

MARITIME SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

A Survey of their Post-War Development
and Current Resources



PETER CAREY

JASO OCCASIONAL PAPERS

1. VERONIKA GÖRÖG-KARADY (ed.)
Genres, Forms, Meanings: Essays in African Oral Literature
2. RUI FEIJÓ, HERMINIO MARTINS and JOÃO DE PINA-CABRAL (eds.)
Death in Portugal: Studies in Portuguese Anthropology and Modern History
3. B.A.L. CRANSTONE and STEVEN SEIDENBERG (eds.)
The General's Gift: A Celebration of the Pitt Rivers Museum Centenary, 1884-1984
4. R.H. BARNES, DANIEL DE COPPET and R.J. PARKIN (eds.)
Contexts and Levels: Anthropological Essays on Hierarchy
5. JOY HENDRY and JONATHAN WEBBER (eds.)
Interpreting Japanese Society: Anthropological Approaches
6. PETER CAREY
*Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom:
A Survey of their Post-War Development and Current Resources*

The publication of this volume has been supported by a grant from the Arnold, Bryce and Read Fund of the Modern History Faculty, University of Oxford.

Copyright © JASO 1986. All rights reserved.

Typeset in 10-point Baskerville at Oxford University Computing Service.
Printed in Great Britain at Ashford Press, Curdridge, Southampton.

JASO is a journal devoted to social anthropology, now in its seventeenth year; it appears three times annually. Subscription and other information may be obtained by writing directly to the Editors, *JASO*, 51 Banbury Road, Oxford, OX2 6PE, England.

JASO OCCASIONAL PAPERS No. 6

General Editors: Jonathan Webber, Robert Parkin, Steven Seidenberg,
Edwin Ardener

MARITIME
SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES
IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

A Survey of Their Post-War Development
and Current Resources

PETER CAREY



JASO

Oxford 1986

FOREWORD

THE idea of undertaking a survey of this nature was first suggested to me by Dr Christian Pelras of the Association Archipel in Paris, when I was visiting the École des Hautes Études en Sciences Sociales as a Directeur d'Études Associé at the invitation of the Association in March 1983. Himself the author of a very useful survey article on Indonesian Studies in France which appeared in the Association's journal, *Archipel*, in 1978,¹ Dr Pelras suggested that the present survey should follow the same format and be restricted principally to the Malayo-Indonesian world, the area of principal concern to the readers of *Archipel*. He also cited, by way of example, the other survey articles which have appeared in *Archipel* over the years on Indonesian and Southeast Asian studies in Japan,² Australia,³ and the Netherlands.⁴ However, when I began my work, it soon became obvious that if the survey was to be anything like comprehensive, it would have to be a good deal longer than either Dr Pelras's own article or the others on Japan, Australia and the Netherlands. In particular, I considered that the scope of the survey should be widened as far as possible to take in work on the non-Malayo-Indonesian areas of Maritime Southeast Asia (in particular the Philippines and Singapore) and the Indian Ocean and Oceanian worlds. The result was that when the survey with its three bulky appendices was completed in

1. Christian Pelras, 'Indonesian Studies in France: Retrospect, Situation and Prospects', *Archipel* 16 (1978), pp. 7–20. This article was also made available as a separate publication by the Cultural Service of the French Embassy in Singapore (5 Gallop Road, Singapore 1025) under the title *Malayo Indonesian Studies in France*.

2. Akira Nagazumi, 'Southeast Asian Studies in Japan', *Archipel* 9 (1975), pp. 3–20.

3. Anthony Reid, "Alterity" and "Reformism": The Australian Frontier in Indonesian Studies', *Archipel* 21 (1981), pp. 7–18.

4. C.D. Grijns, 'Indonesian Studies in the Netherlands around 1980: A Note on their Scope and Position', *Archipel* 24 (1982), pp. 3–16.

mid-1985, it had become much too large for the editors of *Archipel* to contemplate publishing. Instead, an arrangement was reached whereby only the Introduction and Appendix III (the list of libraries, archives and ethnographic collections with holdings on Maritime Southeast Asia, Oceania and the Indian Ocean region) were published in *Archipel*,⁵ the complete survey being permitted to appear elsewhere as a separate publication. Thanks to the good offices of Dr Jonathan Webber of the *Journal of the Anthropological Society of Oxford* (*JASO*), it has been possible to print the latter in the present modestly-priced but handsome format. I wish to express my heartfelt thanks to Dr Webber and the other members of the editorial team of *JASO*, as well as to Mr Stephen Ashworth, who so ably typeset my manuscript and endured my numerous corrections. I would also like to record my gratitude to the Trustees of the recently amalgamated Arnold, Bryce and Read Fund of the University of Oxford's Modern History Faculty for their generous financial support. The Association of South-East Asian Studies in the United Kingdom (ASEASUK), by a decision taken at their Annual General Meeting of March 1985, was kind enough to agree to sponsor the project, and I am particularly indebted to the Secretary of ASEASUK, Dr A.J. Stockwell of the Royal Holloway College, for his constant assistance. Finally, I would like to thank all those, academics as well as librarians, who have cooperated so generously in giving me their time and providing me with the necessary information without which this survey could not have been written. It is to them and their families that I would like to dedicate this work.

Inevitably any survey of such a vast and complex field is bound to be inadequate and incomplete. The tyranny of time alone will soon make many of the details provided in the appendices out of date. But even so, as a snapshot of Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom in the mid-1980s, it may still have its uses if only to identify the main areas of strength and weakness. It is also hoped that it will facilitate greater cooperation between individual scholars and between institutions, so vital at a period such as this when financial resources to promote research and teaching on the Maritime Southeast Asian world in the U.K. are becoming ever scarcer.

Trinity College,
Oxford

March 1986

5. Peter Carey, 'Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom: A Survey of Their Development, 1945-85', *Archipel* 31 (1986), pp. 19-54.

CONTENTS

<i>Foreword</i>	v
 Part I	
Survey of Post-War Developments, 1945–85	3
 Part II: Current Resources	
<i>Lists of Entries in Appendices I, II and III</i>	27
<i>Index to Entries in Appendices II and III by Geographical Location</i>	31
Appendix I: List of Scholars in the United Kingdom with Major Research Interests in Maritime Southeast Asia, Oceania and the Indian Ocean Region	35
Appendix II: List of University Departments and Centres in the United Kingdom Specializing in Teaching and Research on Maritime Southeast Asia, Oceania and the Indian Ocean Region	61
Appendix III: List of Libraries, Archives and Ethnographic Collections with Holdings on Maritime Southeast Asia, Oceania and the Indian Ocean Region	83
<i>Principal References Cited</i>	115

PART I

SURVEY OF POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS, 1945–85

‘The rule is, jam to-morrow and jam yesterday—but never jam to-day.’

Lewis Carroll, *Through the Looking Glass* (1872)

SURVEY OF POST-WAR DEVELOPMENTS, 1945-85

Introduction

THE purpose of the present survey is to give an account of the historical evolution of Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom since the Second World War, and to provide information on the current research interests of British scholars, the main teaching activities of the various departments and centres in the U.K., and the available library, archive and ethnographic resources (see Appendices I-III). It is hoped that this will be of use both to foreign scholars with an interest in Southeast Asia, and to academics in the British Isles who are perhaps insufficiently informed about the current interests of their colleagues.

It should be noted that the term 'Maritime Southeast Asia' here refers to the countries of the Southeast Asian archipelago, namely, Malaysia, Singapore, Indonesia, Brunei and the Philippines. Papua-New Guinea, Oceania, and the Indian Ocean region have also been touched on in connection with scholars and libraries which have Southeast Asian interests,¹ but the present author cannot claim that his coverage of these latter areas has been anything like comprehensive. It would take a separate article to do them justice. Moreover, even within the Maritime Southeast Asian region, certain countries (e.g. Malaysia and Indonesia) loom far larger than others. Studies on the Philippines, for example, have never been strong in the U.K. and the library resources are

It should be noted that the term 'Southeast Asia' is spelled in various ways in the present work. 'Southeast Asia' has been retained throughout, except in those cases where institutions or authors have adopted different spellings (e.g. South East Asia, South-East Asia).

1. See Appendix I, nos. 7, 21, 23a, 39 and 40; and Appendix III pt. C.

patchy.² Since the Second World War, very few Filipino students have studied for higher degrees at British universities, at least in the social sciences,³ and even fewer British scholars have carried out fieldwork in that country, even though it is one of the most open and receptive to foreign researchers in the entire region.⁴ Given the current resources available for Southeast Asian Studies in the U.K. today, however, it does not look as though this situation will change very much in the near future.

Since many of the problems relating to the current state of Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in Britain are also valid for the wider Southeast Asian area, the broader regional picture has been constantly referred to; but the detailed focus has throughout been placed on the island world.⁵

2. The only libraries with substantial holdings on the Philippines are the British Library and the Library of the School of Oriental and African Studies in London (see Appendix III, pt. A, nos. 2A and 11). The Brynmor Jones Library of the University of Hull has a smaller collection, which is primarily of use for teaching purposes (see *ibid.*, pt. A, no. 6). Important archival materials relating to the Philippines, especially the records of British trading companies with Philippine interests, can be found in the Public Record Office in London (see *ibid.*, pt. A, no. 9); and there is an interesting collection of Philippiniana (mainly nineteenth-century Spanish-language volumes) in the Edinburgh University Library (see Appendix III, pt. B, no. 2).

3. Only two theses (out of 169) were completed on Philippine topics at the University of London between 1965 and 1977: one on linguistics (Rosseller Ing, 'A Phonological Analysis of Chabacano', Ph.D., University College London, 1968), and one on international relations (Richard Chung Sum Kwan, 'The Sabah Dispute and the Character of Philippine Diplomacy', M.Phil., London School of Economics, 1971); see G.B. Milner (ed.), *List of Theses and Dissertations concerned with South East Asia accepted for Higher Degrees of the University of London, 1965-1977*, London: Centre of South East Asian Studies, SOAS 1978. At the present time, there are Filipino students who are completing or have completed theses at Oxford (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 4C) and Cambridge (Miss Mia Fernando [Corpus Christi College], 'British Trade and Sugar Production in the Philippines during the Nineteenth Century' [supervisor: Dr D.A. Brading, a Latin-America expert]), and a student of Dr Leifer's preparing an M.Phil. on Philippine foreign policy at the London School of Economics (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 3A n. 15). See also Appendix II, pt. A, no. 3, and pt. B, no. 1C, for references to Ph.D. theses on the Philippine Communist Party and Philippine rice production, by Dr Jim Richardson and Dr Joyatee Smith respectively.

4. This is particularly the case in the fields of archaeology and prehistory, where the Philippines welcomes, or, at least, tolerates, interests by non-Filipino archaeologists and prehistorians, whereas Indonesia and Malaysia make it extremely difficult for foreign scholars to undertake extensive archaeological fieldwork in those countries. This is one of the reasons why so few young scholars with interests in Maritime Southeast Asian archaeology have been able to establish themselves in their chosen field (Dr Ian Glover, personal communication, 2 March 1984). On the contrast between the Philippines and Indonesia in terms of archival sources and ease of access for foreign researchers, see Robert van Niel, *A Survey of Historical Source Materials in Java and Manila*, Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press 1970. It should be pointed out, however, that since Professor van Niel completed his report in the late 1960s, conditions at the Arsip Nasional in Jakarta have improved enormously and access for foreign scholars is now much easier; see *Itinerario. Bulletin of the Leiden Centre for the History of European Expansion*, Vol. III no. 1 (1979), pp. 36-63.

5. This is especially the case with the information assembled in the three Appendices attached to this survey.

The Historical Background (1945-75)

Dr Russell Jones, recently retired (1984) as a Senior Lecturer of the School of Oriental and African Studies (henceforth SOAS) in London (see Appendix I, no. 33), has already given an account of the history of British involvement in Malay Studies from the seventeenth century to the early twentieth,⁶ and has promised a further article which will take developments up to the 1950s. As far as Indonesia is concerned, Dr John Bastin, currently Reader Emeritus in the Modern History of South East Asia at SOAS (see Appendix I, no. 5), has also dealt with the contribution of British scholars to the study of modern Indonesian history up to the mid-1960s.⁷ So this is not the place to give a detailed historical survey of the evolution of Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the U.K. Nevertheless, since it is impossible to understand the present difficulties experienced by area-studies centres in Britain today without reference to the historical background, certain comments on twentieth-century developments will be made by way of introduction.

In 1907, when the University of London and a number of interested societies first approached the British Government with the idea of empanelling a committee to look into the whole question of teaching and research in Oriental Studies in London, Britain was still a world power. With new developments taking place in her colonial territories, and the threat of armed conflict in Europe looming ever larger, it made good sense to establish a centre which would provide specialized expertise on Asian areas where Britain had direct political concerns.⁸ Ten years later, during the worst days of World War I, with British armies locked in deadly conflict in France and the Middle East, the School of Oriental (after 1938, Oriental and African) Studies began to admit its first students and was formally opened by King George V as a new college of the University of London.⁹ Within the first decade of its existence, the number of students rose from a few hundred to over 3000, and many academic posts were created. On the whole, the scholars who filled these positions in the inter-war years were drawn from the ranks of ex-colonial and ex-foreign service officers, and their links with government departments and intelligence bureaux remained strong.

This pattern continued through the period of the Second World War, and, in the closing stages of that conflict (December 1944), the Secretary of State for

6. Russell Jones, 'Malay Studies and the British. I: An Outline History to the Early Twentieth Century', *Archipel* 28 (1984), pp. 117-48.

7. John Bastin, 'English Sources for the Modern Period of Indonesian History', in Soedjatmoko *et al.* (eds.), *An Introduction to Indonesian Historiography*, Ithaca: Cornell University Press 1965, pp. 252-71.

8. See *School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. Calendar for the Sixty-ninth Session 1984-85*, Norwich: Page Bros Ltd. (for the School of Oriental and African Studies) 1984 (henceforth *SOAS Calendar*), p. 45. The report of the committee set up to look into the question stressed the 'urgent need for suitable teaching in London for those about to take up administrative and commercial posts in Asia and Africa'.

9. *Ibid.*, p. 46.

Foreign Affairs, Sir Anthony Eden (after 1957, First Earl of Avon) (1897–1977), who had himself taken a First in Oriental Studies (Persian and Arabic) at Oxford, appointed an Interdepartmental Commission of Enquiry on Oriental, Slavonic, East European and African Studies, under the chairmanship of the Eleventh Earl of Scarbrough. The report of this body, known as the Scarbrough Commission after the name of its chairman, ranged far wider than just the universities and took in the whole gamut of academic, government, financial, cultural and business connections with the areas concerned. Its final report, submitted in April 1946, recommended *inter alia* that substantial new funds should be made available for the expansion of specialist language-teaching and research at the main British institutions of higher education. Prominent amongst these was, of course, the University of London, where both the School of Slavonic and East European Languages and SOAS underwent a period of rapid growth during the five years between 1947 and 1952, when the British Government first implemented the Commission's recommendations. It was during this period, for example, that the pre-war Department of the Languages and Cultures of South East Asia and the Islands was re-established at SOAS, and new Departments of Law and Anthropology created.¹⁰

The Scarbrough Commission thus marked the first stage in the great expansion of area studies in the U.K. in the immediate post-war period. Many younger scholars benefited from the research opportunities opened up by the Scarbrough scholarships,¹¹ and several new posts were created at SOAS and elsewhere. Amongst the most important of these, as far as Southeast Asian Studies were concerned, was the chair of the History of South East Asia at SOAS (now unfilled), which was first occupied by the legendary D.G.E. Hall (1891–1979).¹² During his decade (1949–59) as Professor at SOAS, Hall helped to train a whole new generation of British historians of Southeast Asia and presided over the development of the Department of South East Asia and the Islands, whose head he became. It was under his aegis that new appointments were made in the fields of Thai, Mon, Cambodian, Vietnamese, and Pacific linguistic and literary studies. Existing work in Burmese, Malay and Indonesian was strengthened, and new courses were introduced in Southeast Asian art and archaeology.¹³ Above all, the first edition of his *magnum opus*, *A History of South-East Asia*, which appeared in 1955 (it is now in its fourth revised edition), did much to establish the region as a recognized field of study in English-speaking

10. Ibid., pp. 46–7.

11. Among the many scholars of Maritime Southeast Asia currently holding senior positions in British universities who benefited from these scholarships are Professor Rodney Needham (see Appendix I, no. 49) and Dr Leslie Palmier (see Appendix I, no. 51).

12. For a short biography of Hall, see C.D. Cowan, 'D.G.E. Hall: A Biographical Sketch', in C.D. Cowan and O.W. Wolters (eds.), *Southeast Asian History and Historiography: Essays Presented to D.G.E. Hall*, Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press 1976, pp. 11–23.

13. Ibid., pp. 20–1.

universities.¹⁴

The research initiatives set in train by the Scarbrough Commission were to some extent paralleled in the British colonial territories of Sarawak and Sabah (British North Borneo) by the important sociological surveys commissioned by the Colonial Social Science Research Council in the late 1940s and early 1950s.¹⁵ These were written in the wake of the seminal report by Dr (now Professor Sir) Edmund Leach (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 1A), who had been invited out to Sarawak and North Borneo by the Colonial Office from June to November 1947 to investigate the possibilities for socio-economic research projects in the region.¹⁶ Leach's subsequent (anonymous) patronage of the London School of Economics (LSE) monograph series on Social Anthropology (published by the Athlone Press) was of vital importance in the development of anthropological research on Southeast Asia in Britain, since it provided a ready publication outlet for LSE doctoral dissertations on the region.

Two other anthropologists of great distinction, who did much to make the LSE a centre of international repute on Southeast Asia in the 1950s, were Professor Maurice Freedman and his wife, Judith Djamour. Their work on the Singapore (overseas) Chinese and Malays was extremely influential in focusing subsequent British research on these major ethnic populations of the archipelago.¹⁷ The Freedmans were later closely connected with the London-Cornell Project for South and South-East Asian Studies, which, along with the newly-founded British Social Science Research Council, did so much to further social science research on Southeast Asia in Britain during the 1960s and 1970s. It was from these beginnings that Professor Freedman was inspired to form the Association of South-East Asian Studies in the United Kingdom (ASEASUK) in 1969, and to

14. Ibid., p. 20.

15. The main reports were as follows: (1) F.D. (Derek) Freeman, *Report on the Iban* (Kuching 1955; reprinted as LSE Monographs on Social Anthropology no. 41), London: Athlone Press 1970; idem, *Iban Agriculture* (Colonial Research Studies no. 18), London: HMSO 1955; (2) W.R. Geddes, *The Land Dayaks of Sarawak: A Report on a Social Economic Survey of the Land Dayaks of Sarawak presented to the Colonial Social Science Research Council* (Colonial Research Studies no. 11), London: HMSO 1954 (later partly reprinted in popular paperback form as *Nine Dayak Nights*, Melbourne 1957; itself reprinted London: Galaxy Books 1968); (3) H.S. Morris, *Report on a Melanau Sago Producing Community in Sarawak* (Colonial Research Studies no. 9), London: HMSO 1953; and (4) T'ien Ju-K'ang, *The Chinese of Sarawak: A Study of Social Structure* (LSE Monographs on Social Anthropology no. 12), London: Athlone Press 1953. There was also one unpublished report for the Colonial SSRC on North Borneo (Sabah) by Monica Glyn-Jones, *The Dusun of the Penampang Plains in North Borneo* (December 1953).

16. E.R. Leach, *Social Science Research in Sarawak: A Report on the Possibilities of a Social Economic Survey of Sarawak presented to the Colonial Social Science Research Council* (Colonial Research Studies no. 1), London: HMSO 1950. Leach's report and the socio-economic surveys which followed (see above n. 15) had been prompted by the Colonial Office's desire to gain better information on Sarawak society in view of the very rapid political changes (e.g. the growth of Malay nationalism and Chinese communism) in the immediate post-war years.

17. See Maurice Freedman, *Chinese Family and Marriage in Singapore* (Colonial Research Studies no. 20), London: HMSO 1957; and Judith Djamour, *Malay Kinship and Marriage in Singapore* (LSE Monographs on Social Anthropology no. 21), London: Athlone Press 1959.

cooperate with Leach in the creation of the British Academy's short-lived Institute in South-East Asia (1976–86) (see below). His untimely death in 1975, shortly after moving to the chair of Social Anthropology at Oxford (previously held by the legendary E.E. Evans-Pritchard), was a great blow to Southeast Asian Studies in Britain, coming as it did just as the chill winds of economic stringency and retrenchment were beginning to blow through British universities.

Although the developments at SOAS and the LSE, as well as the research carried out under the aegis of the Scarbrough Commission and the Colonial Office in Southeast Asia in the immediate post-war period, were impressive, they were not matched by anything equivalent in the non-metropolitan British universities, which had witnessed very little change in the traditional structure of their faculties and courses. It was against the background of this disappointment at what had happened in the wider academic community in Britain that the University Grants Committee (the main funding review body for British universities) set up a new committee in January 1960 under the chairmanship of Sir William Hayter, a senior Foreign Office official (subsequently British ambassador in Moscow), which was given the task of assessing how successfully the recommendations of the 1946 Scarbrough Commission had been implemented.¹⁸

While preparing their report, members of this Hayter Committee toured the main graduate centres in the United States and were deeply impressed by the Area Studies Programs (amongst them Cornell University's decade-old Southeast Asia Program), with their generous provision for specialized language tuition, extensive library resources and fieldwork grants, and, above all, their stress on interdisciplinary cooperation and work in the social sciences. Inspired by what they had seen, the Committee published its final report in May 1961, recommending that funds should be made available for a major expansion in social science teaching in Asian, African, Slavonic and East European Studies. They also advised that instruction in the traditional linguistic, literary, cultural and historical disciplines should be further supported and expanded. This meant, as far as Southeast Asian Studies were concerned, that SOAS's role as the pre-eminent centre of research and teaching in the traditional disciplines was to be protected, and that all language teaching would be centred in London. This was to have important (and not altogether favourable) consequences for the new Southeast Asian Studies Centres set up in the wake of the Hayter Committee report (see below).

These recommendations were accepted by the University Grants Committee, and a period of rapid development of the new social science disciplines took place in universities across the country. At SOAS, for example, new Departments of Economic and Political Studies, and of Geography, were established, and the scope of the Department of Anthropology was extended to include sociology.¹⁹

18. *SOAS Calendar*, p. 47.

19. *Ibid.*

Of equal importance was the establishment of new area-studies centres both in London and in the provincial universities. In 1966, no less than five such centres, including one especially for Southeast Asian Studies, were set up at SOAS, while outside London, Centres for Southeast Asian Studies were started at the University of Hull in 1962, and at the University of Kent at Canterbury in 1969. The first was a direct result of the new funding made available by the University Grants Committee as a consequence of the Hayter Committee proposals; the second was altogether more fortuitous, in that extra funds suddenly became available due to the demise of another centre and, while Hull hesitated about whether to accept them, Kent evinced an immediate interest and used the funds to get their own Southeast Asia Centre started.²⁰ The efforts of Professor Paul Stirling, a founder member of the University, and Dr Dennis Duncanson, a Reader in Political Science and expert on Indochina, were crucial here, and it was under their aegis that the Centre began to develop in the early 1970s. In this manner, two non-metropolitan Centres for Southeast Asian Studies were established in the U.K. in the 1960s: a designated Hayter Centre at Hull (see Appendix II, pt. A, no. 1), and a non-Hayter Centre at Kent (see Appendix II, pt. A, no. 2), created largely through the energy and imagination of the local university staff.

Both these Centres developed strongly after their inception and played a crucial role in decentralizing Southeast (especially Maritime Southeast) Asian Studies away from SOAS in the late 1960s and 1970s. In line with the Hayter Committee's recommendations, both Centres gave pride of place to the social science disciplines, and lecturers were recruited in the fields of economics, history, politics, geography, sociology, social anthropology and law.²¹ Moreover, at Hull and, to a lesser extent, at Kent, lecturers with Southeast Asian interests were from the start full members of their appropriate departments and taught across a wide disciplinary range, thus avoiding the rather narrow Southeast Asia-centric orientation of their colleagues at SOAS. The majority of the courses on Southeast Asia at the undergraduate level were also taught as optional subjects to students pursuing traditional departmental degrees, since the number of those opting for the joint honours degree in South-East Asian Studies was always quite small.²² The constitutional position of the Hull Centre as a gathering of departmental members with a common interest in Southeast Asia and a common arrangement for the provision of South-East Asian Studies degrees is thus a very special one, and can be seen as one of the particular

20. Communication of Dr Dennis Duncanson to the interdisciplinary teaching panel on Southeast Asia at the ASEASUK Conference at Kent, 29–31 March 1984.

21. See Bernhard Dahm, *Die Südostasienwissenschaft in den USA in Westeuropa und in der Bundesrepublik Deutschland: Ein Bericht im Auftrag des Instituts für Asienkunde, Hamburg*, Göttingen: Verlag Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht 1975, pp. 41–2.

22. On the structure of the Southeast Asian courses at Hull, Kent and SOAS, see D.K. Bassett, 'Southeast Asian Studies in the United Kingdom', in Tunku Shamsul Bahrin *et al.*, *A Colloquium on Southeast Asian Studies*, Singapore: ISEAS 1977, pp. 58–71.

strengths of the Centre. Significantly, the one attempt to break that pattern by the dynamic first director of the Centre, Professor Mervyn Jaspán (in office 1968–75), was a failure. The special Department of South-East Asian Sociology, which he helped to set up in 1972, did not survive his tragic death in April 1975, and the example has not been repeated.²³

At the graduate level, Hull soon made its mark as a centre of excellence, and between 1969 and 1985 no fewer than forty Ph.D. and M.Phil. degrees were completed on Southeast Asian subjects.²⁴ Furthermore, many of these degree-holders went on to secure academic jobs in the Southeast Asian field, both in the U.K. and overseas, an impressive record at a time when such posts were becoming ever scarcer due to the global economic recession and cutbacks in university posts worldwide.²⁵ The excellent library provisions at Hull, an area in which Professor Jaspán had taken a special interest, was one of the reasons for this success at the graduate level. From the first, the University also made available a generous library budget for the Centre, and, by 1970, when the various holdings were consolidated into one collection, there were already over 10,000 volumes.²⁶ Since then, the number has more than doubled, making it probably the most important single library collection on Southeast Asia outside London (see Appendix III, pt. A, no. 6). Indeed, Hull has been supremely fortunate in having had a succession of very able Librarians and Southeast Asian Assistant Librarians such as Miss Brenda E. Moon (now at the Edinburgh University Library; see Appendix III, pt. B, no. 2), Miss Helen Cordell (now at SOAS; see Appendix I, no. 15), Mr Alan Lodge (now the Assistant Librarian of the Rhodes House Library in Oxford; see Appendix III, pt. A, no. 1) and Miss Helen Stephens (the present incumbent; see Appendix III, pt. A, no. 6), who have made it their task to build on the foundations established by Professor Jaspán and

23. Dahm, *Südostasienwissenschaft*, p. 42; and, for an obituary notice on Professor Mervyn Jaspán (1925–75), Professor of South-East Asian Sociology at Hull, see *Indonesia Circle*, no. 7 (June 1975), pp. 10–11.

24. See the handlist prepared by the staff of the Hull South-East Asia Centre for the University Grants Committee, 'Successful Higher Degree (Thesis) Students supervised by Centre Staff 1969/70 to 1984/85'. I am grateful to Dr D.K. Bassett for letting me have a copy of this list.

25. Amongst those who completed higher degrees at Hull and secured academic jobs in the U.K. during the period 1969–85 are: Dr D.E. Short (Ph.D. Geography, 1971), Lecturer in South-East Asian Geography, University of Dundee; Dr C.W. Watson (M.A. Sociology, 1972; Ph.D., Cambridge, 1981), Lecturer in Southeast Asian Studies, University of Kent (see Appendix I, no. 63); Dr R.W.A. Vokes (Ph.D. Economics, 1978), Lecturer in Southeast Asian Economics, University of Kent (see Appendix I, no. 58); J.R. Walton (M.A. Economics, 1979), Lecturer in Economics, University of Hull (see Appendix II, pt. A, no. 1); Dr V.T. King (Ph.D. Sociology, 1981), Lecturer in South-East Asian Sociology, University of Hull (see Appendix I, no. 38); Dr M.J.G. Parnwell (Ph.D. Geography, 1984), Temporary Lecturer in South-East Asian Geography, University of Hull (see Appendix II, pt. A, no. 1); and Dr C. Webster (Ph.D. Geography, 1985), Lecturer in South-East Asian Geography, University of Wales Institute of Science and Technology (Cardiff). See the Hull Centre's list of 'Successful Higher Degree (Thesis) Students', cited in the previous footnote.

26. Dr D.K. Bassett, personal communication, 2 Oct. 1984. The library budget at Hull for Southeast Asian purchases has been in the region of £3–4,000 per annum over the past decade.

others in the late 1960s and early 1970s.²⁷

By contrast, the Southeast Asian holdings of the new Centre at Kent were always far more modest and were only designed to cover undergraduate teaching needs.²⁸ The proximity of the University to the excellent research libraries in London (see Appendix III, pt. A, nos. 2 and 9–11; and pt. B, nos. 1, 3–5, 7–9 and 11) was thought sufficient for Kent's needs, and the level of University support for the Centre's library budget was correspondingly much lower than at Hull.²⁹ This later proved something of a drawback when the Centre began to expand its graduate teaching activities after the mid-1970s (see below).

No provisions were made initially at either Hull or Kent for instruction in Southeast Asian languages—still less in the literature, art and archaeology of the region—since the generous facilities at SOAS in these fields were deemed sufficient at the national level.³⁰ This followed on from the Hayter Committee's proposals, which had sought to maintain and expand the existing expertise at the School (see above), while encouraging the new centres outside the metropolis to break new ground in teaching and research in the social sciences. In retrospect, this decision to rely solely on London for specialized language tuition (the bedrock for any effective research on the region) was a mistake, and was one of the reasons why neither Hull nor Kent ever developed the inter-disciplinary range of equivalent Southeast Asia area-studies centres in the United States which the members of the Hayter Committee had taken as their model (see above).

Despite these drawbacks, developments at both Hull and Kent up to the mid-1970s boded well for the future. Meanwhile, during the same period, SOAS continued to expand, attracting many talented students from Southeast Asia, in particular Malaysia, the majority of whom went on to complete masters and doctoral degrees under the supervision of SOAS staff. The list of 169 theses and dissertations concerned with Southeast Asia which were accepted for higher degrees at the University of London between 1965 and 1977 bears eloquent testimony to the productiveness and versatility of the School in these years.³¹

27. Mr Lewis Hill, the Curator of the Ethnographic Collection at Hull (see Appendix I, no. 26 and Appendix III, pt. C, no. 16), also played a very important part with Professor Jaspan in the establishment of the Southeast Asian library collection at Hull in the early 1970s.

28. Sarah Carter (revised by Georgia Briscoe), *UKC Library. Southeast Asian Studies: A Guide to Library Resources* (March 1982).

29. The annual library budget at Kent for Southeast Asian purchases over the past few years has been in the region of £900, and no books are bought in Southeast Asian vernacular languages.

30. Dahm, *Südostasienwissenschaft*, p. 39. Since the mid-1970s, Kent has had some assistance in the teaching of Malay/Bahasa Indonesia from Mr Arthur Godman, a retired Malayan Civil Service (MCS) official.

31. Milner (ed.), *List of Theses and Dissertations* (1977). This shows that out of the 169 theses, no less than 48 were on topics relating to Malaysia and Singapore. Furthermore, although forty per cent (or about 75 theses) were completed by British citizens, less than a dozen of these graduates went on to secure academic posts in British universities, almost certainly because of the contraction of Southeast Asian Studies in the late 1970s and early 1980s.

Hall's successor as Professor of South East Asian History, C.D. Cowan, who held the chair from 1961 until 1976 (when he became Director of SOAS), did much to further the discipline of modern history at SOAS. Himself the author of several important studies on nineteenth-century Malaya, Cowan, who was also the first chairman of the Centre of South East Asian Studies at SOAS (in office 1966–71), presided over a department which contained no less than six Southeast Asian historians, five of them (Cowan himself, J.G. de Casparis, John Bastin, Merle Ricklefs and J.A.M. Caldwell) concerned with the maritime parts of the region.³² At the same time, together with the Thai specialist, Professor E.H.S. Simmonds (Head of the Department of South East Asia and the Islands at SOAS, 1966–82), he was instrumental in furthering the links with Cornell which had been established through Professor Hall in the 1960s. The aforementioned London–Cornell Project for South and South-East Asian Studies, which they helped to set up, proved of inestimable value, bringing to SOAS scholars of the calibre of Professor David Wyatt, Dr Ruth McVey (see Appendix I, no. 46), and Professor Merle Ricklefs.³³

During these years interesting developments also occurred in the Department of South East Asia and the Islands at SOAS, which contained around fifteen teachers of languages and literatures, one third of whom were concerned with Malay, Indonesian and Austronesian studies. Initially the main emphasis was on Malay language and literature, since the formative experience of the teachers (notably Mr J.C. Bottoms [died 1965] and Mr E.C.G. Barrett) had been in British Malaya. However, with the arrival of Dr Russell Jones and Dr Nigel Phillips (see Appendix I, no. 52) in the Department in 1966–7, an important shift began to take place towards Bahasa Indonesia, a development which was consolidated after Dr Jones's return from a sabbatical year in Jakarta in 1970–1 and the retirement of Dr Barrett in September 1971. Since that time, the emphasis has been almost exclusively on Indonesian language and literature, with Malay being taught only as a minor option. The establishment of an Indonesian 'overseas' lectureship in 1970 (held successively by Mr Oking Gandamihardja [1970–73] and Dr Khaidir Anwar [1973–82]) greatly assisted this process, as did the appointment of Dr Ulrich Kratz to a post in Indonesian in 1975.

Among the most important initiatives taken by members of the department in the field of Indonesian Studies in the early 1970s were the establishment of the Indonesia Circle Society in March 1973, and the launching of a thrice-yearly periodical which, from modest beginnings as a cyclostyled newsletter, has

32. Today (1985), by contrast, there are only two Southeast Asian historians in the Department of Modern History at SOAS, Dr Ralph Smith and Dr Ian Brown, neither of whom are principally interested in the island world of Southeast Asia.

33. The 'brain drain' was not all in one direction. O.W. Walters, one of Professor D.G.E. Hall's most outstanding doctoral students (later one of his junior colleagues) at SOAS in the late 1950s, went to Cornell in 1963 as the first Goldwin Smith Professor of Southeast Asian History, a post which he held until his retirement in 1985.

developed into a recognized journal in the field.³⁴ Dr Jones, the guiding light behind both these developments, was also involved, along with Professor Luigi Santamaria, Professor Denys Lombard and others, in the foundation of the Indonesia Etymological Project in Paris in July 1973.³⁵ Unfortunately, these encouraging developments in the field of Indonesian Studies were not paralleled by anything equivalent in the equally important disciplines of Old Javanese and Javanese, where teaching effectively lapsed after the retirement of Dr Christiaan Hookyaas (1902–79) in 1970, and the departure of Dr J. G. de Casparis for a chair in Leiden in 1978.

One final development of importance at SOAS during this period was the completion of its new building and library in 1973, which, for the first time since the war, brought the various SOAS departments and collections together under one roof and gave the School a new sense of academic community.³⁶

However, it would be wrong to think of Southeast Asian Studies—still less Maritime Southeast Asian Studies—during this period entirely in terms of SOAS and the provincial centres. Elsewhere new appointments, such as those of Dr Ian Glover to a Lectureship in the Prehistory of South and Southeast Asia at the Institute of Archaeology in London (see Appendix I, no. 24) in 1970, Dr Michael Leifer (previously of the Hull South-East Asia Centre) to a position in the Department of International Relations at the London School of Economics (see Appendix I, no. 42), and Dr Joel Kahn to a Lectureship (now Readership) in Anthropology at University College London (see Appendix I, no. 34), helped to strengthen Southeast Asian teaching in the other colleges of the University of London (see Appendix II, pt. B, nos. 3A and 3B). A strong interest in Malaysia and Indonesia had also developed in the Institute of Social Anthropology at Oxford, where several doctoral theses, based on extensive anthropological fieldwork in the archipelago, were supervised by Dr Rodney Needham (after 1976, Professor of Social Anthropology at the University of Oxford, see Appendix I, no. 49) in the late 1960s and 1970s. One of Needham's students, Dr Robert Barnes (see Appendix I, no. 2), whose study of Kédang had been published in 1974,³⁷ later returned to the Institute in 1978 to take up a post as a University Lecturer in Social Anthropology, thus further strengthening its archipelagic interests, especially in the ethnographic studies of eastern Indonesian peoples

34. This society holds regular meetings to which guest speakers (usually researchers recently returned from Indonesia) are invited. Membership of the Indonesia Circle (currently £8.00 per annum) includes a subscription to the three numbers of the journal, which appears in March, June and November. Those interested in subscribing should write to The Editor, Indonesia Circle, School of Oriental and African Studies, Malet Street, London WC1E 7HP, England.

35. On the origins of the Indonesian Etymological Project, see Russell Jones, 'Ten Years On: A Note on the Indonesian Etymological Project and its Colloquia' (note circulated at the 1983 Leiden Colloquium), and on the colloquia which it has sponsored, see below n. 60.

36. *SOAS Calendar*, p. 48.

37. R.H. Barnes, *Kédang: A Study of the Collective Thought of an Eastern Indonesian People*, Oxford: Clarendon Press 1974.

(see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 4A).

Meanwhile, Oxford's traditional rival, Cambridge, was also very active in the fields of Maritime Southeast Asian and Oceanian Studies in the post-war years.³⁸ At both the undergraduate and graduate levels of the Department of Social Anthropology, teaching and research in these fields were stimulated after 1948 by the presence of Dr (now Professor Sir) Edmund Leach, who was later joined by Dr S.J. Tambiah (Lecturer in Social Anthropology, 1966-72), the late Miss Barbara Ward (Mrs H.S. Morris) and Dr Gilbert Lewis (see Appendix I, no. 43). As a consequence, an average of one and a half Ph.D. dissertations in social anthropology have been completed every year on Maritime Southeast Asian and Oceanian subjects since 1974 (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 1A), the majority of students returning to or obtaining employment in their field in the U.K., Scandinavia, Southeast Asia and Oceania.

Since 1968, the University has benefited from a generous bequest from the late I.H.N. Evans (formerly of Clare College, Cambridge), who was Government Assistant Ethnographer to the Federated Malay States between 1912 and 1932. This bequest has been used to promote archaeological and anthropological research on Maritime Southeast Asia, and provides a unique focus for these studies in Cambridge (see Appendix I, no. 62, n. 8). Since 1970, no less than thirty-one Evans Research Fellowships have been awarded for post-graduate and post-doctoral research, the first such Fellow being Dr Janice Stargardt (see Appendix I, no. 54), currently director of the Cambridge Project on Ancient Civilization in South East Asia. In addition, thirty-nine research awards were made from the Evans Fund, twenty-eight to individual archaeologists, and the other eleven to the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology for research on its collections and acquisitions.

Two active and distinguished members of the committee of the Evans Fund went on to play a formative role in the creation and management of the British Academy's Institute in South-East Asia (see below). They are Professor Grahame Clark, sometime Disney Professor of Archaeology at Cambridge (1952-74), the Institute's first chairman, and Professor Sir Edmund Leach.

At the same time, in the Cambridge Faculty of Economics and Politics, Ph.D. theses on Maritime Southeast Asia and Oceania have averaged almost one per year during the past half decade (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 1C) and again, the

38. Research on Maritime Southeast Asia at Cambridge really dates back to 1898, when the first scientific ethnographic expedition to the region went out under the leadership of W.W. Skeat and C.O. Blagden to carry out studies on the east coast of Malaya. They were supported by the University Museum of Archaeology and Anthropology, which later became the main repository for the expedition's collections and papers (see Appendix III, pt. C, no. 17). Between 1900 and 1950, the Museum received two other major collections on the ethnography of Maritime Southeast Asia (the Haddon and Hose Collection, and the Evans Collection), in addition to the Bateson Collection on Papua-New Guinea, and part of the Cook Collection on Oceania (see Appendix III, pt. C, no. 17). There have been further additions to all these collections up to the present time. I am most grateful to Dr Janice Stargardt for her generous help with this note, and for all the information on Cambridge provided in this Introduction and in Appendix II, pt. B, no. 1A-F.

majority of the successful graduate students have returned to or entered academic employment in their chosen fields. In the Department of Archaeology, a smaller number have completed doctoral theses on East African subjects with relevance to Indian Ocean Studies since 1979 (see Appendix II, pt. B, no. 1B), but none on the archaeology of Maritime Southeast Asia or Oceania.

On a broader level, certain organizations came into existence during the decade 1965–75 which were to play a vital role in co-ordinating the interests of Southeast Asian librarians and scholars in the U.K. The first of these was the South-East Asia Library Group (SEALG). Formed at Hull in 1968³⁹ to serve as a link between the various U.K. libraries with holdings on Southeast Asia, it has grown over the years to include associations with the main Southeast Asian libraries in Europe, especially in the Netherlands, France and West Germany. It holds an annual conference to which European librarians are invited, and also publishes a useful biannual newsletter (now in its thirtieth issue) which is circulated to over one hundred subscribers.⁴⁰ Recently the SEALG conference has been timed to coincide with that of the other main co-ordinating body for U.K. Southeast Asianists, the Association of South-East Asian Studies in the United Kingdom (ASEASUK). This was established in 1969, and represents virtually all university teachers in Britain with a special interest in Southeast Asian arts and social science disciplines.⁴¹ Besides the organization of an annual conference, which usually rotates between the main Southeast Asian Studies Centres at Hull, Kent and SOAS,⁴² and its active cooperation with SEALG,

39. Dahm, *Südostasienwissenschaft*, p. 44.

40. The SEALG Newsletter is normally published in January and July. Subscription rates for four issues (i.e. two years' subscription) are US\$10.00 or £5.00 sterling. Subscriptions should be paid to Miss Helen L. Stephens, The Secretary, South-East Asia Library Group, The Brynmor Jones Library, South-East Asian Studies, The University of Hull, Hull HU6 7RX, England.

41. Dahm, *Südostasienwissenschaft*, p. 44; 'Association of South-East Asian Studies in the United Kingdom: List of Members, 1983' (cyclostyled list); and Dr A.J. Stockwell, personal communication, 4 Oct. 1984. The present chairman of ASEASUK is Dr Michael Leifer (see Appendix I, no. 42) and the Hon. Secretary is Dr A.J. Stockwell (see Appendix I, no. 57). Membership rates are £5.00 sterling per annum for full members, and £3.00 for associate members. Those desirous of joining should write to Dr A.J. Stockwell, Royal Holloway and Bedford New College, Egham Hill, Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, England.

42. For reports on the past four ASEASUK conferences which have been held at Kent (1981), Hull (1982), SOAS (1983) and Kent (1984), see the British Institute in South-East Asia (henceforth BISEA) *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter* No. 4 (July 1981), No. 8 (July 1982), No. 12 (July 1983); see also *ASEASUK News: Newsletter of the Association of South-East Asian Studies in the U.K.*, No. 1 (Nov. 1984). The conference themes have been: 'Ethnicity in South-East Asia' (1981) (many of these papers were published as a special focus issue of the *Southeast Asian Journal of Social Science*, Vol. X no. 1 [1982] edited by Victor T. King and William Wilder); 'Western Colonialism in South-East Asia and its Aftermath' (1982); 'Contemporary Problems of Development in South-East Asia' (1983); and 'Religion and Society in Modern South-East Asia' (1984). For a report on the 1985 ASEASUK Conference, which was held at Trinity College, Oxford from 27 to 29 March 1985, and which addressed itself *inter alia* to the theme of 'Wealth and Poverty in South-East Asia', see *ASEASUK News*, No. 2 (Nov. 1985).

ASEASUK also liaises closely with the British Institute in South-East Asia (see below), represents Southeast Asian interests on the Co-ordinating Council of Area Studies Associations in Britain, and (from 1984) produces an annual newsletter. In its choice of conference topics over the past five years, ASEASUK has tried to address itself to some of the broader debates which are currently taking place in the social sciences.⁴³

The final organization, born during the fertile decade of the mid-1960s to mid-1970s, was the British Institute in South-East Asia (1976–86). Established under the auspices of the prestigious British Academy, the primary goals of this Institute were to stimulate the interest of scholars in Britain and elsewhere in Southeast Asian Studies, in particular in the archaeology, history, art history and cultural anthropology of the region, and to promote and facilitate the work of those scholars by providing them with information on research being done in their fields by Southeast Asian scholars in the region.⁴⁴ On a practical level, it helped to smooth the path of British researchers working in the field by various official and semi-official contacts, and provided access to new research grants through the British Academy's Travelling Fellowship Fund and (up to 1984) the Leverhulme Awards. Originally set up in Singapore in 1976, it moved under its second director, Dr John Villiers (in office 1979–86; see Appendix I, no. 60), to Bangkok.⁴⁵ Between 1980–6, it published a very handsome quarterly newsletter with reports on conferences, colloquia and meetings of scholars in the region, news of research by individual scholars and projects conducted by research institutions, reviews and notices of books and periodicals published in Southeast Asia, as well as information about the latest position with regard to the granting of research permission and access to research materials for foreign scholars in those Southeast Asian countries where certain restrictions were imposed by the authorities. It also had plans to start a locally printed monograph series in its fields of designated competence.⁴⁶

Looking back on the period between the publication of the Hayter Committee report in May 1961 and the mid-1970s, it is clear that Southeast Asian studies in Britain enjoyed something of a 'golden age', with new centres and co-ordinating organizations being founded, and SOAS continuing to expand at an unprecedented rate. True, no British equivalent to Cornell had taken root outside London, as some members of the Hayter Committee seem to have hoped, but what had been achieved seemed to augur well for the future. Unfortunately, the speed of Britain's economic decline during the next decade (1975–85), and

43. See above n. 42.

44. See the BISEA, *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter*, No. 1 (Sept. 1980), and No. 2 (Jan. 1981).

45. This move to the erstwhile Institute's very handsome new quarters at 566 Soi Somprasong 5, Petchburi Road, Bangkok 10400, Thailand, took place in 1984.

46. The first monograph in its new series was due to be published in Bangkok in 1986: P.B.R. Carey (ed.), *The British in Java, 1811–16: A Javanese Account*, White Lotus for the British Institute in South-East Asia. Price US\$45.00. But, because of the British Academy's decision to close down the Institute with effect from 1 April 1986, this will now come out as an ordinary British Academy publication.

the swingeing nature of the cuts imposed by the British Government on the level of funding available for higher education, especially in the humanities, meant that the promise of the post-Hayter period was to enjoy no summer.

The Problems of the Past Decade (1975-85)

Throughout the second half of the 1970s, the financial position for British universities worsened as the U.K. went through the first 'oil shock' (1974-77), experiencing inflation and recession on a scale unknown since the 1930s. During these years, the expansion in area studies was halted, indeed reversed in some places, as hard-pressed vice-chancellors looked for cuts in what were deemed to be non-'mainline' subjects.⁴⁷ At the same time, it became increasingly difficult for young graduate students with doctoral degrees on Southeast Asian subjects to find employment.⁴⁸

If this period had been followed by an upturn in the economy as might have been expected, then the damage would have been limited. Unfortunately, it was followed by the second 'oil shock' of the early 1980s, and with a Conservative Government in office determined to limit government expenditure still further, the funds available for the universities again began to contract sharply. Student numbers fell (an eight per cent decline overall since 1980), key academic posts were 'frozen' (i.e. no replacements appointed when staff retired), and resources were shifted away from arts to science subjects. Along with other area subjects, Southeast Asian Studies suffered particularly severely, and nowhere more so

47. There has been an overall drop of 20,000 student places at British universities since 1981 (*The Observer*, 16 Sept. 1984). In the academic year 1983/4 there was a total of 252,238 arts and science undergraduates and graduates studying for degrees at U.K. universities (*University Statistics 1983-84*, Vol. I [Students], Cheltenham: University Statistical Records for the University Grants Committee 1984). The equivalent figures for the number of undergraduates and graduates reading for degrees in languages, literature and area studies (13% of the total of all students in arts subjects) for the period 1979-84 are as follows:

1979/80	1980/1	1981/2	1982/3	1983/4	
31,680	32,935*	33,413†	32,524	31,892	home undergraduates
1,022	621	468	410	530	overseas undergraduates
1,901	1,957	1,837	1,747	1,737	home graduates
1,074	919	816	893	996	overseas graduates
35,677	36,432	36,534	35,574	35,155	TOTAL

* EEC students (hitherto in overseas category) included in home category.

† Greek students (hitherto in overseas category) included in home category.

48. See above n. 31.

than at SOAS, where the School lived through some anxious years. Its small teacher–pupil ratio (an outcome of the high degree of specialization amongst its staff), the difficulties of attracting overseas students, due to the sudden doubling of their fees, and the lack of money for research, all left it in a very exposed position. But it did manage to survive, albeit in a much reduced form.

As far as Maritime Southeast Asian Studies at SOAS were concerned, the worst losses were on the linguistic side, where the failure to renew the contract of Dr Khaidir Anwar, a very effective Indonesian ‘overseas’ lecturer who had taught at SOAS for nine years (1973–82), and the retirement of Professor G.B. Milner (see Appendix I, no. 47), deprived the School of proper coverage of Austronesian languages. At the same time, the blandishments of the early retirement scheme (introduced by universities to make long-term savings in salary budgets) and the gloomy academic outlook at SOAS precipitated the departure of Dr John Bastin (see Appendix I, no. 5) in 1983, and Dr Ruth McVey (see Appendix I, no. 46) and Dr Russell Jones (see Appendix I, no. 33) the following year. All this, coming on top of the earlier resignations of Dr J.G. de Casparis and Dr Merle Ricklefs to take up chairs in Leiden and Monash in 1978 and 1979 respectively, meant that Indonesian Studies at the School were now primarily represented by linguists.⁴⁹

Similar developments occurred on a smaller scale at Kent, where Dr Roger Kershaw (see Appendix I, no. 37) took early retirement in 1983, and Dr Dennis Duncanson followed him (after reaching his normal retirement age) a year later. Hull also lost one of its lecturers in South-East Asian Politics, Dr Oey Hong Lee (see Appendix I, no. 50), through early retirement in 1982, and their very experienced Senior Lecturer in South-East Asian Geography, Dr Rowena Lawson, went in 1984. Elsewhere, the decision by the Trustees of the Leverhulme Committee to withdraw from the funding of South-East Asian research awards through the British Academy after 1984, and the financial difficulties experienced by the British Institute in South-East Asia at the time of its move to Bangkok in 1983–4, meant that the level of support for British scholars with Southeast Asian interests was sharply reduced.

Given this rather desperate situation, hopes were raised in the early 1980s that a new Hayter-style committee might be empanelled by the Government to look into the plight of area studies in Britain and recommend reforms.⁵⁰ But a committee on this scale with influence to channel new funds in the direction of Southeast Asian Studies (*inter alia*) was never more than a pipe-dream. The

49. The only other specialist on Indonesia at SOAS is Dr P.M. Hobart, an anthropologist; see Appendix I, no. 29.

50. This idea was first mooted at the ASEASUK Conference in Hull in 1982, when it seemed that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) might empanel a committee to look into the situation of specialized language and area studies teaching in the universities. However, the precipitate departure of Lord Carrington from the FCO as a result of the Argentinian invasion of the Falkland Islands on 1 April 1982 put paid to this initiative. See further *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 5 Oct. 1984.

changes which had overtaken Britain in the two decades since 1965 had made such initiatives look like an expensive anachronism. Less than five years after the Hayter Committee had delivered its report, the British Government announced that it was withdrawing its military bases from east of Suez (1966), and today the compelling imperial considerations which led to the establishment of the School of Oriental (after 1938, Oriental and African) Studies in 1917 are very much a thing of the past. Britain is now a declining second-class power with domestic and European considerations foremost in mind, the 1982 Falklands War notwithstanding. So, barring an economic miracle (unlikely in Britain for the foreseeable future), or a sudden influx of money from private sources (even less likely),⁵¹ Southeast Asian Studies will clearly have to make do with the limited resources currently available to them.

This was very much the message which the University Grants Committee gave the area-studies centres in October 1984, when it eventually got round to appointing Sir James Craig (an Arabist and ex-British ambassador to Saudi Arabia) to undertake a one-man enquiry into Oriental and African language provision in Britain (and associated cultural, legal and economic disciplines). Sir James's brief was principally to report on the needs of British commerce, industry and the diplomatic service in these specialized areas, and not to concern himself directly with the existing institutional provision, a sphere which the University Grants Committee regards as very much its own preserve. Furthermore, unlike the Hayter Committee (see above), there was never any likelihood that Sir James's enquiry would lead to any new influx of funds to the various Southeast Asia Centres. The best that could have been expected was a series of recommendations as to where the present scarce resources (especially on the language side) might most effectively be applied to meet current national requirements. The enquiry thus looked likely to concentrate on the future of SOAS and seemed to be pointing towards a further rationalization of disciplines and teaching there.⁵² It is known, for example, that the Foreign and Commonwealth Office (FCO) as well as the British Government's Overseas Development Agency (ODA) have been pressing particularly hard for greater provision for Indonesian language tuition, Indonesia now being regarded as one of the key areas in Southeast Asia for British trade and investment. This has resulted in priority being given by a recent working party at SOAS to two new joint posts in Bahasa Indonesia (see below).

Unfortunately, as of the time of writing (February 1986), it looks as though the enquiry commenced by Sir James will not result in a definitive report much before the middle of 1986. This is because Sir James himself, under pressure of other commitments, has had to withdraw from the survey, and his place has been

51. It is unlikely, for example, that there will be anything equivalent to the generous grants from Japanese and Middle Eastern sources which have recently endowed such research centres as the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies at Oxford, and the Centre for Gulf Studies at Exeter University, given the level of economic development in Southeast Asia at the present time.

52. On the Craig Enquiry, see *The Times Higher Education Supplement*, 5 Oct. 1984.

taken by Sir Peter Parker, until recently (1984) Chairman of British Rail. The particular qualifications of the latter in the sphere of Asian Studies stem from his time at SOAS at the end of World War II, when he took a degree in Japanese. Moreover, his contacts with senior figures in British commerce and industry as well as the civil service will stand him in good stead when he comes to draw up his report and make his final recommendations.

The Situation in the mid-1980s and Possibilities for the Future

It would take a Southeast Asian Dr Pangloss to look to the future of area studies in the U.K. during the next decade with any real optimism. The recent decision by the British Academy to close its Institute in South-East Asia with effect from 1 April 1986 because of the Academy's financial difficulties (due primarily to tighter Government funding) is bound to lead to a further loss of morale amongst British Southeast Asianists. But it would be wrong to conclude that Southeast Asian Studies are doomed to extinction. For a time at least, the storm of early retirements, staff cutbacks and contraction in research grants seems to have blown itself out. Reports from SOAS and the other Southeast Asia Centres suggest that there are some hopeful signs of growth, although whether they will bear fruit is quite another matter.

At SOAS, a recent working party convened to consider the long-term development of the School has recommended that between now and 1995, two new joint appointments should be made, in Indonesian language and Islam in Southeast Asia, and in Indonesian language and Javanese, with 'watching briefs' for Oceanic languages and Tagalog being given to the full-time teachers of Indonesian. If this goes ahead as planned, it will mean that the present 'archipelagic' strength of the Department of South East Asia and the Islands at SOAS will be doubled from its present two to four full-time posts, thus restoring the pre-1982 position. Obviously there are difficulties with such joint appointments, since it will be hard to find scholars who have an equal commitment to both subjects: an expert on Southeast Asian Islam, for example, might jib at having to spend half his time teaching Bahasa Indonesia and vice versa. Furthermore, the problem of finding proper coverage for Oceanic languages and Tagalog hardly looks like being resolved satisfactorily. But, if this proposal is implemented (and much, of course, depends on the availability of government finance for the posts), it will be a major step forward in safeguarding Maritime Southeast Asian interests, in languages at least, for the foreseeable future.⁵³

53. The University of London's Appointments Committee has just (November 1985) turned down SOAS's application for a new post in Indonesian language and Javanese in favour of one in ethnomusicology, so it seems very unlikely that either of these two proposed joint appointments will

Turning to the other centres, the picture is more varied. Despite all the vicissitudes of recent years, Kent seems to have been able to hold its own and even strengthen its position somewhat. Its first director, Dr Duncanson (see above), had already given it a strong link with Mainland Southeast Asia,⁵⁴ but by the late 1970s and early 1980s, it had also begun to develop special interests in Malaysia and Indonesia through the presence of a comparative law specialist, Mr (now Professor) Barry Hooker (see Appendix I, no. 30), an anthropologist of eastern Indonesia, Dr Roy Ellen (see Appendix I, no. 19), and a nineteenth-century Malay historian, Dr Tony Milner (now at the Australian National University).⁵⁵ Successful efforts were made to attract Malaysian graduate students to the University by forging personal links with institutions of higher education (especially Islamic colleges) in the peninsula, and by the establishment of graduate studies programmes in Southeast Asian and Islamic Studies.

Since then, the link with the archipelago has been made even stronger by a new association between Kent and the Universitas Andalas in Padang (West Sumatra), and by the ever-increasing flow of graduate students from Malaysia and Brunei. The current director of the Centre (a post which rotates annually amongst Centre members), Dr John Bousfield (see Appendix I, no. 8), a philosopher with research interests in Sufi Islam in Malaysia, has also helped to expedite this process. At the same time, the establishment of a new post in Southeast Asian Economics (see Appendix I, no. 61; and Appendix II, pt. A, no. 2), and the appointment of Mr Hooker to a personal chair in comparative law, have been a further boost for the Centre, especially given the political power of professors in provincial universities. There is even the possibility that, in view of Dr Duncanson's recent retirement, Southeast Asian Studies will be able to share a joint lectureship post in politics. But, as of the time of writing, these negotiations have not yet reached a conclusion. If there are drawbacks, these seem to be mainly in the spheres of library resources and the provisions for language tuition (see above), and in the pressures to put quantity before quality at the graduate level. But Kent's achievements over the past few years have been impressive and show what can be done, even in the most unpromising circumstances, through imaginative initiatives and careful planning.

Compared to Kent, Hull has had to endure a much more difficult process of adjustment to the cuts imposed on the universities during the past five years. After growing at a very rapid rate up to the mid-1970s, the University was forced, at short notice after 1981, to contract by nearly twenty per cent in terms of staff

materialise in the near future (personal communication, Dr Ulrich Kratz, 18 Nov. 1985). Indeed, it is likely, given the current weakness of the Department of South East Asia and the Islands, that over the next few years the Centre for South East Asian Studies (current chairman: Dr Ralph Smith) will assume an increasingly important role in the organization of Southeast Asian studies at the School.

54. The interests of two other members of the Centre at this time, Dr Jeremy Kemp and Dr Roger Kershaw, in Thailand and Cambodia, should also be mentioned; see Appendix I, nos. 36-37.

55. Dr Milner was succeeded in 1980 by Dr C.W. Watson, a sociologist and historian of western Indonesia; see Appendix I, no. 63; and Appendix II, pt. A, no. 2; and pt. B, no. 1A.

and student numbers.⁵⁶ These cuts were out of all proportion to those suffered by most other universities, and reflected not so much any intrinsic academic failing on the part of Hull, but more an invidious regional bias on the part of the members of the University Grants Committee charged with administering Government policy. As a result the University has had to return to its pre-1970s size, with all the wider repercussions this has entailed with regard to financial provision for staffing and research. Inevitably the interests of the Centre have also suffered, and the sort of opportunities for expansion along the lines of Kent have simply not been available. Nevertheless, effective steps have been taken to ensure that Southeast Asian Studies will continue to be an integral part of university teaching at Hull, both at graduate and undergraduate level, and that the Centre will survive into the 1990s. The quiet tact of Dr David Bassett (see Appendix I, no. 4), who succeeded Professor Jaspan as the Centre's director in the mid-1970s, has been very important here, and has helped to ensure strong support for the Centre from all levels of the University. Indeed, now that the worst is over in terms of retrenchment, there is even a possibility that money for new posts in Southeast Asian Studies (e.g. in Economic History, Regional Geography and Development Planning) may soon become available.⁵⁷ It should be noted too that, as with Kent, important personal contacts with institutions in Southeast Asia have been built up over the years by members of the Hull Centre, and moves are afoot to establish a new scholarship scheme to help graduate students from Southeast Asia who wish to pursue higher degrees at the University.⁵⁸

Turning to the wider picture, one of the most striking features about Maritime Southeast Asian Studies in the U.K. today is that well over half the scholars who currently hold academic positions in British universities and institutions of higher learning are not members of any of the established centres (see Appendices I and II). Some have to function in quite isolated positions in large disciplinary departments, or in places far removed from adequate library resources. Exposure to what is happening in other disciplines can be valuable. One thinks here of the way in which anthropologists, sociologists and political scientists have been able to undertake interesting comparative work which transcends regional and even disciplinary boundaries. The natural habitat of a Southeast Asianist is not necessarily in an area centre. But having said this, there is now a greater need than ever for effective cooperation between the various scholars and institutions

56. Between 1981 and the present, Hull has lost 900 student places, leaving it with about 4000 places, still comfortably on the large side compared to other British provincial universities (Dr Jan Wisseman Christie, personal communication, 2 Oct. 1984).

57. Dr D.K. Bassett, personal communication, 22 Oct. 1984. The money is likely to come from the so-called 'New Blood' posts (posts restricted to U.K. research students under the age of 28) instituted by the Secretary of State for Education, Sir Keith Joseph, in 1982.

58. The South-East Asian Studies Centre at Hull has particularly close ties with individuals and institutions in Thailand, Peninsular Malaysia, Sarawak and Brunei, reflecting the research interests of members of the Centre.

involved with Southeast Asian Studies both in the U.K. and elsewhere. As Professor G.B. Milner (see Appendix I, no. 47) has recently pointed out:⁵⁹

...in comparison with other countries such as the Netherlands, New Zealand, Australia and the United States, we [British] tend to work as lone pioneers in various necks of the wood without taking sufficient advantages of one another's knowledge and experience. Even the efforts of ASEASUK have not succeeded in overcoming this tendency. One is also still aware of the legacy from the past with the coincidence of British academic and colonial 'in the best sense of the word' interests in Burma, Malaysia and the western Pacific; Indonesia and New Guinea [Irian Jaya] being left to the Dutch; Madagascar to the French; the Philippines to the Americans etc. In linguistics, [as well as] in other disciplines, this no longer makes any sense. . . .

Some steps have already been made in the right direction. The biennial European Colloquium of Malay and Indonesian Studies, the first of which was held in Paris in 1978, has played an important role in maintaining scholarly contacts between European researchers with archipelagic interests, especially in the related fields of literature and linguistics.⁶⁰ The University of Bielefeld (West Germany) Colloquia on Southeast Asia have fulfilled a similar function for those scholars interested in modern sociological and economic developments in the region.⁶¹ From time to time, individual conferences and seminars on Southeast Asia have been hosted by the main Southeast Asia centres in Europe, in particular in France, West Germany, the Netherlands and Britain.⁶² But it is clear that much more needs to be done in terms of intra-European cooperation in this field.⁶³ Even within the United Kingdom, the Association of South-East Asian Studies in the U.K. still has a long way to go before it can really be

59. Professor G.B. Milner, personal communication, 14 April 1983.

60. For reports on these biennial colloquia, which have been held in Paris (1978), London (1979), Naples (1981), Leiden (1983) and Sintra (1985), see *Indonesia Circle*, No. 16 (June 1978), p. 47; *ibid.*, No. 19 (June 1979), p. 36; *ibid.*, No. 26 (Nov. 1981), pp. 73-4; *ibid.*, No. 32 (Nov. 1983), pp. 44-6; and *ibid.*, No. 38 (Nov. 1985), pp. 39-40; BISEA, *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter*, No. 10 (Jan. 1983), pp. 4-5; and *ibid.*, No. 13 (Oct. 1983), pp. 7-8; *Archipel* 17 (1979), pp. 31-3; *ibid.* 20 (1980), pp. 15-17; and *ibid.* 28 (1984), pp. 25-7.

61. The past three Bielefeld Colloquia have been on the themes of 'Urbanization in Southeast Asia' (Jan. 1983)—see BISEA, *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter*, No. 13 (Oct. 1983), pp. 3-4; and *Archipel* 28 (1984), pp. 17-18—'Trade and State in Southeast Asia' (June 1984) and 'Contemporary Southeast Asian Studies' (June 1985)—see BISEA, *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter*, No. 21 (October 1985), pp. 4-5.

62. Information on these can be found in the BISEA, *South-East Asian Studies Newsletter*, Nos. 2-20 (1981-5).

63. An important new initiative has recently been taken by the Royal Institute for Linguistics and Anthropology (KITLV) in Leiden, which is conducting a survey of research by European Indonesianists working in the fields of the social sciences and humanities as an initial step towards achieving closer cooperation between European Indonesianists and research institutions through the organization of conferences and seminars. Further information can be obtained from Prof. Cees van Dijk, Koninklijk Instituut voor Taal-, Land- en Volkenkunde, Postbus 9515, 2300 RA Leiden, The Netherlands.

considered as an effective nucleus for the promotion of area studies and the maintenance of contacts between individual scholars.

Conclusions

The latter part of this survey has dealt with the possibilities for the future. By its very nature, it has been somewhat speculative, but there is not the slightest doubt that if Southeast Asian Studies, especially those relating to the island world, are to prosper during the next decade, there must be far greater cooperation than hitherto between individuals and between institutions. The days are gone when well-endowed centres could go it alone. And this holds not only for post-imperial Britain, but also for Western Europe and the links between universities in this hemisphere and those in Southeast Asia. Any sort of 'splendid isolation' in the present context would be sheer folly.