

Southeast Asian Studies after Said

ADRIAN VICKERS*

This is the first part of a broader attempt to describe the state of Southeast Asian Studies, and to suggest a number of alternative paths that we might follow in order to maintain the integrity of the field. Here I suggest that we Southeast Asianists have tended to throw the textual baby out with the Orientalist bathwater, and that a study of Southeast Asia should be based on theories of representation.

Like 'Asia', 'Southeast Asia' is an entirely artificial term. While 'Asia' has been around for a very long time indeed, the sub-set of Asia that stretches between the eastern-most border of India and Papua-New Guinea has only been designed as 'Southeast Asia' – or 'South East Asia' – since the 1940s. Southeast Asia came into being as a military convenience when Mountbatten and MacArthur were dividing their commands in the campaign against the Japanese.

Southeast Asia is incredibly diverse – it covers complex ethnicity and hundreds of languages, found within at least four major language groups: Burmo-Tibetan; Mon-Khmer; Tai; and Austronesian. If we accept that there is such a thing as 'Southeast Asian Studies', then the question is how to study this diversity. Or, more particularly, how are we to represent Southeast Asia in scholarly terms? While Southeast Asian Studies has always had its own methodological histories, these have not always been articulated. I argue that it is by adhering to the examples set by scholarship of the region that we can best come to terms with it, and that means specifically returning to a study of forms of representation, the kind of study rejected in the wake of Edward

* *Adrian Vickers is Professor of Southeast Asian Studies at the University of Sydney. This inaugural lecture was delivered to the Arts Association on 3 September 2009.*

Said's 1978 book, *Orientalism*.

The term 'Southeast Asia' initially involved a definition slightly broader than the present-day one. Mountbatten's base in Ceylon – Sri Lanka – was the headquarters of his command, and from time to time there is discussion of whether or not Hong Kong is actually part of Southeast Asia. Timor Loro Sae is still deciding its position. The creation of SEATO during the Cold War briefly created a unity, but of course only amongst the anti-Communist states, and it is only with the extension of ASEAN in recent years that some kind of general political and economic substance has been given to the sense of the region as a region.

In academic terms, the prior existence of journals of Southeast Asian Studies and, more recently, departments, has been important to creating communities of scholars. There is also a major prize in the field, the Benda Prize, although it has evolved into a book prize for those working in US institutions. The premier journal in the field, the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies*, began in 1970 but had existed since 1960 as the *Journal of Southeast Asian History*. In this form the journal published one of the great meditations on Southeast Asia as an entity, by John Smail.¹ Thus journals, as bearers of scholarly discourse, are important to constituting the object of study, as are research and teaching institutions.

Singapore and Hanoi are the only places that have Institutes for Southeast Asian Studies. Departments or Programs of Southeast Asian Studies exist at the National University of Singapore and Cornell University; Centres/Centers of or for Southeast Asian Studies exist at the Australian National University, Murdoch University, Kyoto University, Northern Illinois University, University of California Los Angeles and Berkeley, University of Michigan, University of Hawai'i, Ohio University, Washington University, University of Wisconsin, Madison, University of British Columbia (Centre of Southeast Asian Research); Leiden University has a Department of Southeast Asian and Oceanic Studies, but it is currently being restructured; and the School of Oriental and African Studies in London has a Department of Languages and Cultures of South East Asia and the Islands; Yale University has a Southeast Asia Council; and there is a Department

of South and Southeast Asian Studies at Calcutta University.

Southeast Asia was confirmed as a political entity when all of the countries of the region entered the Association of Southeast Asian Nations (ASEAN), a more successful body than its Cold War predecessor, the South East Asian Treaty Organisation (SEATO). ASEAN, however, has nothing like the coherence of the European Union, and at the time of writing there are significant conflicts between ASEAN states, notably armed conflict between Cambodia and Thailand over a temple, and cultural disputes between Indonesia and Malaysia.

Just at the point in time where the existence of Southeast Asia seems most certain in institutional terms, there have been heavy discussions about the nature of Southeast Asian Studies. Most of this discussion has taken place over the last fifteen years, but its roots go back to the challenge raised by Edward Said's critique of Orientalism – the textual study of the East – as a way of reproducing a colonial discourse of domination by the West.² Related critiques of colonialism were already an important part of Southeast Asian Studies before the appearance of Said's work. Smail's view of 'autonomy' implies viewing Southeast Asia in its own terms. Prior to Smail, J. C. van Leur had argued that island Southeast Asia needed broader perspectives than those from the ship's deck or the walls of colonial bastions – to paraphrase his characterisation of the colonial perceptions of Indonesian history.³ Syed Alatas's 1977 work on anthropology in Southeast Asia was an important assertion by a Southeast Asian scholar of the same problem.⁴

Edward Said's *Orientalism* provided an important moment in Asian and Islamic studies. I can think of few single books that have had this direct kind of impact, and it is the kind of work that is frequently cited by people who have not read it. While Said's critique began with philological studies of texts, his arguments extended as far as political policy-making. Studies inspired by Said have worked on the nexus between textual studies and colonialism in Malaya, Thailand and Indonesia, and thus demonstrated the importance of thinking about representation in colonialism.⁵ These studies move into the disciplines of history and geography, and to the Social Sciences in general.

In Southeast Asian Studies, history has been one of the defining disciplines. Smail and Van Leur were both historians, and the preeminent scholar of Southeast Asia in more recent decades has been Anthony Reid. Reid trained many other key figures in the field, and acted as ringmaster for major groupings of scholars at the Australian National University and the Asia Research Institute in Singapore. His collected works, particularly his *Lands below the Winds*, provide his own broad vision of Southeast Asian history. This two-volume study focuses on the idea of a Southeast Asian golden age, an 'Age of Commerce' from the fifteenth to the seventeenth century. This age represents the height of Southeast Asia's integration, arising from the increase in trade during this period. Two consequences of his analysis are: an economic determinism, and the problem of how to account for the period after the seventeenth century. The latter is particularly explained in the title of one of the edited volumes on the eighteenth century, *The Last Stand of Asian Autonomies*, with deliberate reference to Smail. The collective argument of this book both ignores the irony in the reference to Custer, and emphasises the colonial break of the nineteenth century.⁶

Craig Reynolds has returned attention to some of the problems in the Smail-Reid discussion in a review of some of the literature on pre-colonial states in Southeast Asia.⁷ There he argues that the search for an 'autonomous' Southeast Asia leads to a *cul-de-sac* in which the indigenous and the authentic are seen as identical. Through the concept of 'autonomy', historical studies fulfil the requirements of postcolonial nationalist regimes and tourist industries by combing through the remnants of the past to separate the originally local from the 'foreign and exogenous' (p.150). There are several ironies involved in this process, particularly as it has been applied to examinations of Southeast Asian state systems: first that the 'original' is endlessly receding, and is always seen retrospectively. There was always something before the original: the evidence of 'foreign' trade predates evidence of Southeast Asian states. Further, most of the models of state systems depend on or derive from Western models of the state, and are based on the assumption that Southeast Asian states 'lacked' something which Western states have or had. In other words,

we have not moved far beyond Europe at all.

Southeast Asian studies, as a form of 'area studies', is multi- and inter-disciplinary. A leading British anthropologist of Southeast Asia, Victor King, in his quest to authenticate Southeast Asian studies, identifies history, anthropology and geography as the key disciplines of the field. Although I can claim only practising knowledge of the first, and to some degree the second, I think this view is too limiting. King is one of a number of writers who have contributed to the debates about Southeast Asian studies over the last decade, and his piece shows the field to be under threat. King lays the case out persuasively, that

... preoccupation with region is charged with being old-fashioned, ethnocentric, parochial, politically conservative, essentialist and empiricist in its mission to chart distinctive culture-language zones and draw boundaries in an increasingly changing, globalizing world. These allegations have been made with increasing intensity during the past three decades, including from insiders and sympathizers like McVey, who remarked in the mid-1990s that 'Southeast Asia itself has changed far more massively and profoundly than have Southeast Asia[n] studies' (1995: 6). In addition, the charge that post-war, American-led area studies is in the direct line of succession of pre-war European Orientalism has brought into question the ethics and underlying purpose of studying and characterizing other cultures at a distance.⁸

King's agreement with Ruth McVey indicates an anxiety that Southeast Asian Studies has not kept up with developments in theory in the disciplines. Whereas once scholars such as Clifford Geertz and Benedict Anderson brought their Southeast Asian fieldwork to considerations of issues prominent in major disciplinary discourse, this is now rarely the case. A large number of other commentators have provided variations on this theme, most prominently Peter Jackson, who has argued that Area Studies can be a counter to a Euro-American centred Global Studies.⁹ Developing a point made elsewhere by Benedict Anderson, Jackson points to the difficulties of being an area specialist, because we have to acquire knowledge of multiple languages and an understanding of working within certain cultural domains, as well as being familiar with theoretical advances in disciplines.¹⁰ Disturbingly, some writers posit a kind

of 'either-or' between deep cultural and linguistic knowledge, and theory. To some degree this may be explained by the pressures of the US job market, which create, particularly amongst younger scholars, conference performances and writings which have to show off some kind of five-star 'Theory' in order to pass muster. But if theory is a set of assumptions and concepts that we need to engage in the study of something, then it is not only an essential part of what we do, but crucial to building any kind of methodology.

Jackson's focus is on the contemporary, so Geography, as a spatially and materially based discipline, becomes the clearest solution to how to study the region. In opposition to King, I would like to argue that attempts to reject the historical construction of the discipline have led to the problems that King outlines. Jackson leaves aside questions of historical understanding, and of how textual readings can contribute to forms of knowledge, thus setting aside the possibility that such readings might form part of a process of translation.

Both King and Jackson accept the line that Orientalism is a bad thing, and do not stray into the territory proscribed by readers of Said. This is a pity, because Said himself does not reject everything 'Orientalist'. Said specifically rejects colonial influences in the study of Islam, demonstrating a line of continuity between philological studies and US support for Israel, although I am doing him a disservice by putting his argument in such bald terms. His commentary is not on 'Asia' as a whole, but the same conflation present in the idea of 'the East' pervades the Saidian critique of the same idea. This is the first of a number of logical contradictions built into the way that Said's work has been received.

Detailed attacks on Said have appeared since his death (conveniently when he cannot defend himself, as with the famous Derek Freeman attack on Margaret Mead). Although written in a distinctly curmudgeonly English style, Robert Irwin's *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies* is one of the more sensible of these anti-Said accounts.¹¹ Despite resorting to silly *ad hominem* point scoring at the end of his book, Irwin provides a series of insights into the divergent histories of Orientalism, and depicts at times distinctly anti-Orientalist Orientalists. He points out that Said's

criticisms of philology are misplaced, and that not all philologists were complicit in the colonial project. Indeed, Said himself had always professed his admiration for the French Orientalist Louis Massignon (1883–1962), whom Irwin shows to be a complex and deeply fascinating figure, motivated by a kind of spiritualism that was entirely sympathetic to his objects of study.

A key point in Irwin's book is that there are many streams of Orientalism, some of them based on specific national traditions, some of which revolve around 'teacher-pupil' relationships or specific parts of the academy. Thus while his grasp of Foucauldian theory may be shaky, Irwin still manages to show that identifying 'Orientalism' as a single discourse about 'the East' is extremely questionable. Said himself leaves this door open since, while Foucault provides his theoretical starting point, he rejects Foucault's anti-humanism. In his longer exposition of methodology, *Beginnings: Intentions, and Method*, Said reintroduced individual agency into Foucault's post-structuralism, which was also a necessary step in explaining the status of the literary works that interested Said.¹²

The more one looks for eccentric individuals in the study of Southeast Asian texts, the more one finds the field being defined by people who are not only not clearly 'European', but who have come to terms with local forms of discourse in ways even more interesting and complex than Massignon. H. N. van der Tuuk, the major nineteenth-century scholar of Balinese and Old Javanese language (and Batak, Malay and other local languages), was of Chinese-Dutch parentage, born in Melaka, and spent very little of his life in the Netherlands. It would be misleading to call him 'Dutch', despite the fact that a long tradition of textual study at Leiden University depended on his work. Likewise recent research by Esrih Bakker (from the same university) has shed light on the dictionary-maker and translator C. F. Winter. In other writings he is taken as the Dutch foil to the Javanese poet Ronggowarsito, but Bakker portrays him as very Eurasian in cultural style, more at home writing in Javanese than Dutch (and in fact Winter appears to have lived all his life in Java, never even visiting the Netherlands). Bakker shows that Winter was able to write sections of the Modern Javanese poetic version of the

Ramayana that were as much a valid response to the mestizo space of Batavia as any Javanese courtly poet's contribution.¹³

Bakker's paper was presented as part of a recent conference on the Old Javanese *Kekawin* (poem in Indic metres) *Ramayana*, held in Jakarta, co-organised by Leiden scholars, working with an Australian, but in collaboration with the University of Indonesia and the École Française d'Extrême Orient. This conference drew together insights from Sanskrit texts, the temple reliefs of Prambanan, archaeology in Central and East Java, close editing of the Old Javanese (or *Kawi*) poem, and related texts from Sunda, Central Java and Bali. One of a number of insights to come out of the conference was the importance of on-going cultural interchange, not just between India and Indonesia, but also between different parts of Indonesia. Thus nineteenth-century versions of 'branch' or tangential stories from Bali have a stronger connection with versions of the *Ramayana* from the Punjab than those from Malaysia. It is only thanks to detailed 'Orientalist' studies of a diverse range of texts that we can understand the complexity of such connections, and go back and decode the ancient inscriptions of Southeast Asia. Such studies show Asia – and its sub-set Southeast Asia – as being formed historically from a complex and on-going set of cultural interactions.

Before Said's book appeared, Southeast Asianists had already rejected the view that such processes of cultural influence were a one-way street, or belonged to some ancient past divorced from the present. Although one of the founding works in the field was Georges Coedès' famous study, *The Indianized States of Southeast Asia*, Southeast Asianists long ago rejected the view that Southeast Asian culture was an extension of India (and in any case, the original title of the book was *Les états hindouisés d'Indochine et Indonésie*). Ironically it is only Asians who still adhere to the 'Greater India' view of Southeast Asia: Tamil nationalists, whose website displays fantastic interpretations of Southeast Asian history as the product of Indian colonisation.¹⁴

Strangely, too little has been done on Chinese influences on Southeast Asian culture. Only one major collection of essays examines textual connections, and that is long out of print.¹⁵

The rejection of Orientalism has been seen by some observers

as part of the decline of studies of Indonesian literature.¹⁶ While I sympathise with such views (despite being identified as one of the culprits in Aveling's account), they do not recognise that there has been a great shift in student interest. The best way to promote the teaching of the narrative traditions of Southeast Asia is through the study of film, mass media and popular culture. Southeast Asian scholars of Southeast Asia, such as Ariel Heryanto, are leading the way in such studies.¹⁷

It is a mark of the changing nature of agendas in Southeast Asian studies that Southeast Asians are providing some of the freshest insights into Southeast Asia. A recent prize-winning PhD thesis from the National University of Singapore by Davisakd Puaksom provides a brilliant illustration of the cross-over between Javanese cultural forms, Malay literature and performance in the development of Thai narratives of the hero Inao.¹⁸ In studying ongoing Java-Thailand links, this thesis embraces issues of language change, loan words and mutual reflection.

Davisakd's dissertation simply could not have been written without the benefit of the Orientalist studies of prior generations. It also illustrates the changing landscape that has produced a more equal interaction between local and Western scholarship. The object of the study, Panji stories, demonstrate the importance of continued attention to texts, and what they tell us about Southeast Asia.

Panji stories provide a cultural understanding of Southeast Asia that is an alternative to the trade-based view of Reid. Panji stories are useful for understanding both pre-colonial and colonial situations, since they cross national boundaries, and thus do not suffer from the limitations of national histories. The narratives themselves come from nearly all parts of Southeast Asia: there are Burmese, Thai, Khmer, Lao and Cham, as well as Malay, Javanese and Balinese Panji stories, found in such diverse locations as Jambi, Kutei and Makasar. The earliest narratives date to East Java in the fourteenth (and possibly even thirteenth) century,¹⁹ but the most recent versions include a Thai television series.

One of the key elements displayed in Panji stories is the shared culture of mobility in Southeast Asia. The stories show pre-colonial

kingdoms to be shifting, with palaces that can be relocated, mobile aristocracies travelling by land and water, and groups of people wandering throughout the region. The sense of fluid boundaries that arises in these narratives extends to boundaries of ethnicity and language, as Malay princes merge into Javanese kingdoms, and vice-versa.²⁰

Should we talk about this phenomenon as a Southeast Asian 'Culture'? Since the term originally had a kind of ethnic specificity linked to racially-based views of the nation, it would be better to speak of a Southeast Asian 'Civilisation'. This is not the same as the idea of Chinese civilisation, since the latter is based around an empire, relying partly on military conquest as the basis of domination of different zones.²¹ The grounds for military domination by earlier Southeast Asian kingdoms are dubious: definitely not in the case of the Medieval kingdom Sriwijaya (which may have been a collection of upgraded chiefdoms),²² and unlikely in the case of the later polity of Majapahit, except for Central, East Java and Bali. Majapahit's contemporary, Melaka, was more limited, and the different claims of mainland states need to be examined carefully, including the arguments that advocate the continuity of the Burmese state.²³

The domain depicted in Panji stories approximates to Eric Wolf's definition of 'civilisations' as

cultural interaction zones pivoted upon a hegemonic tributary society central to each zone. Such hegemony usually involved the development of an ideological model by a successful centralizing elite of surplus takers, which is replicated by other elites within the wider political-economic orbit of interaction. Although one model may become dominant within a given orbit . . . the civilizational orbit is also an area in which a number of models coexist or compete within a multiple array of symbols, which find their differential referents in the shifting relationships among the tributary societies compromising the orbit.²⁴

The polities mentioned above indeed had centralising ambitions, but that does not mean they were necessarily successful in carrying them out. As Reynolds has shown,²⁵ these polities should not be judged in terms of Western notions of the state. The most relevant part of Wolf's definition is the concept that civilisation involves ideological models that come to be accepted as part of a common set of signs.

While the civilisation presented in Panji stories is that of a pre-colonial world, a world outside of the domains created by imperialism, the stories were continually recreated in colonial and post-colonial contexts. Such representational practices do not fit with the view that 'Asian autonomies' had a 'last stand' in the eighteenth or even the nineteenth century, which is to say that imperialism brought about a uniform state of Western modernity in institutional and representational terms.

The boundaries of 'autonomous' Southeast Asia versus colonial and post-colonial Southeast Asia are blurred. In the early nineteenth-century Somnat Wihan royal temple in Bangkok, Panji (Inao) murals show an extraordinary range of contemporary and modern scenes. These include modern technology such as ships, architecture, and even a garden menagerie that includes Australian wallabies.

I have already argued in *Paradise Created* that imperial conquests did bring about major epistemological breaks. These happen in different periods and in very uneven fashion, and there is often a gap of one or two generations between the political moments of Western control and civilisational changes.²⁶ Nor should even more recent epistemological changes be considered as a simple displacement of indigenous thought by Western concepts. Michel Picard's Foucauldian analysis has shown that the formation of Balinese cultural discourse from the 1970s to the present is the result of interaction between Western representations, national institutions and local practices.²⁷ The same can be said for Southeast Asian forms of Christianity, or cultural products as diverse as the royal Vimanmek Palace in Bangkok (completed in 1901) and Balinese paintings from the 1940s.²⁸

Examining the civilisation of Southeast Asia thus requires complex forms of cultural history and anthropology. This cultural history, or more precisely a civilisational history, needs to incorporate various forms of modernity, as Goh Beng-Lan and others have shown in a variety of contexts.²⁹ A Western-oriented model of change would perhaps locate forms of modernity as a response to the West, but such an approach ignores Southeast Asian agency. A post-Saidian analysis needs to incorporate Southeast Asian modernities as Southeast Asian epistemologies. The Vimanmek palace and a Balinese painting fit

together as assertions of a localised modernity, as much as Sukarno's National Monument in Jakarta, or Phibun's Victory monument in Jakarta.

The way into these civilisational forms is a study of representations, which can be philological or art historical. The study of Southeast Asian civilisation should take as its object both high and popular forms of culture. Teaching these does not mean cutting ourselves off from the more ancient forms of representation, as found in the continuation of *Ramayana* narratives in Indonesian art (from imported Indian series to Garin Nugroho's *Opera Jawa*), or Thai and Indonesian horror films that draw on older legends. Thus the shared sensibilities of major film-makers are important, but so too are Thai and Indonesian films about ghosts, which draw on very deep common cultural beliefs in spirit forms.

Here at the University of Sydney we have both a long history and a bright future in such studies. As well as being a cultural history, the study of Southeast Asia needs to take account of mobility across the region and its various cultural and material manifestations. An example would be the cross-fertilisation of communist parties from their coming together around the figure of Pridi in Bangkok in the 1940s, to the development of a relationship in organisation and writings between D. N. Aidit and Jose Sisson in the 1960s. Craig Reynold's textual analysis of Jit Poumisak's *Real Face of Thai Sakdina* can be put next to Ruth McVey's analysis of the writings of Aidit to study one particular mode of Southeast Asian modernity.³⁰ This kind of study carries very much into the present day. In the case of labour activism and transnational labour, especially Southeast Asian discourses arise from a long history of localisation of labour and Marxist discourse.³¹ These kinds of movements are very much a feature of present-day mobility, so this is not some kind of antiquarian study. The interaction of contemporary painters in the region has been going on at a lower level since the 1950s or 1960s, when exchanges were organised, and the Indonesian painter Basuki Abdullah became court artist to the Thai and Filipino ruling elite. But in more recent times, as my colleagues John Clark and Thomas Berghuis are showing, such interactions are becoming more common, especially around two

foci, the major Biennale events, and the auction house.

These kinds of insights do not depend on a major change to the theoretical and methodological bases of Southeast Asian Studies but, rather, on adjusting attitudes, and not being afraid of Orientalism. If we assume that mobility is an inherent part of Southeast Asian states and societies, then we can first assume that people moved and brought elements of culture backwards and forwards; and, second, that wider patterns of fluidity are built into local epistemology and ontology. So we can speak of common Southeast Asian patterns, or better, a Southeast Asian civilisation.

Notes

- 1 John R. W. Smail, 'On the Possibility of an Autonomous History of Modern Southeast Asia', *Journal of Southeast Asian History* 2.2 (1961): 72–102.
- 2 Edward W. Said, *Orientalism*, London, 1978.
- 3 J.C. van Leur, *Indonesian Trade and Society: Essays in Asian Social and Economic History*, The Hague, 1967.
- 4 Syed Hussein Alatas, *The Myth of the Lazy Native: a Study of the Image of the Malays, Filipinos and Javanese from the 16th to the 20th Century and its Function in the Ideology of Colonial Capitalism*, London, 1977.
- 5 Hendrik M. J. Maier, *In the Center of Authority: the Malay Hikayat Merong Mahawangsa*, New York: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 1988; Thongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: a History of the Geo-body of a Nation*, Honolulu, 1994 (originally a University of Sydney PhD thesis). Phillip King, 'From Periphery to Centre: Shaping the History of the Central Peninsula', PhD thesis, The University of Wollongong, 2006.
- 6 Anthony J. S. Reid, *Southeast Asia in the Age of Commerce, 1450–1680*, 2 vols, New Haven, 1988–1993; ed., *The Last Stand of Asian Autonomies: Responses to Modernity in the Diverse States of Southeast Asia and Korea, 1750–1900*. Basingstoke, England; New York, 1997.
- 7 Craig J. Reynolds, 'Authenticating Southeast Asia in the Absence of Colonialism: Burma', *Asian Studies Review* 15.3 (April 1992): 141–51. Reynolds formerly taught at the University of Sydney, where he was supervisor of the dissertations of Hong Lysa and Thongchai Winichakul.
- 8 Victor T. King, *Defining Southeast Asia and the Crisis in Area Studies: Personal Reflections on a Region*, Working Paper No 13, Centre for East and South-East Asian Studies Lund University, Sweden www.ace.lu.se, 2005, p.2. Referring to Ruth McVey, 'Change and Continuity in Southeast Asian Studies', *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* 26 (1995): 1–9.

- 9 Peter A. Jackson, 'Space, Theory, and Hegemony: The Dual Crises of Asian Area Studies and Cultural Studies', *Sojourn* 18.1 (April 2003): 1–41; 'Mapping Poststructuralism's Borders: The Case of Poststructuralist Area Studies', *Sojourn* 18.1 (April 2003): 42–88.
- 10 Jackson, 'Mapping Poststructuralism's Borders', p.83.
- 11 Robert Irwin, *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*, London, 2006.
- 12 Edward W. Said, *Beginnings: Intention and Method*, New York, 1975.
- 13 Esrih Bakker, 'The Serat Rama: A Modern Javanese Version of the Ramayana Story'. Paper given at the 'Old Javanese Ramayana: Text, History, Culture' Workshop, Jakarta, 26–28 May, 2009; cf. Kenji Tsuchiya, 'Javanology and the Age of Ranggawarsita: An Introduction to Nineteenth-Century Javanese Culture', in *Reading Southeast Asia: Translation of Contemporary Japanese Scholarship on Southeast Asia*, pp.75–108. Ithaca: Cornell University Southeast Asia Program, 1990.
- 14 Tamilnation.org, *Tamils, a trans-nation state*. TAMIL HERITAGE ... the Tamils are an ancient people Kappal Ottiya Thamilan: The Overseas Exploits of the Thamil & the Tragedy of Sri Lanka G.K.Rajasuriyar 27 March 2002, Australia. <<http://www.tamilnation.org/heritage/rajasuriyar.htm>>, read 15th August 2009.
- 15 Claudine Salmon, ed., *Literary Migrations: Traditional Chinese Fiction in Asia (17–20th Centuries)*, Beijing, 1987.
- 16 Harry Aveling, 'Literature and the Australian Study of Indonesia'. Paper presented at the 17th Biennial Conference of the Asian Studies Association of Australia, Melbourne, 1–3 July 2008.
- 17 But see Ariel Heryanto, 'Can there be Southeast Asians in Southeast Asian Studies?', *Moussons. Recherche en sciences humaines sur l'Asie du Sud-Est* 5 (2002): 3–30.
- 18 Davisakd Puaksom, 'The Pursuit of Java: Thai Panji Stories, Melayu Lingua Franca and the Question of Translation', PhD thesis, National University of Singapore, 2007.
- 19 Lydia Kieven, 'Meaning and Function of the Figures with a Cap in Reliefs at East Javanese Temples of the Majapahit Period', PhD thesis, The University of Sydney, 2009.
- 20 Adrian Vickers, *Journeys of Desire: The Balinese Malat in Text and History*. Leiden, 2005; *Peradaban Pesisir: Menuju Sejarah Budaya Asia Tenggara*. Yogyakarta, 2009.
- 21 David S. G. Goodman, 'Economics, Empire, and Ethnicity: Old Perspectives on China and Globalisation', seminar paper, 13 May, The University of Sydney, 2009.
- 22 Anton O. Zakharov, 'Constructing the polity of Sriwijaya in the 7th–8th centuries: The view according to the inscriptions', *Indonesian Studies*

- Working Papers series, The University of Sydney, 2009 <<http://www.arts.usyd.edu.au/departs/indonesian/series/papers.shtml#number9>>.
- 23 Michael Aung Thwin, *The Mists of Ramanna: The Legend that Was Lower Burma*, Honolulu, 2005.
 - 24 Eric R. Wolf, *Europe and the People without History*, Berkeley, 1982, pp.82–83.
 - 25 Craig J. Reynolds, 'A New Look at Old Southeast Asia', *The Journal of Asian Studies* 54 (1995): 419–46.
 - 26 Adrian Vickers, *Bali: A Paradise Created*, Ringwood, Vic., 1989.
 - 27 Michel Picard, *Bali: Cultural Tourism and Touristic Culture*, Singapore, 1996.
 - 28 Adrian Vickers, 'Balinese Art and the Struggle to be Modern', *TAASA Review* 15.4 (December 2006): 8–9.
 - 29 Goh Beng-Lan, *Modern Dreams: An Inquiry into Power, Cultural Production, and the Cityscape in Contemporary Urban Penang, Malaysia*, Ithaca, 2002.
 - 30 Craig J. Reynolds, *Thai Radical Discourse: the Real Face of Thai Feudalism Today*, Ithaca, N.Y.: Southeast Asia Program, Cornell University, 1987; Ruth McVey, 'The Enchantment of Revolution: History and Action in an Indonesian Communist Text', in Anthony Reid and David Marr, eds, *Perceptions of the Past in Southeast Asia*, pp.340–58, Hong Kong, 1979.
 - 31 Michele Ford, *Workers and Intellectuals: NGOs, Trade Unions and the Indonesian Labour Movement*. Singapore: Asian Studies Association of Australia, NUS Press, 2009.