CENTRE OF SOUTHEAST ASIAN STUDIES

WORKING PAPERS

No. 27

THE HSAYA SAN REBELLION (1930—1932) REAPPRAISED

by

Patricia Herbert

MONASH UNIVERSITY
MELBOURNE 3168,
AUSTRALIA.

PRESENTED BY:

The Author

No. 27

THE HSAYA SAN REBELLION (1930—1932) REAPPRA SED

by

Patricia Herbert

Department of Oriental Manuscripts
and Printed Books
The British Library
1982

THE HSAYA SAN REBELLION (1930—1932) REAPPRAISED

The Hsaya San rebellion that occurred in British-ruled Burma in 1930–32 has attracted in recent years considerable scholarly attention. It has, above all, served as *the* Burmese case study or counterpoint in several comparative studies, most notably those by Harry Benda, James Scott and Michael Adas.[1] A variety of interpretations of the rebellion has been offered. All Western studies have emphasized the traditional and millenarian aspects of the rebellion, with some also concentrating on economic factors and others treating it in terms of what has been called the peasant ethic. Yet unlike other Southeast Asian rebellions (for example in Java and the Philippines) there has been no full scale study of the rebellion and very little use made of Burmese language source materials. Moreover, what interpretations of the rebellion all lack (whatever the perspective from which they are written), is an internal dimension. Writings on the Hsaya San rebellion — a rebellion that from start to finish was essentially a rural rebellion — do not carry us far towards understanding the world of Burmese peasants in the 1920s and 30s.

Is such an understanding an impossible goal? It might seem so given how little appears to be known about even the more educated and articulate members of early 20th century Burmese society. In the standard accounts (such as those by Cady, Moscotti and Trager) members of the Burmese elite figure only as names in lists — lists of the founders of the YMBA, the GCBA, members of the Legislative Council, etc. These studies have not been based upon an appreciation or examination of the many Burmese political and literary writings of the period and hence they have largely failed to advance our understanding of Burmese society at that time and of what its members thought, believed and wrote. The Burmese nationalist organizations and politicians of the early 20th century remain little more than a collection of names and events arranged in a progressional sequence from colonialism to independence. Viewed from such a perspective, the Hsaya San rebellion has predominently been treated as a throwback, as the "last gasp of traditional Burma". The purpose of this paper is to challenge that view and to give a more internal dimension to the objectives and perceptions of the Burmese under British rule than can be provided by the essentially top-downwards focus of colonial reports and sources.

The main events of the Hsaya San rebellion — the biggest anti-colonial uprising in Burmese history — are quite well known and only need outlining. The rebellion's outbreak in December 1930 shattered the apparent surface calm of rural Burma and took the British authorities by complete surprise. Outside government circles it came as less of a surprise. Right on the eve of the rebellion, the leading Burmese language newspaper, *Thu-ri-ya* (The Sun) had published an editorial entitled "A Warning to the British Government" which spoke of Burma as a "keg of dynamite" which could explode at any time.[2] The first targets for attack by the rebels were village headmen — four were killed in the first 48 hours and within a year altogether 38 headmen had been killed and another 250 attacked and wounded. (Why villagers should attack their own headmen will be discussed later.) Within five days the government had rushed 2,000 troops into Tharrawaddy District (the main centre of rebel activities), and on December 31 the rebel headquarters was located and destroyed.

But the rebellion was far from over and it was to take the government another 18 months to stamp it out. As well as in Tharrawaddy District, there was serious rebel activity

and fighting in Pyapon, Henzada, Insein, Pegu, Prome and Thayetmyo Districts and as far afield as the Shan States. Plans for uprising in Bassein, Maubin, Toungoo and Yamethin Districts were for the most part thwarted by the authorities' prompt arrest of suspects. A confidential government report on the rebellion spoke of a "reign of terror" prevailing throughout March and April 1931 and of large tracts of the country from April to August being in "a state of anarchy".[3] In July 1931 the authorities considered the situation so serious that they (unsuccessfully) asked permission from the government of India to introduce martial law. In all, over 1,300 rebels were killed and an incalculable number wounded, and a further 9,000 rebels surrendered or were captured or arrested. Hsaya San and 125 other rebels were hanged and 1,389 were sentenced to terms of imprisonment or of transportation.

The rebellion was a large scale, violent protest that posed the greatest threat to British rule since the troubled years of the so-called "pacification period" following the British annexation of Upper Burma in 1885. To this day the rebellion has tremendous political relevance in Burma where Hsaya San is regarded as the nation's foremost peasant/worker hero and his rebellion commemorated each year by special exhibitions and speeches on national days such as Peasants' Day, and where as recently as 1981 President Ne Win was considering what action to take regarding a monument in Prome which was, in the words of the Burmese newspaper report "erected by the foreign government in memory of Burmese traitors". These "traitors" were two monks who as members of the Monks' Peace Mission had been killed by rebels while they were, in the words of the British monument "working for restoration of peace"; or, as the newspaper puts it, were "executed by Saya San's group for zealously attempting on orders of the colonial government to defuse the anti-colonial peasants uprising led by Saya San".[4] Such contrasting wording illustrates vividly how widely interpretations of events can and do vary from 1931 right up to the present day.

To the colonial authorities at the time there was no doubt about the origins and causes of the rebellion. In May 1931 the government issued a report on the rebellion which stated baldly:

> As regards the causes it is well known:— (1) that the Burman is by nature restless and excitable; (2) that in spite of a high standard of literacy the Burman peasantry are incredibly ignorant and superstitious; the belief in the efficacy of charms and tattooing as conferring invulnerability being still widespread; and (3) that such rebellions are usually started with the object of overthrowing the government, the history of Burma being a record of sudden and successful rebellions usually ending in the seizure of the throne and there being many prophecies current especially in Upper Burma that the throne of the King of Burma will be won again.[5]

None of the points listed can really be considered a cause of rebellion. The Report's emphasis on the superstition and gullibility of the peasants reveals more of the British authorities' unchanging attitude to the peasant than it does of factors motivating the peasants. The superstition of the Burmese peasantry is undubitable. It is the significance ascribed to that superstition that is in doubt. The government saw the peasants as having been manipulated and duped by a "charlatan" and "quack doctor" — Hsaya San. The use of such disparaging terms shows the authorities' inability to appreciate the standing and importance of a practitioner of indigenous medicine in rural society — a position partly indicated by the prefix '*hsaya*' which is a term of respect meaning 'master', 'learned person', 'teacher'. Moreover, the Report's statement on the causes of the rebellion (quoted above) was not even original, but was in fact taken from a 1914 confidential report giving guidance to civil officers in the event of an outbreak of disturbances! This 1914 Report — which contained such statements as "All that is required [to defeat the Burman] is prompt and reliable intelligence, tirelessness, ruthless pursuit, and at the end, straight shooting at close

quarters''[6] — was reissued to government officials in 1931.

Right from the rebellion's outbreak, Burmese nationalist members of the Legislative Council had been demanding, without success, an inquiry into the rebellion. In 1933 they renewed their demands arguing that the government's earlier grounds for refusing to hold an inquiry (which were that it was impractical as they were too busy suppressing the rebellion) were no longer valid. In the course of the ensuing debate, government spokesmen called the rebellion ''a blot upon the province'' and maintained that it was an event best forgotten and that the appointment of a committee of inquiry was unnecessary since the causes were clearly contained in the records of the rebels' trial proceedings.[7] After an acrimonious debate the government gave an undertaking to publish the information contained in these records.

Accordingly, the government's *The Origin and Causes of the Burma Rebellion (1930-32)* was published the following year, 1934.[8] This, together with the earlier 1931 Report upon which it elaborates, is an official report only in the sense that it gives the fullest available statement of the government view of the rebellion, drawing upon previous government reports and communiques and giving selective, supportive extracts from the trial proceedings. It was more concerned to uphold the government view and to dismiss variant views than it was to air or investigate issues. It was strongly criticised on precisely these grounds by the editor of *Myan-má Alin* newspaper, U Chit Maung, who wrote a rejoinder called 'The Real Origin and Causes of the Burma Rebellion'.[9] For the government the rebellion remained purely political — an attempt to overthrow its authority — engineered by one main leader, Hsaya San, who exploited the people's discontent and superstition to accomplish his own ends. Exactly why Hsaya San should want to do this was not explained.

Interpretations of the rebellion both at the time and subsequently have all emphasized the form of the rebellion. The symbolism of royalty, of the mythical Galon (garuda) bird, the drinking of oath-water, the rebels' faith in tattoos and amulets are all seen as evidence of the 'primitive' or 'traditional' nature of the rebellion. Several studies have in addition pointed to a linked aspect of the rebellion, its messianic and millennial Buddhist content. The conclusion drawn from this emphasis on these traditional and millenarian aspects has been that the Hsaya San rebellion was retrogressive — that it represented (to quote Benda) ''a turning away, ... a cosmological attempt to exorcise the foreigner by recreating the traditional Burmese monarchy in a jungle clearing, complete with the magico-religious paraphernalia of old Burma''.[10]

How true is this? To what extent was the Hsaya San rebellion the last gasp of traditional Burma? Only partly so. Undoubtedly traditional elements were important. But for Hsaya San not to have made use of such elements would surely have been more surprising than the fact that he did so. To look briefly at just one traditional element: the belief in invulnerability conveyed by tattoos and amulets. For many Burmans it would be foolhardy to embark upon a dangerous endeavour without the protection of tattoos or amulets — every bit as foolish as British observers of the rebellion considered the rebel's faith in such protection to be. When rebel soldiers were killed or wounded by the bullets of their enemy, faith in invulnerability was not necessarily shaken. It was believed either that the oath-taker must have broken his oath and so prevented himself from absorbing the power of the amulet, or that the incantation administered was faulty and the amulet or tattoo thereby rendered ineffective. It follows that an amulet that had been made, charmed and administered by someone with a high reputation would be especially desirable. Such a reputation Hsaya San undoubtedly had. He was a skilled practitioner of medicine, a *hsei hsaya* (it is worth noting that the Burmese word *hsei* can bear the meaning of both medicine and magic) and the author of a published book on medical diagnosis[11] and another on alchemy.[12] Hsaya San made full use

of his skills when recruiting followers. He made by alchemic processes special charmed needles both for tattooing and for embedding under the skin of the forearm.

In Burma the practice of alchemy is especially associated with certain esoteric sects (or *gaing* — termed by Mendelson "messianic Buddhist associations"), whose members aim to acquire magical and religious powers, especially the power to become a superior being, a *weik-za*, who can live until the coming of the next Buddha or who can improve conditions for others.[13] The Buddhist concept of a Universal Emperor (Pali: *Cakkavatti*) who is the precursor of the Future Buddha (or can also potentially be the Future Buddha) has merged into Burmese beliefs in a future king and formed the basis for millenarian expectations. The future king can be a *weik-za* and is often believed to be the embodiment of two famous past *weik-zas*, Bo Bo Aung and Bo Min Gaung. Popular beliefs in the powers of a *weik-za* and in a future king draw on, and are expressed in, a folk literature (both oral and written) of cryptic sayings, rumours and prophecies. Undoubtedly many prophecies were associated with Hsaya San and added to his reputation. In Western accounts of the rebellion Hsaya San's appeal is seen primarily as that of a *weik-za*, a future king and, by extension, even a Universal Emperor.[14] But the extent to which Hsaya San saw and presented himself in such terms or was so regarded by his followers is by no means clear. In 1972 I questioned twelve former rebels from three districts. None would admit to thinking of Hsaya San in such terms or as belonging to a *gaing*.[15]

In order to answer the question of how traditional the rebellion was it is necessary to look at other Burmese rebellions. The continuity with the past that the presence of traditional elements in Hsaya San's rebellion is taken to indicate has not been examined critically. There has been no attempt to define what exactly a traditional rebellion against either Burmese royal rule or British colonial rule might constitute. The common denominator in these rebellions is not a *gaing*, but what I would call the *min-laung* phenomenom.

Min-laung means literally king-to-be (or embryo or future king). In the context of Burmese rebellions a distinction can be drawn between its immediate sense (which is the act of declaring oneself a candidate for the throne and taking possession of the palace and regalia, etc.) and any millenarian expectations that the *min-laung* or pretender to the throne can draw upon. Traditionally, to the Burmese only a king had the legitimate authority to rule and as king he was considered to have the greatest amount of accumulated positive merit. In order to assert his right to rule the king must possess a palace and royal regalia and he must act as supporter and patron of Buddhism. In the time of the Burmese kings a pretender to the throne, if he could not immediately attack and take the existing palace and capital, would need to build his own palace, however makeshift, as a means to claiming recognition. The British, by removing the king of Burma and by their inability to fulfill his religious duties reinforced expectations of a future king and champion of Buddhism as never before. It is understandable that for many Burmese the alternative to British rule was royal rule. With the last king gone and with fewer royal descendants around, the scope to declare oneself a *min-laung* was considerably enlarged. Under the Burmese every *min-laung* was by definition a threat to the throne. Burmese kings watched zealously for signs of, or claims of special powers (magical or religious) and suppressed such movements, understanding well the connections between religion, magic and power. The British, however, saw religion at the state level as a matter for virtuous non-interference, and at the popular level viewed its magical connections only as evidence of superstition and backwardness.

To assess how traditional Hsaya San's rebellion was compared with other rebellions we need to look at the proclamations and texts associated with previous rebellions, and above all to look at the style, the language and the tone of such documents. The data for rebellions

in pre-British times is understandably limited: it is not in the tradition of Burmese chronicles to analyse unsuccessful rebellions against the throne. But there is a striking example of a successful *Min-laung* rebellion — that led by an Upper Burman minor official who became King Alaung-hpaya, the founder of the last dynasty (*Kon-baung-zet*) of Burma in 1752. As someone not of royal blood Alaung-hpaya paid much attention to legitimizing his authority and constructed for himself an elaborate royal genealogy and in particular made great use of the Burmese concept of *hpon*. *Hpon* can be translated as glory or merit (as in the Burmese word for monk, *hpon-gyi*, or 'great merit') but it also bears the connotation of power — power, that is, in the sense so well expressed by Anderson in his studies of Javanese culture, as being not abstract or external, but innate to man and the environment.[16] *Hpon* is especially associated with kingship and a phrase meaning "he who has very great *hpon*" is an integral part of the titles of Burmese kings.

Alaung-hpaya believed that he possessed superior *hpon* and *kamma* (Sanskrit: *karma*). He asserted this repeatedly in his royal orders, particularly those issued in the course of his campaigns to subdue first Ava, then Prome and Pegu, and finally the Thai capital of Ayudhya. He often explained the downfall of the last king, Maha-damá-ya-za-di-pati, of the previous dynasty and his own triumph over adversaries by quoting the saying "When a man with *hpon* comes, the man lacking in *hpon* disappears."[17] When marching against Ayudhya he sent a message to the Thai king, saying "There is no rival for my *hpon* and *kamma*; it is like comparing a Galon with a swallow, a naga with an earthworm, the sun with a firefly, Dhataraṭṭha the Haṃsa king with a cow dung beetle."[18] Alaung-hpaya, like other Burmese kings before him, also claimed to be an Embryo Buddha and a Universal Emperor. The name Alaung-hpaya means Embryo Buddha and his royal title specifically stated that he possessed the Arindama lance, the *cakka* weapon, and the white elephant — attributes of a Universal Emperor. Also, much was made of various omens and portents that marked Alaung-hpaya as a man of *hpon*, such as that flames, or heat, had come from his right arm (flames being a sign of his *hpon*).[19]

The *min-laung* rebellions of the British period demonstrate a similar use of symbolism and follow a well-established pattern of legitimizing claims to authority. The leaders of these rebellions issued royal style proclamations and spoke of their possession of all the attributes of royalty. For example, Nga Pyan, leader of one of the earliest rebellions to occur under British rule — in Tenasserim in 1843 — issued a royal proclamation which began:

> The sovereign of the four grand continents, the most glorious lord of the tsad-dan, white elephant, master of the aring-d-mah tsah-khay [Arindama cakka] spear, owner of the ma-nana-ma-yah gem, radiant in benevolence and power, (as) effulgence bursting forth from the summit of Myen-mo [Mount Meru], ... issues a royal order ...[20]

Thus, Nga Pyan used the same royal titles as Burmese kings and, just like Alaung-hpaya, claimed to possess the special spear and weapon, Arindama. Although we do not possess the original Burmese text, but only Adoniram Judson's contemporary translation of it, it is clear that Nga Pyan too was rich in *hpon*.

Another rebellion in 1862 used the same symbolism of the Galon bird (garuda) against the Naga (representing the British) that Hsaya San was to use nearly seventy years later. Its leader, Min-laung Aung Gyi, issued the following royal order:—

> This is the order of the most meritorious and exalted supporter of the religion, Maha-damá-ya-za Alaung-min-taya-gyi ... Throughout the lower country [ie. British Burma] the Naga rises, and the fish seethe, and it is prophesied that they shall be completely destroyed. In the chin-tei's land the strong winged Galon will pounce on the Naga king ... The Male Galon king with a gold crown on his head, the famous Galon glance, wearing the twenty cubit long and four cubit wide fabulous noose, and with a complete cakka will appear. Surrounded by the glory of the religion he shall reign in the golden palace.[21]

The early 20th century saw many minor *mìn-laùng* rebellions, mostly in Upper Burma. The starting point for one, the 1910 Mìn-laùng Hpo Thàn rebellion in Sagaing District, was an incident in which a villager's jacket caught fire from a cheroot in his pocket. This was interpreted as an arm glowing with fire, the sign (as we have seen in Alaùng-hpayà's case) of someone destined to become a great ruler. Another rebellion, that of Ban-daká Yathei (the hermit Bandaka) broke out just a few years before Hsaya San's rebellion. Ban-daká Yathei by the early 1920s had acquired a reputation for curing diseases and was believed to have magical powers. In July 1924 Ban-daká Yathei printed and sold a 42 page autobiography in which he called himself invincible and claimed to have the powers of the 84,000 fabulous hermits and the ability to convey invulnerability. He announced that he was the reincarnation of a *mìn-laùng* named Tei-zá who was in turn believed to be a reincarnation of King Kyanzittha of Pagan. It was said that King Thibáw in 1883 had ordered the arrest and execution of Tei-zá for building a royal-type pagoda, but that Tei-zá miraculously escaped. Ban-daká had enacted in his village a play which he had written in which it was intimated that Ban-daká was destined to fulfill a prophecy that Tei-zá's pagoda would be finished in 1926. Ban-daká was able to build a complex of royal buildings costing altogether 50,000 rupees on a four acre site. They included a royal pool, a royal pagoda, a one-entrance cave (built only by kings) and an elaborate white umbrella hall. It would be hard to find a more striking illustration at the rural level of the association of kingship and merit-making activities. Rumours and prophecies came to a head in 1927 with a wave of rebel outbreaks in the Lower Chindwin district.[22]

The significance of the Ban-daká Yathei rebellion and earlier *mìn-laùng* rebellions is that they were made up of traditional elements only. Hsaya San's rebellion was not on a par with these rebellions. Hsaya San to his followers must undoubtedly have possessed *hpòn*, but he did not cultivate or promote it in the way we have seen it used in earlier rebellions. Although he was from the Shwebo area associated with Alaùng-hpayà, Hsaya San did not exploit this fact and he made no claims of royal descent. The proclamations of Hsaya San do not use consistently any one royal title, nor a full blown elaborate royal appellation. Moreover, he also used the title '*thamadá*' (president) as on the stock enlistment tickets which he had printed for enrolling recruits to what he called his "Galon Association". His proclamations were very straightforward. For example, that of December 29, 1930, begins:—

> All the inhabitants who reside in Burma: it is for the economic prosperity of Rahan [monks] and inhabitants, so also in the interest of the religion of our Lord that I have to declare war. English people alone are our enemies ...[23]

Most of the evidence for Hsaya San's assumption of royal status — which has been made so much of in Western accounts — comes from a rather curious document admitted in evidence at Hsaya San's trial. It is in the form of a notebook, headed 'Memoir of the Galon King' with entries in brief diary form at irregular intervals. Unlike royal proclamations it does not use the royal nominative pronoun, but is written in the third person (with a royal honorific). The entry describing Hsaya San's royal coronation on October 28, 1930 reads simply:—

> Tuesday, 11.33 p.m. at Myasein Taungnyo Pagoda in the Insein District east of Tharrawaddy proclaimed king with the title of Thupannaka Galuna Raja for the first time. At 11.50 p.m. at the same pagoda took medicine.[24]

There is an absence of impressed eye witnesses for this event. One Maung Chon (granted immunity from prosecution at the rebel trial proceedings) described the scene as follows:—

> All of us who went with Saya San sat down in a row including Saya San except Tun Lin and Yan Line. They stood up and held a white flag each with the figure of a 'galon' and 'naga' painted thereon. Then Saya Daing read something. After he had read it, he said 'May there by victory, may there by victory'.[25]

If he had wanted to do so, Hsaya San could have made much more of these royal elements. The language[26] used in his diary indicated that at times he was resigned to going through the motions of implementing tried and traditional techniques, but that he was ambivalent, embarrassed even, on this score. In his statements made to CID officers immediately after his arrest in the Shan States and in a newspaper interview before he was transferred to Tharrawaddy jail, Hsaya San made different statements from those in the diary (which he always denied was his). These statements at least deserve equal weight with the much quoted "royal" diary and put a different interpretation upon his actions and reveal a different side to Hsaya San.

The tendency in interpreting the rebellion has been to assume that no values or symbols other than the traditional had made an impact at the rural level, or to think that traditional symbols can only be put to certain traditional uses and not used in other ways or in combination with other elements. Where some note is taken of changes in the society, then peasants are seen as having their traditionalism reinforced by changes around them. The emphasis on form has obscured the context of the rebellion. Where the context has been examined, it has been seen primarily in terms of social and economic changes as in the stimulating recent studies of Adas and Scott. What both writers treat only very briefly is the nationalist political context of the rebellion.

In *The BurmaDelta,* Adas modifies J.S. Furnivall's classic concept of the plural society and gives it an historical dimension by tracing the stage by stage development of the rice delta economy of Lower Burma.[27] Adas shows that the process which he calls the closing of the rice frontier (the taking up of all land, etc.) blocked off economic options and contributed to an agrarian crisis. In *Prophets of Rebellion,* Adas takes the subject further and argues that in this situation (blockage of options or absence of alternatives) a prophet becomes crucial and violent protest becomes directed into pre-existing millenarian channels. However, the Burmese peasant in the 1920s did potentially have another outlet and this was the organisation of rural nationalist associations called *wun-tha-nú athìn.*[28] The second socio-economic study of the rebellion, Scott's *The Moral Economy of the Peasant,* confronts the question of how peasants see their situation: Scott postulates a subsistence ethic. His evidence, however, is all from colonial period sources, and the suggestion of a moral economy ethic among peasants in pre-colonial Burma is far from proven. In particular, it is possible that the peasants' opposition to taxes came about not so much because the taxes were fixed, but because the authority imposing them was not considered to be legitimate and the methods used in their collection were unjust. There is a moral element to the peasants' perception of changes — to loss of land, to violations of customs and rights, to their sense of resentment and deprivation, but it is grounded not in an age-old subsistence ethic but in the gathering momentum of the rural *wun-tha-nú* organization. The push into rebellion comes from the internal dynamics of the *wun-tha-nú* movement.

It is, I believe, not so much the economic factors that explain the rebellion but rather the way in which these and other consequences of British rule were confronted by Burmans in the years before the rebellion. The rebellion must be seen in the context of the development of twentieth century Burmese nationalism. What has been insufficiently explained with regard to the Burmese nationalist movement is the grass roots momentum and the early politicization of the Burmese peasantry.

Although Hsaya San's connections with the village nationalist associations (*wun-tha-nú athìn*) have been noted by some writers,[29] the links between the village and the central level associations and the whole scale of the *wun-tha-nú* movement have not been examined in detail. The activities of these organizations dominated Burmese nationalist politics in the

years leading up to Hsaya San's rebellion. Through the Burmese records of annual, regional and local level conferences, and through a whole range of Burmese publications of the 1920s — most importantly in the village context, handbooks of model sermons for use by monk and lay preachers on nationalist politics — it becomes possible to get closer to that elusive internal dimension.

Hsaya San and villagers throughout Burma became involved through the *wun-tha-nú* movement in new, modern sorts of activity reaching beyond the limits of their own localities. They did not remain untouched by this process but acquired new aspirations and ways of articulating their grievances. In the early 1920s village associations under a variety of names proliferated rapidly, prompted and fostered by the central nationalist associations, the General Council of Burmese Associations (GCBA) and General Council of Sangha Samaggi (GCSS, the monks' association). By 1925 there were over 10,000 village associations throughout Burma, all linked to the central executive committee of the GCBA by an administrative structure of village, circle and district boards — a structure which, it is important to note, deliberately paralleled that introduced by the government with their Rural Self-Government Act of 1921. The village associations provided an alternative source of authority to that of the village headman and a channel through which government authority was challenged.

I said earlier that the writings and speeches of even the central level figures of early Burmese nationalism had received insufficient attention from scholars. Such sources throw light on the intellectual process whereby the political and cultural implications of the YMBA's and GCBA's declared aims — fostering of the Burmese race, language, religion and education — were worked out. But these works and speeches, though very important, naturally had less currency at village level than the flood of publications that accompanied the foundation of the village associations and were designed for use at that level. These publications presented a formulation of the Burmese past from a *wun-tha-nú* perspective, and advocated direct action and advised on boycott and non-cooperation tactics. An important work of this type was C.P. Hkin Maung's *Wun-tha-nú Ret-hkí-tá* (Nationalist Principles), published in 1924. C.P. Hkin Maung had a long involvement in nationalist politics and he was the publisher of the YMBA's annual conference records and the author of several political works. He ran a printing press (his initials stand for the name of his press: 'Commercial Printing') and a "school for political education" in Mandalay.

C.P. Hkin Maung's *Wun-tha-nú Ret-hkí-tá* comprised collected articles and speeches "for the use of the *wun-tha-nú* endeavour and the monks' associations' endeavour".[30] Throughout the work, *wun-tha-nú* principles and preaching are linked to the life and teachings of the Buddha, and are said to be "in accordance with the Buddha's wishes".[31] C.P. Hkin Maung lists twenty-two points for "true Burman Buddhists" to reflect upon beginning: "Please consider whether or not the Buddhist religion revered by the Burmese is the purest and highest pinnacle in the present world and future state" and, building up step by step, says: "Consider whether our forefathers have laid down that in this world and present existence we should be contented under, and obey, foreigners; consider whether in this world, if one's race is oppressed and reviled, our character and honour will be renowned or will be diminished."[32]

C.P. Hkin Maung makes many comparisons between the system of government in Britain and that of the Burmese kings. He points out that Burmese kings and officials had to observe certain principles and duties and swore to act for the people's good. The Burmese word for minister, *wun-gyì*, means literally 'great burden' and ministers are so called, he says, "because they bear the king's burden and the people's burden and these are that the

king should make no errors, that there should be no conflict or opposition with the people, and that the country should be populous and pleasant and the people tranquil and contented".[33] It is, he says, "the Burmese custom that the king should with compassion and loving kindness heed the people's wishes"[34] and he cites the Vessantara Jātaka (where King Sañjaya is forced to banish Prince Vessantara because the people are so enraged that he has given away the kingdom's white elephant).

It should not be assumed that the book was just a simplistic proposition that things were better under the kings. It explored the question of what is meant by the concepts "nation" and "national" and what are the particular characteristics that make one truly Burmese. The purpose of the *wun-tha-nú* movement is specifically stated as being to awaken and develop Burmese national spirit, pride and character. *Wun-tha-nú* teachings such as C.P. Hkin Maung's were disseminated to villagers through the rural *wun-tha-nú* associations and teams of *damá kahtí-ká* (Pali: *dhammakatika*), or preachers of the law. These preachers, or lecturers on nationalist politics, were trained and licensed by the central GCSS and by the boycotting GCBA organizations.

An idea of their style of preaching to villagers is conveyed by the work entitled *Damá kathi-ká let-swè* (Preachers' Handbook), published in 1921.[35] This is a collection of model sermons on such topics as 'Stories of the Buddha in previous existences being the head of associations', 'How the Buddha preached that if the people are united they will be free from all dangers', 'The story of the Boddhisatta's escape from prison', 'The laws of self-government' and 'How to form associations to get independence'. The book also contained sample forms for founding and registering a *wun-tha-nú* association and for enrolling members and keeping records. Many of the sermons are presented in the form of a debate between a monk and a villager. For example:

MONK	Are you afraid of prison?
VILLAGER	Afraid, I am so afraid that I am afraid even to hear the sound of the word prison.
MONK	If that is so, if you don't want to go to prison, should you fear the government, or should you fear the laws which send you to prison, or should you just fear prison?
VILLAGER	I fear the laws which get you sent to prison.
MONK	In that case, shouldn't you be planning to know the laws so that you don't infringe them in the slightest and get sent to prison?
VILLAGER	I don't have time to learn the laws. Only after learning English and then passing my BA and going to England and becoming a barrister would I then be skilled in and understand the laws.[36]

The monk then goes on to say that the only laws the villagers need worry about are the laws or teachings of the Buddha and keeping the Buddhist precepts.

A constant theme of the preaching is that villagers should not be afraid. Village association meetings were often attended by government detectives and police officials in whose presence villagers became intimidated. The preacher would try to counter this by pointing out that villagers did not need to use polite honorifics when referring to the police: that they were not to call the police "*paleik-daw-mìn*", but should simply use the word "*paleik*" — police. The preacher then told the villagers that the police were just ordinary men, not monks, not kings, and there was no need to address them in that way. The monk preacher then urged the villagers to be bold in speech, asking them to repeat after him, first: "Police"; then "Hey, Police" and lastly "Hey, dog Police" at which point the audience burst out laughing.[37]

During the anti-tax campaigns of the mid-1920s, the *wun-tha-nú* movement held regular sessions of what was called "administering the medicine of bravery".[38] Again, repetitive chanting was much used. For example:

Who took our territory unlawfully?	The English, the English.
Who is oppressing our race?	The English, the English.
Who is our real enemy?	The English, the English.
Who is it that we must not fear?	The English, the English.[39]

The lecturer's style of preaching was not confined to putting across slogans — explanations and advice were also communicated. At a meeting in a village about not paying taxes and about the government's habit of taking villagers' property and auctioning it in lieu of taxes, the *wun-tha-nu* preacher spoke as follows:—

> Don't be afraid. There is a saying that even a star or a mountain like Mount Meru can topple. Today we are not going to topple Mount Meru, but the chicken coop [i.e., jail]. If you don't pay taxes, you will go to jail. Our people, our people, can you bear this? Yes, yes, we can bear it [they reply]. If you are not sent to jail, then your possessions will be auctioned. To be auctioned means that what is worth 50 rupees will be sold for 10 rupees. Can you bear this auctioning? Yes, we can; yes we can. In this matter of auctions, we can nevertheless succeed in one way. There is one means of winning. The audience here now is the same audience as for the auction. If you do not bid and remain united and firm, you will not lose. Can you remain firm? Yes we can, yes we can.[40]

A first-hand account of tax collection in 1925-26 in Nhahpyu-galei village, Tharrawaddy District, was written by one of the participants in Hsaya San's rebellion. He relates how the district police commissioner and Gurkha soldiers came to his village and assembled the villagers. The police commissioner asked three questions:—

> Who are those who are going to pay capitation tax? Who are those who are applying for a delay in payment? And who are those who are not paying at all?[41]

He then held up two canes — one used, he said, for cattle and one for horses. He threatened the villagers saying that the cane for cattle would be used to punish the men and the cane for horses would be used on the women. He then ordered the villagers to seat themselves in groups according to their attitude to paying taxes. All the villagers went and sat together in the "will not pay at all" place. Altogether thirty men and one woman were arrested and the village's *wun-tha-nú* leader was sentenced to three months in jail.

Similar incidents continued throughout the 1920s. When villagers could not or did not pay the taxes demanded, their assets — cattle, jewellery, household goods and even food in the house — were seized in lieu of payment and auctioned. There were many reports of villagers being ill treated, and of police and soldiers washing their feet in water pots, and kicking or even urinating on Buddha images. When villagers were jailed, or fined, or lost their possessions, their *wun-tha-nú* association gave them practical support: assocation members would, for example, help a jailed member's family manage the ploughing and harvesting, etc., and financial aid was available from a special contingency fund. This kind of support, both moral and practical, was made possible by the *wun-tha-nú* adminstrative structure reaching (as referred to earlier) from village to central GCBA level.

The GCBA's annual and regional conferences kept local and central levels of the *wun-tha-nú* movement in touch with each other. The annual GCBA conferences were impressive affairs lasting several days, and were held in conjunction with the GCBS. The conferences took place in a different town from year to year and attracted huge audiences. The 1926 annual conference, for example, held at Meik-hti-la was attended by 20,000 monks from some 700 monks' associations and over 10,000 delegates from GCBA affiliated associations, with another 30,000 invited 'guest delegates' from various districts and a local audience of some 20,000. The impact upon the ordinary villager of these conferences with hundreds of senior monks seated on a platform beneath white umbrellas, and with elaborate opening ceremonies with recitations from Buddhist texts, Brahimins blowing on conch shells, music, songs, and stirring speeches was considerable. The conferences provided a means for village *wun-tha-nú* association delegates to raise points and to get resolutions passed on matters of concern to them.

From 1920 to 1924 the *wun-tha-nú* movement focused its attention on campaigning

against certain unpopular provisions in the government's 1907 Village Act — those, for instance, requiring villagers to build stockades and to do guard duty, entitling touring officials to demand services and supplies from villagers, and fining villagers communally for harbouring criminals or for having stolen property found in their village. The relationship between the local *wun-tha-nú* associations and the central GCBA and the way the *wun-tha-nú* movement came into conflict with the British adminstration is best demenstrated by reference to the records of the local Prome District GCBA conference held in April 1923 at which the Village Act was discussed. Two full days were occupied with reading and discussing 52 letters of complaints against headmen and government officials that had been submitted by village *wun-tha-nú* associations throughout Prome District. To quote from one:—

> This report is submitted by Kan-kyi-kon *wun-tha-nú* association delegate Maung Hpò Saw to the Prome District Conference. On December 21, 1922, the headman Ko Pan Hlaing summoned the villagers and ordered us to build a spiked double fence nine feet high, with sticks sharpened at both ends; also, spears, torches and long-handled bamboo fire beaters were to be prepared; each three post house must keep three water pots on its roof and each four post house must keep four water pots. This work must be completed by December 27 and if it was not, a fine of 5 rupees would be levied. . . . Old men of over sixty were also made to work at building the spiked stockade . . . Even old men who are freed from paying capitation tax have to do night guard without a rest from 6 pm to 6 am. . . . When by January 11 1923 all the double fence had not been completed by about seventy households, they were fined from 1 to 10 rupees each. I report this forcible ordering of villagers to build fences at harvesting time and the levying of punishments and fines and the oppression of poor farmers so that it may be considered and action taken as soon as possible.[42]

This and other reports demonstrate the hostility of the associations to their own village headmen who had come to be considered agents of the government. They also show the way in which the village associations had begun to operate within a large and in many ways modern organization. A political momentum at village level is evident in this documentation. It is also clear that even at the village level, techniques of record keeping, submission of complaints, debates and resolutions were being developed. The columns of the newspapers, *Wun-tha-nú*, founded and funded by the GCBA, similarly show villagers writing in to report the activities of their local associations, their complaints, and their attendance at conferences and observations thereon.

The GCBA structure provided a channel through which people like Hsaya San could rise up from village level through to township, district and national level conferences. Hsaya San, as Executive Officer of his local village association, in 1924 regularly submitted reports and wrote letters to *Wun-tha-nú*. For example, he wrote an account of a prayer meeting that he had organised in his villge to pray for the release from prison of the famous nationalist monk, Ù Ok-tamá, pointing out that to use a prayer meeting for a political purpose was a new event. Hsaya San rose from village association representative to township, to district representative attending national GCBA conferences. He became a well-known speaker not just in his own locality (Belu-gyùn, Moulmein) but elsewhere. He was billed as a visiting notable guest speaker side by side with the GCBA Treasurer and with Ù Ok-tamá's brother (also a monk) at the 1926 Insein District conference. His name first appears in national level GCBA conference reports in 1925 — an important conference which made Ù Sò Thein the new GCBA President (U Chit Hlaing having lost the backing of the monks). At this conference Hsaya San was the seconder of several resolutions including the one which nominated Ù Sò Thein for the presidency. At the 1926 annual conference (held in Meik-hti-la), Hsaya San seconded resolutions stating that *wun-tha-nú* members should hold resolute to their principles and never apologise for their actions, and expressing dissatisfaction with the government's collection of taxes.

The GCBA conference records are full of resolutions on matters of concern to villagers:

taxes, the Village Act, the headmen's use of stocks to punish villagers, the government's treatment of monks in prison, and the general need to improve conditions by flood prevention works, setting up land mortgage banks, and so on. Many of the GCBA resolutions were taken up by Burmese nationalist members who had opted to enter (rather than boycott) the Legislative Council. But, despite the efforts of the Legislative Council members and the central GCBA, any successes and reforms gained were very short lived. For example, in 1924 the government did modify the unpopular Village Act, but then in 1927 went back on this and reintroduced it in its original form. Similarly, in 1926 the government set up a Capitation and Thathameda Taxes Enquiry Committee. The Report of this Committee recommended the abolition of these taxes, but the government did not implement the recommendation on the grounds that no satisfactory substitute source of revenue could be found. In a 1927 Legislative Council debate on taxes, Tha-ya-wadi Ù Pú expressed the frustration of his fellow nationalist members of the Legislative Council when he said: "We, on our part, will therefore support only a Committee appointed by the people. A Government appointed Committee is only a make-believe because although the Committee may make recommendations yet the Government will do what it likes."[43]

The 1928 GCBA annual conference, held at Min-bu, decided to set up its own committee of inquiry into taxes, and specifically into abuses in the collection of taxes and the methods used. At this point Hsaya San advanced from his position of regional GCBA delegate to become President of the GCBA Committee on taxes. The GCBA inquiry, unlike the earlier government committee, was not concerned to find substitute taxes, but only to demonstrate that the taxes were causing hardship and that there were abuses in their collection. Hsaya San spent the next few months travelling the country collecting data for his report (which was to contain 170 case-studies). In August 1928 he drew up a document proposing the formation of a Galon Association to be affiliated to the GCBA. Hsaya San's report on taxes was to have been submitted to the 1929 GCBA annual conference at Taungngu in March 1929, but the conference fell apart when the senior GCSS monks withdrew their support from Ù Sò Thein and backed Ù Sú (the GCBA Treasurer) for the Presidency. The monks were alarmed by several items on the agenda including a proposal to form "national defence groups". The conference broke up before the question of taxes could be discussed. The central ranks of the GCBA and GCSS turned upon each other and embarked upon an unedifying squabble by pamphlet propaganda between different factions.

At a critical time the village *wun-tha-nú* movement was left without effective leadership. The central GCBA after years of building up the expectations of its rural mass membership failed its followers, and backed away from any commitment to action. The most ardent boycotters of the early 1920s — men like Tha-ya-wadi Ù Pú — had one by one compromised and stood for election to the Legislative Council. Both the Legislative Council and the central GCBA had proved ineffective; nothing had been achieved. The government was taking ever stronger measures against the *wun-tha-nú* associations, thereby adding to their grievances and to the momentum of the *wun-tha-nú* movement. The villagers were, in fact, more radical than the central level Burmese nationalists and were steadfast in their adherence to the policies of non-cooperation and boycott. These were policies originally advocated by their leadership but abandoned by one group after another. By September 1929 Hsaya San had come to the conclusion: "The country will not be got [back] by talking, writing and asking for it."[44] He set about organizing his Galon Association and began enrolling recruits.

Hsaya San was, therefore, a product not of traditional Burma but of a grass-roots political momentum built up during the 1920s. For years villagers had been actively cam-

paigning about issues of concern to them, only to find that the central GCBA and GCSS leadership had turned upon itself and broken up into rival factions. Hsaya San expressed matters very clearly in a letter seeking refuge in the territory of a Shan States sawbwa. He wrote: "Although *wun-tha-nú* associations were formed ..., there has been no success."[45] While awaiting execution in Tharrawaddy jail, one of Hsaya San's last acts was to authorize two *Thu-ri-yá* newspaper journalists to use the proceeds from the sale of his book on medical diagnosis to buy works for a library in his memory.[46] The first books bought (in March 1932) were the works of Lenin, Trotsky and Marx.

To expect that Hsaya San and his followers would have propounded a specific political programme during the rebellion would be misguided. After all, the nationalist literature of the 1920s devotes little space to outlining a programme for an independent Burma, but concentrates on how to *obtain* independence. Other Burmese leaders before and after Hsaya San — men like Ù Chit Hlaing and Dr Bá Maw — also tapped traditional roots and drew on traditional forms but, unlike Hsaya San, they have not been labelled "traditional". Later events testify to the fact that the Hsaya San rebellion heralded a new age rather than the last gasp of an old one. The young Thahkins movement of university students which founded the *Dó-bama Asì-ayòn* ('We Burmans Association') of the 1930s and prepared the way for the independent modern Burma state gained inspiration from Hsaya San. Their first annual conference, held at Yei-nan-gyaùng in 1935, began by passing a unanimous resolution that tribute and praise should be paid to Hsaya San and the monks and men who had fought and died "for the nation and for the race" in the Tharrawaddy Galon rebellion.[47] Thahkin Bá Sein observed that Burma was as if "in a deep sleep" and only aroused from its "slave and subdued mentality" by Hsaya San's rebellion.[48] The lesson the Thahkins acknowledged they learnt from the Hsaya San rebellion was that the next time the Burmese people challenged the British government they must be properly prepared, trained and armed to drive the British out.

Is there anything to be learnt from this discussion of the context of Hsaya San's rebellion for the study of peasant rebellions in general? We can, of course, find in most rebellions a mixture of economic, traditional, millenarian and other factors. But rebellions can also be examined from the inside and within a culture, and peasants may be studied not primarily as belonging to some international category of peasants or in terms of peasant ethics or little traditions, but as members of a certain polity and culture. The key to an inside study is the written and reported declarations of the peasants themselves — a category of material which has received amazingly little attention in studies of rebellions. It has long been assumed that the development of the Burmese nationalist movement was shaped by the elite level of Burmese society. But, just as has been shown in recent studies of revolution in Java and the Philippines,[49] an important impetus sometimes comes from those below and the role played and the perceptions held by those "below" deserve careful attention.

NOTE: The research on which this paper is based is more fully documented in my doctoral dissertation (in course of preparation). This paper is a revised version of a seminar paper given at the Research School of Pacific Studies, Australian National University and at the Centre of Southeast Asian Studies, Monash University. I am grateful for comments and suggestions received at the time and in particular to Dr A.C. Milner and Kate Milner, and above all to friends and colleagues in Burma.

ROMANIZATION: Burmese words have been romanized using the conventional transcription with accented tones given in John Okell, *A guide to the romanization of Burmese* (London: Luzac, 1971), pp.66-67. I have for the most part left place names in the form most commonly found in English language sources, but most personal names are given in transcription (eg. Saya San as Hsaya San, U Ottama as Ù Ok-tamá, etc.).

FOOTNOTES

1. Harry J. Benda, "Peasant movements in colonial Southeast Asia," *Asian Studies*, 3 (1965): 420-434. James C. Scott, *The moral economy of the peasant: rebellion and subsistence in Southeast Asia* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 1976). Michael Adas, *Prophets of rebellion: millenarian protest movements against the European colonial order* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1979).

2. *Thu-ri-ya* (The Sun), editorial "A Warning to the British Government," December 22, 1930.

3. Government of Burma. *(Confidential) The rebellion in Burma, April 1931—March 1932. In* India Office Records, *Political and Judicial Correspondence,* File 7347; p.1, p.6.

4. *The Guardian* [Rangoon], March 10, 1981.

5. Government of Burma. *Report on the rebellion in Burma up to the 3rd May 1931*, p.10. (Published as Command Paper 3900 in *Parliamentary Papers,* 12 (1930-31).

6. B.S. Carey, *Hints for the guidance of civil officers in the event of the outbreak of disturbances in Burma.* (Rangoon: Govt. Press, 1931), p.2.

7. The resolution and debate is reported in *Burma Legislative Council Proceedings,* 24 (1933): 230-247.

8. Government of Burma. *The origins and causes of the Burma rebellion* (1930-1932). (Rangoon: Govt. Press, 1934).

9. Ù Chit Maung, *The real origin and causes of the Burma rebellion.* Appendix *in* Gya-ne-gyaw Má Má Lei, Thu-lo-lu (Rangoon: Gya-ne-gyaw Má Má Lei sa-pei, 1968), pp.769-794. (1st published 1947). Ù Chit Maung's critique was written some time between 1938 and 1946.

10. Benda, *op. cit.*, p.428.

11. Hsaya San, *Let-hkamú-zú-kyàn* (Moulmein: Myan-ma-taing thadin-za pon-hneik-taik, 1927). In the book's preface, Hsaya San states that he finished writing the book in 1917. The frontispiece portrait of Hsaya San was used by the British in 1931 on posters offering a reward for Hsaya San. The 1927 edition was reprinted in 1968 (by Yamon-na sa-pei, Rangoon) with an added biography of Hsaya San. Hsaya San's book was over 100 pages long, contained a preponderance of Pali terms and stanzas, criticised Western medicine and treatment, and gave instructions for making traditional medicines.

12. Hsaya San, *Weik-za theik-pan in-got-taya-kyàn* (Nat-talin: Pyin-nya alin-bya, n.d.). The book costs 3 rupees. I have not seen a copy of it.

13. The fullest treatment to date of the subject of *weik-zas* is John P. Ferguson and E. Michael Mendelson, "Masters of the Buddhist occult: the Burmese weikzas", in *Contributions to Asian Studies,* volume 16: Essays on Burma, edited by John P. Ferguson (Leiden, Brill, 1981): 62-80.

14. See especially, E. Sarkisyanz, *Buddhist backgrounds of the Burmese revolution* (The Hague: Martinus Nijhoff, 1965), pp.160-165; Melford E. Spiro, *Buddhism and society: a great tradition and its Burmese vicissitudes* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1971), p.172, p.384; E. Michael Mendelson, *Sangha and state in Burma: a study of monastic sectarianism and leadership* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1975), pp.205-209; Scott, *op. cit.*, pp.149-150; and Adas, *op. cit.*, pp.101-102.

15. Spiro, *op. cit.*, p.173, sees membership of a *gaing* as one of the generic attributes of millenarian ideology, and he further seems to imply that the *gaing* is the only vehicle for the expression of such beliefs and for their translation into millenarian protest movements. Ferguson and Mendelson, *op. cit.*, p.79, note 25, do not find Hsaya San included as a weik-za in any Burmese *weik-za* literature that they have seen.

16. Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, "The idea of power in Javanese culture," *in* Claire Holt, *ed., Culture and politics in Indonesia* (Ithaca and London: Cornell University Press, 1972): 1-69.

17. For example, in a communication to the East India Company in 1754, and to the Thai King in 1759. See, Hkin Hkin Sein, *ed., Alaung-min-taya amein-daw-mya* [The royal edicts of Alaung-hpaya] (Rangoon: Burma Historical Commission, 1964), p.3, p.212.

18. *Ibid.*, p.212. [Reading *nwà-chì-bo* ('dung beetle') for *nwà-chì-dó*]. I am grateful to John Okell for suggesting this reading.

19. For a discussion of Alaùng-hpayà's quest for legitimacy, see Victor B. Lieberman, "The Burmese dynastic pattern, circa 1590-1760: an administrative and political study of the Taùng-ngu dynasty and the reign of Alaung-hpayà", (PhD dissertation, SOAS, University of London, 1976), pp.313-317.

20. "Report of a trial for rebellion held at Moulmein by the Commissioner of Tenasserim. Communicated by the Sudder Dewanny Adawlut", *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal*, n.s. 14:2 (July, 1845): 751.

21. British Library manuscript, OR. 3670. The rebel proclamations from which I have made this translation are on ff.55-58.

22. Details of Mìn-laùng Maung Thàn's rebellion taken from the trial judgement delivered on June 21, 1911. Reported in *Rangoon Gazette*, July 31, 1911, p.13. Details of the Ban-daká Yatheí rebellion from the trial judgement of March 19, 1928 *in* Political Department (Confidential), file 365.B.27 part 2 (National Archives, Burma). See also, R.R. Langham-Carter, "A rebellion in Upper Burma", *Burma Police Journal*, 2:1 (April, 1939): 15-29.

23. Quoted in Origin and Causes, *op. cit.*, p.10.

24. *Ibid.*, p.9.

25. *Ibid.*, p.8.

26. Hsaya San's diary was published in Burmese in *Ban-du-la* ['*Bandoola Journal*'], 12 no.15 (Sept. 1931): 41-42. The above quoted extracts are the authorities' official translation of the diary.

27. Michael Adas, *The Burma delta: economic development and social change on an Asian rice frontier, 1852-1941* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 1974).

28. Throughout this paper I have tended to use *wun-tha-mú* interchangeably with the word nationalist. *Wun-tha-mú* derives from the Pali meaning 'supporting own race' and began to be used quite extensively from about 1915 onwards in Burma, always with the sense of 'nationalist', 'patriotic'.

29. Besides the works by Adas, Mendelson and Scott already cited, see especially Maung Maung, *From sangha to laity: nationalist movements of Burma, 1920-1940* (New Delhi: Manohar, 1980; Australian National University monographs on South Asia, no.4).

30. C P. Hkin Maung, *Wun-tha-mú ret-hkí-tá* [Nationalist principles] (Mandalay: Kù-thàn-yaung-we-yeì pon-hneik-taik, 1924). The quotation is from the book's (paragraph-long) sub-title.

31. *Ibid.*, p.31.

32. *Ibid.*, pp.43-44.

33. *Ibid.*, p.57.

34. *Ibid.*, p.55.

35. Kyaw Dùn, *Damá kahtí-ka let-swè* [Preacher's Handbook] (Mandalay: Pyei-gyì min-gala sa-pon-hneik-taik, 1921).

36. *Ibid.*, p.81, pp.83-84. I have slightly abridged the original Burmese in translation.

37. A recounted in the collcted remiaiscences of monks and others involved in the nationalist movement, with special reference to the life of a *damá kahtí-ká*, Shwei-myet-hman Ù Wí-zayá. *Wun-tha-mú ret-hkí-tá Shwei-myet-hman Ù Wí-zayá* (Rangoon: Kyì-bwà-yeì pon-hneik-taik, 1981), p.97.

38. *Ibid.*, p.101.

39. *Ibid.*, p.118.

40. *Ibid.*, p.101.

41. Hpò Byu, "Let-nek-hmín lú-yu sò-mò-hkè-thaw In-galeik asò-yá-hkit taung-thu-le-thamà-mya on-chwá-hmu-gyì" [The peasants' great unrest in the time of the English who ruled by force of arms]. Unfinished typewritten manuscript in the Defence Services' Historical Research Institute, Rangoon; manuscript DR 5789, p.20.

42. *Pyei-si-yin-zú-lòn hsaing-ya hnit-le asì-aweì agyaùng* [Report of the Prome District Annual meeting] (n.p., 1923), Document 8, pp.28-31.

43. *Burma Legislative Council Proceedings*, 11 (1927), pp.198-199.

44. Letter of Hsaya San, September 5 1929, to the GCBA Executive Committee, seized at GCBA headquarters. Appendix D to R.C. Morris, "Causes of the Tharrawaddy rebellion (1930)" *in* India Office Records, *Political and Judicial Correspondence*, File 7347, f.681.

45. Translated from the text in Dagon Shwei Hmya, *Hsaya San* (Rangoon: Sa-pei beik-man, 1959), pp.20–21. See also, Origin and Causes . . . , *op. cit.*, pp.9–10.

46. The original letter is in the Defence Services Historical Research Institute, Rangoon; manuscript DR 4325.

47. *Burma naing-ngan-lòn-hsùng-ya Dó-Bama asì-ayòn-gyì* [The all Burma We Burmans Association] (Rangoon: Shwei-pyei-nyún sa-pon-hneik-taik, (1959), pp.20–21.

48. Bá Sein, *Thahkin-mya bama lut-lat-yeì chò-pàn-hmú* [The Thahkins' struggle for Burma's freedom] (n.p., 1943), p.31.

49. Benedict R. O'G. Anderson, *Java in a time of revolution: occupation and resistance, 1944–1946* (Ithaca and London, Cornell University Press, 1972). Reynaldo C. Ileto, *Pasyon and revolution: popular movements in the Philippines, 1840–1910* (Quezon City: Ateneo de Manila University Press, 1979).

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Patricia Herbert studied at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London, and at the University of Michigan. She lived in Burma in the early 1970s where she learnt Burmese and was able to do research in Burmese libraries and archives. On returning to England, she joined the Department of Oriental Manuscripts and Printed Books of the British Library where she is now Assistant Keeper in charge of the Mainland Southeast Asia collection. She has made several return visits to Burma, the most recent being for three months in 1980—81. She expects to submit her doctoral dissertation on the Hsaya San rebellion and the *wun-tha-mú* movement to the University of Michigan in the near future.

MONASH PAPERS ON SOUTHEAST ASIA

No.

1. **The Indonesian Communist Party and Land Reform, 1959–1965* by Rex Mortimer. 1972. $2.50 * (Photocopy format, as out of print).
2. *The 1971 Election in Indonesia: An East Java Case Study* by Ken Ward. 1974. $5.00 (overseas postage please add 50 cents).
3. *India Seen from the East: Indian and Indigenous Cults in Champa* by Paul Mus. Translated and edited, with introductory essay, by David Chandler and Ian Mabbett. 1975. $5.00.
4. *Perhimpunan Indonesia and the Indonesian Nationalist Movement, 1923–1928* by John Ingleson. 1975. $5.00.
5. *One Hand Clapping: Indonesian Nationalists and the Dutch 1939–1942* by Susan Abeyasekere. 1976. $5.00.
6. *The Constitutionalist Party in Cochinchina: The Years of Decline, 1930–1942* by Megan Cook. 1977. $5.00 (overseas postage please add 50 cents).
7. *Studies in Indonesian Music.* Edited by Margaret J. Kartomi. 1978. $5.00 (overseas postage please add 50 cents).
8. *Bureaucrats, Petty Bourgeois and Townsmen: an Observation on Status Identification in Kota Bharu* by Halim Hj. Salleh. 1981. $5.00.
9. *Fishermen in Flats.* A study of involuntary urbanization affecting the Malay minority in Singapore by Chew Soo Beng. 1982. $5.00.

*** *SPECIAL OFFER* Complete set of Monash Papers on Southeast Asia, 1–9 including postage $35.00.

*Prices quoted in AS and include postage.

MISCELLANEOUS PAPERS

1. *Secondary Schools Guide to Resources on Indonesia* by Susan Abeyasekere *et al.* 1973. $2.80.
2. *The Image of Asia in Children's Literature: 1814–1964;* by Cecile Parrish. 1977. $1.80.

ANNUAL INDONESIA LECTURE SERIES

A series of Indonesian lectures organised annually by the CSEAS and the Australian-Indonesian Association of Victoria.

1. *Religion and Social Ethos.* 1977. $3.00. "Professor Haji Kahar Muzakkir and the Development of the Muslim Reformist Movement in Indonesia", by Mitsuo Nakamura; "Religion and Politics in Indonesia Since Independence", by Benedict R. O'G. Anderson; "Priyayi Value Conflict", by Muhammad Slamet, and "Millenarianism and the Saminist Movement", by Benedict R. O'G. Anderson.
2. *People and Society in Indonesia: A Biographical Approach.* 1977. $3.00. "Arung Palakka and Kahar Muzakkar: A Study of the Hero Figure in Bugis-Makassar Society", by Leonard Andaya; "The Chinese Minority: Politics or Culture", by Charles A. Coppel, and "Tan Malaka: Perantauan and the Power of Ideas"; by Yuji Suzuki.
3. *The Life of the Poor in Indonesian Cities.* 1978. $3.00. "The Pondok System and Circular Migration", by Lea Jellinek; "Pockets of Privilege Amidst a Mass of Poverty. Wages and Working Conditions in Indonesian Industry", by Chris Manning, and "The Poor are Always With Us: A Demographic Perspective on the Urban Poor", by Gavin Jones.
4. *Contemporary Indonesia: Political Dimensions.* 1979. $3.00. "Indonesia since 1945 — Problems of Interpretation", by Jamie Mackie; "From Sukarno to Suharto: A Reply to Jamie Mackie", by Herb Feith; "Regionalism and National Integration in Indonesia: The Acehnese Experience", by Nazaruddin Sjamsuddin, and "The Last Phase of the 1945 Generation: Critical Problems of the Years Ahead" by Hamish McDonald.
5. *Kartini Centenary: Indonesian Women Then and Now.* 1980. $4.50. "Kartini — Her Life, Work and Influence", by Ailsa Thomson Zainu'ddin (ed.); "Women in a Yogyakarta Kampung", by Kadar Lucas; "Women in the Workforce", by Yulfita Raharjo; "The Search for Women in Indonesian History", by Christine Dobbin, and "Rights and Responsibility, Power and Privilege: Women's Roles in Contemporary Indonesia" by Lenore Manderson.
6. *Five Essays on the Indonesian Arts — Music, Theatre, Textiles, Painting and Literature.* 1981. $4.50. "'Lovely When Heard from Afar': Mandailing Ideas of Musical Beauty", by Margaret Kartomi (ed.); "The Pleasure of the Stage: Images of Love in Javanese Theatre", by Barbara Hatley; "Textiles and Tusks: Some Observations on the Social Dimensions of Weaving in East Flores", by Robyn Maxwell; "Indonesian Painting: In Search of Recognition", by Koswara Sumaamidjaja; and "Conflicting Perceptions of the World: Some Thoughts on a Modern Indonesian Novel", by Paul Tickell.
7. *Indonesian Medical Traditions: Bringing Together the Old and the New.* $4.50. "Encounters with Traditional Healers", by A.A. Gde Muninjaya; "Folk Medicine in Sumba: A Critical Evaluation", by David Mitchell (ed.); "Ships of Fools and Vessels of the Divine: Mental Hospitals and Traditional Healers in Bali", by Linda Connor; and "Curing the Community: The Response to Epidemic Illness", by Tuti Gunawan.

WORKING PAPERS

1. *Life in a Javanese Village* by Supomo Surjohudojo. 1974.
2. *Some Questions Regarding Timber Exploitation in East Kalimantan* by Gale Dixon. 1974.
3. *Population Control in Village Java: The Case of Maguwohardjo* by Terence Hull. 1974.
4.& 5. *The Samlaut Rebellion and its Aftermath, 1967-1970: The Origins of Cambodia's Liberation Movement* by Ben Kiernan. Part I. 1975. Part II. 1975.
6. *Rice Harvesting in the Krawang Region (West Java) in Relation to High Yielding Varieties* by Boedhisantoso. 1975.
7. *Traditional Yogya in the Changing World* by Supomo Surjohudojo. 1976.
8. *The Friends Who Tried to Empty the Sea: Eleven Cambodian Folk Tales* by David Chandler. 1976.
9. *The Life of a Jakarta Street Trader* by Lea Jellinek. 1976.
10. *The Early Phases of Liberation in Northwestern Cambodia: Conversations with Peang Sophi* by David Chandler, Ben Kiernan and Muy Hong Lim. 1976.
11.* *Early Thai History: A Select Bibliography* Edited by Ian Mabbett. 1977.
12. *Analysing Theories of Development* by David Goldsworthy. 1977.
13. *The Life of a Jakarta Street Trader — Two Years Later* by Lea Jellinek. 1977. A fascinating sequel to No. 9.
14. *The Cultivation System and "Agricultural Involution"* by R.E. Elson. 1978.
15. *Brahmin and Mandarin: A Comparison of the Cambodian and Vietnamese Revolutions* by Robert S. Newman. 1978.
16.* *Notes on the Structure of the Classical Malay Hikayat* by A. Bausani; a translation from the Italian by Lode Brakel. 1979.
17. *The Pedlars of Ujung Pandang* by Dean Forbes. 1979.
18.* *Back Alley Neighbourhood: Kampung as Urban Community in Yogyakarta* by John Sullivan. 1980.
19. *Ketoprak Theatre and the Wayang Tradition* by Barbara Hatley. 1979.
20. *Growing up in a Javanese Village: Personal Reminiscences* by Supomo Surjohudojo. 1980.
21. *Famine in Cirebon Residency in Java 1844-1850: A New Perspective on the Cultivation System* by Radin Fernando. 1980.
22. *Aid, Basic Needs and the Politics of Reform in Indonesia* by Philip J. Eldridge. 1980.
23. *Three Early Indonesian Short Stories by Mas Marco Kartodikromo (c. 1890-1932).* Translated and introduced by Paul Tickell. 1981.
24. *The "Exploitation" of Marine Fishermen in Malaysia: are Co-operatives a Solution?* by G.R. Elliston. 1981.
25. *Market Traders and the Sale of Clothing in Rural Java* by Glen Chandler. 1981.
26. *The Poorest of the Poor: Three Case Studies from Indonesia* by Abd. Chamid, edited and translated by Keith Foulcher. 1982.

Price: $1.50, with the exception of Paper Nos. 11, 16, and 18, which are $2.00.