

ULASAN BUKU/BOOK REVIEWS

Maruah Bangsa Melayu Gagal? oleh Chan Tse Yuen, Kuala Lumpur: Leane Enterprise, 1991, mm. i-vii, 433, gambar-gambar.

Buku ini adalah himpunan 118 tulisan pendek berupa pandangan-pandangan Chan Tse Yuen sebagai penulis pujuk di dalam akhbar-akhbar *Mingguan Perdana* dan *Watan*, dan beberapa pandangan atau jawapan pihak lain terhadap perkara-perkara yang telah diumbulkannya itu, antara tahun-tahun 1986-1991.

Melihat kepada kepelbagaian hal yang disentuh penulis, tajuk buku ini nyata mengelirukan dan tidak membayangkan isi sebenar perkara yang dibincangkan. Secara amnya susunan perkara adalah bercampur-aduk dan tidak menentu, baik daripada segi penumpuan mahupun tarikh. Perkara yang dibincangkan menganjal atau melompat-lompat daripada hal-hal dalaman MCA, kepada politik tanahair, kepada isu-isu bahasa, budaya dan kebebasan, kepada politik antarabangsa, hinggalah ke soal rokok, sukan dan iklan di TV. Secara keseluruhannya, buku ini adalah suatu himpunan catatan fikiran dan penyuaaran pandangan sepintas lalu, oleh seorang rakyat Malaysia keturunan Tionghua yang peka dengan perkembangan sekeliling.

Daripada pengucapannya dan tema-tema yang lebih sering disentuhnya, buku ini dapat juga dilihat sebagai suatu dokumentasi sikap atau rentak tarik politik seorang warganegara Malaysia yang disamping berulang kali menegaskan kesetiaan mutlaknya kepada Malaysia dan keazamannya membantu membentuk sebuah negara yang bersatu padu, juga berkeras memperjuangkan kebebasan berbudaya Tionghua dan kepelbagaian budaya Malaysia di dalam kerangka "masyarakat majmuk" yang menurutnya dijamin Perlembagaan Negara. Sebagai orang kuat (Ketua Pemuda) MCA, dengan falsafah perjuangan politik yang mendahulukan kepentingan orang Malaysia berketurunan Tionghua, penulis sering mengkritik pihak-pihak tertentu termasuk pertubuhan-pertubuhan Melayu seperti UMNO dan kementerian-kementerian Pendidikan, Penerangan dan Kebudayaan, kerana tindak-tanduk yang dianggapnya menjejaskan kepentingan politik-ekonomi-sosial kaum lain terutama Tionghua.

Penulis menolak "Dasar Kebudayaan Kebangsaan" anjuran Kongres Kebudayaan Kebangsaan, 1971, yang menurutnya tidak rasmi dan tidak pernah menjadi dasar kerajaan. Berteraskan hujahan kemanjuran dan ke "caca-merba"an - tradisi budaya Malaysia yang menurut penulis yang seakan-akan mengulangi pandangan R.O. Winstedt, tiada apa yang aslinya kecuali "ala budaya bogel", penulis berpendapat pelaksanaan "Dasar Budaya Kebangsaan" akan melahirkan "kebudayaan kolonialisme" atau "kebudayaan paksaan" yang

merugikan dan menjejaskan nama baik Malaysia di mata dunia (mm. 15-21). Penulis juga menyuarakan bantahannya, yang didakwanya mewakili juga pandangan umum masyarakat Tionghua dan bukan Islam dalam isu-isu seperti pengutamaan bahasa Malaysia di papan-papan tanda, pelaksanaan hukum hudud dan larangan penjualan arak di hotel-hotel di Kelantan, serta kewajipan memakai songkok di upacara konvokesyen UTM (m. 203), yang kesemuanya diujahkannya sebagai bertentangan dengan semangat Perlembagaan. Tentang ura-ura Kementerian Pendidikan menjadikan bahasa Perancis bahasa ketiga di sekolah-sekolah, penulis berpendapat adalah lebih munasabah menggantikannya dengan bahasa Mandarin dan Tamil yang telah pun menjadi sebahagian daripada kehidupan ramai orang Malaysia. Penulis sering mengulangi sokongannya terhadap dasar-dasar utama yang telah dipersetujui MCA sendiri seperti bahasa Melayu sebagai Bahasa Kebangsaan Malaysia dan Dasar Ekonomi Baru, tetapi terus mempersoalkan "perlaksanaannya" yang pada pandangannya tidak menepati tujuan asal serta menjejaskan hak dan peluang bukan bumiputera.

Kepekaan penulis sebagai orang politik ternyata daripada langkah berhati-hatinya dalam hal-hal yang menyentuh dua tokoh utama UMNO yang juga dua pemimpin utama kerajaan, Dr. Mahathir Mohamad dan Encik Ghafar Baba. Tokoh-tokoh ini sering dipujinya sebagai benar-benar kemalaysiaan dan berkeupayaan memimpin dan memajukan negara. "Jalan selamat" yang diambil penulis ketara daripada tiadanya tindak balas lanjut beliau terhadap jawapan Perdana Menteri kepada suratnya pada tahun 1988 bersabit surat Perdana Menteri kepada 34 ahli Parlimen New Zealand tentang tahanan-tahanan ISA (mm.348-354). Dr. Mahathir menganggap penulis "merasa tersinggung" tidak kena pada tempatnya dan bertindak seolah-olah jurucakap "masyarakat Tionghua dan India" seluruh dunia. Bantahan keras penulis pada tahun 1986 terhadap pernyataan Timbalan Menteri Luar China manasihati warganegara Malaysia berketurunan Tionghua menumpukan kesetiaan kepada Malaysia jelas membuktikan betapa perasanya penulis apabila kesetiaan masyarakat Mahua kepada Malaysia seolah-olah diragui. Di samping menganggap "nasihat" itu sebagai campur tangan "pemimpin asing" dalam hal-ehwal Malaysia, Chan Tse Yuen menyatakan kekecewaannya terhadap kerajaan Malaysia yang berdiam diri terhadap tindakan "mencerobohi kedaulatan negara" Malaysia itu (mm. 358-361).

Kerana keyakinannya kepada MCA yang dianggapnya satu-satunya jurucakap tulen masyarakat Tionghua Malaysia, pada waktu-waktunya penulis bertelagah secara berdepan dengan pertubuhan-pertubuhan dokongan masyarakat Tionghua yang lain seperti DAP dan Gerakan. Sikap politik partisan penulis ketara sekali daripada kegembiraannya menyambut "lompatan" Ahli Dewan Undangan Negeri Gerakan kawasan Tanjung Bunga ke MCA pada akhir 1988 (mm.242-244) walaupun di tempat lain beliau menyindir pelakuan "si katak" seorang

ahli Parti Semangat 46 yang khabarnya akan "memeluk" UMNO semula selepas pilihanraya umum Oktober, 1990 (m.106).

Sikap bermati-matian mempertahankan MCA jelas di dalam tulisan-tulisan penulis. Pernyataan-pernyataan para pemimpin kanan MCA semuanya diulas secara positif. Presiden MCA, Tan Koon Swan yang dijatuhi hukuman penjara dua tahun oleh mahkamah Singapura bersabit kes PAN-EL terus dibela penulis sebagai "adalah *innocent* dan tidak akan bersalah baik dari segi undang-undang ataupun moral kerana beliau merupakan "mangsa" pihak Singapura" (m.47). Penulis menanggap orang-orang yang menyeru Tan Koon Swan mengosongkan kerusi Parlimen Gopeng sebagai "sedikit pun tidak menunjukkan sikap kemanusiaan sebaliknya bersikap kejam terhadap orang yang telah ditimpa 'takdir'" (m.46).

Buku ini bukanlah buku ilmiah dan bukan juga buku politik sepenuhnya. Walaupun pada tempat-tempatnya diselubungi tujuan yang seakan-akan, ia tidaklah dapat disamakan dengan *The Malaysian Chinese - Towards National Unity*, terbitan MCA Wilayah Persekutuan, tahun 1982, atau *Time Bombs in Malaysia* oleh Lim Kit Siang (1978). Dari segi maklumat ia tidaklah seteliti buku pertama dan dari segi kelantangan berhujah ia tidaklah sehebat buku kedua. Namun, ini tidaklah mengurangkan kegunaannya, terutama sebagai bahan berfikir bagi peminat-peminat budaya atau pemikiran politik Malaysia khususnya yang menyentuh generasi baru Mahua di zaman pembentukan masyarakat baru Malaysia kini. Pandangan-pandangan penulis tentang hal-hal umum dan kepentingan awam seperti hak asasi manusia, Akta Rahsia Rasmi, pembayaran tol lebih raya, masalah kesihatan, dan iklan rokok, misalnya, semuanya membayangkan sikap kesedaran kemasyarakatan yang sepatutnya ada pada generasi baru yang lebih terdedah kepada maklumat dan ilmu.

Sejauh manakah buku ini berjaya memenuhi hasrat penulisnya memupuk pemikiran "yang lebih rasional... ke arah kelahiran generasi Malaysia yang lebih berwibawa" yang mengutamakan perpaduan dan keharmonian (mm. vi-vii), tidaklah dapat diukur. Namun, tahniah diucapkan kepada Chan Tse Yuen yang dengan dorongan semangat "xiao"-nya bukan sahaja berjaya meninggalkan suatu "lambang kenangan yang abadi" buat mendiang ibunya, tetapi juga telah menambahkan satu lagi bacaan umum dalam Bahasa Kebangsaan Malaysia. Sekaligus hasil usahanya ini mendedahkan watak khusus dan menarik masyarakat Tionghua Malaysia masa kini.

Abdul Rahman Haji Ismail
Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Kemanusiaan
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Sejarah Tanah Besar Asia Tenggara oleh Abu Talib Ahmad. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1991, m.s. 332, Bibliografi, Indeks.

It is always a great academic challenge to Southeast Asia scholars to emulate and perhaps surpass the monumental achievement of D.G.E. Hall and bring out yet another complete work on the whole region of Southeast Asia or a substantial part of it. Dr. Abu Talib Ahmad has accepted that challenge; and it is to his credit that he has in a timely and single-handed manner come out with *Sejarah Tanah Besar Asia Tenggara* to help ease out the dearth of textbooks in Bahasa Malaysia on the region. *Sejarah Tanah Besar Asia Tenggara* is an updated account of Southeast Asia compared to the translated versions of both Hall's *A History of Southeast Asia* and Steinberg's *In Search of Southeast Asia*. It is undoubtedly an academic effort that deserves praise all round.

The book covers the period from early nineteenth century to 1970's. It is divided into six chapters, to wit, Mainland Southeast Asia in the Classical period, from the early era right up to the mid-nineteenth century; Imperialism, Colonialism, and Change, approximately from 1850's to 1930's; Nationalism Before 1941; Nationalism, Japanese Occupation, and Independence 1942-1950's; Mainland Southeast Asia 1950's - 1970's, Political Development, Economic Growth, and National Unity; and Mainland Southeast Asia, 1960's - 1970's. It is clear that the author accords more weight to the last 40 years of the 170 years or so under study. Nationalism, the question of nation-building and national unity, for example, sprawl over three of the last four chapters. Dr. Abu Talib must have felt a need to examine closely the present history of Southeast Asia.

Though *Sejarah Tanah Besar Asia Tenggara* is without doubt written for students in universities and institutes of higher learning in Malaysia, it is also a good introduction to those who are seriously interested in Southeast Asia. The author has successfully introduced a rather new and attractive approach to the study of the region (in Bahasa Malaysia), namely a survey of historiographic debates on Southeast Asia (*Pengenalan*, pp. xiii-xxiii). This approach is employed throughout the book (p. 63, pp.115; 176-177, 253-4, *passim*). By inserting these recommended reading materials into the text, the author effectively arouses the reader's awareness concerning the on-going historical interpretations of particular aspects or problems, and thus helps sharpen his/her understanding of the author's own intention or explanation.

From the contents perspective, *Sejarah Tanah Besar Asia Tenggara* gives a refreshing treatment to the study of Southeast Asia. The book endeavours to strike a balance between the "Western centric" and the "Southeast Asian centric" approaches through the use of both subject and chronological approaches, and through the use of native writings whenever possible. (The author's weakness, as he himself confesses, is his inability to consult native sources written in

all the vernacular tongues (p. xxii). As expected of a task of this magnitude, details are conspicuously pushed aside. In their place is a wide-ranged discussion on concepts, ideas, and structural changes--all of which go a long way towards cultivating a sophisticated and comprehensive understanding among its targeted audience. (for example, pp.3-8; 59-62; 115-120, 276-278).

It is only to be expected that an academic effort which covers the whole region of such diversity as its political development, socio-culture, and ethnicity, no matter how well it is presented, will still leave the reader's appetite for more. For this reader in particular, certain points need further clarification. The preference of the author for "zaman klasik" as a term describing the period of the Southeast Asian mainland of the nineteenth century, for instance, requires a more comprehensive explanation than what is offered by the author, namely that the term is preferred by Michael Aung Thwin in his study of Burma (p.1); Aung Thwin's study is of course on Pagan the accepted classical period of the Burmese history, and not about the Konbaung Burma. I also find the explanation that there was little change in the government and the life of the people between the "classical period" and the period under discussion in the book a rather shallow one. After all, one of the basic differences between the classical and traditional periods is not so much in the form but in the substance or spirit residing in that form. More explanation is needed because as *Sejarah Tanah Besar* is offered as a text to the study of Southeast Asia in Malaysia, it may well cause some confusion and misunderstanding among would-be historians in our country. The terms "classical" and "traditional" periods have in fact been widely employed by historians to basically differentiate the period of "original" achievements in various fields of a society: political, socio-cultural, and knowledge which made it (the classical period) a model, while the subsequent periods, from the period which witnessed the emulation of these achievements sometimes in both form and substance, most of the time in form only, have been referred to as the traditional period. The question to ask is whether the Southeast Asian mainland of the nineteenth century actually preserved the substance of the form it inherited from the classical time. The answer is surely a negative one. If the author wishes to adopt Michael Aung Thwin's analysis, he must at least explain that Southeast Asia of the nineteenth century revealed no significant changes in the *substance/spirit* of the form set by the Southeast Asian classical time.

The treatment of other subjects in *Sejarah Tanah Besar* also beg further explanations. For instance, in Chapter 2, why should the study of the Theravada Buddhist society concern only Burma and Siam? What happened to Cambodia and Laos? The reader is likewise left uncertain as to why nationalism must be broken into the before and after 1942 periods (Chaps. 3-4). Is it because the author believes as Harry Benda did that the coming of the Japanese and the Pacific war represent a great break in the development of

Southeast Asia history? (The author implies that this is not the case, e.g. pp. 176-77. So why the 1942 dividing line?) The 1950's are the politically crucial years for Southeast Asian mainland states not only because of the preoccupation of the individual states with their independence, sovereignty, and survival as a modern state, but also these are the years of intense ideological warfare which found Southeast Asia a front-line region. *Sejarah Tanah Besar* does not seem to allocate appropriate discussion on the latter nor does it enlighten the reader on how the Great Powers tried to map out the political directions for the region (chap.5). The fact remains that the emergence of the Cold War both directly and indirectly as well as substantially dictated the politico-economic development of the mainland states of Southeast Asia.

Perhaps most surprising of all is the author's readiness to adopt the "pro-" (as in "pro-Jepun") and "anti-" (as in "anti-British") labels to describe certain Southeast Asian nationalist leaders and movements (e.g. p. 173, 178, 187, 191). These pro- and anti-terms have commonly been employed by Western scholars particularly for the immediate postwar years. The terms carry an unflattering connotation of doing things with little regard to the real interests of one's nation. All of Southeast Asian nationalists and those who struggled for the independence of the motherland were only "pro" their individual homeland. If at times they moved closer to, or co-operated with the British, Japanese, French, etc., it was because they thought the cause would serve the interests of their "nation". Aung San and the AFPFL are excellent examples of this always pro-the-motherland stand. For a Southeast Asia-born scholar to accept these over-used terms at this historiographic juncture wherein a substantial academic ground has been gained to study history from the native perspective, is inexplicable and almost unforgivable.

From the format angle, perhaps it would help the reader if a glossary and an abbreviations list are added. The glossary appears most urgent as the author tends to refer to vernacular terms often without rough translations of their meaning.

Sejarah Tanah Besar, even with its shortcomings, is a laudable academic exercise, a type of work that should be encouraged and emulated. It has certainly served the author's purpose of providing an up-dated text for the Bahasa Malaysia-reading audience.

Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian
History Department
Universiti Kebangsaan Malaysia

The Southeast Asian Port and Polity: Rise and Fall by J. Kathirithamby-Wells and John Villiers (eds.). Singapore: Singapore University Press, 1990, Maps, illustrations, index, pp. 332.

Buku ini mengandungi 12 artikel termasuk pengenalan yang telah disumbangkan oleh sepuluh orang ahli akademik dan enam daripada artikel ini pernah dibentangkan di dalam satu seminar yang telah diadakan di Jabatan Sejarah, Universiti Malaya. Lima daripada 10 penyumbang berasal dari Malaysia (4 UM dan seorang UKM), seorang dari negeri Thai dan yang lainnya dari Australia dan England (tempat bertugas masa kini). Mereka merupakan pakar di dalam bidang masing-masing dan perbincangan-perbincangan menarik dalam buku ini menunjukkan pentingnya sumber-sumber Belanda, Portugis dan Sepanyol di samping sumber Inggeris dan tempatan di dalam mengkaji sejarah Asia Tenggara. Jelas juga semakin bertambahnya bilangan pengkaji Asia Tenggara yang berkeupayaan merujuk kepada sumber Eropah - bahasa Belanda bagi dua orang sarjana yang terlibat dengan buku ini, Dr. J. Kathirithamby-Wells dan Dr. Dhiravat Na Pombejra - untuk meneliti zaman yang mereka terokai, satu perkara yang sudah lumrah di dalam tradisi penyelidikan di Barat (atau Australia dan Jepun).

Artikel-artikel ini menumpukan perhatian kepada kawasan-kawasan yang berada di luar pelabuhan utama yang kerap mendapat perhatian seperti Aceh, Melaka dan Johor sebelum abad ke-19. Terdapat dua artikel yang membincangkan Tanah Melayu sebelum abad ke-19, dan setiap satu berkenaan Terengganu di antara abad ke-18 dan 19, Srivijaya, Kepulauan Banda di antara abad ke-15 dan 16, Banten di antara abad ke 16 dan 17, Makasar di antara abad ke-16 dan 17, Ayutthaya pada abad ke-17, Magindanao pada abad ke-18, Kesultanan Sulu pada abad ke-19, dan Brunei pada abad ke-19. Ringkasnya, tumpuan utama buku ini ialah kepada kepulauan Asia Tenggara. Kita percaya pertumbuhan pelabuhan dan hubung kaitnya dengan kemunculan ataupun pengukuhan kerajaan di Myanmar (contohnya Pegu) ataupun di Tonkin tidak kurang pentingnya.

Kebanyakan artikel ini, contohnya berkenaan Makasar, Terengganu mahupun Brunei, menunjukkan kaitan yang jelas di antara pertumbuhan ekonomi eksport yang berasaskan kepada perdagangan rempah-ratus serta hasil tempatan yang lain, sama ada yang ditanam seperti beras ataupun dipungut di hutan ataupun dari laut, dengan kemunculan serta pengukuhan kerajaan. Sejajar dengan pertumbuhan ekonomi ini maka berlaku perubahan sosial dan politik yang menjurus ke arah pembentukan kerajaan yang lebih mantap, pelabuhan bertukar menjadi sebuah negeri ataupun sebuah pelabuhan-negeri menjadi sebuah empayar, yang berjaya bertahan sebelum dihapuskan oleh imperialisme dan kolonialisme Barat pada abad ke-18 dan 19 ataupun diserapkan oleh kerajaan baru yang lebih bertenaga. Peniaga-peniaga tempatan seperti orang-orang Melayu yang lari dari Melaka turut menyumbang kepada kemakmuran baru ini

seperti di Banda dan Makasar walaupun peniaga-peniaga Cina dan juga Eropah tidak kurang pentingnya seperti di Banten dan Ayutthaya. Malah di Ayutthaya mereka turut terlibat di dalam pergolakan politik tempatan sementara di Banten pula, saudagar-saudagar Cina diberikan tugas-tugas pentadbiran kerajaan.

Namun begitu penguasaan ke atas sumber ekonomi tidak menjamin pengukuhan kuasa politik yang berterusan. Seperti yang telah ditunjukkan oleh Pombejra berkenaan Ayutthaya ataupun Laarhoven berkenaan Magindanao dan Warren berkenaan Sulu, penguasaan ke atas buruh termasuk hamba masih merupakan kunci penting kepada kuasa politik dan seterusnya kemakmuran ekonomi. Artikel-artikel ini jelas menunjukkan kebijaksanaan pembesar-pembesar tempatan berorganisasi bagi menguasai sumber manusia termasuk hamba, menguruskan perdagangan antarabangsa dan perhubungan dengan orang-orang Eropah untuk manfaat ekonomi, politik dan barangkali juga ilmu. Agama Islam turut memainkan peranan bukan sahaja di dalam sistem kerajaan dan ideologi politik (barangkali masih bercampur-aduk) tetapi juga untuk tujuan mewujudkan tindakan bersama bagi menjamin kepentingan tertentu seperti pemberontakan orang-orang Makasar di Ayutthaya ataupun penentangan terhadap kemasukan Belanda yang sudah pasti menamatkan kekuatan ekonomi yang menjadi asas kepada kuasa politik kerajaan-pelabuhan ini. Sementara itu, pada abad ke-16, Islam berjaya menonjolkan Brunei sebagai pusat perdagangan dan keagamaan yang penting di Asia Tenggara dan barangkali juga, menjadi alat utama menguasai Sabah, sebuah kawasan pedalaman yang penting apabila jajahan takluk Brunei mengecut dengan mendadak selepas 1870-an.

Perbincangan berkenaan Tanah Melayu oleh Leong Sau Heng dan Jan Christie memang dilakukan dari sudut ekonomi tempatan dan perdagangan antarabangsa tetapi mereka juga telah mengajukan beberapa persoalan menarik seperti keadaan di Tanah Melayu sebelum kedatangan pengaruh India berdasarkan sumber arkeologi. Kita setuju dengan kedua-duanya bahawa masih terdapat banyak kekosongan dalam rangka sejarah Malaysia sebelum 1400 namun begitu kedua-duanya meyakinkan kita bahawa sejarah pra-Melaka juga tidak kurang penting dan menarik. Dalam lain perkataan kita perlu melihat lebih awal dari Kesultanan Melayu Melaka.

Akhir sekali, buku ini berjaya memberikan satu sumbangan yang bermakna kepada satu bidang di dalam pengkajian Asia Tenggara yang masih tidak begitu mendapat perhatian para sarjana tempatan. Buku ini bukan sahaja berguna sebagai rujukan kepada para pengkaji dan pembaca tetapi lebih penting lagi, berkemungkinan menggalakkan penyelidikan asli berkenaan ekonomi Asia Tenggara dengan lebih terperinci lagi, barangkali melalui kerjasama yang lebih giat di kalangan para akademik serantau.

A. Samad Ismail - Ketokohan dan Kewartawanan oleh A. Karim Haji Abdullah. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1991. Pengantar, Gambar, Indeks, m.s. 441.

Pada tahun 1987, sebuah buku berjudul, *A. Samad Ismail: Journalism and Politics* diterbitkan oleh Teks Publishing susunan Prof. Cheah Boon Kheng. Empat tahun kemudian lahir pula *A. Samad Ismail - Ketokohan dan Kewartawanan*.

Buku ini merupakan sebuah pendokumentasian yang penting. Dengannya kita lebih mudah untuk membuat rujukan terutama jika penyelidik yang mengejar masa. Apalagi pembaca umum yang bukan sahaja kesuntukan masa tapi juga mungkin tidak ada kesempatan untuk melakukannya. Buku ini menyogokkan bahan seperlunya untuk mengenali dan memahami tokoh yang dibicarakan. Ia berguna bukan sahaja di bidang kewartawanan tetapi juga bidang-bidang lain seperti sejarah, sastera, kemasyarakatan, kebudayaan dan politik.

Membaca buku ini kita tidak terasa seperti sebuah karya yang hanya mahu mengangkat dan menggilap ketokohan sahaja. Buku ini meletakkan A. Samad Ismail sebagai manusia biasa dan tokoh yang dihormati oleh lawan dan teman. Beliau dianggap oleh kenalannya sebagai seorang periang yang lepas laku, kasar tapi menarik (hal. 15). Dalam dunianya beliau adalah pemimpin yang terus dihormati seperti yang tersusun dalam bait-bait sajak penyair Firdaus Abdullah dan Bachtiar Djamily.

Penyelenggara buku ini telah membahagikan kepada lima bahagian bagi memudahkan kita mengikutinya. Bahagian pertama diberi judul *Pandangan dan Pemikiran Sarjana dan Sasterawan Tentang A. Samad Ismail*. Lima orang penulis membicarakan A. Samad Ismail dari kaca mata masing-masing. Dr. Wan Hashim Wan Teh mengungkapkan sumbangan A. Samad Ismail dalam pidato umum sempena penganugerahan Ijazah Kehormat Doktor Persuratan kepada tokoh ini. Dr. Wan Hashim berpendapat sumbangan besar A. Samad Ismail terserlah dalam bidang kewartawanan, kesusasteraan, bahasa dan politik. Tokoh ini diangkat sebagai Bapa Kewartawanan Malaysia.

Dr. Kamaluddin Muhammad (Keris Mas) menggelarkan A Samad sebagai Wartawan dan Sasterawan Melayu yang Ulung. Sebagai kenalan Dr. Kamaluddin melihat A. Samad Ismail dari kaca mata Khairul Anwar - "binatang jalang dari kumpulannya terbuang." Cermin yang terpancar dalam karyanya

berbeza pula kerana A. Samad dianggap sebagai seorang pemikir dan perancang berwibawa. Gelar yang diberi oleh Dr. Usman Awang (Tongkat Warrant) kepada tokoh ini sebagai "Pemikir Yang Tajam". Dr. Usman agak kesal dengan nasib malang yang selalu menimpa A. Samad yang menjadi mangsa politik tetapi telah berjaya menempuhnya.

Tulisan Mohd Said Abd. Hamid (Dino SS) berguna untuk kita mengutip beberapa data peribadi penting dan sejarah ringkas penglibatan A. Samad Ismail dalam dunia penulisan. Dan kerana itu beliau wajar diberikan berbagai anugerah kerana sumbangannya dalam bidang kewartawan, politik dan sastera. Ketiga-tiga bidang ini dianggap mematangkan sikap dan pandangan A. Samad. Kertas kerja Mazlan Nordin yang membincangkan perkembangan persuratkhabaran Melayu dan peranan media. Mazlan menggariskan sejarah perkembangan akhbar Melayu sejak abad kesembilan belas dan A. Samad Ismail diangkatnya sebagai "Bapa Surat Khabar Melayu Selepas Perang." Sebagai wartawan A. Samad tidak melaporkan "semuanya dalam keadaan baik Tuanku" kerana dianggap sindrom yang bahaya.

Bahagian pertama ini dikupas dengan gaya bersahaja tetapi berkesan sebagai latar belakang untuk kita mentelaah dan meneliti pemikiran A. Samad seterusnya. Bahagian kedua diberi judul *Kewartawanan dan Persuratkhabaran*. Sebanyak 22 tulisan A. Samad yang berupa rencana, kertas kerja, syarahan umum dan ucapan. Ini adalah sebahagian sahaja kerana mengikut catatan penyelenggara, A. Samad telah menghasilkan ribuan esei dan rencana selama lebih lima puluh tahun. Jadi jika semua tulisan ini dapat didokumentasikan tentulah besar faedahnya dan berupa mutiara berharga.

Hasil tulisan yang disiarkan ini ditulis sejak tahun 1956 sehingga 1990. Banyak perkara yang disentuh - sejarah dan pengalaman peribadi, sejarah akhbar, kewartawanan, budaya dan politik. Beliau juga tidak lupa mengupas tokoh-tokoh yang berjasa bukan sahaja kepada dirinya tetapi juga bidang kewartawanan seluruhnya. Ini dapat dikesan dari tulisannya tentang A. Rahim Kajai dan Ishak Haji Mohammad. A. Samad bukan sahaja membicarakan bidang pekerjaannya tetapi juga tidak lupa mencatat tentang institusi tempat beliau bernaung. Beliau menganggap *Utusan Melayu* dan dirinya saling pengaruh mempengaruhi dan saling terhutang budi (hal. 85). Beliau juga mengulas perkembangan *Berita Harian* sehingga menjadi sebuah akhbar nasional.

Tulisan beliau seronok diikuti walaupun yang telah ditulis lebih tiga puluh tahun dahulu. A. Samad bukan sahaja menulis fakta tetapi juga mencetus idea baru dan cadangan-cadangan membina. Kepada bakal-bakal penulis beliau tidak jelak menasihati dan membimbing sehingga ramai anak muridnya yang telah berjaya.

Bahagian kedua buku ini jelas memancarkan berbagai pemikiran A. Samad Ismail. Ia mencakupi idealisme dan praktis. Bahagian ini menjadi sumber primari untuk memahami pemikiran dan visi tokoh wartawan ini.

A. Samad Ismail juga seorang sasterawan besar yang menghasilkan sebelas buah novel, cerpen dan esei kesusasteraan bermutu. Dalam menghasilkan karya kreatif beliau bukan sahaja bertolak dari dunia mindanya sahaja tapi mengungkap manusia dan kehidupan. Penyelenggara memuatkan dua belas hasil tulisan A. Samad Ismail bagi menonjolkan tanggapan dan pemikiran tokoh ini dalam kesusasteraan pada bahagian ketiga buku ini. Bahagian ini dinamakan *Kesusasteraan*.

Perbicaraan tidaklah menyentuh teori kesusasteraan sedalamnya tetapi berguna sebagai petunjuk praktis. Anak muda yang mahu menjadi sasterawan boleh mengutip petua-petua yang dipeturunkan. A. Samad Ismail juga menyentuh proses penciptaan dan memperkatakan genre novel dan cerpen. Dan dalam kehibuhan sastera Islam, beliau sempat memberikan pandangannya pada tahun 1984. Bukan teori yang muluk yang akan menjamin kejayaan tetapi nilai yang dipegang oleh penulis. Berasaskan ketauhidan dan penguasaan kemahiran penulisan (hal. 298-299) adalah senjata yang dipercayai oleh A. Samad untuk berjaya dalam dunia penulisan. Walaupun sumbangan A. Samad Ismail dalam kesusasteraan besar tapi kajian mendalam sumbangannya dalam bidang ini masih tidak seberapa.

Bahagian seterusnya memuatkan tiga belas wawancara yang tersiar dalam majalah *Era*, *Mastika*, *Dewan Masyarakat*, *Dewan Budaya* dan akhbar *Watan*. Dari wawancara ini kita dapat menangkap ketajaman berfikir dan mengungkapkan pandangan secara spontan. Beberapa isu semasa telah dibincangkan merangkumi hal-ehwal politik, kemasyarakatan, kebudayaan dan kewartawanan. Dengan ini kita boleh memahami visinya yang terbit dari mindanya. Dan proses ini sudah tentu ditimba dari pengalaman dan pembacaan yang luas walaupun beliau kurang percaya kelulusan sebagai syarat mutlak.

Bahagian akhir buku ini diberi judul *Umum*, memuatkan tujuh tulisan A. Samad Ismail. Temanya lebih condong membicarakan sosiopolitik Malaysia selepas merdeka (1967-1990). Bagaimanapun ini sudah tentulah tidak mencukupi kerana jangka waktu yang dicakupi agak panjang (23 tahun).

Buku ini berjaya menampilkan A. Samad Ismail sebagai penulis prolifik yang menguasai banyak bidang - dari berita sampai kepada falsafah dan dari fakta analisis hingga dunia kreatif dan fiksi. Ini adalah hasil usaha yang jerih dan bertatih sejak sebelum Perang Dunia Kedua. Ternyata kail yang dimiliki oleh A. Samad Ismail tidaklah sejengkal panjangnya. Beliau bukan sahaja seorang sasterawan tapi juga intelektual, nasionalis, budayawan dan ahli politik.

Usaha membicarakan A. Samad Ismail sebagai tokoh yang luar biasa ketokohnya memang bermanfaat kepada banyak pihak. Usaha mengumpulkan dan membukukan tulisan-tulisan beliau yang berselerak akan memperkayakan pendokumentasian khazanah negara. Bukan sahaja dunia wartawan dan sastra yang akan mendapat manfaat bahkan juga akan menjadi wadah sejarah intelektual Malaysia. Dan seperti didambakan oleh Prof. Cheah yang kemudiannya diulangi oleh Dr. Firdaus dan A. Karim Abdullah - harapan untuk menatap memoir atau autobiografi A. Samad Ismail sememangnya ditunggu. Dari situlah akan terungkap pengalaman dan pemikiran yang menyeluruh.

Mohammad Isa Othman
Pusat Pengajian Luar Kampus
Universiti Sains Malaysia.

The Ethnic Chinese in Vietnam and Sino-Vietnamese Relations
by Ramses Amer, Kuala Lumpur: Forum. 154 pp., maps, index, pp. 261.

This is a useful and timely book packed with information and facts on a topic that has curiously received scant academic attention. Its overall value lies in its alerting us about the significant presence of an ethnic Chinese community within Vietnam - yet another instance for exploding the myth of the homogenous "nation-state" - and its larger implication for ethnic relations on the international level not only for Vietnam and China but the region as a whole.

Amer's tracing of Chinese migration into Vietnam begins with the thousand years of Chinese suzerainty over Vietnam from 111 B.C. to 939 A.D. but concentrates more on the colonial period beginning in 1883 (Chapter 2). By the end of the French period, according to Amer, the Chinese in Vietnam had assumed typical Southeast Asian characteristics; the vast majority were labourers, Chinese played an important role in fishing, trade and industry and the trade in the staple (rice) was controlled by Chinese merchants and syndicates (p. 11). In the period of the two Vietnams, the Chinese community may have numbered some 400,000 in the South while the North saw an exodus southwards of some 40,000 to 45,000 from a proportion of the overall population that was quite small.

Amer finds that both governments regarded the Chinese as Vietnamese citizens although in the South they were "less integrated and its members had taken Vietnamese citizenship mainly for pragmatic reasons..." (p. 24). Matters apparently only hotted up after the fall of Saigon to the communists in 1975 (Chapter 4). Two years later Vietnam broke off diplomatic relations with the China-backed Democratic Kampuchea and the relations with China itself had

reached breaking point. Domestically, the new communist government's campaign against the "compradore bourgeoisie" in the South naturally affected the ethnic Chinese. A policy was carried out to register Chinese as citizens, which actually saw some resistance, a fact which hardly helped quell communist suspicions of their loyalty.

Amer goes on to treat the question of China's differences with Vietnam which led ultimately to the teach-Vietnam-lesson war of February 17, 1979. (chapters 5-7). I don't propose to review the whole substance of this main portion of the book, but only to point to one of the more interesting observations of the author. It appears that the ethnic Chinese became a pawn in the power politics of the two states. This is apparent after one scours through the mass of statements and consider the actions of both sides which Amer has meticulously reconstructed. The classic situation happened in the North when an estimated 240,000 Chinese crossed into the China side of the Vietnam-China border in 1978. The Vietnamese authorities apparently did nothing to stop the hapless refugees - who expected war between the two states to start any time - from crossing the border while China made political capital of the event, encouraging the exodus. In the same breath China castigated Vietnam for its mistreatment of an ethnic minority. Such callous treatment of minorities has become a commonplace of international politics.

Amer's book ends with the question and problem of the re-integration of some 900,000 "Hoas" who neither crossed the border nor took off in boats supposedly to greener pastures. The soured history of China-Vietnam relations will make this a difficult task.

At the end of the book, the reader is left a little disappointed that the author does not go beyond his somewhat introspective approach to the broad issue of Chinese minorities and foreign policy. Could he not have drawn on the rest of Southeast Asia for parallels, lessons and generalizations as well as for a little theorising? In the context of the region, has China viewed Vietnam differently from Indonesia, Malaysia, Burma or Thailand? And, if so, why? The book is also certainly short on theoretical conceptualization. The literature now teems with writings on the issues of ethnicity and minorities and the resolution of such conflicts. Amer's book is conspicuous for its lack of reference to such literature. This notwithstanding, the book deserves the attention of Malaysianists who will be well advised to read it to add weight to their knowledge of the intricacies of ethnic conflict.

Johan Saravanamuttu
School of Social Sciences
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Tuhfat-al-Nafis, Naskah Terengganu, The House of Tengku Ismail Sdn. Bhd., 1334 Jalan Kenanga, 20400 Kuala Terengganu. 285 pp., 1991. Salasilah charts. Introduction by Shaharil Talib, Ismail Hussein and Michiko Nakahara.

Virginia Matheson Hooker, **Tuhfat-al-Nafis: Sejarah Melayu-Islam**. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1991. Gambar, Salasilah Raja Haji, Singkatan, Glosari, Bibliografi, Indeks, m.s.736.

The *Tuhfat-al-Nafis, Naskah Terengganu* has been made available for review largely due to the recent acquisition of a copy by the Universiti Sains Malaysia library. The library paid M\$240.00 for the copy. The beautifully-bound volume, which is embellished with elegant motifs, is a facsimile reproduction of an original hand-written Jawi manuscript, which has been in the possession of Tengku Ismail bin Tengku Su, a member of the Terengganu royal family. The Jawi script is clear and executed in bright colours of black and red dyes. The manuscript has a contents page which lists sub-headings and page numbers in Arabic numerals. The penmanship of the copyist or copyists is of a high order. The publication of this rare manuscript is to be greatly welcomed as it will add to the growing list of variant versions of the *Tuhfat* and enable scholars in Malay studies to make further comparisons and reassess its role in Malay historiography. The publication was supported by the Toyota Foundation of Japan; the Crown Prince of Terengganu has written a foreword; while the introduction is the work of Professors Shaharil Talib, Ismail Hussein and Michiko Nakahara - probably in that order. A pre-publication interview was given by Tengku Ismail to the newspaper, *The New Straits Times*, which carried it in its edition of 5 October 1991. This was the first time the public knew about its publication. The newspaper reported that ten per cent of the proceeds from the book's sales will go towards the new Yayasan Seni Budaya Terengganu as payment of monthly allowances to old musicians and actresses who will teach young people the ancient Terengganu court dances.

The original *Tuhfat* was written by two Bugis court officials in the Riau-Lingga sultanate. Raja Haji Ahmad (1778-1878) wrote a short version which was later expanded by his son Raja Haji Ali (1809-1872). Including the *Naskah Terengganu*, there are six known copies (the Introduction only mentions five) transcribed from the original. The two best known copies of the *Tuhfat* at present are those which were in the possession of Sir William Maxwell, the Resident of Perak, whose edition was copied from the Perak court in 1890 and that of A.L. van Hasselt, the Dutch Resident of Riau, whose edition was a shorter version copied in 1896 and believed to be the work of Raja Haji Ahmad. Hasselt's edition has been transcribed into Rumi and edited by Dr. Virginia Matheson and published by Fajar Bakti in 1982, while an English translation of Maxwell's copy has been published by Oxford University Press (1982). The translation was the joint work of Dr. Matheson and Dr. Barbara Watson Andaya, both of whom also annotated the text. A lesser known edition is that of Sir

Richard Winstedt who between 1920 and 1930 obtained a 1923 text of the *Tuhfat* which belonged to Tengku Fatimah, daughter of Sultan Abu Bakar of Johor. Winstedt's copy was later transcribed into Rumi by Munir bin Ali and published in 1965. A fourth edition of the *Tuhfat* was identified in 1971 by Mohd. Khalid Saidin among old manuscripts in the possession of the Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka in Kuala Lumpur. A fifth edition was discovered in the library of Leiden University by Dr. T. Iskandar. It had been donated by Dr. A. Rinkes in 1954. Dr Iskandar has yet to publish his study of this text.

Only the *Naskah Terengganu* has eluded the survey of Dr. Matheson, who has done a critical and comparative study of the five manuscripts, including aspects relating to authorship, the historical period they were produced in, the philological aspects of the various texts as well the author's use of sources. She also discusses the influences of earlier Malay, Bugis and Islamic historiography on the *Tuhfat*. Her study which appears under the title *Tuhfat-al-Nafis: Sejarah Melayu-Islam* (1991) includes a full Rumi transcription of the Jawi text of Maxwell's edition of the *Tuhfat* which had been translated into English and annotated by Dr. Matheson and Dr. Barbara Watson Andaya earlier (published by OUP in 1982). Based largely on her doctoral dissertation submitted to Monash University in Melbourne, and done under the supervision of two well-known scholars in Malay studies - the late Prof. C. Skinner and the late Prof. L. Brakel - Dr. Matheson's study is an impressive piece of scholarship and serves as an invaluable guide to students working on the *Tuhfat*. In a communication to this reviewer, Dr. Matheson said she had heard of the *Naskah Terengganu*, but unfortunately was unable to see the copy.

In the Introduction by Shaharil Talib, *et.al.* to the *Naskah Terengganu*, it is stated this is the oldest version of the *Tuhfat*, having been copied originally in 1886. The original copyist was a person named Alwi in the Karimun Islands, but the final work was completed by Haji Abdul Rahman ibni Inche Long (1834-1914), who was the Imam of Masjid Seberang, Bukit Tumboh, Kuala Terengganu, on 4 April 1901. Haji Abdul Rahman was then in the service of Sultan Zainal Abidin III (1881-1918). The *Naskah Terengganu* differs radically from the other known variant versions of the *Tuhfat* in that it has several *tambahan* (additions) which project a Malay-centric and/or Terengganu-centric view of Terengganu's history as well as the history of the Malays in Riau-Lingga. Owing to the Bugis background of the original authors of the *Tuhfat*, they have been regarded as having projected a pro-Bugis version at the expense of the Malays. The Malay-Bugis conflict had started in 1721 after the Bugis had captured the seat of the Riau-Lingga kingdom. They had driven the Siak prince, Raja Kecil, and his Minangkabau supporters from Riau-Lingga, appointed Raja Sulaiman, the son of the late Bendahara as the new Sultan and then placed one of the Bugis chiefs, Dahing Merewah, in the office of the Yam Tuan Muda, or Under-king. Bugis leaders also married Johor Malay princesses. In short, Riau-Lingga came under Bugis domination and the Malay Sultan had to take orders

from the Bugis Under-king. In this conflict Terengganu represented the Malay opposition to Bugis rule, and thus has been depicted in the pro-Bugis versions of the *Tuhfat* as being treacherous to the Under-king in Riau-Lingga. It is this picture which the *Naskah Terengganu* has tried to alter with its own *tambahan*.

The Introduction in presenting this discovery in a celebratory passage has trumpeted it at a very strident note: "The copying of the Terengganu *Tuhfat* and its retention in the Royal Court of Sultan Zainal Abidin III is a masterstroke in history writing. In a single page, without any substantial change to the text, the entire pro-Bugis approach of the manuscript was transformed into a Malay-centric interpretation of events beginning with the death of Sultan Mahmud in 1699. The Malay genealogical tree that was inserted in the first *tambahan* went against the grain of the Bugis account of events embodied in the *Tuhfat*. It brilliantly summarizes the Terengganu image of reality throughout these centuries. The silent facts behind the *Tuhfat's* condemnation of the Terengganu Malays' 'treachery' now assumed a new historical significance. Terengganu disputed and challenged the Bugis commanding position in a Malay world. The copyist was writing for his master - Sultan Zainal Abidin III, the eleventh Malay ruler of Terengganu. The central argument is that Sultan Zainal Abidin III was, at the time of copying, the most senior ruler in the Malay world - successor to the ancient Srivijaya, Melaka, and Johor-Riau-Lingga Empires. All the other ancient family branches, with the exception of Perak, had met their political demise towards the nineteenth century. In 1901 Sultan Zainal Abidin III could well look back and assert that Terengganu was the last of the old Malay line of rulers whose ancestry could be traced to Melaka and beyond...."

The last line in the quotation above slightly contradicts the second last line wherein it mentions the Perak dynasty, which could easily contest the truth of that statement. The Introduction has many more such passages which endorse the Terengganu dynasty's claim that it is presently the "spiritual heir" of the sultanate of Melaka; the dynasty puts down the royal houses of Pahang and Johor as its "junior" branches. The Terengganu dynasty's Salasilah Chart (Genealogical Tree) in the *Naskah Terengganu* shows that their lineage is from the Melaka kings ("Salasilah Keturunan Raja Melaka"). One is inclined to believe that the authors of the Introduction had endorsed such a claim because they believed in it, and not because of their patronage. Still, one wonders why a more critical and objective appraisal of the historical facts relating to the Terengganu dynasty's claim has not been undertaken.

Several scholars including Winstedt, Leonard Andaya and Virginia Matheson have maintained that the lineage of the Melaka kings had ended with the assassination of Sultan Mahmud of Johor in 1699 by a minor chief, Megat Sri Rama, in revenge for the king's murder of his pregnant wife for eating a piece of his jackfruit. Because the king left no heir the Bendahara, Tun Abdul Jalil, who had taken part in the plot with Megat Sri Rama, ascended the throne. He was

toppled in 1717 by the Siak prince, Raja Kecil, who had claimed to be the son of the late Sultan Mahmud. After becoming ruler of Johor, Raja Kecil had him killed in 1720. It was the Bendahara's sons, Raja Sulaiman and Tun Abbas (from different wives), who sought Bugis help to overthrow Raja Kecil in revenge for killing their father, the Bendahara Abdul Jalil in 1720. According to Winstedt (*A History of Johor*), in 1725 four years after Raja Sulaiman had been installed as Sultan Johor-Riau-Lingga, following the Bugis victory, the first Bugis Raja Tua, Dahing Manompok, had installed as the first Sultan of Terengganu Bendahara Abdul Jalil's brother, Tun Zainal-'Abidin, who was the uncle of Sultan Sulaiman. "On 7 March 1733 Sultan Zain al-'Abidin died," wrote Winstedt, "and was succeeded by his son, a ruler destined to play a leading part in the Malay struggle against Bugis dominance, namely Tun Dalam alias Raja Kecil, who at first used the style Yang di-Pertuan Kecil." He was later installed as Sultan Mansur Shah by Sultan Sulaiman when he became the latter's son-in-law.

It was thus the Bendahara line that had led to the sultanate in Terengganu, and not that of the Melaka kings, as claimed by the Terengganu dynasty in their salasilah chart in *Naskah Terengganu*. This chart traces the ancestry of Sultan Zainal Abidin and his brother the Bendahara Tun Abdul Jalil (former Sultan of Johor) to their father, the Bendahara Sri Maharaja Tun Habib Abdul Majid, who is shown as the brother of a "Sultan Abdul Rahman of Johor". The father of Bendahara Abdul Majid and "Sultan Abdul Rahman" was said to be descended from the lineage of Melaka kings ("Raja Melaka Al-Sultan Muhammad Malik Al-Johor yang managkat di Kota Tauhid iaitu Negeri Johor"). No historian has so far presented any genealogical tree of the Johor Bendaharas beyond the Bendahara Sri Maharaja Tun Habib Abdul Majid, whose death according to Winstedt's genealogical tree occurred in 1697. Until its appearance in the *Naskah Terengganu* there is also no known account of "Keturunan Raja Melaka Al-Sultan Muhammad Malik al-Johor yang mangkat di Kota Tauhid, iaitu negeri Johor." This is not to say such a lineage never existed, but what is puzzling is that all the known historical lists of Johor kings do not include the name of this king or that of "Sultan Abdul Rahman" who was said to be the brother of Bendahara Tun Abdul Jalil.

This reviewer feels that an explanation of these missing links in the background of the Terengganu dynasty would have been helpful in the Introduction. As to the claim that the *Naskah Terengganu* represents "a masterstroke in history writing," yes undoubtedly so, but then this is nothing unusual - it happens every time a Malay copyist copies a hikayat. In the old days there was no photocopying machine, so each time a copying is done - particularly in a royal court - the copyist will make changes to the text he is copying; he might change words to improve on the previous text, reconstruct a story, or add in passages to clear what he considers "obscurities" or sometimes he deletes passages, if his patron, the king, is displeased with certain accounts. If he is a learned man, the

copyist may also show off his learning in other ways, such as use his knowledge of Islamic texts or the Arabic/Persian language. That is why there are 29 known variant versions of the *Sejarah Melayu*, and six known variant versions of the *Tuhfat-al-Nafis*. It is rare that one comes across a hikayat text that is identical with another in almost every respect. In every case one has to take into account the skills or "alterations" of the Malay copyist. The *Naskah Terengganu*, therefore, serves as an excellent example of the Malay copyist at work. Undoubtedly, it can contribute a great deal to our understanding of the craft of traditional Malay historiography.

Cheah Boon Kheng
School of Humanities
Universiti Sains Malaysia

Catatan ringkas/Briefly noted

Muhammad Ikmal Said and Johan Saravanamuttu, (eds.), **Images of Malaysia**. Kuala Lumpur: Persatuan Sains Sosial Malaysia, 1991.

The articles of this book were originally presented at the "Perceptions of Malaysia" colloquium held on June 29 to July 3, 1987 in the Universiti Sains Malaysia, Penang, jointly organised by the Malaysia Society (Asian Studies Association of Australia) and the Malaysian Social Science Association. Contributors include R.A. Cramb, Glen Chandler, Muhammad Ikmal Said, Ng Gan Chee, Ng Ban Lian, Mohd Shukri Abdullah, Chamhuri Siwar, Nik Hashim Mustapha, Allan M. Healy, Khong Kim Hoong, Michael Leigh, Rajah Rasiah, and Wan Abdul Manan Wan Muda. *Images of Malaysia* presents a variety of views and academic perspectives on Malaysia's economy and politics, ranging from colonial issues, agricultural policy and the electronic industry to ethnic conflict and Malaysia's 70-million population policy.

Khoo Kay Kim. **Malay Society: Transformation and Democratisation**. Kuala Lumpur: Pelanduk Publications, 1991. Paperback. Acknowledgement, author's note, introduction, index, pp.312.

Buku ini mengumpulkan lapan buah esei yang telah diterbitkan di dalam berbagai jurnal oleh ahli sejarah yang terkenal, Datuk Profesor Khoo Kay Kim dari Jabatan Sejarah, Universiti Malaya. Di dalam Pengenalan, Prof. Khoo menerangkan kesemua lapan esei itu membincangkan masyarakat Melayu dari sesuatu masa ke sesuatu masa mulai dengan zaman Kesultanan Melaka sehingga masa pencapaian kemerdekaan Malaysia. Penumpuan di dalam dua buah esei diberikan kepada Johor, Terengganu dan Kelantan pada abad ke-19; sebuah esei mengkaji pergerakan sayap kiri Melayu di Semenanjung Tanah Melayu, 1945-

1948, dan sebuah lagi tentang Islam di Malaysia. Format paperback ini suatu bentuk baru dan mengagumkan. Harganya \$17.00 berpatutan dan mampu dibeli oleh para pelajar. Suatu koleksi esei tentang sejarah Malaysia yang sangat berguna.

Sarnia Hayes Hoyt, **Old Penang**, Images of Asia series. Singapore: Oxford University Press, 1991. Colour plates, maps, select bibliography, index, pp.97.

There has been no single book devoted to a complete history of Penang from its known period of existence up to today. Sarnia Hayes Hoyt's book attempts to present some glimpses of Penang's past in a nutshell for the tourist. It is a small and handy guidebook with 15 beautiful colour plate reproductions of well-known paintings of old Penang by English artists James Wathen, John Turnbull Thomson, William Daniell and others. Throughout the text is interspersed with sketches and pictures of the local people, their social activities, sites of administrative buildings, mosques, temples and public centres like the port, and the hill railway. The book is the result of regular trips to Penang by a native New Yorker who was a resident in Singapore, but who had heard enough of the charms of the Pearl of the Orient to try her hand at writing a short popular history of the island. A former history student in the America of the late 1950s, the author states in her Preface that after her arrival in Singapore she had a chance to correct her "Eurocentric myopia and begin to acquire an Asian perspective". The text shows she has certainly succeeded. It is a very readable book written with a detached perspective. She has done a lot of readings, and carried out interviews with local people. What is more important she is very sensitive to local perceptions. She, handles the controversy among historians over Francis Light's "deception" of the Sultan of Kedah over the lease of Penang very well. Her chapters on the local communities and cultures are well-written. Invariably, given the vast literature available in English on Penang, most of the information have been gleaned from English official sources. Still, this is a fairly creditable account of old Penang provided in some 60 pages of text.

Qasim Ahmad, **Karya Sejarah: Pendekatan dan Persoalan**. Kuala Lumpur: Dewan Bahasa dan Pustaka, 1991. Prakata, pengenalan, bibliografi, indeks, m.s.115.

Sebuah koleksi enam buah esei tentang beberapa aspek penting pensejarahan. Antara tajuk-tajuk yang dibincangkan ialah isu-isu yang senantiasa menjadi perdebatan hangat di kalangan para sejarawan, seperti soal kuantifikasi, penyeluruhan dan pengadilan moral. Dalam sebuah esei pengarang telah membuat satu tafsiran yang menarik tentang persoalan, "Machiavellianisme: Satu Realisme Politik?" Satu lagi esei bertajuk, "Pemikiran Kesedaran: Satu Garis Pemisah Revolusioner." Tiga buah esei di dalam buku ini telah dahulu diterbitkan di dalam *Dewan Masyarakat* dan *Dewan Budaya*, and satu esei bertajuk, "Penyeluruhan Dalam Sejarah: Revolusi Industri Sebagai Contoh"

telah diterbitkan di dalam *Kajian Malaysia* (Jil. VIII, No.2, Jun 1990). Dua buah esei lain - "Kaedah Kuantifikasi" dan "Pemikiran Kesedaran" - diterbitkan buat pertama kalinya di dalam buku ini. Buku *Karya Sejarah* adalah sangat berguna kepada mereka yang terlibat dalam pengajaran dan pembelajaran sejarah khususnya dan peminat sejarah amnya. Profesor Madya Qasim Ahmad ialah seorang pensyarah yang mengajar kursus-kursus sejarah Eropah dan pengantar sejarah dan memegang jawatan pengarah Pusat Pengajian Luar Kampus di Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Brenda S.A. Yeoh, *Municipal Sanitary Surveillance, Asian Resistance and the Control of the Urban Environment in Colonial Singapore*, Research Paper No.47, School of Geography, University of Oxford, U.K., 1991. Plates, tables, figures, pp. 53.

This short monograph presents a new and interesting perspective of evaluating the British colonial regime's project to sanitise the city of Singapore during the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It sees the issue as "a dialectical encounter between the municipal authorities of the city and the Asian plebeian classes." Packed with rich data and photographs gleaned from the old colonial records of the Singapore Municipality, which have so far been neglected by historians and other scholars, Brenda Yeoh reconstructs the "ideological impetus which led to the passing of a ramifying web of municipal by-laws to regulate the daily routines and habits of the Asian plebeian classes." She examines colonial perceptions of death and disease in Singapore, the strategies devised by the municipal authorities to secure the sanitation of the city and the Asian attempts at imposing their own counter-view with regard to health, disease and the management of the urban environment. This monograph shows that even over the issue of sanitary control, the 'passive resistance' of subject peoples may be detected. Her conclusion displays the theoretical force behind her critical assessment of the urban conflict in Singapore which had ended in the Municipality's defeat: "The 'power' of the Asian masses, and their counter strategies of evasion, concealment and non-compliance, were at least in indirect ways, partly responsible for forcing the hand of the Municipal Commissioners. In Foucault's terms, just as disciplinary institutions employ a panoply of meticulous, minute techniques embodying the 'micro-physics' of power, the subjects of discipline were themselves capable of 'small acts of cunning endowed with a great power of diffusion', which were 'all the more real and effective because they [were] formed right at the point where relations of power [were] exercised." Dr. Brenda Yeoh is a lecturer in the Department of Geography at the National University of Singapore.

PENYUMBANG: PENYUMBANG/CONTRIBUTORS

John Gullick

Sarjana Inggeris yang terkenal. Penulis banyak buku tentang Sejarah Melayu, termasuk *Indigenous Political Systems of Western Malaya* yang telah diterjemahkan dalam bahasa Melayu.

Well-known British scholar. Writer of many books including Indigenous Political Systems of Western Malaya, which has been translated into Malay.

A.C. Milner

Pensyarah sejarah di Australian National University di Canberra. Penulis buku *Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule*.

Lecturer in history at the Australian National University in Canberra. Author of Kerajaan: Malay Political Culture on the Eve of Colonial Rule.

Wong Soak Koon

Pensyarah, Bahagian Kesusasteraan, Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Kemanusiaan, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Lecturer, Literature Section, School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Ab. Latif bin Ibrahim

Fellow, Bahagian Geografi, Pusat Pengajian Ilmu Kemanusiaan, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Fellow, Geography Section, School of Humanities, Universiti Sains Malaysia.

Marie-Andree Couillard

Pensyarah, Jabatan Anthropologi, Faculte Des Science Sociale, Universite Laval, Canada

Lecturer, Department of Anthropology, Faculte Des Science Sociale, Universite Laval, Canada