ing institutions, many of whom still wield considerable political power today. Her innovative work shifts the center of political conflict in this period away from the urban protest sites of Bangkok to the rural communities of Thailand's farming majority. The book's boldness is also evident in Haberkorn's unusual mix of disciplinary approaches. An anthropologist by training, Haberkorn uses ethnographic techniques to complement a sophisticated reading of eclectic historical sources, many of which have not been scrutinized in any previous scholarship. The result is a multifaceted and lively argument for justice made on behalf of the victims and their allies. This book is a welcome addition to the corpus of scholarly volumes on Southeast Asian revolutionary movements in the Cold War era.

RICHARD A. RUTH
United States Naval Academy

JONATHAN SAHA. *Law, Disorder and the Colonial State: Corruption in Burma c. 1900*. (Cambridge Imperial and Post-Colonial Studies.) New York: Palgrave Macmillan. 2013. Pp. x, 166. $80.00.

Jonathan Saha provides here a study of official corruption in colonial Burma. In Saha's book, we find corruption almost as a way of life, or, as he calls it, "everyday misrule," subordinate officials using the levers provided by the existence, not the absence, of law and of the colonial legal apparatus (p. 7). Although treated by other historians as rational, Saha contends that the colonial state was instead "duplicitous, theatrical, despotic, highly personalised, and masculine" (p. 7). To make his case, Saha explores various episodes of official misconduct throughout the book on the basis of 240 files of the investigations of subordinate-level misconduct in the Irrawaddy Division of the colony between the years 1896 and 1909.

This is a powerful, intellectual engagement with the extant archival sources on an unexamined but crucially important area of the colonial state in Burma: its relationship and interactions with the general indigenous population. It also represents a new approach to the colonial state in Burma. Saha challenges the prevailing line of study, beginning with John S. Furnivall's views of the emergence of the colonial leviathan and continuing to very near the present in Robert Taylor's account, which sees a rational, bureaucratic state emerge, separate from society, by the early twentieth century. This model, however much it fits the notions of ruler and ruled, provides no room for the complex ways that the state was experienced on an everyday basis (p. 7). Among these was the distancing of women from both the informal and formal resources of state power. Women's voices are absent from the archives; therefore Saha views the colonial state in Burma as a masculine one.

The book opens up two new avenues for further research. First, it would now be useful to learn more about the educational backgrounds of those who became subordinate officials in Burma. Saha gives us ample biographical data on individuals after they begin work for the colonial service, but nearly nothing on their training, education, or expectations of life under employment. Indeed, drawing upon Philip Abrams, Saha stresses how much of colonial-state-making was a process of imagining and argues that there was a clear gap between the rational state imagined at the highest levels of the state and the utter absurdity of these notions at the level of everyday life (p. 8). At the everyday level, subordinate officials were also engaged in another form of state-making. Saha, building on Timothy Mitchell's ideas of the "state effect," observes that misconduct "was both a discourse for imagining the state and a set of practices through which the state was constituted" (p. 10). Understanding more about the intellectual universe of these men would help us understand this process better.

Second, it is arguable that the processes examined in Saha's book may not be peculiarly colonial. As Saha explains, the upper echelons of the colonial state, with the high ideals of rational rule, were occupied by Britons who resided in the main towns of the colony (if we leave aside the intermediary metropole of Calcutta). The subordinate officials he sees as working out the colonial state on an everyday basis were Indians and Burmese living in the smaller towns and villages. The idea of locals in country settings running their domains informally even until relatively recent decades is not an unfamiliar story in Europe. How much of a gap between the high ideals or officials and the everyday corruption of country officials as an urban-rural phenomenon exists in the making of states globally? Saha hints at this issue, making the point that it was the "mixture of aloofness and acquiescence in informal British anti-corruption policy in Burma that was distinctively colonial" (p. 130). It might have been helpful to the reader if Saha, who examines colonial officialdom in Burma vertically, from the bottom to the top (village headmen, township officers, deputy commissioners), had made comparisons horizontally, perhaps pairing his case study of the Irrawaddy Division with one of the Rangoon municipality, comparing how Burmese officials performed in both places, what was expected of them, and how they imagined their own place in the colonial state. My guess is that we would see two very different kinds of subordinate-level Burmese officials.

This is an important, well-written, erudite, and novel approach to colonial Burmese history and the book achieves what it sets out to do. It is also timely, both for Burmese studies, which is enjoying a boost from recent political changes in the country, and for colonial studies, where law has tended to be viewed as a defining force for illegality, not a tool for corruption.

MICHAEL W. CHARNEY
University of Tokyo

JULIE E. HUGHES. *Animal Kingdoms: Hunting, the Environment, and Power in the Indian Princely States*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press. 2013. Pp. xii, 304. $49.95.

Downloaded from https://academic.oup.com/ahr/article/118/5/1504/18087 by School of Oriental and African Studies SOAS user on 19 March 2025