

COMMUNICATIONS

Editor, *Journal of Asian Studies*:

In the review by Cecil Hobbs of the *Bibliography of Indonesian Peoples and Cultures* by Raymond Kennedy, revised and edited by Thomas W. Maretzki and H. Th. Fischer, New Haven, 1962 (*The Journal of Asian Studies*, XXII [August 1963], 492-493), no mention is made that this is virtually a reprint of an edition prepared in 1953 and published in 1955. The re-issue of this bibliography was decided upon by the Human Relations Area Files to satisfy many requests for the revised edition since its supply was exhausted almost as rapidly as that of the original 1945 edition. The 1962 issue was not prepared by the editors. As stated in the preface: "No new titles have been added. The format has been changed to allow publication in a single volume and the usefulness of the bibliography has been enhanced by the addition of asterisks opposite the more important and crucial titles."

When the second edition was prepared in 1953, there were few titles on anthropological and related subjects in Indonesian. Certainly, numerous publications in Indonesian and other languages have appeared since. It would be the reviewer's privilege to take issue with the reprint of a bibliography now several years out of date. But if a reprint is to be reviewed at all, the review should keep in mind the actual date of publication.

Mr. Hobb's suggestion that an over-all author and/or subject index is much needed in such a bibliography is recognized as a valid criticism.

THOMAS W. MARETZKI

University of Hawaii

Editor, *Journal of Asian Studies*:

Readers of the *Journal* may wish to note the following corrections to two inadvertent errors in Cecil Hobbs' review of our *Southeast Asian History, A Bibliographic Guide* in your August 1963 issue:

(1) As the introduction explains, graduate students compiled in draft form the annotations for about 170 of the 632 separate entries.

The reviewer's statement that the volume was "prepared largely by graduate students" is therefore not accurate.

(2) The reviewer states that "a large number" of items in our volume are also to be found in Cecil Hobbs, comp., *Southeast Asia: An Annotated Bibliography of Selected Reference Sources* (1952) or in John Echols, Comp., "Southeast Asia" in *The American Historical Association's Guide to Historical Literature* (1961). Although at a number of points in our work we have cited the annotations given in these excellent bibliographies, 489 of the items in our volume, or 77% of the total number, are not mentioned in either of them.

STEPHEN N. HAY
MARGARET H. CASE

University of Chicago

NOTICE

The English-language bi-monthly journal, *Orient / West*, wishes to invite the attention of the members of the Association for Asian Studies to its interest in essays and translations in the fields represented in the *Journal of Asian Studies*. In particular, essays of a more general nature than might be appropriate for the *Journal* would be welcomed for consideration. The readership of the magazine is not restricted to the academic profession nor to Japan and the United States. It extends to many professions and includes businessmen and governmental officials in a number of Asian countries.

Manuscripts should be sent to the Editor-in-Chief, Maurice Schneps, *Orient / West*, C. P. O. Box 652, Tokyo, with a return envelope and international reply coupons. Queries about the kinds of material suitable may be addressed to Earl Miner, English Department, U. C. L. A., Los Angeles, California, 90024. Annual subscriptions (6 issues) are \$7.50 or ¥2,700 by international money order.

Editor, *Journal of Asian Studies*:

In the discussion of *India and Pakistan, A Political Analysis*, by Prof. Hugh Tinker,

your reviewer has based his appraisal of the book on faulty foundations. "Mr. Tinker," the review begins, "happens to be one of the last of the 'Heaven born Guardians' who served India under the British Raj." And from this opening sentence, one can easily deduce the indictment that follows: Prof. Tinker, it seems, has not yet liberated himself from the evil influences of English imperialism. "The roots of Mr. Tinker's thinking," the reviewer continues, "at least his thinking about the colonial era of Britain and its aftermath, are those of the nineteenth-century Liberal tradition. To writers in this tradition, the *summum bonum* of democracy is the two-party system as it has developed in the Anglo-Saxon world. Democracy in the new nations is judged against the yardstick of how quickly they are able to build up two strong and equally poised political parties which form government and opposition alternately, with several or no weak third parties. To these authors, democracy in the 'new democracies' is perpetually in danger because there is no sign on the horizon of the emergence of a strong opposition. In the opinion of the reviewer, this is an erroneous way of looking at the politics of newly independent countries, particularly India." With this last sentence, I, and probably several other students of India, would heartily agree. But no one, at least here, in Britain, would be in more enthusiastic agreement with this than Prof. Tinker himself.

For anyone familiar with Prof. Tinker's thought, the news that he seeks to judge democracy in the new nations "against the yardstick of how quickly they are able to build up two strong and equally poised political parties," must come as a real howler; for Prof.

Tinker seldom misses the opportunity to point out the inapplicability of Western concepts or institutions like the two party system to the Asian context. This point is explicit in the book itself; and, most surprisingly, it is explicit in the very passage which the reviewer cites as representative of "the most important and significant contribution" of the study; that is, "the extended discussion of the role of the Socialists and the new ideas of democracy and political theory being formulated and expressed by J. P. Narayan and his followers. 'The decline of the Socialists is all the more unfortunate because their leaders have shown by far the greatest originality and vision in drafting programmes and policies designed to meet India's unique needs'."

As anyone familiar with J.P.'s thought knows, *partyless* democracy is a cornerstone of his programme. And, if the reviewer had not been preoccupied with assessments of Prof. Tinker's preconceptions, he might well have seen the full significance of Prof. Tinker's deep commitment, not to the Socialist Party, but to the political theory of Jayaprakash Narayan, a commitment which deserves serious consideration; this has not been forthcoming because few political theorists have taken J.P.'s ideas seriously.

To begin a review of a book with misguided remarks about the author is bad enough; to attribute to the author preconceptions which he does not hold, and are nowhere supported in the text itself, is still worse; but to base one's evaluation of the book upon these false assumptions is clearly worst of all.

DENNIS DALTON

*School of Oriental and African Studies
University of London*