethnology. This collection makes several of his papers, that were published between 1971 and 1997 in often hard to locate sources, readily available to a wider audience.

The papers in the volume cover three major topical areas. These are issues of ethnic identity and ethnogenesis (Chapters 1–4), ethnographic descriptions of specific groups or cultural traits (Chapters 7, 9, 10–12), and theoretical and empirical explorations of religion in Vietnam (Chapters 5, 6 and 8).

**Ethnic Identity and Ethnogenesis**

In chapters 1 and 3 the author presents very interesting discussions of the approach to ethnic classification employed by Vietnamese ethnologists. The classification of ethnic groups has been, since the modern origins of the discipline in then North Vietnam in the late 1950s, a major preoccupation of Vietnamese ethnologists. Their concern with this issue has been to a large extent dictated by the Vietnamese State’s need to effectively administer its diverse multi-ethnic population. The initial directive to make a scientific ethnic classification came from President Ho Chi Minh himself. During a visit to a province in the northern mountains in 1958, President Ho asked the local authorities how many ethnic groups lived there. The provincial chairman responded that there were 16 groups while the Party Secretary replied that there were 10 groups. As Dang Nghiem Van reports (pp.10–11),

> Faced with this confusion, President Ho Chi Minh personally directed Vietnamese ethnologists to find the answers to several apparently simple questions which in fact required scientific verifiability: How many ethnicities are there in Vietnam? What are they? What are their habitats?

Research intended to answer President Ho’s questions was immediately initiated, but the results were a long time coming—a comprehensive classification was not accepted until 1979—10 years after the death of Ho Chi Minh. Vietnamese ethnologists employ three criteria to identify ethnic groups. Ideally, an ethnic group is characterized by the following attributes:

1) Its members speak a common language,
2) They share a common set of cultural traits, and
3) They self-consciously identify themselves as belonging to that specific group.

1 ) When writing in English, Dang Nghiem Van, like most Vietnamese ethnologists, uses “ethnicity” as a noun in place of the more familiar “ethnic group” employed by English-speaking anthropologists. He pointedly rejects use of the term “ethnic group” on the grounds that it is “too vague” (p. 10), although I fail to see the logic of his argument and will use “ethnic group” in this review.
In the actual classification process, however, only the third criterion is considered critical. For example, the San Chay ethnic group includes some local communities (Cao Lan) that speak a language belonging to the Tai family and others (San Chi) that speak a Chinese dialect. It is believed that the San Chi lost their native language and adopted Chinese during their long period of residence in Southwestern China prior to migrating into Vietnam. In another example, all speakers of Thai languages are classified together as belonging to the “Thai” ethnic group although these languages are not all mutually intelligible and the different local groups (e.g. Black Thai, White Thai, Da Bac Tay) display considerable differentiation in terms of cultural traits. This “lumping” is justified, however, on the grounds that “it was representatives of the various Thai communities throughout north and central Vietnam who decided that they constituted a single ethnicity during a conference convened in the early 1960s” (p. 25).

Vietnamese ethnologists have an essentialist concept of ethnicity. Ethnic groups are seen as natural phenomena rather than social constructs. No ambiguity in classification is permitted: For example, the national identity card carried by every citizen displays the bearer’s ethnic affiliation. The transactional approach to ethnic identity pioneered by Frederick Barth in which the identities and boundaries of ethnic groups are continuously being reshaped by relations with other groups seems to have little or no influence on the thinking of Vietnamese ethnologists. Nor is it recognized that different scientists can propose different (and equally legitimate) classifications of the same set of communities according to the different purposes for which they are making their classifications. Dang Nghiem Van is critical of the ethnic classification of the “Montagnard” groups in the Central Highlands proposed by American researchers during the war, claiming that “this paralleled a political strategy of sowing division among and within ethnic groups (a continuation of the French colonial practice of dividing so as to conquer)” (p. 31, note 1). It hardly seems necessary to invoke “dark plots” by the imperialists to explain the origin of this classification. It was developed by applied linguists associated with the Summer Institute of Linguistics who employed language as their criterion for delineating ethnolinguistic groups. Consequently they split some communities viewed by northern Vietnamese ethnologists as single “ethnicities” into several different groups based on analysis of the mutual intelligibility of languages spoken in these communities. They may, as Dang Nghiem Van claims, have been mistaken in their judgments about linguistic boundaries, but use of language as their criterion for identifying ethnic groups was dictated by their scientific orientation, not their political views.

**Ethnographic Descriptions**

The several chapters devoted to ethnographic descriptions are all of considerable value in making information on previously little known groups broadly available. Chapter 7, written in French, presents a quite nuanced discussion of the relationship of shifting cultivation to the social organization of minority groups. It is unusual among Vietnamese discussions of shifting cultivation (swidden agriculture) in acknowledging that this technique has been adopted in recent years by groups that have traditionally practiced wet rice agriculture, such as the Thai, in response to population growth and consequent shortage of wet rice land. Dang Nghiem Van points out (p.305) that the Thai and other groups at lower elevations have actually destroyed more forest than the Hmong and other highland groups that have traditionally been swidden farmers (and who are usually blamed in the press for causing deforestation). He also recognizes that the productivity of swiddens can be higher than that of
wet rice fields under good conditions but disputes claims made by other (mainly foreign) anthropologists that long-cycle rotational swiddening can be sustainable. He supports this view with the claim that one-half of the surface area of the northern mountains was denuded by shifting cultivation in the last 200 years and also asserts that shifting cultivation caused severe environmental degradation in ancient Mesopotamia, Asia Minor, Central America (the Maya), and the Khmer Empire. At least some of these examples do not really support his argument. For example, ancient Mesopotamia employed a sophisticated system of irrigated agriculture that was destroyed by salinization, not shifting cultivation, and it is not yet known to what extent the Maya and Khmer relied on shifting cultivation.

Chapter 11 presents an overview of Thai society and culture. It contains a quite detailed description of the structure of the pre-revolutionary "feudal" society that appears to closely resemble Elman Service's evolutionary model of the "chiefdom." Chapter 12 describes the Khmu ethnic minority lining in the northwestern mountains. Although in their homeland in Laos they had lived in autonomous village communities that constituted the maximal unit of Khmu social organization, after migrating into Vietnam they had to fit themselves into a new social niche as subject populations in the hierarchically structured Thai feudal domains.

Religion

Dang Nghiem Van is one of the most knowledgeable and sophisticated analysts of religious sociology in Vietnam. In chapters 5 and 6 he discusses religious beliefs and practices and the social role of religion in Vietnam. He presents data collected from several surveys conducted by his institute among Catholics and non-Christians in the northern part of the country. Catholics are distinguished from non-Christians by their high reported level of religious need (99 percent compared to 47 percent for non-Christians), their certainty that there is an afterlife (96 percent compared to 8 percent) and their much lower level of belief in horoscopes (9 percent compared to 30 percent) and divination (5 percent compared to 35 percent). They are also much more likely to report worshipping in churches (99 percent) than non-Christians to report worshipping in pagodas (55 percent). Also noteworthy is the very high percentage of Catholics (64 percent) who report that they practice ancestor worship, although this percentage is smaller than that of non-Christians who engage in this practice (82 percent). This is an interesting example of how an imported religion has been "indigenized" even though ancestor veneration was explicitly prohibited by Church doctrine until the Vatican II reforms.

Concluding Remarks

The papers in this volume offer valuable insights into the theoretical concerns of Vietnamese ethnologists. They also contain considerable valuable ethnographic information. Given the very difficult conditions under which much of this research was carried out, one can only feel a sense of profound respect for Dang Nghiem Van's dedication to ethnology as a science. This makes his occasional comments impugning the motivations of non-Vietnamese ethnologists all the more disturbing. For example, he seems to tar all Western ethnologists with the sin of racism. Thus, in Chapter 2 (reprinted from a paper originally published in 1995), he claims that, the policy of imperialism to change the skin complexion has also been carried out in a number of other countries, like New Zealand, with the encouragement of theoreticians of ethnology, note-worthy being the Vien [sic] school, especially the functional school with such names as B.
Malinovski (1984–1942) and R. Brown (1881–1955). Racism with F.R. Grebner and P.W. Schmidt, the premise of fascism, contributed an important part. (pp. 95–96)

Some members of the Vienna School may have been racists but that is hardly true of all anthropologists who employed the functionalist approach. Indeed, it can be argued that functionalism, by showing the logic behind what had previously been seen only as strange and bizarre primitive customs and superstitions, contributed to the acceptance of the cultural relativism advocated by Boas and his students. Far from advocating racism, since the 1930s the majority of Western anthropologists have been vocal critics of this pernicious doctrine.

Finally, although Dang Nghiem Van's writing in Vietnamese is notably clear and lucid, these qualities suffer occasional damage from the rather poor quality of some of the English translations. Despite such problems, this work can be read with great profit by anyone interested in culture and society in Vietnam.

(A. Terry Rambo • CSEAS)

の整備が追い付かないことである。

上記の仮説を検証するのが、「第4章 フィリピン：森林の合法的殺戮」「第5章 サバ：新局面」「第6章 サラワク：抑えがたい本能」「第7章 インドネシア：森林を『よりよく利用』する」の4事例である。サバとサラワクが別々に章立てられているのは、それぞれ独立した州政府の制度のもとで森林が管理されているからである。木材ブームは、フィリピンにおいて1960年代初め、サバに

1960年代初め、インドネシア（外島）に1960年代後半、そしてサラワクに1960年代半ばの頃まで到来した。4事例の森林はすべて国有林であり、木材ブームによって森林の経済的価値が上昇したため、レント分配は伐採権の付与と伐採量の許可の形で行われた。仮説検証のための指標は、木材ブーム到来後、森林局長の職にあたる伐採権の付与者がどのように政治家の手に移ったか、ブーム前に持続的森林経営のための制度が確立した伐採量を超えて、政治家がどれほどこの伐採量許可を持たせて、さらに、森林生活の場とする先住民の権利を保障する法律をいつどのように改正したかである。また、木材ブームによって生じたレントは、 GMT愛される方法または社会的な影響力や信頼を高めることを目的にした。サラワクの場合も、1960年の選挙によって州首相の座にいたラマノ＝ヤクブが似たような方法を採用して自らの伐採権の付与権を直接的、排他的、任意的にもした。すなわち、林業大臣の兼任、広大な森林を管理するサラワク財団の設立とその他の州首相兼管、植民地時代に制定された森林法の改正、先住民の森林利用の大半の規制である。インドネシアの場合は、木材価格の上昇を見て、スカルトはもっとも州政府と地方の間の権限で対流伐採権の付与権を無効とした。森林の管理は形式的には森林長官のスジャルウィに委ねられていたが、実質はスカルトの支配のもとにあった。

第3の仮説に関しても、4事例でその妥当性が証明されたという。フィリピン、サバ、サラワクには、木材ブームが到来する以前に持続的な森林経営を行う国家の制度が存在した。もとくサバの森林制度は最もしっかりしていた。3事例ともに、森林は政治から自律した森林局によって管理さ
れており、伐採権の付与は森林官でもある森林局長の排他的なる権限であった。しかし、政治家のレントシーディングは森林局長の権限を奪った。サバとサラウクの根本、森林管理を州首相の直轄とするためにはサバ財団、サラウク財団が設立され、森林局の自律性は完全に失われた。フィリピン、サバ、サラウクともに、木材ブーム到来前に持続的な森林経営のために設定された伐採量水準は無視され、政治家によって年々その何倍もの伐採量が許可された。インドネシアの場合は、他の3事例のような森林を保全するための国家制度はもともと制定されていなかったが、森林を利用する先住民の生活を保証する慣習法（アダット）を法的に認めることで、非制度的に森林が保全されるしかが存在した。サバでも同様に、先住民の慣習的な森林利用は「复合植民時代に法的に認められた権利」であった。しかし、木材ブーム到来後、レントを最大限にしたい政治家によって事例例とこれからの法律は実質無効になった。4事例ともにレイヤリティーと税金は低く抑えられ、ブームによって生じたレントのほとんどは伐採権保有者の手に渡った。

第4の仮説は、証明するためのデータが不足しているために、検証するのはたいへん難しいが、しかし、この仮説を支持する証拠はあるという。戒厳令発令後のマルコスは、民主主義体制の歴代政権よりも長期的な視野をもって森林経営を行ったという。それは、それまでの伐採権の付与期間が4年以下と短期であったのに対し、10年という長期の伐採権の付与を行ったこと、さらに伐採速度を落とすために、原木輸出量を制限したことである。

1980年代初めから木材生産量は減少していった。スハルトの長期独裁政権では、伐採量は持続的伐採量をはるかに超えた他の3事例に比べて低かった。伐採権の付与期間も8年間と比較的長期に設定された。さらにインドネシアのほか、原木輸出の禁止措置をとった。マルコスもスハルトも長期政策を持てないで、選挙対策のために短期間にレントを分配する必要がなくなったことが木材生産量の減少を可能にしたといえる。

一方で、議院内閣制のサバとサラウクの政治家は選挙を免れることはできない。選挙に負ける危険が高まるとレント分配が速くなった。サバの場合、1980年代初めに許可された伐採量は持続的伐採量の4倍に及んだ。同様に、サラウクでも、1980年代中から1990年代初めにかけての伐採権が大幅に増加した。結果として、新しい政治家が選挙に勝った場合、旧政治家が持っていた複数の伐採権を承継できなくなり、新たな政治家が選挙に勝った場合、旧政治家が持っていた複数の伐採権を承継できなくなってしまう。
ランソワ・ネクトゥーの『熱帯林破壊と日本の木材貿易』（築地書館，XXX年）に、日本の商社が「政治的コネ」を利用して現地の木材会社に巨額の資金貸付を行い、それを早く回収しようとして伐採を急いだとする。木材ブームを享受した供給側だけではなく、需要側の分析も必要である。

また、著者がたてた4つの仮説について、第1，2，3の仮説については十分説得力があると思うが、第4仮説についてはどうだろうか。政治基盤が不安定な政治家はレント分配を急ぐという仮説はわかるとしても、対象に長期安定政権を確保した政治家は資源をゆっくりと使うという仮説は理論的にはそうかもしれないが、はたして実際にはそれが証明されたかどうかは疑問である。戒厳令発令後のフィリピンはもうすでに森林面積が減少しており、必然的に木材生産量は減少した。さらに森林保全のために原木輸出を全面禁止にするとしていながら、結局、実現しなかった。インドネシア、スハルト政権の場合は、石油という木材以上に外貨獲得に魅力的な資源があったことが、原木輸出禁止の措置を可能にしたのではないかと思う。著者も認めているように第4仮説を証明するのはたいへん難しいと思う。

以上のようないくつかの問題はあっても、本書はたいへん優れた研究論文だと思う。本書が優れ、説得的であることがゆえに残された熱帯林の将来を考えるとより憂鬱な気持ちになる。しかし、翻って、木材ブームがすでに去った東南アジア諸国を見てみると、コミュニティによる森林管理など環境コストを内部化するためのさまざまな取り組みが始まっている。私は、これからもそれらをひとつひとつ丹念に拾っていきたい。

（葉山アツコ・京都大学大学院アジア・アフリカ地域研究研究科）