

博士学位論文審査報告書

Summary of Doctoral Thesis and Report of Examination

研究科長 殿

下記のとおり、審査結果を報告します。

To the Dean:

We report the result of Examination for the Doctoral Thesis below.

学籍番号 Student I.D. No.: 4011S015 -9

学生氏名 Name: LEANG SIM ONN

和文題名 Title in Japanese: 歴史記述を通して見たクメール・タイの相互認識の比較研究：イデオロギーと言説

英文題名 Title in English: A Comparative Study of Khmer-Thai Perceptions through Historical Writings: Ideologies and Discourse

記

1. 口述試験参加教員 Faculty Members Involved in Oral Examination

①審査委員会主査 Chief Referee of the Screening Committee

氏名 Name: Murashima Eiji 印

所属 Affiliated Institution: GSAPS WASEDA University

資格 Status: Professor

博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution

②副査（審査委員 1）Deputy Advisor (Member of Screening Committee 1)

氏名 Name: Kuroda Kazuo 印

所属 Affiliated Institution: GSAPS WASEDA University

資格 Status: Professor

博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution

Ph.D (Education), Cornell University

③審査委員 2 Member of Screening Committee 2

氏名 Name: Hayase Shinzo 印

所属 Affiliated Institution: GSAPS WASEDA University

資格 Status: Professor

博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution

Ph.D (History), Murdoch University

④審査委員 3 Member of Screening Committee 3

氏名 Name: Sasagawa Hideo 印

所属 Affiliated Institution: Pitsumeikan Asia Pacific University

資格 Status: Associate Professor

博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution

Ph.D(Area Studies), Sophia University

2. 開催日時 Date / Time: (Y)2013 / (M) 11 / (D) 26 (Time) 5 時限 ~ 時限

[時限 / Period] 1st: 9:00-10:30, 2nd: 10:40-12:10, 3rd: 13:00-14:30, 4th: 14:45-16:15, 5th: 16:30-18:00, 6th: 18:15-19:45, 7th: 20:00-21:30

3. 会場 Venue: 313

4. 合否判定 Result: 合/Passed ~~否/Failed~~ (該当する方に○ Circle as appropriate)

5. 添付資料 Attached document(s)

6 枚 pages (和文4,000字程度、もしくは英文1,500語程度。ただし、論文題目のみは、和文・英文を併記すること)
(Approximately 4,000 characters in Japanese, or 1,500 words in English. The Doctoral Thesis title, however, must be written in both Japanese and English.)

Graduate School of Asia Pacific Studies

WASEDA UNIVERSITY

REPORT OF DOCTORAL THESIS EXAMINATION

学生氏名: Leang Sim Onn

学籍番号: 4011S015-9

和文題名: 歴史記述を通して見たクメール・タイの相互認識の比較研究:イデオロギーと言説

英文題名: A Comparative Study of Khmer-Thai Perceptions through Historical Writings:
Ideologies and Discourse

About the Study

This dissertation deals with the fundamental issue of the ‘perceptions’ between Cambodia and Thailand, two ASEAN members which remain mired in chronic antagonism and ‘love-hate’ relationship, through historical writings. The 2003 incident that culminated in the burning of the Thai Embassy in Phnom Penh and the recent border disputes concerning their sovereign rights over the Preah Vihear Temple, as well as the invocations of hostile political discourse of historical memories among the people, have recaptured our attention to the impacts of the ‘history problems’ and history education in these hereditary enemy states. Most of the political discourses among the Cambodian and the Thai are mainly adaptations of their divergent historical narratives of past memories which tend to convey hereditary enmity to each other through various negative stereotyped and enemy images. Having these distinct historical narratives, people in these countries tend to perceive the other’s narratives as both offensive and distorted. For its revealing these behavioral patterns and lines of thought, this study can be considered a fresh attempt to conduct discourse analyses of the core content of these images and to prove that the ideologies derived from these images are of different political motives.

To achieve high level of historical objectivity, this study presents the case by examining the debates over the authenticity that involves the constructions of collective memories, portrayals and stereotypes through historical evidence conceptualized by comparative historical categories, which can be viewed as their defense of national identities. The debates touch upon three main areas including the conceptions of self, the stereotyped and enemy images, and the discourse of irredentism. By conducting content analyses of a large body of historical writings ranging from history textbooks and royal chronicles to printed and online media articles, this dissertation has provided answers to two main questions: 1) how does history shape the perceptions of the two peoples and what are the authenticity debates over the major different perceptions, beliefs and opinions as witnessed in their historical narratives? 2) why are the issues of historical perceptions between the Cambodian and the Thai persisting?

Summary of Dissertation Chapters

The overall image of the study is introduced in the first chapter with a series of melodramatic historical backdrops—a resurgence of the past events including the 1962 Preah Vihear Temple case, the 2003 violent riots in Phnom Penh, and the 2008 Preah Vihear Temple case. This chapter provides a presentation of the current issues with detailed content analyses of the political discourse of historical memories within both the Khmer and Thai political societies which reveals the current ways of thinking of the two peoples. The research statement comes after this introduction followed by chapter 2, 3 and 4, which basically provide an anatomy of the historical perceptions by presenting authenticity debates over various key components of identity, stereotyped and enemy images, and discourse of race-ethnicity, irredentism, cultural ethnocentrism and civilizational ethno-chauvinism.

Chapter 2 deals with an account of the Khmer-Thai conceptions of self with an assumption that historical narrative is a form of self-narrative that reveals basic concepts of self and thus discloses personal or national identities as well as their political and cultural values. The authenticity debates show two conflicting schools of thought adopted by the Khmer and the Thai. Within the Khmer's line of thought, the Thai in their early nation-building processes embarked on fabricating and reinforcing their own historical traditions, reviving Khmer native language as their own literary language, re-appropriating the culture and folklores that are similar to those of the Khmer, and at last reasserting their historical existence as a nation. While the Thai tend to adopt opposite line of thought from that of the Khmer, a synthesis perspective holds that both the Cambodian and the Thai attach their national identities to the same root, that is, the Angkor civilization.

Chapter 3 examines the authenticity debates over various stereotyped and enemy images in both Khmer and Thai historical narratives and fictions and discusses the internal and external political systems that reveal the ideologies from which these images are derived. It is argued that the basic self-conceptions discussed in chapter 2 are also reflected in these fundamental aspects of all the portrayals, stereotyped and enemy images, which conform to the local and regional political systems of the era under discussion. The image of Cambodia as a tributary to both overlords Siam and Vietnam has been projected and portrayed in all of these narratives while the Cambodian elites seemed more likely to prefer self-narratives that portray themselves as independent. These schools of thought are considered to be part of their ego-centric perspectives that are associated with a broader context of their internal political culture, patrimonial social structure, and the hierarchical inter-state relationships in the region.

Chapter 4 explores the discourse of irredentism and shows the linkage of the discourse with the sense of ultra-nationalism within both Khmer and Thai political societies. It has shown that Khmer and Thai irredentism of the modern time have been an adaptation of earlier irredentist discourses which had been deposited since the early 19th century. The lost-territory mentality is one of the main themes which exist in both Khmer and Thai historical narratives that run through the courses of their history. Within the Khmer school of thought, Thailand has always been the subject of potential irredentism from her inception while Thailand's ownership perspective of Cambodia runs its courses through Thai historical narratives most apparently from the Ayudhya period up to the Bangkok era and eventually becomes the root of Thailand's lost-territory mentality, national trauma and humiliation when the tributary system was broken in the wake of the French colonization of Indochina in the late 19th century. Finally, this chapter has also revealed that there are no signs of any irredentist codifications in the constitutional documents of both countries.

Chapter 5 and 6 deal with the second main question: why the issues of historical perceptions between the Cambodian and the Thai remain persisting. Chapter 5 discusses the politics of history and historical memories and how it affects the perceptions of the two peoples mainly from the 1940s. This chapter makes two main points. First, both external factor (the transnational policies adopted by the colonialists) and internal factor (personal aspiration for cultural and political superiority), which are attributed to the change in international politics of the time, provided a favorable political environment in which the historical reconstructions in both countries became an effective tool making history an ideological weapon. Stood at the center of the issue were the weak historical traditions and the absence of national archives for many centuries. Second, these public perceptions came to be reinforced by the symbolic politics

of chauvinist mobilization from the 1940s for the sake of their different political goals and ideological orientations. This strategic politic of nationalistic populism has induced the identity conflict, which has been caused by the politicized interpretations of the nation's past based on the existing discourse and the biased historical traditions. It has been institutionalized through textbook censorship and biased history textbooks and propagandized through various government propaganda tools.

Chapter 6 focuses mainly on the relevance of the national myth-making theory and how it can be applied in the case of Cambodia and Thailand. By reviewing and assessing the mythical-historical complex and the characteristics of myth in Khmer and Thai historical writings, as well as highlighting some holes of logic, this study has shown that the national myth-making theory has proved to be unable to provide adequate explanations for the case of Khmer-Thai historical perceptions. In addition to this limitation, this study has suggested an alternative explanation, *identity anxiety* or fear of losing identity and fear of group extinction, which has more explanatory power to account for the significant variations in the political behaviors influenced by that hostile mythical-historical and symbolic complex and the mechanisms in historical settlement between the two countries.

The last chapter, chapter 7, concludes the study with three points. First, Khmer and Thai historical writings contain a large pool of discrepancies, distortions, ambiguities and traces indicating that the new past has been constructed in a way that induces divergent historical interpretations conveying hereditary enmity to each other. Second, Khmer-Thai historical perceptions are virtually a product of the historical reconstructions triggered by colonialism, reinforced by myths of nationalism, and ruled by identity anxiety. Third, The major cause of the century-long 'love-hate' relationship between the Cambodian and the Thai has been their own

identity anxiety, the enduring fear of losing national identities which are historically attached to the same root—the Angkor civilization. This dissertation argues that this identity anxiety is a prerequisite to the hostile historical discourse and the biased historical traditions.

Assessment of Academic Contribution

From the above summary, it is no exaggeration to claim that this study has come to add more perspectives to our moral judgment (to what is thought to be right or wrong in our perceptions) and regulate thought of readers and learners of both Khmer and Thai histories. It has invited us to rethink our ‘correct’ or ‘official’ versions of history propagated by the governments or politicians in Cambodia and Thailand as well as the perceptions and interpretations of these conventional historical traditions, which for decades have shaped our attitudes and opinions towards each other and thus enslaved us through certain political ideologies. With the multi-perspective method, the study has introduced a kind of ‘cultural shift’ from the old conventional wisdom of Khmer and Thai histories to a new historiographical method which can be employed to create new version of history that can be accepted by both sides—a bi-national history. Most significantly, the study is meant to introduce readers to new perspectives or ‘regimes of truth’ different from what we have always learned or taken for granted in public schools.

The study has made major academic contributions on two main points. First, it has filled the gap of the existing knowledge about the historical perceptions of the Cambodian and the Thai by dealing with the biased historical traditions, with the dominant views of history clash, and with why they have been set into conflicts with each other. It has also exemplified and elaborated

to a great extent on both the *intra-* and *inter-*contradictions in Khmer and Thai historical writings through the large body of discrepancies, ambiguities and distortions within Khmer and Thai historical narratives when conceptualized in comparative perspectives of key components of identity by examining not only the original or old texts but also the debates over the authenticity of these divergent historical narratives and their interpretations.

Second, the discourse analyses of the core contents of Khmer and Thai historical perceptions in this study have provided new perspectives on the dominant paradigms in Khmer and Thai official histories and have dealt with an alternative method of historical analysis in examining ideational factors affecting contemporary political societies, which is meant to divert any deliberate incitement to racial hatred through political abuses of history in both countries. In effect, it has casted negative reflections back upon the long-standing historical traditions in both countries—the traditions in which the line of moral judgment distinguishing between history and myth has become blurred and much less detectable to the public eyes and the contrast between what is ‘We-self’ and what is the otherness has been rendered into an ideological weapon.

In conclusion, the study adequately contributes to the progress of academic knowledge in our understanding of the historical perceptions in Khmer and Thai historical writings and the effects the history problems and human perceptions have on the relationship of contemporary political societies, apart from economic factors and the likes. The quality of the research work, document analysis, and academic writing shown in this dissertation are in par with the standard of qualified doctoral thesis. The oral presentation was held on November 26, 2013 with the attendance of all the four examiners. They unanimously decided to pass the doctoral thesis.

(例)

氏名 Name: 早稲田 太郎 印
所属 Affiliated Institution: 早稲田大学アジア太平洋研究科
資格 Status: 教授
博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution
博士（学術） 早稲田大学

氏名 Name: Waseda Taro 印
所属 Affiliated Institution: Graduate School of Asia-Pacific Studies, Waseda University
資格 Status: Professor
博士学位名・取得大学名: Ph.D. Title Earned・Name of Institution
Ph.D. Waseda University