

Comments and Discussions

Atsushi Kitahara*

This paper describes and analyses the discourse on community by following the Western sociological tradition, the past anthropological rural studies in Thailand, and the present community studies in Thailand. It made clear the concept of the community was the product of the modern age, and it has changed and varied according to the researcher's views and prospects to rural society. Especially, this paper contributed to show the discourses of Thai rural studies have drastically changed in the 1990 by the theoretical wave of post-modernism.

Two comments. Firstly, the neo-evolutionist tradition to the peasantry is here characterized to be placed on some intermediate stage of the continuity process of civilization from the primitive to the civilized society, mainly depending upon Kearney's view. However, it might have an idea that the peasant society was the product of the state formation, and that, in this sense, it was a civilized form and had discontinuity from the past primitive age. The community of the peasantry was also considered in this context of the relation with the state.

Secondly, the more generalization of the present Thai community discourses would be needed. This paper emphasized the discourses, which pay keen attention to the subjective consciousness of the community members, and characterize the community as space of contest and conflict, rather than that of static traditionalism. These are, for example, "the local history approach" and "the community and identity approach". I think that these approaches would overlap with the subjective side of the community by Kitahara's definition, and would be related to the dynamic and invented nature of the community, which would be a target for both social movement and state policy.

* Dean, Graduate School of Economics, Nagoya University.