

the late Amin Sweeney who is only mentioned shortly on p. 5. Sweeney's studies on the Kelantanese *wayang kulit* were based on his fieldwork in the late 1960s and were published in the early 1970s. His enormous fieldwork experience made him write his impressive studies and lead him to further research on the nature of orality in the Malay shadow play and traditional Malay literature. We do not learn anything on oral aspects of the Malay *wayang kulit*. Writing down a kind of libretto of Malay shadow plays by an American scholar in the English language is an anachronism to the Malaysian oral cultural background, the more, as Osnes mentions that she imbued the texts with her "own interpretations of the spiritual mystery of the *wayang*" (p. 104).

Aspects of politics or the modern nation-state are also excluded from this book. We are informed that the PAS-run government of the state of Kelantan had forbidden *wayang kulit* performances only in a short subordinate clause without any further explanation or discussion (p. 91). This would have been necessary as the fundamentalist Islamic party PAS introduced the ban due to the "un-Islamic contents" of the shadow play, while performances for tourists were not involved. Nor does Osnes discuss the *wayang kulit* performances carried out by the Malaysian Ministry of Culture in Kuala Lumpur as part of the Malaysian national culture. As Malay *wayang kulit* is a cultural expression more or less exclusively located in the northeastern parts of the Malay Peninsula and in its traditional surroundings almost everywhere in decline, these ministry-ordered performances would make a nearly perfect example of invented traditions in Hobsbawm's sense. Interesting would also be some information on gender aspects of Malay *wayang kulit*. Malay (and probably all other Southeast Asian) puppeteers (Mal.: *dalang*) are male. Osnes included photographs which show her performing the shadow play in Kelantan. It would be interesting how the audiences reacted to her and

what Malay *dalangs* in general thought of female puppeteers.

Furthermore, the fieldwork experience might also have been too intensive. Although Osnes claims to have been taught by a Kelantanese puppet player in the Kelantanese dialect, her mastering of Malay seems not to be very deep as there are faults in the language examples: "*sekola bas*" (p. 10) means "school of buses" instead of "school bus" (*bas sekolah*). The traditional *rebab* played during performances is not a wind instrument as claimed by Osnes (p. 55), but a string instrument.

Summarizing, this book is rather descriptive and lacks any deeper interpretation, based on firmly grounded theoretical work on shadow play. Factual (and also several spelling) errors are also quite numerous. Thus, whoever wants to read well-founded works on Malay shadow play still has to rely on the ground-breaking studies by Amin Sweeney.

Holger Warnk

### Andres Ufen: Ethnizität, Islam, Reformasi. Die Evolution der Konfliktlinien im Parteiensystem Malaysias

Wiesbaden: VS Verlag, 2011. 307 S., EUR 34,95

Andreas Ufen has written one of the best single volume studies on Malaysia's political system, capturing both its historical development and current trajectory. But he has also made a major contribution to the comparative study of Southeast Asian politics, particularly Indonesia, the Philippines, and Thailand. He offers an additional comparison between the different political party systems of west with east Malaysia. I hope it is not long before it is also translated into English so that it can reach a wider audience.

In the introduction Ufen explores the distinctiveness of the west Malaysian party system. Theoretically his chief concern is to show the continued relevance of the "old" European-based Lipset and Rokkan cleavage

theory by "updating" and applying it in a different cultural context where cleavage formation has differed in important ways from the experience of Europe. He examines how social cleavages have evolved in Malaysia from ethnicity (in the 1950s) to Islamization/secularization (in the 1970s and 1980s), and finally to political reform and (authoritarian) status quo orientation (since the late 1990s).

The first chapter sets out Ufen's theoretical framework. He briefly analyses Malaysia's electoral authoritarian system in the context of the literature about this "quasi-authoritarian" regime type in which elections which are short of being free and fair are held in an attempt to prevent greater substantive democratization through this manipulation of democratic form. He then distinguishes milieu and clientelist-based parties (a crucial distinction for his later discussion of the role of cleavages in Malaysia's milieu-based party system). The next chapter introduces a typology of party systems. This is based on a careful empirical analysis of party systems in the Philippines, Thailand, and Indonesia – as well as of differing party systems in east (Sabah and Sarawak) and west (peninsular) Malaysia. The Philippines and Thailand have clientelist party systems where there are few obvious cleavages based on class, ethnicity, religion, etc. Without deep seated cleavages to socially "root" the parties, these political organizations prove to be little more than shifting, temporary coalitions of ambitious politicians, created as easily as they are dissolved. By contrast, in Indonesia, like in Malaysia, parties are more strongly rooted in social cleavages. Known as *aliran*, or pillars in Indonesia, these differences based on religion (more nominal and religious approaches to Islam and, among the latter, distinctions between "traditionalist," "modernist," and "Islamist" Muslims) stabilize the party system through social anchoring. Though there have been recent signs of growing "Philippinization" in Indonesia (presidential parties, personalism, clientelism, office and vote buying, etc.), parties

there still remain much more cleavage based than in primarily clientelist party systems. Compared to Indonesia, Malaysia differs in the fact that these cleavages have not remained frozen but have significantly evolved over the last half a century – from being primarily ethnic, to increasingly religious and now quite significantly political in the distinction between democratic reformers and defenders of the authoritarian status quo. In contrast to West Malaysia's milieu-based east Malaysia's party system is more hybridic being a mixture of clientelist and milieu systems.

The fourth chapter in Ufen's book examines the structural changes behind these shifts in political cleavages in Malaysia and which, in turn, are contrasted with Indonesia in order to bring out better the particularities of the former case. One important point emphasized in this chapter is the weakness of the worker/capital cleavage, which was so crucial in the European experience but has generally been less significant in Southeast Asia (in no small part due to the "labor repressive" policies of developmentalist-oriented regimes in this region). In this sense, Malaysia is typical of the regional experience in this regard. Rather than class, it is religious cleavages that have been more important in Malaysia as well as in Indonesia. Ufen examines the particularities of "Islamization" in the Malaysian party system in the context of an electoral authoritarian regime. He also stresses the importance of ethnicity in the Malaysian context, which he contrasts with Indonesia where ethnic identification plays almost no role in the party system. The fifth chapter sums up the various points of the entire volume.

I would offer two criticisms of Ufen's analysis. One is that he underestimates the importance of "populism," a controversial term that can nonetheless be understood as a style of political campaigning that involves direct, media appeals to the poor who it is claimed are exploited by a greedy elite. The instability of clientelist party systems in the Philip-

pires and Thailand became most obvious after the emergence of two "populist" politicians, Joseph E. Estrada (in the Philippines) and Thaksin Shinwatra (in Thailand). They both used media-based, quasi-class appeals to the poor to transform the previously clientelist-dominated party landscape to their own advantage. This caused panic within the conservative elite in both countries, leading both candidates to be unconstitutionally removed from office in "people power coups." The complexities populism has introduced to the party systems of the Philippines and particularly Thailand are missed in Ufen's analysis that concentrates too narrowly on clientelism in these countries and thereby misses the growing politicization of class differences. Interestingly, populists have not made a major breakthrough in Indonesia where "self-cancelling" cleavages have blocked the politicization of class thereby contributing to democratic stability. In Malaysia, Anwar Ibrahim is a reformist challenging the political status quo based largely on issues of corruption and civil liberties, but not a "populist" in the sense making appeals to the poor against the rich. Populism has been common in previously clientelist-based party systems in Southeast Asia, not in milieu-based ones, a point which if further explored would have strengthened Ufen's analysis.

The other point is a methodological one. Like many qualitative-oriented political scientists with an "area speciality," Ufen takes a defensive posture towards quantitative approaches. However desirable a quantitative analysis based on social class and voting behavior, among other factors might be, it is simply impossible given poor data in the Malaysian context. While this is undoubtedly a genuine problem for a quantitative analysis, Ufen thereby underplays the advantages of his own qualitative, structural approach. It would have been helpful if Ufen had made more use of the arguments in favor of a qualitative approach to Southeast Asian politics in a recent volume edited by Kuhonta, Slater, and Vu (2008). They detail

the advantages of "interpretive analysis," "process-tracing," and other similar qualitative approaches.

Kuhonta *et al.* further argue that political science in Southeast Asia is not "punching its weight" in comparative politics. There are several reasons for this, including the relative paucity of political scientists working on this region. But an additional problem is that given the enormous cultural differences between countries, few political scientists have dared to venture generalizations outside of "their" chosen case study: Malaysia specialists tend to study only Malaysia, Indonesianists Indonesia, etc. What Ufen has done in this study is to show that one can both be an accomplished "Malaysianist" and a Southeast Asian comparativist. He has demonstrated just how fruitful comparative analysis can be in this regional context. Thus Ufen's study should serve as a model for more genuinely comparative political analysis of Southeast Asian politics in the future.

Mark R. Thompson

**Lilli Breiniger, Michael Reckordt**

**(Hgg.): Rohstoffausch.**

**Die Auswirkungen von Bergbau in den Philippinen**

Essen: Medienwerkstatt GmbH, 2011.

150 S., EUR 9,90

In zehn Einzelbeiträgen setzen sich verschiedene Autoren kritisch mit historischen, globalen, nationalen und lokalen Zusammenhängen sowie Auswirkungen industrieller Bergbautätigkeit in den Philippinen auseinander. Die zehn Beiträge des Buches führen über eine zunächst globale Betrachtung hin zum lokalen Fokus auf die Philippinen. Diese Struktur ermöglicht dem Leser eine Gesamteinordnung der Zusammenhänge einer globalisierten Rohstoffausbeutung mit lokalen Auswirkungen.

Im einführenden Teil werden die wesentlichen allgemeinen Mechanismen, Instrumente und Konsequenzen der globalisierten