


Book Review

Guy Trébuil; and Mahabub Hossain. *Le riz: Enjeux écologiques et économiques* [Rice: Ecological and Economic Challenges]. Paris: Belin, 2004, 265p.

This book, written by two researchers who are closely associated with the International Rice Research Institute (IRRI), presents a useful overview of the agroecology and political economy of rice, the world's most important grain crop. Although the coverage is global, rice in Southeast Asia receives special attention, reflecting the authors' extensive experience in that region. Because this volume is only available in French, and, therefore, is unlikely to find a wide readership among Southeast Asian area studies scholars, in this review I have attempted to summarize some of its main findings and conclusions, although also raising questions about a few problematic points.

The volume has seven chapters. The first chapter highlights the strategic role of rice in the global food economy. It is impossible to overstate the importance of this crop, which is planted on 152 million ha (one-tenth of all arable land) in 122 countries and is the staple food of 2.6 billion people, mostly Asians, who consume some 600 million tons of grain annually. Unlike wheat and maize, rice is mostly consumed in countries where it is produced—only 6% of the total crop is traded on the world market. Five countries (Thailand, Vietnam, China, the United States, and Pakistan) account for almost 75% of all exports. The shallowness of the market enhances price volatility so that it is predicted that a shortfall of 10% in supply would result in a doubling of price, threatening the welfare of millions of poor Asians. Not surprisingly, Asian governments are deeply committed to maintaining self-sufficiency in rice production, despite the fact that per capita consumption has been declining for

several decades in more prosperous countries. In less developed countries, however, both human populations and per capita rice consumption are still increasing, so that by 2025, even after allowing for continued changes in food habits, Asian farmers will need to produce one-quarter more rice than in 2001. This represents a huge challenge because the cultivated area per capita is expected to fall from 0.15 ha per person in 1995 to only 0.09 ha per person in 2025, the average annual rate of yield increase has fallen to 1.4% (compared to 2.2% during the Green Revolution years), production inputs, especially irrigation water and labor, are becoming scarcer and more expensive, and environmental constraints (e.g., declining soil quality, pest problems) are becoming more serious.

Chapter 2, which is illustrated with excellent maps and photographs, describes the four major rice ecosystems in the IRRI typology: Irrigated rice, rainfed lowland rice, upland rice, and deepwater rice. Irrigated rice occupies only 55% of the total global rice area but yields 75% of the crop. It is the dominant type in China, Indonesia, the Philippines, and Vietnam. Rainfed lowland rice occupies over one-third of the planted area but produces less than 20% of the crop. It is the dominant type in Burma, Cambodia, and Thailand, as well as large areas in Bangladesh, India, and the Philippines. Grown in non-irrigated banded fields that retain rainwater to keep the roots of the rice plants submerged, yields are highly variable due to unreliable rainfall and inability of the farmers to control water levels. Upland rice occupies 10% of the total global rice area but accounts for only 3% of production. It is the dominant rice ecosystem in Africa and Latin America but in Southeast Asia is now found primarily in remote mountain areas where slash and burn agriculture is still prevalent. Deepwater rice accounts for only 3% of total global production. It is a marginal system except in Bangladesh, Burma, and localized areas in Cambodia, Vietnam, and Thailand.

Chapter 3 directly challenges the widely held belief among social scientists that the environmental and economic impacts of the Green Revolution have been mostly negative, with particularly adverse consequences for the rural poor. The authors argue quite the contrary position: in their view the Green Revolution prevented mass famine by producing the vast quantity of grain desperately needed to feed rapidly expanding populations. Nor, contrary to the expectations of many of its early critics, did it lead to the economic polarization of rural societies or differentially favor large farmers over small ones because, in practice, Green Revolution technology has turned out to be essentially scale neutral. Even landless hired workers saw an increased demand for their labor. The authors conclude that the positive benefits of the Green Revolution to small peasants, sharecroppers, agricultural laborers, and poor urban consumers have greatly exceeded its costs.

Their assessment of the environmental impacts of the Green Revolution is also largely positive. While acknowledging that widespread planting of high-yielding semi-dwarf rice varieties (HYVs) has caused environmental degradation due to excessive application of chemical fertilizers and pesticides, the authors suggest that the condition of the environment would have been much worse without the Green Revolution because farmers would have had to bring 40 million additional ha of marginal, easily eroded land under cultivation to meet the need of rapidly growing populations for grain. That seems to me to be a valid conclusion but I find their assertion that, “the observed facts do not accord. . . with the received wisdom according to which the Green Revolution, by its very nature, has reduced the diversity of genetic resources present in Asian rice fields” (p. 91) to be more problematic. It is true, as they point out, that since IR8 was decimated by brown plant hopper outbreaks in the 1970s, IRRI and national research centers in several Asian countries have generated thousands of new varieties, thus broadening the genetic base and reducing vul-

nerability to pests and diseases. But these new varieties have mostly been planted in the lowland irrigated areas. I am not sure that this fully compensates for the almost complete loss of local varieties in the many small-scale irrigated rice ecosystems in the uplands of Southeast Asia, such as in Vietnam’s northern mountain region, where ethnic minority farmers have almost totally abandoned local varieties in favor of planting a very few HYVs. The authors also make the interesting claim that genetic diversity is actually lower in lowland rainfed rice ecosystems (that have been largely untouched by IRRI varieties) than in the irrigated zones, where IRRI varieties are now dominant. For example, they claim that only two “traditional aromatic varieties” now occupy several million ha of rainfed fields in Northeast Thailand where more than 3,000 local varieties were planted until the 1980s. While they are correct in claiming that only two varieties (RD6 and KDML105) are now grown on a large scale, these are not, or are no longer, “traditional” varieties. KDML105 is a genetically homogeneous variety produced by the Thai government through “pure line selection,” while RD6 is a glutinous mutant of KDML105, produced by irradiation.

Chapter 4 is devoted to discussion of current problems affecting the different types of rice ecosystems and Chapter 5 lays out some possible solutions. Attention is focused on irrigated rice and lowland rainfed rice ecosystems because the authors believe these are the systems that have the greatest potential for improvement. Little attention is paid to deepwater and upland rice ecosystems, which they think have much less potential for development. Deepwater rice is rapidly disappearing as higher value uses are found for the limited area currently used for this low yielding crop. Upland rice is also perceived to be rapidly declining in importance as the formerly subsistence economies of the mountain areas are integrated into the market system and farmers exploit the comparative advantages of their environment to produce higher value vegetable and

fruit crops for lowland markets. In my view, however, this is an overly optimistic view. Certainly, in those upland areas fortunate enough to enjoy good road links to urban centers, such as in Northern Thailand, farmers fare much better by producing temperate crops for sale to the lowlands than they would if they persisted in planting hill rice, but in large parts of Laos and Vietnam, where markets are rudimentary and transportation systems lacking, farmers are forced to continue planting upland rice even though yields have fallen to pathetic levels. This is a problem that will not go away anytime soon yet relatively little research is focused on improving yields of hill rice.

Irrigated rice, although it is far and away the most productive rice ecosystem, faces many serious problems, including: (1) All of the easy gains in productivity have already been achieved with the gap between the best yields achievable at IRRI and actual yields obtained by farmers falling from 4 t/ha in the 1960s to 1.2 t/ha now; (2) Lowland rice fields are being converted to urban and industrial uses, reducing the productive area. In Java alone, 30,000 ha are being taken out of production each year, an area that would produce enough grain to feed 800,000 persons; (3) The agricultural labor force is shrinking as young rural people migrate to cities, raising labor costs and forcing adoption of mechanization and broadcast seeding in place of transplanting; (4) Water for irrigation is becoming scarcer and more expensive as urban and industrial consumers compete with farmers for limited supplies of clean water; (5) Use of chemical fertilizer and pesticides is wasteful and inefficient, raising costs and degrading the environment. (Because 50 to 70% of nitrogen fertilizer is not taken up by the rice plants, to increase yields by 25% farmers would need to double N application to 400 kg/ha! The cost of pesticides now exceeds their benefits yet only 5% of rice fields employ integrated pest management); and (6) The soil-water complex is displaying signs of "fatigue" in intensively cultivated areas

with IRRI experimental plots recording yield declines of 35% in the last 25 years due to loss of soil organic matter and depletion of micronutrients. There are no easy solutions for any of these problems but the authors do see new hybrid varieties as having the potential to considerably boost yields. One experimental Chinese "super-hybrid" produced almost 18 t/ha, while an IRRI hybrid of Japonica and Indica gives yields of 13–14 t/ha.

It is lowland rainfed rice that the authors believe has the greatest potential for increasing production. The average yield of lowland rainfed rice was scarcely affected by the Green Revolution, increasing from 1.4 to 1.8 t/ha between 1964 and 1991 so that, on average, farmers achieve only 45% of the yield potential of rainfed rice (compared to the 70% of yield potential obtained with irrigated rice). Breeding of drought resistant varieties that can reduce inter-annual yield variability and limit the risk of crop failure is seen as a long-term solution, but one that has so far eluded plant breeders. The authors hold out the hope that application of biotechnology may produce better results but not for another decade or more. In the shorter term, however, there are no magic bullets to be found because the spatial heterogeneity and temporal variability that characterize rainfed zones necessitate very localized and small-scale innovations in soil, water, and crop management to improve yields. Unfortunately, the existing system of rice research described in Chapter 6 does not appear well suited to conduct such localized work. IRRI, which is by its very nature a centralized research institution, has suffered the loss of one-third of its budget in the past 10 years, reducing its ability to implement location specific projects. The majority of IRRI's budget is still allocated to research on irrigated rice with rainfed lowland rice receiving only one-quarter of the total. In any case the main burden must be borne by the national rice research institutions but these remain largely dominated by breeders and short of social scientists able to effectively imple-

ment on-farm investigations. Although the number of qualified researchers has increased significantly over the past 20 years in the Philippines, Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam, it has actually decreased in Thailand (which, despite its relative prosperity, supports only 14 scientists per million ha of rice fields, compared to 53 scientists per million ha in the Philippines).

The final chapter examines changes in supply and demand over the past four decades and considers the challenge that demographic growth in the next two decades poses for food security in Asia. The challenge is a daunting one. Asian demand for rice is projected to reach 650 million tons by 2025 (compared to 542 million tons harvested in the region in 2001). Can Asian farmers increase production fast enough to meet this need? The authors suggest that decentralization of rice research systems to bring scientists into closer contact with farmers in specific agroecological zones can lead to major productivity gains in lowland rainfed rice ecosystems, but, in view of past failures to significantly improve yields in these intrinsically variable and high risk systems, I find it difficult to fully share their optimism. Regardless of such questions, however, this book makes an important contribution to our understanding of the multiple ecological and economic challenges facing rice cultivation in the twenty-first century. It is to be hoped that it will become available soon in English translation to make the information it contains accessible to a much wider readership in Asian countries.

(A. Terry Rambo · Khon Kaen University and East-West Center)

* * *

Keith Foulcher; and Tony Day, eds. *Clearing a Space: Postcolonial Readings of Modern Indonesian Literature*. Leiden: KITLV Press, 2002, viii + 381p.

The editors of this volume, Keith Foulcher and Tony Day, observe that because the “national literature” of Indonesia is not written in the language of a former colonizer, it has become somewhat more difficult for this body of works to enter the canon of postcolonial theory and practice. This collection, made up of essays the majority of which are of great interest and of the highest quality, attempts to fill this gap. Among these, the contributions of Doris Jedamski which analyzed the Indonesian translations of *Robinson Crusoe*, the *Count of Monte Cristo* and *Sherlock Holmes* and of Melani Budianta which dealt with the representation of “money culture” in the relatively obscure novel *Tjerita Boedjang Bingueng* represent pioneering efforts both in terms of subject matter and method. The close textual analyses of Marco Kartodikromo’s novel *Mataharia* by Paul Tickell, the astute reflections on language and Malay writing by Henk Maier, the rigorous and innovative study of Abdoel Moeis’ novel *Salah asoehan* by Thomas Hunter and the excellent study on the national *lingua franca* and figures of intimacy and isolation by Day are all brilliant and inspiring. These are able to combine a thorough and rigorous grasp of their subject matter with a confidently creative theoretical perspective. These studies executed with much aplomb are also able to dispel any prior misgivings that this collection of essays may just represent an effort to hitch a ride on the post-colonialist bandwagon.

This volume is an excellent and convincing introduction to the main themes and problems of postcolonialism as these may be relevant to Indonesia and other similar contexts. Despite the depth and richness of many of the individual contributions, perhaps the best way to grasp this collection of the essays as a whole would be to take a closer look at the most contentious and contrary of

them all, namely Will Derks' essay "Sastra pedalan: Local and regional literary centres in Indonesia." Derks' provocative essay begins by criticizing the tendency of modern literary scholarship in Indonesia of inappropriately privileging the novel within the "Indonesian literary system" and proposes a greater recognition of the strong orientation towards orality of the Indonesian literary system "as a whole." To begin with, it is indeed striking that 8 out of the 13 essays in this volume deal with novels. Derks accordingly criticized what he considers the over-emphasis on the works of Pramoedya Ananta Toer in particular whom he considers a "marginal" phenomenon which "does not tell us much" about the "Indonesian literary tradition in general." Although poems and short stories, as Derks explains, "are preponderant in the orally oriented literary system of Indonesia," these orally-oriented genres have nevertheless not received the same importance and attention that the Indonesian novel has from Western scholarship. Indeed, the only piece in this collection which dealt at any length with poetry is the evocative essay by Goenawan Mohamad. Foulcher himself, the co-editor of the collection, is taken to task for not according poetry its proper significance in his other writings. Though Derks would probably not disagree with the results of Henk Maier, who pointed out the persistence of centripetal energies and the "inconclusive play between orality and literacy" especially in Pramoedya's early works of fiction, he would probably still dispute the overall contribution of the "stream of commentaries" on Pramoedya's novels at arriving at what he deems as a real understanding of modern Indonesian literature. In spite of the plausibility of Derks' emphasis on orality in understanding contemporary Indonesian literature, he is undoubtedly going too far in asserting that the work of Pramoedya constitutes an "alien element in modern Indonesian literature." This expressed attitude could be likened to that of a foreigner who having formed such a clear and unequivocal image of what

he understands to be the "native culture" of Indonesia bemoans and even resents the very existence of Indonesians he considers to be Westernized or of those, who in his view, have stepped beyond the acceptable boundaries of what he considers as making up "their culture." One should also add that the reason why Pramoedya's novels were banned in Indonesia under the New Order regime was precisely because these were charged with being infused with an "alien" ideology. Derks' notion that he is in possession of the "intrinsic" criteria and "horizons of expectations" which unproblematically belong or should belong to the "Malay World" betrays an affinity to the aggressive colonizing mentality which permitted the Dutch colonial regime to arrogate upon itself the task of *teaching* the Indonesians how to write and speak what they considered "good and correct Indonesian" by means of such institutions as the Balai Poestaka. (Cf. Henk Maier's essay in this collection.) Pramoedya's weakness in Derks' view is that he, and perhaps others like him, has not conformed enough to what Derks, as a Western scholar of Indonesian culture of some repute, considers as constituting "good and correct Indonesian" orally-oriented literature. Against this, it should be stressed that novels in the Indonesian language are just as much "facts" of the Indonesian literary system as the alternative literary journals from the regions which make up the main focus of Derks' essay. One may well concede that these works are indeed elitist and marginal in terms of overall effect, but it would be excessive and illogical to brand them as "alien" cultural products. Ward Keeler's contribution falls into a similar trap of reifying what he had observed as Indonesian "hierarchical" behavior and of sentimentally idealizing "Western egalitarianism." He recommends "ridding ourselves" of "polarized thinking" in order to develop a certain degree of tolerance towards such distasteful behavior on the part of the Indonesians, all the while inexorably and repeatedly enacting one ver-

sion of this self-same dichotomous structure in his own unreflective “us” versus “them” rhetoric. This dichotomy is strikingly evident in such sentences as “if . . . *we* could accept with equanimity such qualities as androgyny and passivity, then *we* might overcome the need to find exemplars of autonomy in the people in subordinate positions with whom *we* meet.” (my italics. — RG) With some reservations, Foulcher’s point of view on this matter is generally more acceptable than those of Derks and Keeler and allows for a more sophisticated analytical approach. According to Foulcher, “colonial culture exists not in binary opposition to the culture over which it exerts its control; rather, it engages in a process of increasing imbrication with them. From the struggles that ensue within that imbrication come the ‘increasingly uncertain patchwork identities’ that — we might argue — are the mark of an emerging postcolonial culture.” The rigidly totalizing contrast between the “Western literary system” on the one hand, and the “Malay literary system” on the other, is simply not a viable theoretical position. What is and is not “Indonesian,” what does or does not belong to *the Dunia Melayu* is something for the Indonesians themselves to decide, and more importantly, it is also something that they necessarily live out and create every day of their lives.

Derks is the most adamant among all the writers included in the anthology in rejecting the relevance of applying the “postcolonial template” to Indonesia. In his view, the postcolonial approach just as much as the traditional approaches, tends to presuppose fundamental similarities between the literary systems of the former Western colonial powers and their erstwhile colonies. According to Derks, “the horizon of expectations in a postcolonial literature, be it from India, the Caribbean, or Africa, is basically similar to a Western one.” Among the elements which he names as comprising the postcolonialist Western “horizon of expectations” are “the postulation of a single, hegemonic centre, the emphasis on the printed work (especially in book

form), the preponderance of the genre of the novel, the assumption of stability and tangibility, and an outlook restricted to national boundaries.” Derks then explains the anomalous “uniqueness” of Indonesia in comparison with the other countries which had been studied through the postcolonial lens by pointing out that “Indonesia is the only ex-colony in modern history where the colonizer did not impose his language.” According to him, this led to the dominance of the Indonesian language which in turn resulted in its speakers ending up being isolated and limited in their “reception of Western modernity.” On this point, Derks is both factually wrong and too sweeping in his conclusions. The Spanish “frailocracy” in the Philippines, for example, like the Dutch colonial regime in Indonesia, also did not impose the Spanish language on the population during its three centuries of domination over the islands. And although the Philippines did indeed subsequently experience enforced Americanization under the American colonial regime, it would nevertheless be somewhat too hasty to conclude from this fact that the “horizon of expectations” of contemporary postcolonial literature in the Philippines had become “basically similar to a Western one.” Whose “horizon of expectations” are these anyway? Defining this has never been a clear and uncontested matter and, most likely, the same holds for India, the Caribbean and Africa. Only a careless student of comparative literature would hazard such a conclusion based on the outwardly manifest “Americanization” of the Philippines without any sufficient investigation into the actual material. In addition, it is also highly doubtful whether postcolonialism *per se*, despite its own apparent limitations, flaws and even eurocentrism is inherently bound to the presuppositions which Derks has attributed to it. The other essays in the collections propose varied understandings of postcolonialism which differ among themselves but generally contradict Derks’ rather narrow and unsubstantiated reading of what constitutes the theory of postcolo-

Book Review

nialism. Among these are interpretations of post-colonialism as the celebration of heterogeneity (Maier, Day, Tickell), foregrounding of hybridity (Foulcher, Hunter, Tickell, Jedamski, Budianta, Mohamad), recuperation of the marginal (Hatley, Budianta, Jedamski), and privileging of the micro-narrative (Clark).

On the other hand, Derks' insistence on the dismantling of the Jakarta-centric bias of Indonesia literary studies and emphasis on the value of giving adequate attention to alternative centres of cultural and literary production are laudable. One cannot but agree with him that "modern Indonesian literature is a heterogeneous, multi-centered literature" and also that "Jakarta is just one of the centres that contribute to a larger totality." In fact, the most evident but unacknowledged point of agreement between Derks' viewpoint and that of postcolonialism as understood by most of the other contributors in this collection is his insistence on the inherent heterogeneity of Indonesian literary production as opposed both to the disciplinary regime of the colonial state and the dominant ideologies of the Indonesian nation-state. This concern, for example, is shared by Michael Bodden who cites Nirwan Dewanto's view that "culture is created by 'little units' (*satuan-satuan kecil*) operating in a wide variety of locations" in contrast to the "privileging of the unified nation state as the ultimate and logical frame for cultural production." However, because of his exclusive focus on Indonesian literature in Malay, Derks completely ignores contemporary literary production in the languages of the regions. In contrast to this absence, Day's fascinating discussion on the problems introduced into Indonesian national literature by the relationship between the languages of the regions and Indonesian Malay offers very interesting theoretical perspectives on this issue. Although Day might also be read as implying that a properly "national" literature can only be written in Indonesian, his set of oppositions distinguishing between language as a "tool of com-

munication" and an expression of "isolation" or as a means towards a "sense of community" and a feeling of "intimacy" are quite enlightening and carry much potential.

Derks' contribution on the "sastra pedalaman" is indeed an important and timely one, but his impatient dismissal of postcolonialism based on certain preconceptions which may turn out not to be all that accurate does not seem to be a very constructive position. The other essays in this volume, which have creatively made use of and even transformed postcolonial ideas and theories for their own ends, demonstrate that a critical and creative reception of postcolonial theory in this area of study is both possible and eminently desirable.

(Ramon Guillermo · Dept. of Filipino and Philippine Literature, University of the Philippines)

Hjorleifur Jonsson. *Mien Relations: Mountain People and State Control in Thailand*. Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 2005, xiv + 198p.

「こういう本が欲しかった」。これが本書を手に取り、ばらばらとめくったときの第一印象である。本書はタイ山地民のひとつであるミエン（またはヤオ）の人々が、歴史を通じてどのように外部世界との関係を切り結び、それがいかにミエンとしてのアイデンティティを規定してきたかについて考察したものである。

本書の構成は全7章からなる。序章ではまず、本書を貫く理論的立場が述べられる。それは、現代のミエン社会におけるアイデンティティ形成の磁場が、ナショナルあるいはグローバルな政治経済の文脈に分かち難く結びつけられていること、しかもそれは20世紀後半の近代化過程で突然そうなった（それまでは孤立した伝統社会であった）のではなく、歴史を通じ一貫してそうであったことを示すというものである。

次に第1章で取り扱われるのは、前近代国家における山地やその住民の位置づけについてである。前近代国家においては文明は王都の中心から放射

されるのに対し、周縁の山地ないし森は文明に対置すべき野蛮なる空間であった。そして王国の外部に位置する山地の住民は、一定の条件下に納税や用役の免除あるいは指導者への称号の付与が認められていた。空間と人間の双方を階層的に整序するのが前近代国家の統合原理であり、山地やその住民はそのなかで特殊な地位を与えられていたわけである。前近代における山地住民は、国家と無縁な孤立した民族集団ではなく、むしろ朝貢関係のなかでの一種の身分カテゴリーとして位置づけられた存在であった。

第2章では、20世紀に生じた山地住民の位置づけの変化が論じられる。タイ国が近代国家として再編成されるに伴い、かつての山地・平地関係を成り立たせていた朝貢関係は解消された。それに代えて持ち込まれたのが人種用語による人間分類であり、その結果として従来の身分カテゴリーは人種ないし民族集団として読み替えられていった。しかも山地の住民は外国に起源をもつ（たとえばミエン／ヤオの場合は中国）人種だということになったため、近代国民国家としてのタイ国家（「タイ人種」の国）における正当な権利を持たぬ「内なる他者」として位置づけられることになった。こうして見出された山地住民は近代の対極にある存在と規定されただけではなく、さらに20世紀後半には、その独自の生活様式（特に焼畑耕作）自体が国家への脅威とみなされるようになり、その改変を通じて国民国家や資本主義経済に同化させることが政府の目標となっていく。こうした山地をめぐる言説の形成には、行政官のみならずタイ国外の人類学者もまた関与してきた。

第3章では、従来の民族誌がミエン社会の特徴とみなしてきた「世帯中心性 household centrality」が、民族の不変の本質ではなく20世紀半ばの特殊な政治・経済的文脈の産物であったことが論じられる。農業生産や饗宴の主催をめぐる世帯間競争に中心的価値をおく「世帯中心性」は、朝貢関係の消滅を受けて山地の軍事指導者の統制力が弱まり、各世帯の自律性が高まった結果として生じたものである。しかもこの、多額の投資を必要とする競争に参加できるのは、実際には富裕層に限られている。これまでの先行研究は、この特殊な一

時的傾向にすぎぬものを、その歴史的、政治的文脈から切り離して過剰に一般化してきたのみならず、富裕層の声のみを特権化して貧困層の存在を抹殺してきたと著者は批判する。

第4章では、現在のミエンにおけるアイデンティティ形成が論じられる。20世紀後半には、政府による焼畑の規制により、「世帯中心性」を成り立たせていた条件が失われていく。そこでは20世紀半ばにみられた世帯の拡大競争に代わり、文化フェアや運動会などが新たなミエン・アイデンティティ表出の場となっている。そこにみられる特徴とは、これらイベントの実施単位が国家行政の末端を構成する村落や村の学校であること、資金協力や観客、来賓としての参加を通じて外部からの関与が顕著であること、国旗の掲揚や国歌の斉唱などによる国家への忠誠表明が主要モチーフとなっていることなどである。ここにおいて人々にとっての文化は、世帯など小規模社会集団の内部に向けられたものから、国家を舞台に演者と観客とを巻き込みつつ実演するものへと変容していく。

第5章で取り扱われるのは、著者の調査時に村で起こったある事件である。これは調査地の一部が森林局によって野生動物保護区に指定されたために木の伐採や狩猟、あるいは恒久施設の建造（たとえば学校や道路）が不可能になってしまい、さらに森林局の役人によって不法な抑圧がくり返されたことへの抗議として、村人たちが保護区に建てられた森林局の施設に集団で放火したという事件である。この事件とそれに引き続く行政側との話し合いの過程を通じ、村人たちは自分たちこそが法秩序や民主主義を尊重する存在であり、反対に森林局の側は法をねじ曲げて住民の権利を不当に剥奪しているとの主張を展開する。そこでは人々は、近代法治国家の語彙を採用し、自らを模範的市民として演出することで、山地での権利をめぐる交渉を国家とのあいだに行っている。

以上を受けて結論の章では、ミエンの人々にとってのアイデンティティは、歴史を通じ一貫して国家権力との関わりによって規定されてきたこと、またそれは常に山地における権利や地位の承認を主題としてきたことが論じられる。ただし、そうした関係のありかたは、歴史的条件の変化に応じ

Book Review

て異なるかたちをとってきたのであり、その過程は現在も進行中である。その一例として、この章の後半では前章での放火事件の後日談がくり返される。それはある村人が、民主主義体制下であっても人々の剥奪状況が改善されないことへの憤懣について、こんなことなら豚にでも投票させた方がましだと言いつつ放ったという一幕である。「世帯中心性」の基盤がすでに失われ、森林での権利を国家と争っている状況においては、豚による選挙制度の揶揄の方が（豚をつぶした）祖先祭祀よりも有効であると著者は述べ、特定の文化要素のみを一般化して時間を越えた民族の本質を抽出する方法を批判し、政治的文脈との関わりのなかでミエン・アイデンティティの歴史の変遷をとらえるアプローチの妥当性を改めて主張する。

以上が評者なりの本書の要約である。評者個人としては、本書の試みは基本線において支持しうると考えている。これまでタイ山地民研究が暗黙の前提としていたのは、1960年代の民族誌に描かれた情景が、その民族の数百年来の伝統であるとする根拠のない思いこみであった。タイ国が山地民の南下移住経路の末端に位置するという単純な事実を思い起こすだけでも、この前提のあやうさがよくわかるであろう。もちろん現在の山地社会は、かつての人類学者が期待したような伝統社会ではない。この現実に対応するために研究者が積み重ねてきたのは、簡単に言えば国民統合が伝統社会をいかに変容させるかという視点からのアプローチであった。この場合、今述べたような怪しげな前提は議論の出発点として、手つかずのまま温存されてしまうことになる。

議論が出だしからつまづいてしまうことを避けるには、国民統合政策の開始以前に遡って社会変化の過程を跡づけることが必要となる。しかしそうすると今度は、現在の民族集団を過去に投影した上で、その通時的一貫性を論証してみせるというあべこべの論法に陥る危険が生じる。本書の最大の独創性は、このジレンマに陥ることを巧みに回避しつつ論理整合性の高い議論を展開している点にあるといえる。ここで著者が採用しているのは、山地社会と国家権力との関係設定の論理それ自体に着目するという手法である。この手法を採

用することで、ミエンという範疇が山地社会と国家との相互交渉の歴史を通じて存在し続けてきたことを論じつつ、しかも個々の局面に応じてこのミエンという記号が意味内容を大幅に変化させてきたことを説得的に提示することが可能になっている。

本書の価値のもうひとつは、運動会や文化イベントなどといった要素を積極的に分析の俎上に取り入れていることである。タイ山地のフィールドでこれらが行事としての重要性を増していることを実感しながら、しかしそれをどう扱ってよいかわからず手を拱いていた研究者は、評者のほかにも数多く存在するだろう。フィールドの現実には分析語彙が追いついていないわけである。本書はこの落差を埋める試みだといえることができるが、それはただ単に事例の新しさだけをもって読者を威嚇するというレベル（そういう研究はしばしば見られる）にとどまるものではない。これらの新しい事例もまた、山地・平地関係を規定するパラダイムの歴史的变化という本書全体の主題に接続されることで、議論の奥行きを深めている。

「こういう本が欲しかった」という冒頭の感想は、おおむね以上の理由によっている。ただし個々の各論については疑問も多い。論旨全体に関わる点について述べれば、祖先祭祀や勲功祭宴が「世帯中心性」に固有の特徴だという主張ははたしてどの程度妥当だろうか。もし「世帯中心性」が20世紀半ばの特殊な状況の産物であるならば、これらの儀礼もまた同時期に突然出現したと想定せざるを得ない。しかしながら本書第3章では、「世帯中心性」の確立に先立つ時期においても、世帯単位の祖先祭祀が人々の社会生活のなかで重要な意味を担っていたと明確に述べられている（p. 79）。ならば祖先祭祀は「世帯中心性」に随伴する現象ではない。しかしそうだとすると、焼畑の規制が「世帯中心性」の基盤を破壊し、その必然的結果として祖先祭祀が意味を失うという本書の図式は根本的に再考が必要となる。このあたりは、従来の先行研究が描いてきた伝統文化像への対決を急ぐあまり、過剰な図式化が先行してしまっているように思われる部分である。

そのほかにも、著者の問題意識が一種の気負い

となることで、不用意な断定や極端な誇張を帰結している箇所がまみられる。たとえば、ミエンの運動会や文化イベントは学校単位で生徒を組織・動員するため、学校のない村の成員はそうしたイベントが描きだす社会空間から排除されてしまうと第4章では述べられている (pp. 111-112)。ならば学校のない村の子供は就学できないのかという疑問が生じるが、次章 (pp. 133-134) にはそうした村では子供たちが隣村への徒歩通学で非常に苦勞しているという記述が登場する。何のことはない、学校のない村の子供は単に他村の学校に通えばよいというだけのことなのである。そうであるならば、文化イベントを通じたミエン・アイデンティティの表出は学校の有無によって成員資格をあらかじめ選別しているのだという断定は少々不用意である。また、儀礼面での世帯間競合への言及が一部の金持ち文化のみを特権化し貧困層を民族誌から排除してきたという上述の批判も、

いささかの外れではないか。財産の浪費を伴う勲功祭宴が金持ち文化に属するのは、その定義に照らして自明なことである。そうした儀礼的浪費への指向性が存在するのであれば、その事実に言及すること自体は批判に当たらない。

これらは些細な点ではあるが、こうした誇張が重なるにつれ議論全体の信頼度が少しずつ損なわれていくのは残念なことである。本書の価値を十全に引き出し、その問題提起を生産的に継承するためには、著者の気負いに由来するであろう細部の歪みを見逃すまたは補正し、議論のエッセンスを抽出する必要がある。もっとも、それだけの作業を行う値打ちはじゅうぶんにあると評者は考えている。特にこれまでのタイ山地民研究に飽きたらぬものを感じていた読者にとっては、かっこのたたき台となる一冊である。

(片岡 樹・目白大学等非常勤講師)