

業主導型の金融発展パターンを同定した。情報生産機能を担う主体に着目した本書のアプローチがどこまで適格性をもつものであるかの追求は始まったばかりであり、個別経路について理論と実証の両面で分析の深化を図る余地はまだ大きいと思われる。政策金融主導型にしる、外資企業主導型にしる、それらが国内金融システム機能の発展を妨げたがゆえにアジア経済危機を招いたのであるか。政策金融主導型金融発展では国内工業部門が自立したが、外資企業主導型ではそれが難しいように思われるが、それは各々の今後の金融発展にどのような含意を持つものだろうか。本書の著者らの今後の研究成果がこれらの論点の解明にヒントを与えてくれることを期待したい。

(高阪 章・大阪大学大学院国際公共政策研究科)

Mikael Gravers, ed. *Exploring Ethnic Diversity in Burma*. Copenhagen: Nordic Institute of Asian Studies, 2007, xx + 283p., maps, tables, photos.

A well-informed academic volume such as this on ethnicity in Burma has been much needed, and any audience will find the chapters richly informative and many of them stimulating. Most of the papers probe the process through which ethnonyms and ethnic categories have been formulated, especially since colonial times, though for some groups from the period immediately preceding British entry and for others more recently. Originating in a conference held in Sweden in 2002, the book overall provides well-contextualized information on the historical formation of ethnic categories and classifications. The volume leads us to question some taken-for-granted and essentialized ethnic categories, and readers will be prompted to consider alternative possibilities for negotiating the diversity that characterizes Burma.

There will be two, no doubt overlapping, types of audience for this book: the academic audience interested in politics and ethnicity, es-

pecially in Burma, and the audience concerned mainly with the current political situation in Burma. The editor certainly has both types of reader in mind, a policy I think is admirable for a volume on such a topic. However, it is possible that the use of terms specific to academic theorizing on ethnicity may put off some in the latter audience, while a few among the former might find some of the politically situated assertions too forward and partial. An exercise of probing into ethnic category formation in Burma can never be apolitical, and there is inevitable variety in the tone adopted by each author regarding the regime.

As editor, Gravers sets the academic tone in the introduction (chapter 1). On the one hand, he asserts the importance of contextualizing and historicizing ethnic categories and ethnonyms, including how they have become instruments of identity politics, and of recognizing how primordialism, which supports the apparent givenness of ethnic categories, is itself historically constructed. On the other hand, Gravers recognizes that ethnic categories are an essential part of the way people imagine their place in the world and the way they reflect upon their position, as in a “modernist cosmology.” In other words, ethnicity is a tool of the ruling hegemonic power, but at the same time a tool for those who must position themselves within the system founded by that power. The volume, as set out in this introduction, is an attempt to look at these two aspects in interaction. Most papers accomplish this through examining the interplay of various actors and relationships, including on-the-ground practices of those who bear the ethnonyms themselves.

Unfortunately, there is one important gap. While there are papers dealing with the Chin, Kachin, Karen, Kayah/Karenni, Mon, and Shan as large categories, and while nationalism in Burma constitutes the implicit background of

most discussion, the editor has left out the issue of the ethnic term “Burman,” the ethnonym of the majority. If ethnonyms of the minority are historical constructions formulated in relational situations, then their emergence should be analysed and understood in relation to the consolidation of the category “Burman.”

Mandy Sadan’s chapter 2 is a cogent and articulate paper on the formation of the Kachin category. Sadan is strongly aware that such analytical probing and de-essentializing of ethnic categories might undermine the nationalist intentions of Kachin elites. Analytical emphasis on diversity among what is considered a solid ethnic group may even be of use to the regime, giving support to its efforts to divide and rule. While this could be a dilemma in dealing with ethnic politics anywhere, the problem could not be more acute than in the case of Burma. Yet, Sadan correctly points out that abandoning the effort would give free rein to the essentializing of ethnic categories by all parties. Conscious of the positioning of research and writing in the midst of ongoing political negotiations regarding ethnicity, Sadan emphasizes the primary importance of decolonizing ethnic diversity. The paper therefore attempts to construct a model for understanding ethnicity that falls between ethnicity as political mobilization and ethnicity as primordialism. The question is—and this question applies to and is posed by many other papers in the volume—where minority elders take the lead in consolidating ethnic categories and their contents, how can we acknowledge diversity in a way that does not simply mimic and repeat the hegemonic essentializing of top-down categories?

Sandra Dudley’s chapter 3 is a study of the far more recent construction of the category of Karenni and Karenni-ness in the setting of border refugee camps. Here, the effects of not only displacement, but generational difference

and contacts with international agencies come to the fore. The border provides access to social space outside the territorial nation-state and to a transnational situation of displacement; at the same time it offers an opportunity to relativize one’s experience inside the border. This is a situation shared by many of the ethnic groups analysed in this volume.

In chapter 4, Chit Hlaing (F. K. Lehman) reflects on the origins of the Kayah category, while providing a cognitive solution to the question of why, despite generalized awareness of ethnicity as a political construct, some scholars and social actors still associate ethnicity with culture. Another issue taken up by this (and Gravers’) chapter is the relationship between state-hegemony and native agents, in which primordialism is implanted by the state and taken up by minority agents.

Using the term Burmanization (defined as the process whereby the Bamar have politically and culturally influenced the Shan) and Shanization (referring to processes of preservation and revitalization of their own culture and the formation of a collective identity under the pressures of Burmanization), Takatani (chapter 7) points out that Shan efforts to research and preserve their own culture has resulted in the crystallization of “culture” and “Shan-ness.” Both Takatani and Chit Hlaing refer to ways in which culture is mobilized and stabilized in the process of marking difference under hegemonic rule. It is not only the regime that essentializes but the minorities themselves, by constructing their own culture in response to the regime’s policy.

As Gravers states in his own chapter 9, Christianity in Burma has always been associated with the non-Buddhist minorities, such as the Kachin and Karen, as part of the process of opposition and confrontation with the Burmese. Focusing on the Karen, this chapter discusses the much politicized historical relationship be-

tween ethnicity, religion, and nationalism. Through a well-informed analysis of the Buddhist and millennialist tendencies among the Karen, Gravers demonstrates that the question is never as simple as the generally propagated opposition between minority Christians and majority Buddhists. Lian Sakhong (chapter 8), himself a Christian Chin in exile, examines Chin Christianity in relation to identity, Chin nationalism, and the ongoing conflict. After examining the Chin ethnonym using historical and oral sources, the author discusses how Christianity was indigenized among the Chin and how its indigenization and growth provided a means of preserving Chin identity and promoting Chin interests in the face of powerful forces of change. Of all the minorities among whom Christians constitute a significant portion, the degree of inseparability between ethnic identity and Christianity is undoubtedly the strongest among the Chin.

In chapter 5, Karin Dean discusses the physical as well as symbolic and social space of the Kachin, a topic that resonates with Gravers' paper on the Karen. Both Kachin-land and the Karen's Kawthoolei are disconnected spaces that do not refer to a distinct, contiguous geographical area but rather to a symbolic space. Dean points out how social spaces cut across territorial boundaries, while the territorialities themselves allow no coherent locale in which Kachin constitute a majority. It is doubtful that the Kachin can in fact "contest" the state's territorial boundaries as Dean claims, but it must also be true that the demonstrated cross-cutting relationships and practices indeed undermine and weaken state boundaries.

Ashley South's chapter 6, with its unresolved mixture of hope and despair, addresses the possibilities of opening space towards a civil society in Burma in the context of the Mon ethnic movement, which the author character-

izes as just as power-ridden and hierarchical as the regime. South claims to explore new forms of state-society relationships, but aside from passing reference to international NGO work, it is not clear what is meant by the re-emergence of civil society networks in ethnic minority areas, which she suggests might contribute to political transition in Burma. Whether this is overly optimistic or there is indeed foundation for hope, we cannot fathom from the chapter.

Other chapters, too, such as those by Dudley and Gravers, refer to the current involvement of transnational communities, information networks, international agencies, and a turn among ethnic leaders away from the discourse of ethnic rights and towards a discourse of democracy and federalism. Yet since 1988, the regime has resorted to claiming the existence of 135 ethnic groups as a basis for asserting nationalism and cultural Myanmarization and undermining the political power of the seven larger ethnic categories (p. 5). What indeed would be the image of a democratic state and true recognition of diversity? What is the viable alternative? This is the crucial question that, through the weaving together of hope and despair, this volume poses, providing its readers with well-informed description and analysis as food for thought.

There are many points that resonate among the chapters. Gravers lays out the questions in the introduction, and many of the points raised in his own chapter are shared by others. However, since each chapter delves into the rich thickets of ethnic history, the volume would be far more readable to a diverse audience if there were a clearer mapping out of the issues and linkages between the chapters and a summing up some of their common threads. There are also a distracting number of typographical errors, which is unfortunate in a volume that deserves wide attention.

(Hayami Yoko <速水洋子> • CSEAS)