theory of “the five elements”, Chinese food should be discussed in specific regional terms. Thus, Sichuan and Yunnan cuisines are at least as different as French and Italian cuisines. Indeed, just as in France or Italy, regional cuisines are the more meaningful units of analysis in the study of Chinese food.

However, while it is tempting to distinguish between the cuisines of contemporary regions in the People’s Republic of China, such as Guangdong or Fujian, Chinese immigrants in Southeast Asia arrived from different and smaller gastro-cultural sub-regions. To complicate the picture even further, the cuisine of each community is influenced, to a greater or a lesser extent, by the cuisine of the host society and, at times, by other culinary sources such as the colonial cuisine. Here again, there are local, regional and national foodways, as well as the cuisines of different colonizing nations, and they all have an impact on the ways in which each of the Chinese communities cook and eat.

Finally, many of these hybridized cuisines have been (re)introduced to new destinations where, once more, they are adopted and fused with local foodways. The outcome is highly complex, dynamic and varied foodways that are unique and different in each location and, at times, in each and every home and restaurant.
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Anthony Reid’s book is a collection of twelve essays previously published in journals and volumes over the span of four decades of his career. While the individual essays — which address a variety of topics — are noteworthy scholarship, putting them together in
a collection appears to be motivated by the desire to give them visibility rather than to advance a new perspective on the topic of the Indonesian revolution. Right off the bat, Reid acknowledges that the collection does not aim for a comprehensive study. The professed overarching theme — Indonesia’s journey to nation-statehood, the course it took and the consequences of which it must deal in the present — is also broad and rarely noted. However, the essays deal with topics known to be dear to Reid. Besides the Indonesian revolution, the collection examines historical trade networks, traditions of servitude, indigenous notions of freedom and ethnic Chinese in Southeast Asia.

Despite the volume’s broad range, Reid frames it as a response to the view held by many Marxist intellectuals — voiced by the late Indonesian author Pramoedya Ananta Toer and the prominent scholar Benedict Anderson amongst others — that the Indonesian revolution is incomplete in that it has failed to advance from an anti-imperialist bourgeois revolution into the next (supposedly ideal) phase of a proletarian revolution. Chapter One visits this problem with an overview of Indonesia’s modern history, leading up to the national revolution. Here Reid argues that some degree of social revolution actually took place in the latter half of the 1940s, manifested most visibly in mass uprisings against hereditary rulers and other authority figures representing the old colonial structure. These often violent incidents, in his view, marked the end of feudalism and despotism in Indonesia.

In addition to giving a succinct survey of the Indonesian revolution, Reid enriches its historiography, which has tended to be Java-centred, with an assessment of its regional implications (Chapter Eight). This peripheral take on Indonesian nationhood helps explain the disjunctures or contradictions of the unitary state form, as opposed to a federal one (Chapter Six). These effects become especially clear when viewed from a region like Aceh, whose commercial links and historical nodes of contact lie outside the current national jurisdiction (Chapter Four). Reid further accentuates the multiplicity of Indonesia with an exploration of how the idea of “freedom” was translated through time and across cultures in the archipelago
(Chapter Five), and with contrasting histories of absolute authority outside Java (Chapter Ten).

The volume showcases Reid’s wealth of knowledge and imagination with chapters as lively as one on betel-chewing (Chapter Three) and as grim and consequential as those on Gestapu (Chapter Four) and the plight of ethnic Chinese (Chapter Twelve). It sheds light on the construction of Indonesia’s past, the (dis)assembling of its history — the myths selected or left out at different times — in the process of nation formation (Chapter Six). It offers a conjecture on what Reid portrays as a chasm in leadership culture between the 1945 Generation and the 1966 Generation; that is, between the Dutch-educated nationalists who took the country to political emancipation and the Japanese-trained military cadres who took over leadership in 1966. The “briefcase” and “samurai sword” metaphors in the title of Chapter Seven allude to these contrasting leadership styles. But while this chapter is thought-provoking, the schematic division into Dutch colonization/Japanese occupation, civil/military and 1945/1966 seems too neat.

The volume’s most glaring shortcoming is a lack of cohesion and continuity across the chapters. They progress from the national revolution to the history of slavery and then to betel-chewing without an attempt at bridging these disparate themes. Some of the chapters do not even concern the twentieth century, despite what the book’s subtitle suggests. But perhaps this multiplicity of foci attests to Reid’s rare qualification to speak about Indonesia in the larger context, while weighing its obstreperous particulars.

Reid is conscious of, and cautious about, his position as a foreign academic “outsider”. This stance restrains him from passing value judgments on the course taken, or not taken, by actors in Indonesia’s history. His sincerity is praiseworthy. Reid has left the chapter on Gestapu republished in its original 1968 form, making an irony of his then optimistic view of Indonesia’s political climate at the time as one in which “a more relaxed atmosphere among intellectuals” prevailed and “opinions can again be expressed without fear of an attack in the night” (p. 191). He trusts his readers to infer with the benefit of hindsight the contradiction that the then newly installed
New Order eventually morphed into the same fear-inducing monster from which Indonesia was supposed to be rescued when the essay first appeared.
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This book is a collection of papers delivered at a conference held in Bogor in January 2011. It examines the variety of manifestations of Islam in Indonesia and an ongoing discussion among representatives of different streams of the religion. The contributions are arranged in three sections: broader assessments of the characteristics of Indonesian Islam, liberal Islamic issues including feminism, and case studies of Salafist activities.

In the first section, the chapters by Kees van Djik and Najib Burhani ask whether Indonesian Islam is different from the Islams elsewhere in the world. Van Djik approaches the question via the opposing views of two classic scholarly interpreters of Indonesian Islam: Clifford Geertz (“yes”) and Christiaan Snouk Hurgronje (“no”). He comes to the — somewhat expected — conclusion that the truth is to be found somewhere in between. Burhani highlights the distinctiveness of Indonesian Islam through the political thought of Abdurrahman Wahid and Nurcholish Madjid, a topic that has also been covered in various other studies and thus quite inevitably triggers a feeling of déjà vu. Robert Hefner perceives Islam in today’s Indonesia as “entirely different” (p. 49) as the country has become more religious in previous decades. He argues that Indonesian Islam can teach the broader Muslim world important lessons through its