

would have been insightful to analyze socialist “evocative transcripts” on shamanism and contemporary Mongolian representations. By presenting her fieldwork as unique account, the author, whose main intent is to remember the history of the Buryat and their shamanism, neglects the disciplinary history of her study subject. One last remark: in a period when new media enable unexpected global connections and when the rural district of Bayan-Uul, portrayed in the book as a symbol of the marginalized, presents itself in a series of YouTube-videos, we have to rethink our modes of representing and anonymizing persons. Buyandelger mentions in the introduction that she changed the names of the persons to protect their identities. She does not discuss her reasoning, I can, however, imagine her dilemma between a Mongolian scholarly tradition of naming shamans and the anthropological tradition of anonymizing informants (although we all know that if anthropological accounts travel back, it is easy for locals to identify them). Shamans live off their public reputation which is authoritatively supported by scholarly books. Maybe she feared exactly this possible advertising effect on a curious international public. However, by keeping their names secret, she obscures shamans’ identities and thus contributes to the production of tragic spirits.

Judith Hangartner

Chapman, William: *A Heritage of Ruins. The Ancient Sites of Southeast Asia and Their Conservation.* Honolulu: University of Hawai’i Press, 2013. 340 pp. ISBN 978-0-8248-3631-3. Price: \$ 59.00

In my recent research on heritage and tourism in Southeast Asia, I have been arguing for the importance of comparative studies of heritage, and in particular UNESCO World Heritage Sites across the region. William Chapman’s lavishly illustrated book is one of the rare excursions into this important field of studies and he demonstrates the value of taking a broad comparative view of the history and material culture of this diverse and complex region south of China and east of India. Overall, he manages successfully to sustain this exercise in regional narrative and analysis in that it is extraordinarily difficult to command such a substantial theoretical, ethnographic, and technical literature; there are a few lapses.

Chapman certainly has the experience and expertise to undertake this monumental task. He has had the great good fortune to have visited a large number of heritage sites from his first introduction to the Angkor Archaeological Park in Cambodia in 1994, to his subsequent visits to the “ruined sites” of Thailand, Vietnam, Laos, and Burma, and then to have the opportunity to teach over several years at the SEAMEO (Southeast Asian Ministers of Education Organization) Center for Archaeology and Fine Arts in Bangkok and through his sojourns in Thailand as a Fulbright Senior Lecturer, in Thailand and Cambodia as a Fulbright Specialist, and then with Silpakorn University. His encounters over some twenty years with sites, students, and specialists in the field of heritage and conservation studies have provided a sound scholarly and practical basis for this ambitious venture in examining the

history, character, and transformation of “ancient sites” in Southeast Asia and the policy and technical dimensions of their management, presentation, and conservation.

Writing this book and undertaking additional field research to widen its scope and increase its scholarly depth have occupied him during the past decade or so. Chapman tells us that he was engaged by the Getty Conservation Institute in Los Angeles in 2002 “to write a survey of monumental sites in Southeast Asia as background for a proposed training program” (xii). It enabled him to visit several more sites, and he managed to complete a first draft of the book at that time. He then secured further funding from a range of sponsors, including UNESCO, and undertook visits and revisits to sites in Burma, Laos, Vietnam, and Cambodia. He records his particular thanks to his home University of Hawai’i in providing support and especially research leave in Southeast Asia whilst he was engaged in this extended and wide-ranging project.

How does one organise one’s material in such a large undertaking which covers “ancient sites” across seven countries and embraces two millennia of historical development and cultural transformation? Chapman provides two general chapters which introduce the Southeast Asian region, and its history and heritage in which, among other things, he covers such matters as “imagining” and “constructing” ruins and the ways in which colonialism shaped the definition, representation, interpretation, and understanding of built heritage (and, therefore, the approach to its protection and conservation), as well as the processes and consequences of what was referred to by earlier European scholars as “Indianisation.”

Chapman then chooses to arrange his material by country and to some degree by colonial influence and legacy in that different European powers had different approaches to their “ancient sites.” There are separate chapters on Indonesia, specifically the UNESCO World Heritage Sites of Prambanan and Borobudur; Cambodia and the UNESCO site of Angkor; Vietnam and Laos are then combined (intriguingly placed “at the periphery of Cambodia” [98], because “Cham and Khmer powers had many points of connection”, they were both brought under French colonial administration, and since independence continue to have “political and economic connections” [99]); his focus in this chapter is on the UNESCO sites of My Son in central Vietnam and Vat Phu in southern Laos; then there is a chapter on Thailand which concentrates on the two UNESCO sites of Sukhothai and Ayutthaya, in addition to the temples of the Khorat Plateau; and finally Burma (Myanmar) and Malaysia, perhaps rather unusually, are brought together in a consolidated chapter not because of “their ancient history” but because of “their common absorption into the British Empire during the nineteenth century” (162) and the fact that, as Chapman argues, “British attitudes to the past differed substantially from those of the French” in that they were “[l]ess inspired by the presence of ancient sites than their French and even Dutch counterparts” (163). He elaborates that “[n]either Burma nor Malaysia witnessed the burst of aesthetic and historical enthusiasm that characterized the French presence in Indochina – or even that of the Dutch

in nearby Java and Sumatra" (193). We might also add that Burma, though it has "ancient sites" and "a heritage of ruins" has no fully inscribed UNESCO World Heritage Sites (though it has eight sites, including Pagan, on the UNESCO Tentative List), and, in addition, Malaysia "sees its heritage in a different light from that of other monument-rich countries, such as Cambodia or Burma" (187).

Chapman finally looks to the possible futures of these heritage sites in a rather mixed bag of a chapt. 7 which brings in the Thai-Cambodian dispute over the inscription of the contested Cambodian site of Prasat Preah Vihear, but focuses primarily on current and future conservation and management concerns, and then what he refers to as "broader issues" to do with the commercialisation of the sites in the context of tourism development, modern and urban transformations on those areas adjacent to heritage sites, and the problems raised by local communities which live around and sometimes on these sites, including their livelihoods, perspectives, and spiritual connections with regard to them. A brief concluding chapter covers such issues as the reappraisal of the past, the "uses" to which "ruins" are put and their interpretation, and the concept of "authenticity."

Chapman is on strong ground when he is describing the cultural and historical context of monument building; the history of conservation, excavation, exploration, and "discovery" from the colonial period onwards (and the particular issues to do with Western perceptions and interpretations of cultural history, built forms, and their representation and conservation as against local ones); the range of problems which the protection, management, conservation, and in some cases restoration of these sites engender; the technical aspects of architecture, construction, and building materials; and the ways in which conservation work is planned, organised, and undertaken. In some areas of his general historical treatment of Southeast Asia in chap. 1 he is perhaps a little less assured. Some scholars of Southeast Asia would now want to say much more about the construction and naming of a Southeast Asian region than that it emerged "as a strategic grouping devised by the Allies to fight the Japanese" (14). The term was already in use at the turn of the twentieth century in German-Austrian ethnographic literature and in early twentieth-century Japanese geographical and historical texts, and was being used at the School of Oriental and African Studies in London in the 1930s. Presumably because the book was long in the writing and in the publication process, some updating was not possible. Chapman notes, for example that "Malaysia has recently nominated the cities of Malacca and George Town, Penang, for World Heritage listing" (234), when they had already been inscribed on the UNESCO list in 2008.

Overall, the book is a most valuable contribution to the comparative study of the material expressions of Southeast Asian cultures, and specifically the history of conservation and the role and work of UNESCO, other international agencies, and local institutions in this endeavour. It is beautifully illustrated; there is a substantial bibliography and a helpful index. It will undoubtedly become an important reference work. Indeed, an abbreviated version

of the book in a lighter, more easily carried paperback form would sell very well in the tourist and travel market in airport bookshops. Chapman manages to combine scholarship with an eye on the interests of a popular readership. I am delighted to have a copy on my bookshelf. With the publication of this volume even greater weight is added to Chapman's observation that "The ancient ruins of Southeast Asia are no longer forgotten or half-forgotten piles of stones and bricks hidden in forests or spread across dusty plains ..." (195).
Victor T. King

Cleall, Esme: *Missionary Discourses of Difference. Negotiating Otherness in the British Empire, 1840–1900.* Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2012. 243 pp. ISBN 978-0-230-29680-0. Price: £ 55.00

This is a comparative study of the London Missionary Society (L. M. S.) as it operated in southern Africa and India during its formative decades. This was before its structure and routine became more fixed by the drastic economic changes after the First World War, before its organization became more bureaucratized, and before colonial governments indirectly influenced it through subsidies and increasing supervision in education and medicine. In short, the book considers an early missionary group before it began to face any contemporary "problems of success." It deals with only one English Protestant mission in two very large and very different areas, each involving a large number of widespread colonial stations, a huge number of native people, and many different cultures and societies. This does not necessarily negate the book's possible value, but its focus on only one missionary group working in two areas is seriously at odds with the book's title which implies a far wider focus on more kinds of missionaries working throughout a worldwide colonial empire. A buyer ordering this book unseen, relying only on its grandiose title, might be surprised and disappointed with its actual narrower focus. The broad title is deeply misleading, but there is even more wrong here. The author never tells us why the English L. M. S. is a good choice for trying to comprehend missionaries in the British Empire. Why was the L. M. S. chosen as the sole illustrative choice? Is it even useful to consider only one exemplary mission? If so, why? Is it useful to ignore British missionaries who were not English but instead Scotch, Irish, or even expatriates? What about the Roman Catholics? What about missions run by non-British subjects? All of these existed in the Empire and certainly were found in southern Africa and India. At the last, Cleall needs to explain the grounds for her particular choices and methods. Furthermore, she makes only a weak attempt to draw her 19th-century data into some useful discussion of what happened later. This would not have been difficult, and it would have made the text appear more relevant to current issues. This book needs better comparative and historical contextualization and justification if its claims are to be better appreciated and judged.

Cleall's aim is to consider three aspects of the L. M. S.: (1) its ideas about marriage and the family, (2) its ideas