Part I The Representation of Differences between "We" and "Others" on the Eve of Colonial Rule

HIROSUE Masashi

Recent research on Southeast Asia during the 18th and the first half of the 19th centuries has shed much light on active trade and contacts between Southeast Asians and visitors and migrants from East and West, revealing the existence of prosperous societies predating colonial rule. Although we are often inclined to discuss decisive differences between premodern and modern states in terms of state territory and the grouping of people (ethnicity), such discussion has not been sufficiently conducted concerning early modern states. The three chapters in this first part deal with those topics, suggesting useful perspectives on comparative study with modern states in Southeast Asia.

The early modern era in Southeast Asian was a time when spices, forest products and minerals were actively traded, and Southeast Asian port cities were attracting foreigners both from outside and inside the region. Islam and Malay culture were enabled to flourish in such a highly cosmopolitan manner that foreign trade developed along multiethnic lines. On the other hand, the argument presented here by Nishio identifies two different aspects of those who ruled the region's port cities: one, the acceptance of foreign visitors as trading partners; the other, emphasis on differences in the ethnic identity among residents and visitors. The case of 18th century Johor-Riau shows that its Malay and Bugis rulers actively invited foreign visitors into their ports, while at the same time differentiating between foreigners and local residents in order to play one group off against the other, thus maintaining a balance of power. Chapter 1 therefore suggests that cosmopolitanism and ethnic discrimination existed as opposite sides of the same coin in early modern Southeast Asia and that the same type of political strategy was occasionally repeated in modern times.

Those territories brought under the influence of the Konbaung dynasty during the latter half of the 18th century and the Nguy n dynasty during the first half of the 19th century are generally comparable to the modern nation states of Burma and Vietnam. Konbaung Burma presents an interesting example of state territory being shaped by the introduction of taxation by that dynasty. Watanabe shows that those who were subjected to taxes imposed by the Burmese king were all treated as his subjects whether they were of Burmese origin or not, while people outside of royal influence became targets of capture and exploitation of their human resources. At

the beginning of the 19th century, the Nguy n dynasty attempted to enlarge its rule over the northern part of Vietnam by helping to reestablish autonomy on the rural level there, where local leaders were allowed to play significant roles in village administration, including the management of communal rice fields. Shimao discusses how genealogy compilation developed under the guidance of local Confucian intellectuals in many northern villages during this period, leading to the reconstruction of patrilineages and the building of halls to commemorate their ancestors. Both the cases of Konbaung Burma and Nguy n Vietnam suggest that local leaders, both political and intellectual, became intermediaries between the dynasties and local peasantry, and their efforts to reconstruct the local community order played a key role in the integration of each kingdom. For the later British and French occupiers of these regions, how to cope with these local leaders became one of the most crucial issues in the introduction and continuation of colonial rule in Burma and Vietnam.