

Concept of "cores" and "zones" as developed by John Smail.

a). "core". Here one could almost as well retain the conventional terms "country" or "state", except perhaps that they have too great a connotation of fixed boundaries, because what is meant by a "core" is a group of homogeneous - type people formed by certain events into a political entity ( e.g. Pagan, Mataram etc ). This process Smail calls "crystallisation". ( It does raise the qn. of whether there was some pre-existing cultural unity among the people concerned wh. allowed the political organisation to develop, or whether on the other hand it was a qn. of an initially ~~small~~ very small unit - a "city-state" extending its influence to include increasingly large population. Probably a bit of both ). Note that to have any sort of "state" one must have a surplus, and therefore all the SEAN cores are characterised by agricultural base. This is not necessarily the case in the zones.

b). "zone". Here what Smail appears to be doing is defining a certain geographical area in terms of the characteristics of its dominant group ( the Shan-Lao group or the Malay group ). This particular group have a large measure of cultural but not of political unity. They are usually organised into a number of small ~~states~~ pol. entities - "mini-cores" which are often of a similar structure throughout the region - the Shan sawbwa-ship etc. However, the total geographical human space of the "zone" is not culturally homogeneous, since the main group live among other groups, and the area is characterised by various relationships of symbiosis or degrees of tension. Comparable w. a constellation? Should be noted that the "dominant" group of the zone is much less able to draw others into its own cultural norms than is the case in the cores. See Leach's study, Political Systems of Highland Burma - goes into the relationship between Shans and Kachins - some Kachins do adopt the Shan way of life ( Shan = universally agreed to be more "civilised" ) but many others seem to oscillate backwards and forwards between Shan and Kachin identity.

How do the Europeans fit into this picture? In the early centuries of Europ. expansion change it comparatively little.- Potuguese and Dutch when they first arrive can be seen as another trading people operating within the Malayo-Muslim " zone " - establish a " trading-post " rather than territorial empire - note that Batavia, the Dutch centre on Java, is outside the " core " area, wh. the Dutch took over only later. The one case where the Europeans of this era did significantly reorganise the pre-existing pattern was in the Philippines. Here they set in motion the political events wh. led to the formation of a new " core "

	Economic base and Population	Where Found	Civic tradition (religion)	Ethnic (language)	Political Organization	'Crystal
<u>Cores</u>	rice plains; dense	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Irrawaddy valley</li> <li>2. Lower Menam</li> <li>3. Lower Mekong and Tonle Sap</li> <li>4. Red River delta southwards to Mekong delta</li> <li>5. Java</li> <li>6. Northern and Central Philippines</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Theravada Buddhist</li> <li>2. Theravada Buddhist</li> <li>3. Theravada Buddhist</li> <li>4. Confucian-Mahayana Buddhist-Taoist</li> <li>5. Islamic (overlaid on Hindu-Buddhist)</li> <li>6. Catholic</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Burman</li> <li>2. "Siamese"</li> <li>3. Khmer</li> <li>4. Vietnamese</li> <li>5. Javan</li> <li>6. various (Tagalog, Cebuano, etc; Spanish as lingua franca)</li> </ol>	<p>Large states</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. "Indian-type"</li> <li>2. "Indian-type"</li> <li>3. "Indian-type"</li> <li>4. Mandarin bureaucracy</li> <li>5. "Indian-type" (ruling class Dutch; bureaucratic)</li> <li>6. Spanish bureaucracy</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. 11th</li> <li>2. 14th</li> <li>3. 9th</li> <li>4. 11th</li> <li>5. 8th</li> <li>6. 16th</li> </ol>
<u>Zones</u>						
I Shan-Lao	I rice pockets; dense	I interior of mainland	I Theravada Buddhist	I Tai dialects	<del>I small states</del> <i>small states</i>	I 14th
II Malayo-Muslim	II trade; sparse	II Along coasts, rivers and islands of the Archipelago	II Islamic	II Many (but Malay as lingua franca)	<del>II small states</del>	II 15th/
<u>Stateless Societies</u>	swidden; very sparse	mainland-hills islands-interiors	none; "animist" cultures	very many	Stateless	

zone Smit seems to define a geo. area  
in terms of the characteristics of its  
dominant group (eg. Shan, Malay)

- This particular group have a large  
measure of cultural but not of political  
unity (usu. organized into a no. of  
small states - 'mini-cores' - wh. are often of a  
similar structure - Shan sawbwer-ship etc)

however The total geographical <sup>human</sup> space of the  
"zone" = not culturally homogeneous - the  
main group live in symbiosis (or tension) w. other  
groups. [s.o. constellation?] / dominant group much less  
able to draw others into their  
own culture than in the case of the cores  
(see Leach - Shan/Kachin)

cores: old almost as well retain

The old terms of country or state  
(except has too much 'boundary' considerations)

= a group of homogeneous-type people  
formed by the edment of a state  
e.g. Pagan, Mataram [raises the qn of what  
people makes a state - unless state = understood  
as city-state of initially limited importance  
gradually extending its influence]

- to have a state, must have a surplus,  
has agricultural basis (always)