

rie, ohne deren Existenz auch in westlichen Gesellschaften Geschäftsbeziehungen nicht funktionieren? Und was bedeuten schließlich die gewalttätigen Übergriffe gegen die chinesischen Unternehmen in Südostasien sowie die massenhafte Flucht der Chinesen im Kontext der Diskussion um den Zusammenhang von Kultur und Ökonomie? Die Drucklegung bzw. die Abfassung der Manuskripte lag vor den dramatischen ökonomischen, sozialen und politischen Umbrüchen in Südostasien. Das bedeutet, dass auch in Hinblick auf die veränderte Situation weitere Fragen aufgeworfen worden sind und aufgeworfen werden.

Helmut Buchholt

Thomas A. Marks: The British acquisition of Siamese Malaya (1896-1909)

Bangkok: White Lotus Press, 1997, 167 S.

Thomas Marks' small booklet deals on 105 pages text with one of the most neglected themes in the history of the Malayan Peninsula. The diplomatic, economic and political rivalries between Great Britain, Siam, France, Germany and the Malay Sultanates of Kedah, Perlis, Trengganu and Kelantan is so far covered only by a very few historical studies (Tuck 1995, Talib, Suwannathat-Pian a.o.), so Marks' work could have been a useful addition to our knowledge of these states outside the Malaysian 'mainstream' so far. However, this is not the case.

Marks' study is divided in six chapters. The first gives a short introduction to the main developments up to the 1890s in the Malay Peninsula and the British interests in expanding their influence into the east coast and northern states of the Malay Peninsula. Chapter 2 outlines the British role in these sultanates after the signing of an agreement between Britain and France on the existence of Siam as buffer state in 1896 and the conclusion of an Anglo-Siamese secret convention on the future of the Malay states in 1897. Chapter 3 shows the British political and diplomatic attempts to avoid any other foreign (esp. German) influence in the Malay Peninsula by concluding exclusive treaties with the Bangkok government. British-Siamese relations were under pressure due to the further integration of Patani as province into the Siamese state and the exilement of the last Patani sultan which was criticised by several pro-Malay British administrators and government officials (e.g. Sir Frank Swettenham). Chapter 4 is concerned with one of the most bizarre affairs in colonial history, the installment of a British adviser (Walter Armstrong Graham) as Siamese official in the sultanate of Kelantan on the Malay east coast. This led way to the further integration into the British colonial system following the lines of the resident system practised in the Malay states of Selangor, Negeri Sembilan, Perak and Pahang. Chapter 5 deals with the political and economic problems during the extension of the railway system in the Malay Peninsula into the east coast sultanates and Southern Siam since mid-1906. The next months reflect the growing pressure of the British Foreign Office (and of western advisers and officials employed by the Siamese) on the Bangkok government, related to the fear of the extension of German influence in Siam. This leads finally further to an agreement to put the southern

dependencies into British hands in early 1908 by the Siamese officials which was finally signed in 1909, as described in the final chapter.

It is Marks' intention to "cull through the *available* English-language material" (p. 1, own italics) to give an account of a small, but fascinating extract of Southeast Asian colonial history. His sources are limited to documents of the British Foreign Office (today located in the Public Record Office) and two English-language newspapers, the *Bangkok Times Weekly Mail* and the *Straits Times* (Singapore). Historians on Southeast Asia have already for quite some time been complaining about the neglected use of newspapers as historical sources (see especially on English-language newspapers Khoo 1985), since they provide in many cases interesting materials on politics, society etc. As there are already some studies on early Malay and Thai journalism the English-language media in Malaya and Bangkok are so far almost totally ignored (with the exception of the *Straits Times* of course). It would have been most interesting to include further informations, e.g. on the nature of these sources, particular correspondents, political intentions etc. especially of the *Bangkok Times* which was published by the British citizen W. H. Mundie. Marks unfortunately tells us nothing on the background of these newspapers.

However, one starts immediately wondering whether the Colonial Office Archives (located in Public Record Office too) do not contain significant material and whether only two (!) contemporary newspapers reflect the developments of the relations between Siam, the Malay sultanates and Great Britain as well. Especially the *Siam Daily Advertiser*, edited by the Siamese Government in Bangkok, might contain additional and/or new material. Contemporary British officials published analyses on this matter too (e.g. Blagden 1906) or give insights of their thoughts on the Malay states (e.g. Graham 1911).

Marks' bibliography includes only very few outdated (no book after 1970!) titles and almost no journal or other articles. The author does not use materials from important scientific journals such as the *Journal of the Siam Society*, *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, *Journal of the Malaysian Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* or *Modern Asian Studies* which contributed highly interesting researches on his chosen topic. Furthermore, he ignores all studies of the last thirty years or so on the history of the sultanates of Trengganu, Kelantan, Kedah and Perlis which include such easily available works as Suwannathat-Pian (1988), Ahmat (1985), Klein (1968), Numsonda (1967), Talib (1984, 1995) and Jeshurun (1971), to cite only a few. He even does not seem to know the "reference" histories of the Andayas (1982) on Malaysia and of Wyatt (1984) on Thailand. Nor does he cite any other sources and references in French, Malay or Thai in his study.

From this very limited use of available material follows a nearly mere listing of events and newspaper clippings which reflect only British views on the diverse matters. Thai views of its dependencies in the South, King Chulalongkorn's diverse trials to keep the Siamese territory and his many trips to the sultanates are only mentioned if they were reported by one of the very few English-speaking Siamese officials in his small amount of sources. Marks fails in many parts of his study to give analyses and interpretations of his sources which finally becomes most evident in the lack of any conclusion in his book.

Even weaker than the Thai side of the imperial game is the position and ways of keeping the status quo by the sultanates themselves. Malay states appear only as passive participants and their trials to play the Siamese off against the British and vice versa to maintain their independence (most effectively, but however not successful by Sultan Zainal Abidin III. of Trengganu) are ignored. The Malay side which always denied to be part of Siam remains unheard. Malay (which are close to Thai) views of territoriality are not reflected. The concept of clear state boundaries which was most important to the British was not known to Southeast Asia before the coming of the Europeans. The "long-standing boundary dispute" between Pahang and Trengganu (p. 67) is better referred to as a territorial one. Malay society is described in many topoi and colonial stereotypes which had been overcome since quite some time. In Malaya "slavery was an institution" (p. 9), a characterisation of the Sultan of Kedah as "practically mad" (p. 90) was cited without any commentary, the "Malay character" (sic!) was described with McNair (1878) as sole reference (p. 10) but not with Alatas (1977), and so on.

Finally, the reviewer had never heard of a civil war in Penang in 1858 (p. 4, actually it happened in Pahang). Inaccuracies in spelling of Siamese names (Puket, Nakhon Sri Tammarat, Patalung, Chumpon) irritates while reading the text.

Holger Warnk

Helmut Buchholt: Zwischen Macht und Ohnmacht. Die chinesische Minderheit in Südostasien

Münster: Lit-Verlag, 1998 (Kultur, Gesellschaft, Umwelt – Schriften zur Südasiens- und Südostasien-Forschung; Band 2), 352 S.

Wer ein Buch über die Macht oder Ohnmacht der Chinesen in Südostasien sucht, ist hier falsch. Helmut Buchholt, den Lesern von *ASIEN* nicht unbekannt (H. Buchholt und T. Menkhoff, "Huaquao, der heute kommt und morgen bleibt: Die soziale Rolle der Nanyang-Chinesen am Beispiel Indonesiens," *ASIEN*, (April 1994) 51, 25-38), schrieb, im Gegenteil, einen Vergleich zwischen anti-chinesischen ("anti-sinitischen") Äußerungen in Indonesien und in den Philippinen, besonders hinsichtlich der Frage ihrer Häufigkeit und Intensität. Dabei sind diese Äußerungen in Indonesien, nach Buchholt, oft gewalttätig, während in den Philippinen gewalttätige Ausbrüche gegen Chinesen seit der spanischen Kolonialzeit fast unbekannt sind. Wer sich einen Überblick über anti-chinesische Ausschreitungen und eine im Grunde antichinesische Politik in Indonesien bis 1995 verschaffen will und wer Hintergründe für die Ausschreitungen von 1998 sucht, wird das Buch nützlich finden.

In anderer Hinsicht ist das Buch weniger befriedigend. Die relativ kurze Diskussion über die Philippinen enthält praktisch nichts über die amerikanische Zeit. So erwähnt Buchholt nicht die amerikanische "Chinese Exclusion," die zu einer weitgehenden Drosselung der Immigration aus China zwischen 1900-1945 führte, während die Immigration nach Indonesien bis etwa 1930 stark blieb.

Der Vergleich Indonesien-Philippinen, abgesehen von den historischen Aspekten, beruht weitgehend auf dem Vergleich zwischen Ausschreitungen in Indonesien und