Personal archive and the records continuum : a case study of Tej Bunnag' s private papers, at the Siam Society library

Tejasen, Chirabodee

2018

Tejasen, C. (2018). Personal archive and the records continuum : a case study of Tej Bunnag' s private papers, at the Siam Society library. Doctoral thesis, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore.

<http://hdl.handle.net/10356/75638>

<https://doi.org/10.32657/10356/75638>

Nanyang Technological University

Downloaded on 26 Apr 2023 14:10:07 SGT

**NANYANG
TECHNOLOGICAL
UNIVERSITY**

SINGAPORE

PERSONAL ARCHIVE AND THE RECORDS CONTINUUM:
A CASE STUDY OF TEJ BUNNAG'S PRIVATE PAPERS,
AT THE SIAM SOCIETY LIBRARY

CHIRABODEE TEJASEN

WEE KIM WEE
SCHOOL OF COMMUNICATION AND INFORMATION

2018

Personal Archive and the Records Continuum: A Case Study of
Tej Bunnag's Private Papers, at the Siam Society Library

Chirabodee Tejasen

Wee Kim Wee
School of Communication and Information

A thesis submitted to the Nanyang Technological University
in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

2018

ABSTRACT

This thesis aims to elucidate the relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archives. To achieve this end, it examines a body of private papers kept by an important Thai diplomat – Tej Bunnag – during the two time periods (1969–1976 and 1980–1986) when he was the Honorary Editor of the Journal of the Siam Society. The theoretical framework for such an examination is drawn from the concept of ‘evidence of *me*’, which Sue McKemmish¹ developed out of the records continuum theory. This concept has the potential to recognise personal archives as a means for evidencing and memorialising a life. Within this framework, it is argued that personal records (including archives), like their counterparts of an organisational nature, have functions to perform, and that these functions are interpreted as purposes and uses. Research methods include document analysis, interviews and documentary research.

Results of the analysis of Tej’s private papers, supported by data from interviews and other documentary evidence, show multiple functions of the studied archive. Four functions (as purposes) of Tej’s personal archiving can be identified, namely, (1) keeping for future reference, (2) sharing information, (3) building a legacy, and (4) constructing identities. At the level of individual records contained in the collection, these papers were used as a means through which Tej (1) performed roles of the JSS Honorary Editor, (2) maintained personal relationships, and (3) represented his multifaceted self.

This study contributes to the understanding of the relationship between personal archives and the records continuum theory. Firstly, it shows that it is possible to approach a personal archive through the analysis of its functions by looking at its

¹ Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of me ...’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 28–45.

purposes and uses. Secondly, it challenges the binary opposition between organisational and personal archives. The results of this study suggest that the boundaries between these two types of archives are permeable. Lastly, it shows that the ‘evidence of *me*’, which is an extension of the continuum thinking to cover personal records (including archives) is workable, despite the propositions questioning its validity.

NOTE

This thesis follows the Thai norm of referring to Thai authors by given names, not surnames, and all citations by Thai authors are alphabetised in the bibliography by given names. The referencing style follows the *Chicago Manual of Style* (17th edition, 2017), as a general guideline.

With regards to references to materials from Tej Bunnag's private papers, an identification number was assigned to each item within the collection (see chapter 4 for details). When referencing a particular item, the identification number is put in square brackets followed by a short description.

A variety of chronological systems have been used in Thailand. For clarity and ease of understanding, they have been transposed into the Gregorian calendar.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The preparation of these last words (typically and peculiarly placed in a position to be read first, though they are) has caused me to reflect upon the course of my long sojourn in Singapore, during which many individuals have been enormously kind and encouraging to me. Although some of them may not recognise their contribution to the completion of my doctorate or regard it as substantial, their help and acts of kindness are especially meaningful to me. I feel deeply uneasy to express my appreciation here, for I am grateful to them beyond words.

I offer my profound thanks to my thesis supervisors, Dr Natalie Pang and Associate Professor Brendan Luyt, for their guidance and painstaking patience. Despite their differing approaches to supervision, I have greatly benefited from their advice and support throughout the various stages of my studies. I also appreciate the constructive comments on this thesis from the two very thoughtful, anonymous external examiners, as well as the three members of the oral examination panel.

My research in Thailand would not have gone as smoothly without the courtesy of khun Kanitha Kasina-Ubol and khun Supharat Roopsuay of the Siam Society. I would also like to express my eternal appreciation to Dr Tej Bunnag, whose private papers are the object of this study, for being generous with his time. The interviews with him were always enjoyable and informative. Without him and his personal archive, this thesis would not have been possible.

At school, I have enjoyed the company of many schoolmates who cheer me along: Chen Xinran, Ei Pa Pa Pe Than, Guo Yanru, Iyra S. Buenrostro, Karryl Kim Abella Sagun, Khasfariyati Binte Razikin, Leung Yan Wah, Wee Chui Neo Janet, Abdul Rohman, Cliff Loke Choon Mun, Lee Wei Jian Edmund, Mohamed Ariffin Bin

Mohamed Kawaja Kamal and Wang Xiaohui. They are a source of vital support, which has contributed to making my study life more memorable and bearable.

Much of my life outside study was spent in Crescent Hall, where I learned more about the possibilities to explicate meanings of a campus life. Particular mentions are due to Du Zhenglin, Ong Li Lin, Yeo Chun Kiat, Ratima Suntornnond, Tan Shu Min, Edwin Ang Ching Jitt, Tan Hong Yi Kenneth, and Yannapol Sriphutkiat, for their friendship, camaraderie and listening ears in times of need, which I shall never forget. I also want to extend my sincere thanks to Tan Yi Pin Bryan, Tan Young Kiat Zenn, Tiong Wen Shuo, Yap Jian Beng and Yang Jingfan. Each, in different ways, has caused a little extra colour to elaborate my plain campus life, and beyond, thus brightening my long days of research and my nights of doubts.

I have been blessed with many other caring and steadfast friends in Singapore and elsewhere. I cannot refrain from mentioning Kochakorn Ratanagosoom, Tanut Watanachanobol, Khanyapuss Punjaisri, Kirana Kovintha, Nitchakamol Chiaravanond, Danupon Siritranon, Norasak Suvachittanont, Pornnalat Prachyakorn and Rajjaphong Noottacharoen. They have been a source of encouragement and moral support, for which I am grateful.

To my parents, I owe a great debt of gratitude for their dedication and commitment to giving their children the best education and their love. I also appreciate the continuing support of my two aunts and three siblings – Chiradhip, Chiranath and Chirachatra. Without them, I would not have come this far.

I end by remembering a good friend and true companion – Warunyou Boonyong (11 September 1982 – 17 January 2013) – whose life was all short. Despite the tragic death, the beautiful memory of his remains undimmed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter

1. INTRODUCTION	<i>page</i> 11
1.1 Background and statement of problem	11
1.2 The case study	14
1.3 Theoretical framework	16
1.4 Research objective and research questions	17
1.5 Significance of the study	17
2. LITERATURE REVIEW: PERSONAL ARCHIVES IN ARCHIVAL THEORY	18
3. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK	34
3.1 The records continuum model: an overview	34
3.2 The ‘evidence of <i>me</i> ’	47
3.3 Application to the case of Tej Bunnag’s private papers	56
4. METHODOLOGY	59
4.1 Case study as a research framework	59
4.2 Object of study	61
4.3 Data collection	64
4.4 Data analysis	72
4.5 Considerations in research ethics	73
5. TEJ BUNNAG AND HIS PRIVATE PAPERS AT THE SIAM SOCIETY LIBRARY	78
5.1 Early life and early career of Tej Bunnag	79
5.2 Tej Bunnag and his editorships of the JSS	84
5.3 Tej’s private papers ‘on deposit to the Siam Society Library’	92
6. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION	98
6.1 Functions as purposes: What is the archive for?	98
6.2 Functions as uses: How and for what purposes was the archive used?	123
6.3 Discussions	161
7. CONCLUSION	179
7.1 Summary of the study	179
7.2 Limitations of the study	181
7.3 Suggestions for future work	182

BIBLIOGRAPHY	184
APPENDIX A: THE SIAM SOCIETY AND ITS JOURNAL: AN OVERVIEW	197

LIST OF TABLES

Table

3.1	Generations of Continuum Thinking	<i>page</i> 43
3.2	Approaches to the Study of Documents	54
4.1	Amount of Tej Bunnag's private papers by volume	61
4.2	Dates of Tej Bunnag's private papers in each volume	62
4.3	Interview sessions with Tej Bunnag	66
4.4	List of interview questions for session 1, 25 June 2014	67
4.5	List of interview questions for session 5, 27 April 2017	68
4.6	Chronology of data collection	71
5.1	Top 20 contributors to JSS, January 1972 – January 1976	89
5.2	Top 20 contributors to JSS, 1981 – 1985	89
5.3	Breakdown by type of contributions to JSS, January 1972 – January 1976	89
5.4	Breakdown by type of contributions to JSS, 1981–1985	91

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure

3.1	Records Continuum Model (by Frank Upward)	<i>page</i> 36
5.1	Tej Bunnag by Piriya Krairiksh	82
5.2	Details of spines of four ring binders holding Tej Bunnag's private papers	93
6.1	Communication between Tej Bunnag and Benjamin A Batson on editing a manuscript	102
6.2	Letter from George P. Shultz to Tej Bunnag, 30 June 1981	118
6.3	Traces of correspondence on a draft of a written account prepared for the Minister of Affairs of Thailand, by Tej Bunnag	120
6.4	Notes for contributors to the JSS under Tej Bunnag's editorships	131
6.5	Notes for contributors to the JSS (current version)	132
6.6	Letter from Nigel Brailey to Tej Bunnag, 9 September 1983 with notes in Tej's handwriting	134
6.7	Last page of Tej Bunnag's letter to Secretary of St Antony's College, 20 June 1971	155

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background and statement of problem

Historically, archival theory has focused on records created in organisational contexts, and bypassed the realm of personal archive.¹ Despite the trend in which '[m]any archivists and archival institutions have a collecting mission that includes personal papers, manuscripts, and other noninstitutional materials',² there is still a lack of literature that would guide archival thinking about these materials. This has resulted in a paucity of specific directions for practitioners to address theoretical questions regarding this type of archives.³ It was not until 1996, as Jennifer Douglas observes, that the attempt to fill such a gap has started to increase,⁴ and accelerated in the past decade following the emergence of digital personal archiving.⁵ For example, taking personal papers of contemporary politicians as a testbed, archivists at Universities of Oxford and Manchester collaborated to explore how they might select, acquire, process, store, preserve and provide access to the digital personal archives.⁶ Having seen an increasing volume and diversity of digital information objects being created and captured by individuals, a team of three British archival scholars attempted to find a coherent framework to better the understanding of how individuals create, organise,

¹ Christopher A. Lee, introduction to *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011), 1; Catherine Hobbs, 'Reenvisioning the Personal: Reframing Traces of Individual Life', in *Currents of Archival Thinking*, ed. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2010), 214.

² Lee, introduction to *I, Digital*, 1.

³ Riva A. Pollard, 'The Appraisal of Personal Papers: A Critical Literature Review', *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 140; Toby Burrows, 'Personal Electronic Archives: Collecting the Digital Me', *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspective* 22, no. 2 (2006): 85.

⁴ Jennifer Lynn Douglas, 'Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives' (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013), 24–25.

⁵ Burrows, 'Personal Electronic Archives', 85; Richard J. Cox, *Personal Archives and a New Archival Calling: Readings, Reflections and Ruminations* (Duluth, MN: Litwin Books, 2008).

⁶ Susan Thomas, and Janette Martin, 'Using the Papers of Contemporary British Politicians as a Testbed for the Preservation of Digital Personal Archives', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 27, no. 1 (April 2006): 29–56;

manage, use and dispose their digital personal archives.⁷ However, despite these attempts, until recently, such a practitioner as John Langdon⁸ has still lamented for the lack of guidelines for processing personal papers. In part, this is owing to the fact that personal archives are neglected by traditional archival theory, which has, in the first place, resulted in a lack of theoretical framework for archivists handling this kind of material.

As the review of the literature (chapter 2) will show, relatively lesser attention has been paid to personal archives in archival theory.⁹ This is due, in great part, to the inferior status the traditional archival theory confers upon personal archives. Consequently, archival scholars have had to either insist on the applicability of the traditional archival theory to personal archives,¹⁰ or suggest alternative frameworks¹¹ for understanding this kind of archives.

Among the first to propose an alternative approach is Sue McKemmish. Her article ‘Evidence of *me*’ focuses on roles, activities and relationships of individuals to which their personal archive bears witness.¹² As the concept is based on the continuum thinking, scholars have questioned its applicability to personal archive, on grounds that the records continuum theory was initially developed for institutional recordkeeping.¹³

Other alternative approaches have also been proposed. One that has been well received is by Catherine Hobbs who emphasises the character and personality of the

⁷ Peter Williams, Jeremy Leighton John, and Ian Rowland, ‘The Personal Curation of Digital Objects: A Lifecycle Approach’, *Aslib Proceedings* 61, no. 4 (2009): 340.

⁸ John Langdon, ‘Describing the Digital: The Archival Cataloguing of Born-Digital Personal Papers’, *Archives and Records* 37, 1 (2016): 37–52.

⁹ Lee, introduction to *I, Digital*, 8.

¹⁰ See, for example, C[hris] Hurley, ‘Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 8 (February 1977): 351 – 365; and Chris Hurley, ‘Beating the French’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 13–18.

¹¹ See, for example, Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of me ...’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 28–45. This thesis uses the edition published as ‘Evidence of *me*’, *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 174–187; Catherine Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals’, *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 126–135.

¹² McKemmish, ‘Evidence of *me*’, 175.

¹³ Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives’; Verne Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger: Deconstructive Possibilities in “Evidence of Me”’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 8–22.

archive's creator.¹⁴ Scholars and practitioners have cited her work, and the approach has moved to the centre of the stage, rendering such the seminal idea as the 'evidence of *me*' at the side.

Although there have been some studies bearing theoretical contributions to personal archive as an area of research, these works usually focus on a certain kind of personal archive, and/or are based on a similar framework. For instance, Hobbs¹⁵ and her school of thought¹⁶ emphasise the ability of personal papers to reveal the character and personality of the archive's creator, based on their experience with literary fonds. Douglas,¹⁷ who challenges Hobbs' argument, also takes all her cases from literary fonds. Sarah Kim¹⁸ explores a different population, but draws her framework from the social psychological concept of self-reflectivity, which is close to that of Hobbs. As such, there needs to be more studies employing other alternative approaches or using other types of personal archive, in order to add more to the archival literature and contribute to archival theory on personal archives.

This current study will address such the need by adopting a framework in the continuum theory – that is, personal archive as 'evidence of *me*' – to examine a case of private papers¹⁹ curated by one of the past editors of a learned journal. It should be noted that, in this thesis, the term 'archives' is understood from the continuum perspective. That is, 'archives are all records of "continuing value," regardless of

¹⁴ Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives'.

¹⁵ Ibid.; and Catherine Hobbs, 'New Approaches to Canadian Literary Archives', *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 109-119.

¹⁶ For example, Stephen Enniss, 'In the Author's Hand: Artifacts of Origin and Twentieth-Century Reading Practice', *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 106-120.

¹⁷ Douglas, 'Archiving Authors', 56-59.

¹⁸ Sarah Kim, 'Personal Digital Archives: Preservation of Documents, Preservation of Self' (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2013).

¹⁹ Archivists also refer to private papers as personal records, personal fonds, personal papers, manuscripts, private manuscripts, historical manuscripts or manuscript collections.

where they reside or who is currently caring for them’.²⁰ As such, personal archives include documents and records accumulated by or belonging to an individual person.

1.2 The case study

The case study of this thesis was discovered when I was working on a research project²¹ aiming to produce an oral history of an oldest scholarly serial publication published in South East Asia entitled the Journal of the Siam Society (hereafter, JSS), (An overview of the Siam Society and its Journal to the 1960s could be found in Appendix A.) Participants in that study included JSS editors – both past and present. Tej Bunnag was one of the past editors (1971–1976 and 1980–1986) whom I interviewed. During one of the interviews, Tej recalled that he once presented a collection of his personal papers to the Siam Society Library.²² Later, it was found that these papers had been kept intact, in four ring binders.

An initial examination of Tej’s private papers reveals records documenting his editorial work for the JSS, which is not surprising as Tej himself wrote on the spine of the ring binder: ‘JSS editorship, etc’ (see figure 5.2, in chapter 5). However, after a thorough examination, one will realise that the ‘etc’ portion of the papers spreads all over the collection. In other words, they do not only document Tej’s editorial work, but also other matters of his personal interest as well as activities which, in turn, reflect multiple roles that Tej played during the time periods covered by these papers. It is worth noting that the collection was called ‘private papers’, in Tej’s own words, ‘as opposed to public records’.²³ That is, Tej perceives his private papers as his personal archive, although these papers include documents and records created in organisational

²⁰ Lee, introduction to *I, Digital*, 2.

²¹ Chirabodee Tejasen, ‘An Oral History of the Journal of the Siam Society’ (Master’s diss., Nanyang Technological University, 2012).

²² Ibid., 60.

²³ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 24 June 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

contexts. Tej's perception could be considered reasonable because his private papers were collected at an individual level.

A collection similar to that of Tej's private papers is rare to be found. At least, no other JSS editors have hitherto put their private papers on deposit to the Siam Society Library as Tej did. Furthermore, the collection under scrutiny is not normally accessible to users of the Siam Society Library or to the general public. This study will be the first thorough examination of the collection.

In addition, as chapter 5 will show, Tej himself is also an interesting personality. From the last year of the 1960s to 1976, he played an important role in transforming the JSS – one of the oldest learned journals published in South East Asia – into a serial publication of academic standard, thus contributing to scholarly circle of Thai studies. Indeed, Tej worked with such academics as Benjamin A. Batson,²⁴ Craig J. Reynolds²⁵ and Michael Vickery²⁶ to publish their first journal articles (in their academic career) in the JSS. Many of the academics with whom Tej had worked during his editorship later became recognised as distinguished scholars of Thai studies. As a diplomat, Tej was heavily involved in the normalisation of the diplomatic relation between Thailand and the People's Republic of China in the 1970s, and served as Thai ambassador in Beijing, Geneva, Paris and Washington D.C. All this makes the whole collection worth examining in details. As a case study, Tej's private papers represent a complex body of records captured together.

²⁴ Benjamin A. Batson, 'The Fall of the Phibun Government, 1944', *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 89–120.

²⁵ Craig J. Reynolds, 'The Case of K.S.R. Kulap: A Challenge to Royal Historical Writing in Late Nineteenth Century Thailand', *JSS* 61, no. 2 (July 1973): 63–90.

²⁶ Michael Vickery, 'The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation', *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 51–70.

1.3 Theoretical framework

Even though the object of study was found out of serendipity, the theoretical framework for analysing it was selected with due considerations. After a close examination, it was found that there were many different individuals involved in the creation of these papers, reflecting their nature of being records of ‘JSS editorship, etc’. Guided by Lindsay Prior’s idea that every document has function(s) embedded in it,²⁷ it was decided that the framework for this study should be able to accommodate an analysis of functions of these private papers. In addition, the framework should allow for the trace of Tej’s personality and character to emerge, as the object of study is a kind of personal archives.

Led by a more recent idea of Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott who challenge the binary opposition between the personal and corporate archive, this study focuses on the records continuum theory into consideration. Such the theory recognises that records function as both organisational and collective memories from the time of their creation. This recognition is greatly different from the conventional perspective of records lifecycle model, in which records would be first kept for organisational purposes, and only become archives for their continuing value in the later stages of their life. As such, from a perspective of records continuum theory, a personal archive is more encompassing than it is defined conventionally, because it is not restricted to its creation as long as it relates to that person.²⁸ Therefore, the continuum theory is deemed appropriate.

The theoretical framework is developed with special reference to the concept of ‘evidence of *me*’ which is an extension of the continuum theory onto personal

²⁷ Lindsay Prior, ‘Using Documents in Social Research’, in *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*, ed. David Silverman, 3rd ed. (London: Sage, 2011), 96.

²⁸ Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice’, *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 113.

recordkeeping. It focuses on the functionality of records, and views recordkeeping as witnessing a life. The conceptual framework will be discussed in chapter 3.

1.4 Research objective and research questions

This thesis aims to elucidate the potential relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive through the case study of Tej Bunnag's private papers at the Siam Society Library. To achieve this, the case study will be examined with regards to their functions (purposes and uses), through the conceptual lens of McKemmish's 'evidence of *me*'.

The research objective is operationalised into two research questions:

- (1) For what purposes Tej's private papers were kept?
- (2) How and for what purposes did Tej use his private papers?

1.5 Significance of study

This study takes a theoretical framework of the records continuum theory which is underrepresented in the archival literature.²⁹ Therefore, it will contribute to an understanding of how to apply the concept of 'evidence of *me*' to the examination of a personal archive.

Furthermore, Tej's private papers represent a kind of personal archive that is absent from the archival literature. There has been no previous study of a personal archive of learned journals published in Thailand. The case will fill the research gaps in these respects.

²⁹ As a relatively 'young' field of research, there have been less studies in this field as compared to research employing the mainstream approaches to analysing archives and recordkeeping. See Heather Ann Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier: Understanding the Records Continuum as a Framework for Examining the Role of Records in a Community' (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2015).

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW:

PERSONAL ARCHIVE IN ARCHIVAL THEORY

Personal archive are not new to archival repositories of any kind. They have been a part of archival collections, and been used by users of many sorts. One of the most loyal users of archives – the historian – has been using records kept by private individuals to provide proximate, first-hand accounts of past events, in addition to historical narratives from official or organisational records. Indeed, personal records have found their place as primary sources in modern historiography.¹ Apart from the historians, researchers studying literary authors have sought personal archives for early drafts of book or article manuscripts, hoping for new insights into the creative processes of a given author. For literary scholars, Catherine Hobbs points out that there exists ‘an intimacy in the personal archive not present in the collective, corporate, formalized record-keeping system’.² As Jordan Bass puts it, ‘personal archives have often been the province of academic historians and literary scholars’.³ In fact, ‘[f]rom the research viewpoint personal records are, as Caroline Williams suggests, ‘of value in all kinds of studies’.⁴ In addition, Bass also asserts that interest in personal archives comes from various users such as genealogists, healthcare

¹ See, for example, Nicholas Thomas and Richard Eves, *Bad Colonist: The South Seas Letters of Vernon Lee Walker & Louis Becke* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999); Susan Palmer, ‘Sir John Soane: Rewriting a Life’, *Libraries & the Cultural Record* 44, no. 1 (2009): 65-81; Adele Perry, ‘“Is your Garden in England, Sir”: James Douglas’s Archive and the Politics of Home’, *History Workshop Journal* 70 (Autumn 2010): 67–85; Loh Miaw Ping, ‘The two faces of men in white’, in *The May 13 Generation: The Chinese Middle Schools Student Movement and Singapore Politics in the 1950s*, eds. Tan Jing Quee, Tan Kok Chiang, and Hong Lysa (Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information and Research Development, 2011), 227–242.

² Catherine Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals’, *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 127.

³ Jordan Leslie Bass, ‘Getting Personal: Confronting the Challenges of Archiving Personal Records in the Digital Age’ (master’s thesis, University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg, 2012), 3.

⁴ Caroline Williams, ‘Personal Papers: Perceptions and Practices’, chapter 3 in *What are Archives? Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: A Reader*, ed. Louise Craven (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008), 56.

professionals and social workers.⁵ Therefore, ‘while personal archives are often acquired for potential use in academic research, these materials often have purposes not immediately apparent to nor likely appraised for by archivists’.⁶

Despite the values that personal archives hold, ‘the archival establishment has’, as Williams observes, ‘always paid less attention to the management of personal papers than those created by organizations’.⁷ Furthermore, studies have shown that they are an understudied area on the archival research landscape.⁸ In great part, this is due to the exclusion of personal records in the foundational works of modern English-speaking archival practice. The process of such excluding started from what is generally referred to as the ‘Dutch Manual’ (1898) of archival administration, which denied archival status to the records of individuals. It was explained that these materials were not created in the course of the functions and activities of an administrative body, but were ‘gathered together in the strangest manner’, and thus should be in the library custody.⁹ The subsequent influential works were built on the core concepts of the Dutch Manual. In *A Manual of Archive Administration* (1922), Hilary Jenkinson defined archives based on administrative transactions and the concepts of authenticity and impartiality. He emphasised that these elements were important in the cultivation and conservation of the objective evidence of archives.¹⁰ Against Jenkinson’s definition of archives, private records do not have the archival quality found in those records created in the course of administrative functions, for

⁵ Ibid., 3–5.

⁶ Ibid., 5.

⁷ Williams, ‘Personal Papers’, 57.

⁸ Karyn Taylor, ‘From Paper to Cyberspace: Changing Communication Technologies and the Implications for Personal Records Archivists’ (master’s thesis, University of Manitoba, 2002), i; Bass, ‘Getting Personal’, 7; Jennifer Lynn Douglas, ‘Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives’ (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013), 3.

⁹ S. Muller, J.A. Feith, and R. Fruin, *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives* (1898), 2nd ed. (1940), trans. Arthur H. Leavitt (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003), 19–22 & 152–155.

¹⁰ Hilary Jenkinson, *A Manual of Archive Administration*, new and revised ed. (London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co, 1937), 11–12.

they are imbued with expressions of personal opinion and created for posterity outside of official business capacities.¹¹ Later in the 1940s and 1950s, Theodore R. Schellenberg developed a new approach to the management of the massive collection of government records in the American National Archives. In his book, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (1956), he made it clear that ‘[w]hile archives grow out of some regular functional activity, historical manuscripts, in contrast, are usually the product of a spontaneous expression of thought or feeling. They are thus ordinarily created in a haphazard, and not in a systematic manner’.¹² Schellenberg further developed a value-based system to assist in the appraisal of archival records. In this system, records were assessed for evidential value and informational value. While the former could be found in those records documenting the functions of an administrative body, the latter could be observed in those records containing information on people, places and subjects with which the administrative body interacted.¹³ It is clear that the seminal works of archival theory were rooted in the activity of government eventually creating records as a product. This inevitably makes records created and curated by private individuals, as Bass observes, ‘inferior to the records of government’.¹⁴ ‘The concept of authenticity, impartiality, evidential and informational value, and records as products of administrative functions are firmly entrenched in the corpus of modern archival theory and thus have profoundly influenced archivists working in both the government and private dimensions of the profession’.¹⁵

¹¹ Ibid., 4–15 & 40–44.

¹² T.R. Schellenberg, *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003), 18.

¹³ Ibid., 139–141.

¹⁴ Bass, ‘Getting Personal’, 12.

¹⁵ Ibid., 15–16.

Nevertheless, in revisiting the writings of Jenkinson and Schellenberg, Rob Fisher observes that both of them paid a careful attention in differentiating government archives from private archives, for they did not think their principles would apply, 'or would be problematic at best, in the realm of private archives'.¹⁶ Fisher does not disagree that their influential works, on the one hand, 'cast archival theory ... in the mould of archives of national governments'.¹⁷ Rather, he argues that by demarcating the boundary between the archival and the non-archival materials, Jenkinson and Schellenberg, in fact, 'identified and elaborated upon the defining characteristics of private archives', on the other.¹⁸ First, private archives are the product of haphazard, perfunctory or spontaneous activities of individuals or informal groups of individuals in unofficial and unstructured environments. Second, private archives are maintained in circumstances where individuals appraise, edit, retain, and dispose documents which are then preserved in individual or informal custodianship. And third, private archives are collected by institutions only for their research value and potential use by clientele where historical and cultural interests take precedence over evidence of business transactions or government functions.¹⁹ In concluding his re-examination of Jenkinson's and Schellenberg's principles, Fisher contends that these three characteristics have become 'basic foundations for the future development of a theory of private archives'.²⁰

In reality, it seems that archivists have continued to nurture these early archival discourses which, as a results, reaffirm the superiority of the records born of the administrative functions and the significance of the evidential and informational

¹⁶ Rob Fisher, 'In Search of a Theory of Private Archives: The Foundational Writings of Jenkinson and Schellenberg Revisited', *Archivaria* 67 (Spring 2009): 18.

¹⁷ *Ibid.*, 1.

¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 24.

¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 18–19.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 24.

values. Indeed, as Williams observes, ‘personal papers have been viewed as less “archival”, less “reliable” than those generated by organizations’, partially due to their inconsistency in ‘content, context and survival’.²¹ Their informational value is, therefore, likely to be at ‘a micro, individual level – from which it is hard to draw broad empirical conclusions’.²²

However, archivists still have to handle personal archives because they comprise an important archival genre.²³ This can be evidenced by notes and even articles made by archival professionals to publicise the newly available private papers collections in the repositories in which they work.²⁴ These accounts may be descriptive in their tone, but also highlight the importance and uniqueness of the collections that they are introducing. In other words, the authors pinpoint some values in the personal archives that have come into their custody. This suggests that personal archives are undaunted by the archival discourse which favours official and government records. Indeed, no matter how ‘inferior’ they are, personal archives are valuable and can find their place in the archives.

Even so, as archival theory has historically bypassed the realm of personal archives, practitioners have been short of frame of reference when dealing with this type of materials. Despite early attempts to address the issue,²⁵ after the turn of the

²¹ Williams, ‘Personal Papers’, 60.

²² Ibid.

²³ Ibid., 66.

²⁴ See, for example, ‘The Joshua A. Fishman and Gella Schweid Fishman Family Archive’, *Anthropological Linguistics* 37, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 91–92; Eric Lohr, ‘The Papers of Grigorii N. Trubetskoi’, *Cahiers du Monde russe* 46, no. 4 (October–December 2005): 851–854; Clara Anderson, ‘Blagden Papers at the Royal Society’, *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 61, no. 2 (2007): 237–238; Caitlin Moore and Lyn Robinson, ‘The Monty Hyams Archive: A new resource for the information history of the late twentieth century’, *Journal of Documentation* 73, no. 2 (2017): 357–367.

²⁵ For example Virginia Stewart, ‘A Primer on Manuscript Field Work’, in *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*, eds. Maygene F. Daniels, and Timothy Walch (Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Services, 1984), 124–138; Mary Lynn McCree, ‘Good Sense and Good Judgment: Defining Collections and Collecting’, in *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*, 103–113; F. Gerald Ham, ‘The Archival Edge’, *The American Archivist* 38, no. 1 (January 1975): 5–13; Edmund Berkeley, Jr., ‘Appraisal of Current Private

millennium, as Riva Pollard noted, there was still a lack ‘in specific guidelines for addressing key theoretical questions of which people within society should be targeted for the acquisition of papers, and which materials within those papers should be retained’.²⁶ Similarly, Christopher Lee pointed out, a decade after Pollard, that as a result of the ambivalence in the status of personal archive, ‘practical guidance and empirical findings about archival treatment of personal papers and manuscripts has tended to be underrepresented in the published professional literature’.²⁷

Nevertheless, Jennifer Douglas has observed ‘an augmented focus on personal archives in the archival literature, beginning with the dedication, in 1996, of a special issue of the Australian journal *Archives and Manuscripts* to the topic’.²⁸ Some of these articles focus on issues regarding archival practice such as arrangement, description and appraisal of personal archives in Australia.²⁹ In addition, there are also articles that address theoretical issues on the treatment of personal archives, as well as the nature of personal records and personal recordkeeping behaviours.

Among the scholars who have constantly touched upon the theoretical issues is Richard Cox, who argues for the evidential value of personal archives. He remarks:

An individual maintains records for generally the same reasons as does an organisation – to meet the needs of accountability, evidence and corporate memory. Personal records are created out of the same needs to capture transactions, document activities, serve legal and

Papers and Collection Development’, *The Midwestern Archivist* VI, no. 1 (1981): 59–71; F. Gerald Ham, *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts* (Chicago, Society of American Archivists, 1993); Mark Greene, “‘The Surest Proof’: A Utilitarian Approach to Appraisal”, *Archivaria* 45 (Spring 1998): 127–169.

²⁶ Riva A. Pollard, ‘The Appraisal of Personal Papers: A Critical Literature Review’, *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 140. For a brief review of the pre-2000 archival literature on the appraisal of personal records, see Leah Sander, ‘Collecting Our Thoughts and Re-collecting Our Stories: The Collection of Personal Records in Archival Institutions’ (master’s thesis, University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg, 2004), 61–68.

²⁷ Christopher A. Lee, introduction to *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011), 8.

²⁸ Douglas, ‘Archiving Authors’, 24–25, referring to *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996).

²⁹ Margaret Southcott, Neil Thomas and Roger Andre, ‘Theory, Practice and Pragmatism: Arrangement and Description of Personal Papers in the Mortlock Library of South Australia’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 102–115; Graeme Powell, ‘The Collecting of Personal and Private Papers in Australia’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 62–77.

administrative functions, and provide a basis for memory. We maintain records to create our own evidence of crucial work, to protect ourselves, and to provide a kind of corporate memory of home, work, and family.³⁰

Cox does not see personal recordkeeping as being different from what is practised in an organisational context. This has led to the idea that both institutional and private records could similarly be appraised for the evidential value.

Sue McKemmish has echoed Cox on the evidential quality of personal archives in her ‘Evidence of *me*’.³¹ Based on the records continuum theory, whose development she was deeply involved in, McKemmish regards a record as both evidence of social activities and as social agent in its own right. She argues that ‘[r]ecordkeeping ‘is a “kind of witnessing”. At a personal level it is a way of evidencing and memorialising our lives’.³² In short, McKemmish views personal archives in terms of functionality and evidence. The functionality of a personal archive is equal to ‘its capacity to witness a life’ and is ‘dependent on how systematically we go about the business of creating our records as documents, capturing them as evidence ... and keeping them and discarding them over time’.³³

Chris Hurley shares a similar idea that the concept of archival evidence can accommodate personal archives.³⁴ In fact, he has maintained that there is little or no difference in the archival treatment of organisational and personal archives. This can be evidenced by his 1977 article in response to that of Graeme Powell who observed that traditional archival theory could not be applied to personal archives.³⁵ In 1996,

³⁰ Richard J. Cox, ‘The Record in the Manuscript Collection’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 52.

³¹ Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of *me*’, *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 174–187.

³² McKemmish, ‘Evidence of *me*’, 175.

³³ *Ibid.*

³⁴ Chris Hurley, ‘Beating the French’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 13–18.

³⁵ See C[h]ris Hurley, ‘Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 8 (February 1977): 351 – 365, in which he argues against Graeme T. Powell’s observation that traditional archival theory may not apply to personal papers. Powell, ‘Archival

Hurley admitted that the understanding of the concept of archival evidence should be expanded so that it would better accommodate personal archives in the context of electronic recordkeeping. Even so, he insists that there should be little or no difference in the way archivists treat personal and organisational archives.³⁶

However, the idea that organisational recordkeeping theory is applicable to personal recordkeeping without any issue is challenged by Verne Harris. He comments that the idea of much too simplistic, asking '[w]hy should the capacity to witness through personal records depend on the degree of "functionality"?'³⁷ Rather, it is argued that the creation of personal records 'is contaminated by the human instinct to tell story and to create identity', and that personal archives are more about 'storytelling', 'memory' or 'remembrancing', than they are the systematic capturing of transactional evidence.³⁸ For Harris, the realm of personal archives 'is one fraught with complexity' and a 'wilderness' to be acknowledged, respected, and conserved, rather than controlled or 'to tame, to destroy'.³⁹

Similarly, Catherine Hobbs criticises McKemmish's focus on functionality and transactionality in personal archives. She comments that McKemmish has overly placed emphasis on the 'public or formal roles of the individual' and on the interactions that the individual has with others in society.⁴⁰ That is, too much attention has been paid to the 'outer transactional context of records'. Hobbs questions whether 'evidence of me' must always be interpreted as 'evidence of me interacting with

Principles and the Treatment of Personal Papers', *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 7 (August 1976): 259–268.

³⁶ Hurley, 'Beating the French'.

³⁷ Verne Harris, 'On the Back of a Tiger: Deconstructive Possibilities in "Evidence of Me"', *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 12.

³⁸ Ibid.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Catherine Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals', *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 131.

persons and institutions in the conduct of affairs?’⁴¹ According to Hobbs, personal archives are characterised by individuality and idiosyncrasy. Traditional archival theory cannot account for such characters, due to its focus on “the corporate and the collective”.⁴²

When suggesting archivists not to analyse and assess personal archives based on their functionality and transactionality, Hobbs argues that they should instead pay attention to the psychology and character of personal archives. She further explains that personal archives record not ‘just the facts and acts’, but also the individual’s ‘views, opinions, prejudices, and emotional reactions’. As such, it is not only activities and transactions, but also ‘individual character’ and ‘personality’ that are documented in personal archives. They ‘reflect not only what a person does or thinks, but who they are, how they envision and experience their lives’.⁴³ It should be noted that Hobbs bases these arguments on her experience working on literary archives, which, according to her, fit well with the ideas of understanding personal archives as reflective of personality and character of their creators.

Harris’ idea on the ‘wilderness’ and Hobbs’ emphasis on ‘character’ and ‘psychology’ of personal archives have been echoed by archival scholars working on this type of archives. Douglas observes that they ‘have gained a certain amount of currency in the archival discourse’.⁴⁴ For instance, Leah Sander, in her thesis on personal records in archival institutions, calls for a recognition of the ‘human factor’ that ‘renders personal records so distinct from corporate ones’,⁴⁵ and looks for evidence of character and personality in the fonds that she studies. Sara Hodson, in her article about the privacy rights and expectations of authors and celebrities, asserts that

⁴¹ Ibid., 130.

⁴² Ibid., 127.

⁴³ Ibid.

⁴⁴ Douglas, ‘Archiving Authors’, 33.

⁴⁵ Sander, ‘Collecting Our Thoughts’, 70.

most of the value of a personal papers collection lies in those papers that are most ‘intimate’, ‘sensitive’, and revealing of their creator’s personal life.⁴⁶ Amy Tector refers to Hobbs’ ideas on the significance of personal archives as evidence of character and attitude as a key factor in deciding to acquire the private papers of Magdalena Rasekvich, the wife of a well-known Canadian literary figure.⁴⁷ In addition, Jo Klett argues, in an article describing the cataloguing of three English poets’ archives, that judging from the manner in which materials were packed for transfer to the archive (i.e. whether or not they arrived organised), personalities of the poets are ‘very much apparent’.⁴⁸ With the emergence of digital personal archives, scholars also tend to relate this type of archives to the personality and psychology of their creators, and explore acts of ‘personal digital archiving’ in connection with concepts drawn from social psychology such as ‘self-extension’⁴⁹ and ‘self-reflectivity’⁵⁰ to determine the ways in which building a personal archive contributes to an individual’s identity and sense of self.

Despite being supported and cited by archivists, Hobbs’ and Harris’ ideas about personal records and recordkeeping are challenged by Douglas, in her doctoral studies based on literary fonds. She points out that the ideas ‘rest on several suppositions’. These include:

the beliefs that personal records are different in nature than (sic) other records, that concepts such as ‘character,’ ‘personality,’ and ‘intention’ can be revealed – to varying extents – in archival materials, and that archivists can properly interpret these concepts

⁴⁶ Sara S. Hodson, ‘In Secret Kept, In Silence Sealed: Privacy in the Papers of Authors and Celebrities’, *The American Archivist* 67, no. 2 (Fall/Winter 2004): 206.

⁴⁷ Amy Tector, ‘The Almost Accidental Archive and its Impacts on Literary Subjects and Canonicity’, *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 100.

⁴⁸ Jo Klett, ‘From Private Horde to Public Collection: Cataloguing the Archives of the Liverpool Poets’, *SCONUL Focus* 50 (2010): 83.

⁴⁹ Amber L. Cushing, ‘Self Extension and the Desire to Preserve Digital Possessions’, *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 48 (2011): 1–3.

⁵⁰ Sarah Kim, ‘Personal Digital Archives: Preservation of Documents, Preservation of Self’ (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2013).

based on the content and physical order of the materials they acquire.⁵¹

According to Douglas, Hobbs casts the archivist as a kind of psychiatrist with the ‘closet to an all-seeing view’ of a creator’s ‘documentary output’ – a view more ‘all-seeing’ than the creator’s own. ‘The archivist is presumed to be able to correctly identify aspects of “character,” “personality,” and “intention” in the archives of individuals and is advised to use these concepts to help her determine how to appraise, arrange and describe personal materials’.⁵²

Attempting to find an alternative approach, Douglas turns to the ‘life writing’ literature in which ‘the notion that “character,” “personality,” or “intention” can be relayed through text has been disputed’.⁵³ Instead of regarding a personal archive as ‘an intimate site of revelation’,⁵⁴ Douglas suggests, archivists should ‘pay more attention to a variety of agents and actions that shape the structure and meaning of an archive’.⁵⁵ That is:

by studying, describing and accounting for the decisions and actions that have led to an archive’s construction and evolution over time, archivists can provide a fuller picture of the nature of the archive than they may be able to do by focusing more exclusively on the life and character of the individual responsible for its primary creation⁵⁶

In this reading, Douglas’ criticisms of Hobbs may be right in that there are more ‘agents’ than merely the creator involved in the formation of a given record, whose role is as important as that of the creator. Archivists should not overlook these ‘agents’ and their ‘actions’. However, traditional archival theory cannot accommodate the complexity (or wilderness, as Harris puts it) of personal archives, as archivists

⁵¹ Douglas, ‘Archiving Authors’, 35.

⁵² Ibid.

⁵³ Ibid., 36.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 56.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 59.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 35.

have continued to lamented.⁵⁷ As such, it is crucial to have alternatives to the traditional archival framework. And, it seems that such scholars as Harris, Hobbs and Douglas have attempted to fill such a theoretical gap. Nevertheless, Douglas, like Hobbs, relies on one type of creator or, rather, keeper – literary authors – when, in fact, there are other types of creator/keeper of personal archives.

Having said that, it does not mean that Hobbs' and Douglas' arguments are not viable, but that there should be more studies on other types of personal archives. In fact, there have been a small number of research which fill this gap, especially as archivists have faced the challenge of digital personal archiving. For instance, using the papers of contemporary British politicians as a case study, the PARADIGM (Personal ARchives Accessible in DIGtal Media) project, based at the Universities of Oxford and Manchester, has explored how archivists may select, acquire, process, store, preserve and provide access to the digital archives of individuals for use of future researchers.⁵⁸ Joseph Kaye and his colleagues have explored personal archives of forty-eight academics of various disciplines, at Cornell University, to understand the goals and structures of personal archiving.⁵⁹ Although these two projects aim more at practical implications for practitioners, they have born some theoretical contributions. One from each is worth mentioning.

First, in the PARADIGM project, Susan Thomas and Janette Martin have dealt with personal papers kept by contemporary, living politicians, and found an issue in

⁵⁷ See, for example, Pollard, 'The Appraisal of Personal Papers'; Hodson, 'In Secret Kept'; John Langdon 'Describing the Digital: The Archival Cataloguing of Born-Digital Personal Papers', *Archives and Records* 37, no. 1 (2016): 37–52.

⁵⁸ Susan Thomas, and Janette Martin, 'Using the Papers of Contemporary British Politicians as a Testbed for the Preservation of Digital Personal Archives', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 27, no. 1 (April 2006): 29–56.

⁵⁹ Joseph 'Jofish' Kaye et al., 'To Have and to Hold: Exploring the Personal Archive', in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montréal, Québec, Canada, 22-28 April 2006), 275–284.

defining the personal papers. They ask ‘what *is* personal?’⁶⁰ In fact, they were looking for materials reflecting the professional role of the politicians. The key selection criteria were based on the roles, activities and relationships that the records at which they were looking bear witness to.⁶¹ Still, they found ‘the potential for overlap between the content preserved in a personal archive and that contained in official records preserved under legislative requirements’,⁶² which complicated the process. However, the case has shown that under this condition, the idea of records as evidence of a life, and witness to roles, activities and relationships of an individual – or, in McKemmish’s term, ‘evidence of *me*’ – is applicable. In addition, such a complication seems to be unravelled when viewing from a perspective of the records continuum thinking, in which a personal archive, as McKemmish and Michael Piggott suggest, includes

all forms, genres, and media of records relating to that person, whether captured in personal or corporate recordkeeping systems; remembered, transmitted orally, or performed; held in manuscript collections, archival and other cultural institutions, community archives, or other keeping places; or stored in shared digital spaces.⁶³

Second, in exploring personal archives of academics, Kaye and others observe a pattern in what they refer to as the ‘*functions* of the individual archives’, which are interpreted as ‘goals and uses’.⁶⁴ That is, their attempt is to account for how individual archives are used and for what purposes they are kept. They have gone beyond ‘functions’ in the archival sense, and suggest, albeit not explicitly, how archivists may approach ‘functions’ when studying a personal archive.

⁶⁰ Thomas and Martin, ‘Using the Papers of Contemporary British Politicians’, 39. (Emphasis original)

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid., 40.

⁶³ Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice’, *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 113.

⁶⁴ Kaye et al., ‘To Have and to Hold’, 276. (Emphasis original)

A significant implication of the two studies discussed above is that there are potentials to fill the research gaps in terms of both the object of study and the theoretical framework. These two examples take different types of personal archives and different frameworks from those by Hobbs and Douglas, and show that there are still rooms for inquiries into this underrepresented field.

Indeed, there have been attempts to fill such a gap in recent years, especially with the challenges posed by digital records and recordkeeping. Key contributions can be found in a compilation entitled *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*.⁶⁵ Catherine Marshall,⁶⁶ for instance, posits that personal digital collections not only are diverse but also span many repositories, storage media and file systems. As such, management of personal digital archives over time is a problem extending far beyond accurately rendering obsolete formats. According to Marshall, it is important to develop measures and strategies to properly appraise, select, organise, maintain and preserve personal digital archives. Adrian Cunningham⁶⁷ focuses on a principle-based approach to dealing with the complex realities of digital personal recordkeeping. He sees the relevance of the principles developed by the International Council on Archives for institutional recordkeeping to personal recordkeeping. Importantly, Cunningham makes a strong case for collaboration and mutual learning among those responsible for personal records and organisational records. Also in this volume is McKemmish's reprise of her earlier article, 'Evidence of Me ...'.⁶⁸ In this piece, she explores the relationship between personal and public recordkeeping, as well as

⁶⁵ Christopher A. Lee, ed., *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era* (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011).

⁶⁶ Catherine C. Marshall, 'Challenges and Opportunities for Personal Digital Archiving', in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 90–114.

⁶⁷ Adrian Cunningham, 'Ghosts in the Machine: Towards a Principle-Based Approach to Making and Keeping Digital Records', in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 78–89.

⁶⁸ Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World', in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 115–148.

investigates and challenges conventional archival assumptions about personal archives. McKemmish makes the point that her ‘evidence of *me*’ is still relevant and applicable to recordkeeping in the context of digital technologies, record forms and practices. Apart from theoretical issues, this volume also includes works with implications on archival practice such as the appraisal of personal materials in the social web,⁶⁹ and the management of digital photographs of a particular category of photographers.⁷⁰ In addition, practitioners also share their experiences in managing digital collections of personal archives from such places as the University of Virginia Library⁷¹ and the Oxford University’s Bodleian Library.⁷²

The trend set by the volume *I, Digital* is ongoing. There has been an increasing interest in personal archives and recordkeeping.⁷³ Still, also ongoing in parallel is what McKemmish and Piggott refer to as the ‘binary opposition’ between organisational and personal archives in conventional archival thinking.⁷⁴ As a result, there have been attempts to find alternative approaches to examining personal archives, which would accommodate the various needs of individuals to keep their records and memories.⁷⁵ Records continuum theory is one of these alternatives. According to this theory,

⁶⁹ Christopher A. Lee, ‘Collecting the Externalized Me: Appraisal of Materials in the Social Web’, in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 202–238.

⁷⁰ Kristina M. Spurgin, “‘Three Backups is a Minimum’: A First Look at Norms and Practices in the Digital Photo Collections of Serious Photographers”, in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 151–201.

⁷¹ Leslie Johnston, ‘Making It Usable: Developing Personal Collection Tools for Digital Collections’, in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 257–279.

⁷² Susan Thomas, ‘Curating the I, Digital’, in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011): 280–305.

⁷³ Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau, preface to *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, eds. Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J. Lau (Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017), 18.

⁷⁴ McKemmish and Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse’.

⁷⁵ Anne J. Gilliland, ‘Archival and Recordkeeping Traditions in the Multiverse and Their Importance for Researching Situations and Situating Research’, in *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, eds. Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J. Lau (Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017), 56.

personal archive is defined in a more encompassing manner than that of traditional archival theory. This will be discussed in the next chapter.

To summarise, this chapter has presented a review of the archival literature with reference to personal archives. It has shown that since this type of archive has historically been neglected, there are relatively lesser scholarly studies of this topic in the archival literature.⁷⁶ Nevertheless, in the past two decades, such a gap has increasingly been filled. There are a number of alternative approaches to examining a given body of personal archive. This review of the literature has shown a concentration on the approach focusing on the psychology and character of the creator of the personal archive, and on the cases of literary fonds. As such, there needs to be more studies in order to broaden the variety of the literature. This current study is an attempt to fill the research gap in terms of the object of study and the theoretical framework. While the former has been described briefly in the previous chapter, the latter will be discussed in the next.

⁷⁶ Lee, introduction to *I, Digital*, 8.

CHAPTER 3

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The theoretical framework for this study is drawn from the concept of ‘evidence of *me*’,¹ which Sue McKemmish developed based on the records continuum thinking. As such, it will be beneficial to consider a brief overview of the development and growth of the records continuum as a theoretical model. Then, the chapter will discuss how the ‘evidence of *me*’ can be used as a framework to analyse Tej Bunnag’s private papers collection, held at the Siam Society Library.

3.1 The records continuum model: an overview

The records continuum in its theoretical form known today was first proposed by Frank Upward, in 1996,² although the concept has an origin dating back to the work of Ian MacLean, through the Commonwealth Record Series System³ which was implemented in Australia by Peter Scott in the 1960s.⁴ The theoretical framework of this thesis is drawn from the notion deeply influenced by Upward’s records continuum model.

Yet, it is worth noting that the term ‘continuum’ had been used – albeit with a different meaning – before Upward introduced his model in 1996. In 1985, as Jay Atherton critiqued the records lifecycle model – in which records would pass through

¹ Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of *me*’, *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 174–187.

² Frank Upward, ‘Structuring the Records Continuum – Part One: Postcustodial Principles and Properties’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (November 1996): 268 – 285; ‘Structuring the Records Continuum – Part Two: Structuration Theory and Recordkeeping’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 25, no. 1 (May 1997): 10–35.

³ The system takes the series, rather than the fonds, at the highest archival level. See Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, eds., *The Records Continuum: Ian MacLean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years* (Clayton: Ancora Press, 1994).

⁴ Peter J. Scott, ‘The Record Group Concept: A Case for Abandonment’, *The American Archivist* 29, no. 4 (October 1966): 493–504.

clearly defined stages from creation to final disposition – he suggested a continuum approach to managing records and archives.⁵ To Atherton, it did not seem logical that records would be managed in distinct ways until the final selection for inclusion in archives or until their destruction. In other words, he did not see the need for a transfer of responsibilities for records from records managers to archivists. Furthermore, he questioned whether or not the management of current records was the first stage in administration of archives, or the continuing preservation of valuable records the last step in records management. He remarked that the separation of records management and archives administration under the lifecycle model was redundant, and hence the continuum of responsibilities of records managers and archivists. There are four interrelated stages in his model: creation (or receipt), classification, establishment of retention/disposal schedules (and their subsequent implementation), and maintenance and use (in the creating office, inactive storage or archives). Central to Atherton's continuum model is the idea that records managers and archivists share the same work and not two separate domains.⁶ Even though the terminology from the lifecycle model remains, '[a]ll four stages are interrelated, forming a continuum in which both records managers and archivists are involved, to varying degrees, in the ongoing management of recorded information'.⁷

Roughly a decade after Atherton had referred to the idea of 'continuum' in archives and recordkeeping, in 1996 Upward articulated the records continuum model, in his two-part article.⁸ After such an articulation, the model continued to evolve, resulting in changes to certain areas in the original diagram. Drawing on Anthony

⁵ Jay Atherton, 'From Life Cycle to Continuum: Some Thoughts on the Records Management-Archives Relationship', *Archivaria* 21 (Winter 1985-1986): 43–51.

⁶ Heather Ann Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier: Understanding the Records Continuum as a Framework for Examining the Role of Records in a Community' (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2015), 46.

⁷ Atherton, 'From Life Cycle to Continuum', 48.

⁸ See footnote 2 above.

Giddens' structuration theory,⁹ 'Upward's work serves as a reminder that archives and records theory and practice based upon it does not exist in a vacuum, by setting this theory and practice in the wider context of developments in the social sciences in the twentieth century'.¹⁰ As a consistent and coherent management regime, the records continuum model can be regarded as 'a unifying framework for recordkeeping that brings together the work of archivists and records managers, provides a lens for post-custodial discussion, and challenges the lifecycle model that still frames much of North American archival and records management practice'.¹¹

Figure 3.1. Records Continuum Model (by Frank Upward)

Figure 3.1 shows the records continuum model as presented by Upward. There are four dimensions (create, capture, organise and pluralise) and four themes (identity,

⁹ For a concise discussion on influences of Giddens' structuration theory on the records continuum thinking, see Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier', 48–51.

¹⁰ Sarah J. A. Flynn, 'The Records Continuum Model in Context and its Implications for Archival Practice', *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 22, no. 1 (2001): 81.

¹¹ Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier', 40.

transactionality, evidentiality and recordkeeping containers) in the diagram.

Represented by concentric circles, the four dimensions link the four themes together.

These dimensions join the individual record to its contexts, while the themes are coordinates that make the diagram a structure.

Dimension 1: Create

As shown in the diagram, the *create* dimension is at the centre. This represents the beginning of a record and situates it within its context. This dimension involves an *actor* (creator) or *actors* (creators), the *transaction* in which the actor takes part (and in which a document is created as a result), the *document* itself (with or without archival characteristics), and the *trace* (or representation) of that transaction born by the document.

Dimension 2: Capture

In the *capture* dimension, the record created in the first dimension is placed into a broader group context. This dimension involves the (organisational) *unit* with which the actor is associated, the *activity* in the context of which transactions take place, the created document (together with information about its context) captured as a *record*, and the *evidence* (as a result).

Dimension 3: Organise

In the *organise* dimension, the *organisation* is linked to its *functions* and the activities which constitute those functions, to the *archive*, and to its own *corporate memory*. This dimension brings together in the same place the records created and captured in the first two dimensions, and requires, as Upward asserts, '[c]ommonly navigable structures and understandings'.¹²

¹² Frank Upward, 'Modelling the Continuum as Paradigm Shift in Recordkeeping and Archiving Processes, and Beyond – A Personal Reflection', *Records Management Journal* 10, no. 3 (December 2000): 122.

Dimension 4: Pluralise

The *pluralise* dimension represents the placement of records and archives in society. The plural archives are set in the context of *collective* (or societal) *memory*. The term *institution* is meant to reflect the broader social recognition of organisations, while *purpose* equates to functions viewed from a broader societal perspective. Pluralisation includes the reuse and representation of the record for new and multiple audiences and meanings, and ‘involves the use of information [from the record] in ways which are less predictable and controllable’.¹³

In contrast with the lifecycle model, there are no separate steps in a continuum. That is, managing records is considered a continuous process, in which one element of the continuum can seamlessly pass into another. Furthermore, the four dimensions in the continuum are not time-based. Rather, they represent different perspectives on the management of records. The circles move out from the creation of records (in the first dimension), to ensuring that records are captured as evidence (in the second dimension) and to their inclusion in formal systems for records management within the organisation (in the third dimension), while the fourth dimension reaches out towards the (societal) needs for collective memory. Unlike the lifecycle model in which records are first kept for organisational purposes, and only come to meet the needs of a wider society as archives in the later stages of their lives, the continuum model ‘embraces the view that records function simultaneously as organisational and collective memory from the time of their creation’.¹⁴

¹³ Ibid.

¹⁴ Sue McKemmish, ‘Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Continuum of Responsibility’, *Proceedings of the Records Management Association of Australia 14th National Convention*, 15–17 September 1997. Accessed on 19 April 2016 at <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/groups/rcrg/publications/recordscontinuum-smckp2.html>

In her analysis and reflection on the evolution of records continuum theory and practice in Australia, Sue McKemmish¹⁵ elucidates three key characteristics of the records continuum theory, namely, the plurality of the record, the conceptualisation of the record as both enduring and perduring, and the concept of multiple provenance. Indeed, these concepts underpin the records continuum theory, and contribute greatly to making it different from lifecycle thinking. It is worth considering these key characteristics briefly.

Firstly, with reference to the Australian traditions of recordkeeping since the time before the colonising nations arrived in the continent, McKemmish makes the point that records take many forms,

‘including records embodied in people or contained within country, transmitted and accessed through storytelling and performance using speech, dance, art, music and song (for example the songlines in which a wealth of Indigenous knowledge is embedded in country-centric ribbons of song, narrative and performance); rock paintings and carvings; markings on message sticks; and stories of country etched into the linings of possum skin cloaks’.¹⁶

It was only after colonisation that written records became dominant, the pre-colonial recordkeeping traditions were disrupted and lost. This is because, as Ann Laura Stoler argues¹⁷, records and archives were an important part of the infrastructure enabling the colonists to control their far-flung empires and subjugate indigenous peoples. Over time, ‘the written record of a coloniser was privileged over the oral record of a colonised people’,¹⁸ hence marginalising other traditions of recordkeeping. Consequently, orality and the idea of the ‘pre-literate society’ are ‘constructed as

¹⁵ Sue McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum: An Australian Tradition’, in *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, eds. Anne L. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau (Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017), 122–160.

¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 126.

¹⁷ Ann Laura Stoler, ‘Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance’, *Archival Science* 2, no. 1–2 (March 2002): 87–109; See also, Ann Laura Stoler, *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009).

¹⁸ McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum’, 126.

embodying interior forms of evidence, memory and knowledge transmission'.¹⁹ With the superiority of written records in place, there are power imbalances in the current archives and recordkeeping practices.²⁰ In order to transform archival practices and refigure archival spaces to embrace and represent multiple voices and perspectives, the records continuum theory takes its place among the various traditions of recordkeeping.²¹ As such, central to the records continuum theory is the plurality of the record. In other words, the theory recognises the various means of recording data, as well as the many forms the records can possibly take, hence defining the term 'record' in the very broadest sense to encompass 'oral and written records, literature, landscape, dance, art, the built environment and artefacts' insofar as they provide traces of social and organisational activity, that evidence and memorialise individual and collective lives.²² By memorialisation, McKemmish refers to the act of preserving memories. In this context, it means records that have memories embedded in them.

Secondly, as mentioned previously, in the continuum thinking, records are regarded as both organisational and collective memories from the time of their creation.²³ In other words, records are of enduring nature. There is no transformation, as in the lifecycle thinking, of a record into an archive due to its continuing value(s). Rather, a record continues to exist throughout spacetime. As the records continuum worldview recognises the unity of space and time, the records continuum model is, according to Upward, a tool for perceiving and analysing the complex realities,

¹⁹ Sue McKemmish, Shannon Faulkhead, and Lynette Russell, 'Distrust in the Archive: Reconciling Records', *Archival Science* 11, no. 3–4 (November 2011): 218.

²⁰ Joanne Evans, Sue McKemmish, Elizabeth Daniels, and Gavan McCarthy, 'Self-Determination and Archival Autonomy: Advocating Activism', *Archival Science* 15, no. 4 (December 2015): 337–368; Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice', *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 111–144.

²¹ McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum', 125.

²² Sue McKemmish, 'Traces: Document, Record, Archive, Archives', in *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*, eds. Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, and Frank Upward (Wagga Wagga: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005), 1.

²³ McKemmish, 'Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow'.

providing multidimensional and multi-layered views of recordkeeping and archiving in different spacetimes.²⁴ Apart from being enduring, records are also perduring, for they persist ‘through constant renewal’.²⁵ To elaborate this point, McKemmish refers to Upward’s records continuum model (figure 3.1), and emphasises pluralisation (Dimension 4) of records ‘beyond the boundaries of an organisation, family or group, or an individual life’. She explains:

Pluralisation involves disembedding the record from its original multiple organisational and/or personal contexts and carrying it through space time. Thus recordkeeping processes fix the content and structure of records, preserve their integrity by ensuring they are tamper-proof, and link them to ever-widening layers of rich metadata about their multiple contexts of creation and use. This enables them to be accessed, used and interpreted in other spacetimes.²⁶

It is through pluralisation that records can be seen as perduring. That is, records have ‘multiple lives in spacetime as the contexts that surround their use and control alter and open up new thread of action’.²⁷ As a record is ‘configured and refigured through spacetime’, it ‘can never be experienced in all its dynamic complexity by a witness at any one point. It is not wholly present at any given moment, a particularly apt way of thinking about digital documents compared with the artefactual view of records as end products’.²⁸ In the records continuum theory, it is this perduring and enduring duality that is key to an understanding of the nature of records.

Thirdly, intending to make archival spaces representative of multiple voices and perspectives, and serve the needs of wider communities, records continuum theorists and researchers have developed the concept of multiple (simultaneous)

²⁴ Upward, ‘Modelling the Continuum’, 117–119.

²⁵ McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum’, 139.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ Upward, ‘Modelling the Continuum’, 119.

²⁸ McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum’, 140.

provenance.²⁹ Such the concept recognises the idea of records co-creation, as well as multiple records creators. As Chris Hurley highlights, without this notion of multiple provenance and the acceptance of records co-creation, modern archival theory and practice are complicit in privileging the single records creator, and treat individual participants in the transactions and interactions documented in the records as subjects of the records with a very limited range of rights.³⁰ Consequently, as it is the case in Australia³¹, decisions about what records to make and keep as archives are made with little or no consultation with various parties involved or consideration of their recordkeeping needs. Furthermore, the contexts of their involvement in the activities or events documented in the record are not sufficiently captured in, or left out from, the archival descriptive systems. On the contrary, by recognising the co-creation and multiple provenance, the records continuum theory ‘repositions “records subjects” as well as those who are directly impacted by the record as “participatory records agents”’.³² In this manner, a broader spectrum of rights is supported in terms of responsibilities and obligations relating to appraisal, description, management, accessibility, and use of records. Ultimately, as McKemmish asserts,

it brings the multiple contexts and perspectives of the repositioned subjects and those directly impacted by the records into play in decision making – about what records to creat and keep; what records are of continuing value; what metadata needs to be captured to document their multiple contexts; whose rights need to be taken into account in determining disclosure, access, and use policies; and what perspectives need to be addressed in access pathways.³³

Since Upward’s first articulation of the continuum concept in 1996, there have been discussions and debates on the model, including the dynamic conversations

²⁹ Chris Hurley, ‘Parallel Provenance: (1) What if anything is archival description’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 1 (May 2005): 110–145; ‘Parallel Provenance: (2) When something is not related to everything else’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 2 (November 2005): 52–91.

³⁰ Ibid.

³¹ McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum’, 147.

³² Ibid.

³³ Ibid., 148.

between Harris, McKemmish and Upward.³⁴ The records continuum model has also been referred to as a paradigm shift and regarded as providing ‘probably the best extant example of contemporary theory-building’ in archival studies.³⁵ Other archival scholars such as Brien Brothman, Eric Ketelaar and Verne Harris have praised the originality and influential contribution of the records continuum to the archival discourse. Moreover, some continuum thinkers have also aimed to position and extend this model as being applicable to supporting a broader view of societal recordkeeping, rather than using it merely to frame the reading of records within the creating organisational or institutional context.³⁶

Table 3.1. Generations of continuum thinking.

First generation	<i>Foundational</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Explaining and mapping the foundations and contours of the records continuum
Second generation	<i>Functional</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using for evidential and functional description Focusing on create, capture, organise
Third generation	<i>Evolving understanding</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Connecting with discussions of pluralisation, collective memory, archival multiverse

Source: Adapted from Soyka, ‘Records as Force Multiplier’, 53.

As a relatively ‘young’ approach to managing records (including archives), the continuum model has been evolving ever since its introduction in 1996. Heather Soyka observes that the records continuum scholarship may be divided into three overlapping generations (as shown in table 3.1), each with its own focus and direction.³⁷ The first generation can be best described as foundational, focusing on the explanation and

³⁴ Verne Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger: Deconstructive Possibilities in “Evidence of Me”’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 8–21; Frank Upward and Sue McKemmish, ‘In Search of the Lost Tiger, by Way of Sainte-Beuve: Reconstructing the Possibilities in “Evidence of Me...”’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 22–42.

³⁵ Verne Harris, ‘Record-keeping and Records Continuum Thinkers: Examining a Seminal Australian Text’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 2 (November 2005): 161.

³⁶ Soyka, ‘Records as Force Multiplier’, 43.

³⁷ *Ibid.*, 51–53.

elucidation of the origins and possible uses, ‘seeking to place and explain continuum concepts for use in teaching and scholarships’.³⁸ The first-generation scholarship is expressed in Upward’s seminal works,³⁹ and publications by Sue McKemmish,⁴⁰ as well as their colleagues from Monash University and the Records Continuum Research Group.

The second generation focuses on the use of the continuum for functional and evidential description. It is mainly concerned with the first three dimensions of the continuum, namely, create, capture and organise, respectively. This generation of the continuum scholarship can be exemplified by the works of Livia Iacovino⁴¹ and Geoffrey Yeo,⁴² and Iyra S. Buenrostro.⁴³ This generation has seen the development of the Australian Standard for recordkeeping, which the ISO standard is later based on.⁴⁴

The third generation concerns with the fourth dimension of the continuum model (pluralisation). It has continued to evolved with regards to such notions as community records, parallel provenance and archival multiverse, which connect with the wider audiences of archival records.⁴⁵ Soyka also includes in this generation ‘additional continuum models that are layered atop the original information processing grain, such as the Cultural Heritage continuum’.⁴⁶ A key example of works categorised in this generation is the project ‘Trust and Technology: Building Archival Systems for

³⁸ The major works are Upward, ‘Structuring the Records Continuum – Part One’; ‘Structuring the Records Continuum – Part Two’; and ‘Modelling the Continuum as Paradigm Shift’.

³⁹ Such as McKemmish, ‘Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow’; ‘Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice’, *Archival Science* 1, no. 4 (December 2001): 333–359.

⁴⁰ Soyka, ‘Records as Force Multiplier’, 51.

⁴¹ Livia Iacovino, ‘Multi-Method Interdisciplinary Research in Archival Science: The Case of Recordkeeping, Ethics and Law’, *Archival Science* 4, no. 3–4 (December 2004): 267–286.

⁴² Geoffrey Yeo, ‘Concepts of Record (1): Evidence, Information, and Persistent Representations’, *The American Archivist* 70, no. 2 (Fall 2007): 315–343; ‘Concepts of Record (2): Prototypes and Boundary Objects’, *The American Archivist* 71, no. 1 (Spring 2008): 118–143.

⁴³ Iyra S. Buenrostro, ‘Preserving the Postwar Archives Heritage and Collective Memory of Bulacan: Local Government Records and Practice’, *Journal of Philippine Librarianship* 30, no. 1 (2010): 56–74.

⁴⁴ Soyka, ‘Records as Force Multiplier’, 52.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid., 52–53.

Oral Memory’ conducted at Monash University.⁴⁷ It has engaged indigenous Australian communities in the formation of archival collections and enabling shared community control and agency in the records. Drawing on continuum thinking, the project moved beyond conventional configurations of archives, traditional notions of ownership of and rights in government records based on the construct of a singular records creator, and the boundaries between personal and public records. The aim is to provide an archival space where control is shared and all parties involved can negotiate for a framework in which multiple views, provenances and rights in records coexist.⁴⁸ There is also a growing body of literature resulting from continuous research on Australian indigenous forms of records and oral memory. These studies draw on the records continuum theory⁴⁹

More recent examples, apart from Soyka’s thesis itself, include those by Andrew Lau and Leisa Gibbons. While Soyka has applied the records continuum model on a single case of military online communities and further discussed how the model could be to explore the roles of records in a community,⁵⁰ Lau worked on a case study of an art community in Los Angeles. He has analysed the documentation practices of that community through the theoretical lens of records continuum, and

⁴⁷ For details of the project, see <https://www.monash.edu/it/our-research/research-centres-and-labs/cosi/projects/completed-projects/trust>; the project’s final report is available from <https://www.monash.edu/it/our-research/research-centres-and-labs/cosi/projects/completed-projects/trust/final-report>

⁴⁸ Fiona Ross, Sue McKemmish, and Shannon Faulkhead, ‘Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 2 (November 2006): 112–151.

⁴⁹ For example, Shannon Faulkhead, ‘Narratives of Koorie Victoria’ (PhD diss., Monash University, 2008); Sue McKemmish, Shannon Faulkhead, Livia Iacovino, and Kristen Thorpe, ‘Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Embracing Multiple Ways of Knowing and Keeping’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 38, no. 1 (May 2010): 27–50; Shauna McRanor, ‘Maintaining the Reliability of Aboriginal Oral Records and their Material Manifestations: Implications for Archival Practice’, *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997): 64–88; and Livia Iacovino, ‘Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities’, *Archival Science* 10, no. 4 (December 2010): 353–372.

⁵⁰ Heather Ann Soyka, ‘Records as Force Multiplier: Understanding the Records Continuum as a Framework for Examining the Role of Records in a Community’ (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2015),

provided critical discussions of the records continuum and the burgeoning area of research on community archiving.⁵¹ Gibbons take the continuum approach to examine the YouTube case study. She has discussed the role of YouTube in the formation of culture, and explored assumptions and limitations of Australian cultural heritage institutions that collect YouTube video as cultural heritage.⁵²

It is worth noting that Soyka's use of the term 'generation' here is not purely time-based in that scholars in each generation have not only continued to contribute in their area, but also 'crossed' the generation to contribute in areas different from one in which they have previously done. In other words, a given continuum thinker may belong to more than one generation. McKemmish, for instance, had joined Upward in an attempt to flourish understandings of the records continuum model. Then she went on to suggest the application of continuum thinking on personal archives, with an emphasis on the capture and organise dimensions.⁵³ More recently, she has published, with Michael Piggott, a work on the archival multiverse, drawing on the records continuum thinking to challenge the divide between corporate and personal archives.⁵⁴ McKemmish's examples also reaffirm that the three generations of the continuum scholarship are overlapping. That is, a given work may belong to more than one generation. For example, Soyka herself indicates that her application of the continuum concepts on community archives 'adds to ongoing conversations and fits with the third generation of continuum scholarship'.⁵⁵ However, her research also contributes to the understanding of the continuum model as a theoretical framework for archival studies, which is focus of the first-generation scholarship.

⁵¹ Andrew J. Lau, 'Collecting Experience' (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2013), iv.

⁵² Leisa Gibbons, 'Culture in Continuum: YouTube, Small Memories and Memory Making' (PhD thesis, Monash University, 2015).

⁵³ McKemmish, 'Evidence of *me*', pp. 175–176.

⁵⁴ McKemmish and Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse'.

⁵⁵ Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier', 54.

To sum up, this section has provided a brief overview of the records continuum model⁵⁶ and explained its key elements, including the four dimensions (create, capture, organise and pluralise) and the four themes (identity, evidentiality, transactionality and recordkeeping containers) that hold the dimensions together. Additionally, the three characteristic concepts underpinning the continuum theory have been explained, namely, the plurality of the record, the conceptualisation of the record as both enduring and perduring, and the concept of multiple provenance. This section has also referred to Soyka's categorisation of the continuum scholarship into three overlapping generations, as well as their foci and directions. Such the categorisation suggests that there have been attempts to apply the records continuum model on different areas within records and archives management, and also other related fields. Personal recordkeeping is one of these areas. McKemmish, for one, have been supporting the utility of the continuum thinking in exploring personal archives, starting from her seminal work – the 'Evidence of *me*'. As mentioned earlier, this current study adopts the idea that personal recordkeeping is a kind of evidencing and memorialising a life, which is McKemmish's main argument in her 'Evidence of *me*'. Having looked at the records continuum model, the subsequent two sections will then consider the notion of 'evidence of *me*', and discuss its relevance as a framework for analysing Tej Bunnag's private papers collection at the Siam Society Library.

3.2 The 'evidence of *me*'

McKemmish's idea of the 'evidence of *me*' can be regarded as an extension of the record continuum thinking to personal recordkeeping, which, as she states, 'is a "kind of witnessing"'. On a personal level it is a way of evidencing and memorialising our

⁵⁶ For short accounts on historical development of the records continuum model, see Flynn, 'The Records Continuum Model in Context', 80–81; and Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier', 44–47.

lives', activities, experiences, relationships with others, identity and 'place' in the world.⁵⁷ When put in Soyka's categorisation of the continuum scholarship, the concept may be considered a part of the second generation, for its focus on functionality of personal archives. The key elements of the notion lie in the second and third dimensions of the records continuum model (i.e. capture and organise). Treating the act of recordkeeping as a kind of 'witnessing', McKemmish equates the 'functionality' of a personal archive to 'its capacity to witness a life', which

is dependent on how systematically we go about the business of creating our records as documents, *capturing* them as records (that is, ordering them in relation to each other and 'placing' them in the context of related activities), and keeping and discarding them over time (that is, *organising* them into function long-term memory of significant activities and relationships).⁵⁸

In order to understand a personal archive with which they are dealing, archivists can, McKemmish suggests,

analyse what is happening in personal recordkeeping in much the same way as they analyse corporate recordkeeping. Just as they can identify significant business functions and activities and specify what records are captured as evidence of those activities, so they can analyse socially assigned roles and related activities and draw conclusions about what records individuals in their personal capacity capture as evidence of these roles and activities — 'evidence of *me*'.⁵⁹

It is also possible to consider an individual (or the *me*) in terms of his or her relationships with others: '[s]pouse, lover, longtime companion, partner, parent, sibling, child, grandchild, friend, employee, taxpayer, citizen, subscriber ..., *me*, all these words place individuals in relation to others and in society'.⁶⁰ These

⁵⁷ McKemmish, 'Evidence of *me*', 175.

⁵⁸ Ibid. (Emphases added).

⁵⁹ Ibid., 175–176.

⁶⁰ Ibid., 176.

relationships ‘carry with them socially conditioned ways of behaving and interacting that extend also to recordkeeping behaviour’.⁶¹

In other words, the roles that McKemmish refers to are assigned to the *me* through these relationships. These various roles (and their related activities) will then inform what records the *me* wants or needs to capture, in what documentary form, for what reason(s) and for how long. And, in order to understand these personal recordkeeping behaviours, it is possible, McKemmish asserts, to consider them ‘with reference to issues of competencies and related rights, obligations, responsibilities, the need to continue to function effectively in a particular role, or fundamental needs relating to a sense of self, identity, a “place” in the world’.⁶²

Furthermore, McKemmish goes beyond the boundaries of an individual life, touching on the fourth dimension of the records continuum model – pluralisation. Arising from the proposition that the *me* can be considered in terms of his or her relationships with others, the evidence of *me* may not only be limited to the interest of that individual, but also of others with whom he or she interacts. This is how the evidence of *me* can become the evidence of *us*. As such, archivists are, as McKemmish suggests, also responsible for ‘ensuring that a personal archive considered to be of value to society at large is incorporated into the collective archives of the society, and thus constitutes an accessible part of that society’s memory, its experiential knowledge and cultural identity – evidence of *us*’.⁶³

McKemmish’s attempt to liken personal recordkeeping to institutional or public recordkeeping is reverberated by Hurley⁶⁴ and Richard J. Cox.⁶⁵ Hurley, in fact,

⁶¹ Ibid.

⁶² Ibid.

⁶³ Ibid., 175. (Emphasis original).

⁶⁴ Chris Hurley, ‘Beating the French’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 13–18.

⁶⁵ Richard J. Cox, ‘The Records in the Manuscript Collection’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 46–61.

has since 1977 insisted there is no essential difference between documents created and kept by private individuals and those created in an organisational context.⁶⁶ Cox also emphasises the similarities between personal and organisational records, which persist throughout his later work on personal archives.⁶⁷

Despite being hailed as ‘seminal’⁶⁸ and ‘groundbreaking’,⁶⁹ the ‘Evidence of *me*’ has also been critiqued for its ‘perceived emphasis on the transactionality and functionality of personal archives’.⁷⁰ Verne Harris,⁷¹ for instance, argues that the records continuum model was initially developed for institutional recordkeeping. Its fundamental concept would not accommodate personal records. It would not be appropriate to look for an ‘evidence of *me*’ through this conceptual lens.

Key, among others, is Catherine Hobbs, who expresses her disagreement with McKemmish for the focus on functionality and transactionality in personal records. She argues that by focusing on the ‘public or formal roles of the individual’ and on the individual’s interactions with other members of the society, one is overlooking the ‘other, inner, more intimate aspects of human character’.⁷² Linking personal archives to their reflectivity and the psychology, personality and character of their creators, it is further suggested that ‘[p]ersonal writing provides not only evidence of “me,” but is

⁶⁶ C. Hurley, ‘Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 8 (February 1977): 351–365.

⁶⁷ Cox, Richard J. Cox, *Personal Archives and a New Archival Calling: Readings, Reflections and Ruminations* (Duluth, MN: Litwin Books, 2008), 21 & 139–140.

⁶⁸ Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger’, 9.

⁶⁹ Leah Sander, ‘Collecting Our Thoughts and Re-collecting Our Stories: The Collection of Personal Records in Archival Institutions’ (Master’s thesis, University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg, 2004), 68.

⁷⁰ Jennifer Lynn Douglas, ‘Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives’ (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013), 28; see also pp. 28–37 for an extended account of criticisms of the ‘Evidence of *me*’.

⁷¹ Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger’.

⁷² Catherine Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals’, *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001), 131.

simultaneously the ground for playing at self-representation, self-aggrandizement, self-memorialization'.⁷³

Recent studies in the field of digital personal archives have also tended to connect personal archives with the personality and psychology of their creators. For instance, Amber Cushing⁷⁴ and Sarah Kim⁷⁵ – drawing on concepts in social psychology such as self-extension and self-reflectivity, respectively – explore acts of personal digital archiving and consider the ways in which building a digital archival collection contributes to an individual's identity and sense of self.

In spite of such a trend, Jennifer Douglas argues that 'ideas about personal records and record keeping expressed by Hobbs and Harris and supported by the archivists who cite them rest on several suppositions'.⁷⁶ They imply that an individual would reflect his or her life, and especially 'the *inner* life', in the documents he or she creates, keeps and passes to an archival repository. The archive could therefore be 'believed to provide a window that might open into the mind of the individual that lived and breathed outside the archive'.⁷⁷ According to Douglas, these scholars adopt a romantic tone 'to envision the archival creator as solitary and inspired and the archive itself as an intimate *site of revelation*'.⁷⁸ Then, she turns to the literature of 'life writing',⁷⁹ arguing, instead, that one should 'view personal writing as sites of *self-construction*'.⁸⁰ According to Douglas, it is more reasonable to consider 'a variety of agents and actions that shape the structure and meaning of an archive'. This will enable archivists to see 'a fuller picture of the archive than they may be able to do by

⁷³ Ibid.

⁷⁴ Amber L. Cushing, 'Self Extension and the Desire to Preserve Digital Possessions', *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 48 (2011): 1–3.

⁷⁵ Sarah Kim, 'Personal Digital Archives: Preservation of Documents, Preservation of Self' (PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2013).

⁷⁶ Douglas, 'Archiving Authors', 35.

⁷⁷ Ibid., 36.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 56. (Emphasis added).

⁷⁹ Ibid., 36; for her review of the 'life writing' literature, see pp. 37–56.

⁸⁰ Ibid., 56. (Emphasis added).

focusing more exclusively on the life and character of the individual responsible for its primary creation'.⁸¹

It would seem that many archival scholars have, hitherto, cast doubts on McKemmish's 'evidence of *me*' which extends the continuum thinking to personal archives, and highlights their functionality. Verne and Hobbs are not wrong that the continuum concept was initially developed for records created in organisational contexts, while Douglas is right that there should be more actors (than just the primary creator) to be considered in order to understand the nature of a personal archive. However, in her reprise of 'Evidence of *Me* ...',⁸² McKemmish maintains her position about the personal archive, and looks at the impact of new technologies on the fundamental nature of archives. More importantly, she re-emphasises that the notion of 'evidence of *me*' is drawn from the record continuum theory, and is to be seen in the context of the theory's three key characteristic concepts (explained above).

In terms of the plurality of the record, McKemmish refers to her point that recordkeeping is a kind of witnessing, in which she challenges 'conventional boundaries between archival and other forms of recorded information'.⁸³ Her questions about the nature of records as 'evidence of *me*' and 'evidence of *us*', about how lives are individually and collectively witnessed and memorialised are reiterated. She adds: '*witnessing* is used in the Oxford English Dictionary sense of "bearing oral or written evidence," ... [T]he concepts of oral and written evidence are interpreted broadly to encompass any of the many different forms that recorded information and oral

⁸¹ Ibid., 59.

⁸² Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of *Me* ... in a Digital World', in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011), 115–148.

⁸³ Ibid., 117.

transmission take ...⁸⁴ Therefore, the term ‘evidence of *me*’ is used ‘as a synonym for the personal archive in the very broadest sense’.⁸⁵

With regards to the enduring and perduring nature of the record, McKemmish reasserts that records are ‘dynamic objects, fixed insofar as their original content and structure can be re-presented, but “constantly evolving, ever mutating” as they are linked to other records and ever-broadening layers of contextual metadata ...’⁸⁶ In this manner, the personal archive and collective archives, as well as the relationships between them, are constantly evolving and changing shape. As such, an archival document may exist ‘as an act of witnessing in a particular spacetime’, but a witness can never experience it ‘in all its complexity ... in any given space and time’.⁸⁷

On the concept of multiple provenance, McKemmish refers to the fact that when a personal record moves beyond the boundaries of individual spacetime (that is, the record is pluralised), there are more parties involved in shaping that personal record. As a result, the notion of multiple provenance has been introduced to ‘refer to successive creators over time’.⁸⁸ By recognising the co-creation of a record, ‘two or more creators [i.e. provenances], who are part of a singular broader context or ambience, can be identified at the same time’.⁸⁹ Such a recognition is important, as the multiple contexts around which the record was created and shaped over time will be included, and will not subsume one another. That is, as Hurley asserts, the multiple provenances can coexist and be described in a recordkeeping system.⁹⁰

Applying these three characteristic concepts to the ‘evidence of *me*’, McKemmish construes ‘[i]t is possible now to envisage [personal records such as] a

⁸⁴ Ibid.

⁸⁵ Ibid.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 122.

⁸⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 123.

⁸⁹ Ibid.

⁹⁰ Hurley, ‘Parallel Provenance: (1); ‘Parallel Provenance: (2).

diary, a letter, a poem, a painting, an artefact, an oral memory, an autobiography ...’ to take ‘multiple forms’, be ‘linked to other forms of recorded information in multiple ways’, perform ‘multiple functions’, and have multiple provenances.⁹¹ An emphasis is placed on the multiple functions personal records can possibly perform, as she adds that ‘[t]heir capacity to function in multiple or parallel roles depends on how we define and manage them; the social, functional, provenancial, and documentary contexts in which we place them ...; and the enabling technologies of our spacetime’.⁹²

Table 3.2. Approaches to the study of documents.

Focus of research approach	Documents as Resource	Documents as Topic
Content	(1) Approaches that focus almost entirely on what is ‘in’ the document	(2) ‘Archaeological’ approaches that focus on how document content comes into being
Use and function	(3) Approaches that focus on how documents are used as a resource by human actors for purposeful ends	(4) Approaches that focus on how documents function in and impact on schemes of social interaction, and social organisation

Source: Prior, ‘Using Documents in Social Research’, 95.

It has become clear that despite the criticisms cast on her ‘evidence of *me*’, McKemmish still maintains her position. Indeed, she further explains how the key characteristics of the records continuum theory are applicable to personal records as the ‘evidence of *me*’. Still central to her argument is the functionality. In fact, her emphasis on multiple functions resonates with the notions that documents (regardless of their archival character or quality) have their own functions. Lindsay Prior, for example, proposes four approaches to the study of documentation, as shown in table 3.2. Prior’s approach (3) which focuses on how documents are used as a resource by

⁹¹ McKemmish, ‘Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World’, 126.

⁹² Ibid., 127.

various and different kinds of ‘reader’,⁹³ may be viewed alongside McKemmish’s idea that personal records (which are a form of documents) function as a witness to lives and are ‘a way of evidencing and memorialising our lives’.

In the field of documentation, there have been studies on the roles documents and records play in different settings.⁹⁴ A recent case study of art conservators in the Philippines has reiterated the idea that documents are not a mere memory device, rather they have other functions to play.⁹⁵ It is argued that documents are important to these conservators for the functions they play in creating a sense of professional identity, for mediating the tensions created by a bureaucratically structured workplace and an occupation traditionally organised around notions of craftsmanship, and as creators of persuasive evidence for clients.⁹⁶ It is true that these studies do not deal with a personal archive, but the results show that documents play roles beyond being a passive memory device, hence the soundness of the notion about documents and their functions. This should not be limited to the documents created in an organisational context. Rather the notion should be applicable to any documents regardless of their form or genre.

With such a presupposition that documents have functions embedded in them as Prior suggests, it is reasonable to argue that McKemmish’s approach to analysing a personal archive by considering its functionality is valid. By assuming that documents

⁹³ Lindsay Prior, ‘Using Documents in Social Research’, in *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*, ed. David Silverman, 3rd ed. (London: Sage, 2011), 96.

⁹⁴ See, for example, Harold Garfinkel, “‘Good’ Organizational Reasons for “Bad” Clinic Records”, chap. 6 in *Studies in Ethnomethodology* (Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1967); Richard H.R. Harper, *Inside IMF: An Ethnography of Documents, Technology and Organisational Action* (San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998); Tiffany C. Veinot, “‘The Eye of the Power Company’: Workplace Information Practice of a Vault Inspector”, *Library Quarterly* 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 157–79; and Elisabeth Davies, ‘The Script as Mediating Artefact in Professional Theatre Production’, *Archival Science* 8, no. 3 (2008): 181–198.

⁹⁵ Brendan Luyt and Natalie Pang, ‘For the Record: Document and Record Sensibilities of Art Conservators in the Philippines’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 43, no. 2 (July 2015): 131–145.

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 131–132.

are created to function and be used ‘by human actors for purposeful ends’,⁹⁷ it means that McKemmish’s framework is applicable no matter who the ‘human actors’ and what the ‘purposeful ends’ are. The ‘human actors’ can be the creator of a personal archival record or its users/readers, while the ‘purposeful ends’ can be evidencing the socially assigned roles and related activities, self-revelation or self-construction.

3.3 Application to the case of Tej Bunnag’s private papers

In the 1970s and 1980s, as an editor of the JSS, a career diplomat, and a private individual, Tej had various roles to play, as chapter 5 will show, leading to many various related activities. Therefore, Tej’s private papers captured into the collection, now on deposit to the Siam Society Library, are of various nature, but, in one way or another, relate to him in one (or more) of the capacities he had during the time periods the collection covers (1969–1976, and 1980–1986).⁹⁸ As such, McKemmish’s ‘evidence of *me*’ is suitable as a conceptual framework for analysing Tej’s private papers in this current study. This is because it will accommodate the multifaceted self of Tej, as captured in his private papers, evidencing his life in different capacities.

According to Soyka’s categorisation, the ‘evidence of *me*’ belongs to the second generation of the records continuum scholarship. It focuses on the first three dimensions of the model. The key element of this concept is functionality.

Nevertheless, the term ‘function’ may have to be interpreted here in a broader sense than the organisational function. In order to do this, it is possible to turn to Prior’s

⁹⁷ Prior, ‘Using Documents in Social Research’, 95.

⁹⁸ It is worth noting that this fits the definition of the personal archive within the continuum framework, in its broadest sense, as McKemmish and Michael Piggott points out, which does not limit a personal record (including archive) by its creator, as long as it relates to that particular person. The definition, in fact, encompasses ‘all forms, genres, and media of records relating to that person, whether captured in personal or corporate recordkeeping systems; remembered, transmitted orally, or performed; held in manuscript collections, archival and other cultural institutions, community archives, or other keeping places; or stored in shared digital spaces.’ McKemmish and Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse’, 113.

notion of documents and their functions. Here, the term ‘function’ means an activity that is the purpose of a person or a thing. With the main emphasis that Prior places on how human actors use documents for purposeful ends, the term ‘function’ may be defined as ‘purpose and use’. In this case, ‘purpose’ means the reason for which something exists, is done or created, while ‘use’ is the action of taking or deploying (something) as a means (or method) of accomplishing or achieving something.

In fact, such an interpretation has its precursor in a study on how academics at Cornell University kept and utilised their personal archival collections.⁹⁹ The study explored how and for what purposes the research subjects kept, organised and made use of their material and digital archival objects. Even though it seems to have paid more attention to the personal archiving practice, at least the authors have shown that functions of personal archiving can be seen in the light of the purposes and uses of personal archive.

In this study, Tej’s private papers will be analysed for their purposes and uses. Firstly, the purposes for Tej’s personal recordkeeping will be investigated. In other words, this part will address the question why Tej kept his personal papers. Then, the way the private papers were used will be examined. That is, this part deals with the question on how Tej used his private papers to carry out the activities associated with his various roles. Put together, these two parts will reflect on how Tej’s life is evidenced and memorialised by the private papers that he kept.

For a better understanding about the theoretical framework this study draws from, this chapter has provided an overview of the records continuum model, with reference to its development and growth. Over time since its inception, the model has been

⁹⁹ Joseph ‘Jofish’ Kaye, and others, ‘To Have and to Hold: Exploring the Personal Archive’, in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montréal, Québec, Canada, 22-28 April 2006), 275–284.

evolving. Archival scholars have continued to discuss the possibilities to employ and expand it into research in a wider area. McKemmish has applied that concept on personal recordkeeping. She argues that it is one way to evidence and memorialise a life. That is, it is the ‘evidence of *me*’, when the *me* means an individual who keeps records. The chapter has also discussed the main idea of McKemmish’s ‘evidence of *me*’ as a theoretical framework for understanding personal records and recordkeeping, and its applicability to the case of Tej’s private papers collection at the Siam Society Library. It is suggested that the key element of McKemmish’s concept – the functions – is interpreted as ‘purposes and uses’. In this framework, Tej’s private papers will be examined to address the questions (1) for what purposes Tej kept these private papers, and (2) how they were used to fulfil activities associated with Tej’s various roles. That is, in this framework the functions of both Tej’s personal recordkeeping and Tej’s personal records will be unravelled. In turn, this will reflect on how these private papers has evidenced and memorialised his life.

CHAPTER 4

METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research methodology for this study. It will explain and justify case study as the choice of research framework for this project. Then, the object of study will be described, followed by the process of data collection and analysis.

4.1 Case study as a research framework

As a research framework, case study can involve a variety of methods to explore a single case (or a number of cases) in details. Indeed, researchers can cast the wide net for ‘whatever methods [that] seem appropriate ... to develop a full understanding of that case as possible’.¹ In this study, the core data comes from Tej Bunnag’s private papers at the Siam Society Library, which can fittingly treated as a case. To understand such a case as much as possible, this study requires more than one research method.

For their uniqueness and particularity, Tej’s private papers may be considered an intrinsic case study, in which the case itself is of primary interest in the exploration.² However, it is possible to regard them collectively as a set of personal records that serves as an instrumental case study, where the aim is to provide insights into a particular issue and facilitate understandings of something else through the study of a case.³ According to Robert Stake, this type of study involves a deep examination of a specific case, which will in turn provide insight into a broader issue or theory. He further elaborates ‘[t]he case is of secondary interest, it plays a

¹ Keith Punch, *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches* (London: Sage, 1998), 150.

² An intrinsic case study is the study of a case where the case itself is of primary interest in the exploration. See Robert E. Stake, ‘Case Studies’, in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*, 2nd ed., ed. Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Kincoln (Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003), 136.

³ *Ibid.*, 137.

supportive role, and it facilitates our understanding of something else. The case is still looked at in depth, its contexts scrutinized, its ordinary activities detailed, but all because this helps the researchers to pursue the external interest'.⁴

For this study, the case is an exploratory tool to examine the object of study – Tej's private papers – which in turn provide a setting for understanding the records continuum theory. This research employs the single case study approach to study the case through document analysis, interviews and documentary research. To extract and analyse the data from Tej's private papers, close reading and open coding were as the methods. Data from interviews with Tej and documentary research provide a basis for contextualising the data from Tej's records. Central to the data analysis is the records continuum theory. To be more specific, the data from the case study is analysed in the framework of the 'evidence of *me*', as discussed in chapter 3 above. This leads to a discussion of how the continuum can serve as a framework for examining and understanding personal archives and their functions. By examining Tej's private papers both at a collective level (as a body of personal records) and at an individual level, interviewing Tej as the curator of this archive, and consulting other documentary resources, data and discussion that emerge from this study show the way in which personal archives function as evidence and memorialisation of a life.

As mentioned in chapter 3, recent works of such scholars as Andrew Lau,⁵ Heather Soyka⁶ and Leisa Gibbons,⁷ who explore roles of archives through the lens of the records continuum theory, have also taken case study approaches. These studies demonstrate that the case study is a suitable method for examining a varying array of

⁴ Ibid.

⁵ Andrew J. Lau, 'Collecting Experience' (PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2013), iv.

⁶ Heather Ann Soyka, 'Records as Force Multiplier: Understanding the Records Continuum as a Framework for Examining the Role of Records in a Community' (PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2015),

⁷ Leisa Gibbons, 'Culture in Continuum: YouTube, Small Memories and Memory Making' (PhD thesis, Monash University, 2015).

datasets in order to understand more about the records continuum theory and its application. Although this current study looks at a different category of archives, the case study approach is deemed suitable as it allows the use of multiple methods to explore the body of records curated by Tej.

4.2 Object of study

As mentioned above, the object of study in this case is Tej's private papers held at the Siam Society Library, and the examination of these papers has involved document analysis, interviews and documentary research. The interviews and documentary research have provided information concerning the context around which these records were captured as Tej's private papers and eventually passed to its current repository, which will be presented in chapter 5 below. This section will, however, provide descriptions of these private papers, with reference to their volume, dates, subject matters and organisation.

4.2.1 *Volume*

Tej's private papers are kept in four volumes (i.e. ring binders, see figure 5.2 in chapter 5 for illustration). In total, these four volumes contain 1,197 items. Table 4.1 shows the amount of records in each volume.

Table 4.1. Amount of Tej Bunnag's private papers by volume

Volume	Number of items
1	446
2	236
3	281
4	234
Total	1,197

4.2.2 *Dates*

On the spine of each ring binder, Tej wrote by hand the time span that the records in that volume cover (shown in table 4.2). In whole, there are two periods: 1969–1976 and 1980–1986. It should be noted that although Tej became the Honorary Editor of the JSS in 1971, he had been associated with the publication since 1969 under the editorship of Michael Smithies. His major responsibility was for the book reviews section of the serial. Therefore, the first two volumes contain records dating back to 1969.

Table 4.2. Dates of Tej Bunnag’s private papers in each volume

Volume	Time period
1	1969 – November 1976
2	1969–1976
3	1980–1983
4	1983–1986

4.2.3 *Subject matters*

Tej’s handwriting on the spine of every ring binder containing his private papers provides a clue to what these records are about: ‘JSS editorship, etc’. As chapter 5 will show, these private papers were, in fact, curated during the two times during which Tej was heavily associated with the JSS. Consequently, the majority of these papers are, in one way or another, about Tej’s editorial work at the Siam Society, including a wide range of activities.

However, as the ‘etc’ suggests, the subject matters of these private papers are beyond Tej’s editorship. Since Tej was a career diplomat who also took up the position of the honorary editor of a learned journal, the records that he kept would inevitably cover a wide variety of subject matters.

4.2.4 *Organisation*

Each volume has index dividers for sorting the records in it. In general, these records are organised alphabetically (A–Z) according to the names of the person⁸ or institution with whom Tej was associated. The index dividers indicate where the divisions are. For example, all the correspondence between Tej and Alexander B. Griswold are under the G division together with the records regarding, or sent to and from, individuals or institutions with a name starting with the letter G. However, there appears a trace of ‘subdivisions’ within these alphabetical divisions. That is, it seems that Tej put records of the same person or institution together, rather than at random in each division. This also applies in the cases of records created by other individuals but about a particular individual. For instance, the letter from Michael Kemmom of the Department of History, Cornell University, requesting Tej to evaluate David K. Wyatt’s suitability for promotion to full professor, is under the W division, as it is about Wyatt. It should be noted that these alphabetical divisions are used throughout. That is, names in such a language as Thai were all romanised and sorted into one of the A–Z divisions accordingly.

Furthermore, Tej’s private papers are also organised in a chronological order. As mentioned above (table 4.1), each volume of the records covers a certain time span. As such, certain alphabetical divisions (as well as, subdivisions) spread out in these four volumes. That is, it is probable to find records of the same ‘subdivision’ in more than one volume. Therefore, one would have to refer to all four volumes, in order to retrieve for all records from the subdivision ‘David K. Wyatt’, for instance.

⁸ Surnames for foreigners, and first name for Thais.

4.3 Data collection

In this single case study, three sets of data were collected. The first set of data comes from Tej's private papers through document analysis. The second set comes from interviews with Tej as the curator of the object of study in this case. The third set comes from documentary research which includes primary and secondary resource, as well as certain bibliometric data regarding the JSS under both times of Tej's editorship.

4.3.1 Document analysis

There is no track record of how Tej's private papers might have been treated or handled, after they were passed to the Siam Society Library. However, by the time they were found in the storage area of the Siam Society's Chalerm Phrakiat Building, it appeared that they had been kept intact. Even after the rediscovery, the Library does not make this collection of private papers available to its users. In this current study, I sought and obtained permission from Tej to use his private papers collection. But since the custodianship is with the Siam Society Library, I also asked for approval from the Society's general manager – Kanitha Kasina-Ubol. The former was necessary because Tej was the creator of the collection, while the latter was key to the access to and processing of Tej's private papers.

Upon the Siam Society's agreement, I started processing Tej's papers by taking them out from the ring binders for cleaning. Since these records had not been arranged and indexed, I assigned an arbitrary, unique identification number to every item in the ring binder. Each identification number consists of the volume number (1, 2, 3 or 4), and the item number in order of its place in the ring binder (from the first one to the last). The two parts are divided by a forward slash. Therefore, the first item of the first

volume is assigned '1/1' as its identification number, and so on. In so doing, it allows me to refer to each item more easily and also to arrange the records back to the order in which they were found initially. Finally, in order to minimise contact with the original records, I made a photocopy of the whole collection, which was then scanned into the Portable Document Format (PDF) as a backup copy. The whole process took place from December 2013 to January 2014.

Data from Tej's private papers were collected through close reading of the individual items. Based on the framework discussed in chapter 3, when reading Tej's papers, I paid particular attention to how these documents were used, who their users were or might have been, actions they might have prompted, and the reasons why they were created and kept. These emphases allowed certain themes and patterns to emerge in the first reading. Data extracted from the records were taken down on index cards for ease of analysis through open coding in the next stage of the study.

4.3.2 Interviews

In this study, qualitative, semi-structured interviews were conducted with Tej, who was treated as the subject expert. The goal of the interview is to understand more about (1) Tej's private papers, and the context in (and around) which he was working when these papers were created and curated, (2) sources of influence that led him to keep personal archives, and (3) his perspective on archives and recordkeeping. The interview questions were developed to achieve this objective, although in the course of the interviews other questions were asked to probe or follow up.

When I did a research on an oral history of the JSS in 2012,⁹ I was introduced to Tej by Charnvit Kasetsiri.¹⁰ I have since maintained the personal contact with him. Consequently, I could directly seek for his agreement to participate in this current study. As shown in table 4.3, there were six interview sessions, all of which were conducted in Thai. Tej gave his consent, in writing, for the interviews to be recorded and cited in this thesis. It was, however, agreed that the recordings and the transcripts would not be disclosed to third parties.¹¹ In the beginning of every session, I explained the objectives and the outline of the interview.

Table 4.3. Interview sessions with Tej Bunnag

Session	Date	Length of interview	Venue
1	25 June 2014	1 hr 17 mins	Siam Society, Bangkok
2	31 July 2014	1 hr 27 mins	Siam Society, Bangkok
3	29 October 2014	1 hr 35 mins	Siam Society, Bangkok
4	26 July 2016	2 hrs 22 mins	Siam Society, Bangkok
5	27 April 2017	1 hr 28 mins	Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok
6	8 February 2018	1 hr 2 mins	Siam Society, Bangkok

The first session was designed to cover the context of the private papers that Tej kept. Following a background research before the interview, eleven questions were prepared, as shown in table 4.4.

The subsequent three sessions were designed to be a more casual conversation, engaging Tej to reflect more on certain events or particular items documented in his private papers. This was done after the initial reading of the records, and some

⁹ Chirabodee Tejasen, 'An Oral History of the Journal of the Siam Society' (Master's diss., Nanyang Technological University, 2012).

¹⁰ A historian of Thailand and South East Asia, Professor Charnvit Kasetsiri (b. 1941) was my academic advisor at Thammasat University. He once had an article published in the JSS during Tej's first editorship. Charnvit served briefly as the rector of Thammasat University (July 1994 – March 1995), and later played an important role in establishing the South East Asian studies programme in the Faculty of Liberal Arts of that university. An academic laureate of the Fukuoka Prize (2012), he was the recipient of the 2014 Association for Asian Studies Award for distinguished contributions to Asian studies.

¹¹ Tej also gave permission that the recording of the two interviews with him in May and June 2012 for my research on the JSS history (see footnote 9, above) to be used in this study.

documentary research, by the time of which certain themes and patterns had been observed. For example, I selected a group of records from certain subdivisions, showed it to Tej in the interview, explained my observations concerning these records, and asked questions to clarify or verify the points that were not clear. Furthermore, Tej was shown bibliometric data of the JSS under his editorship, and then asked to reflect on the data. Thus, the interview questions were initially not as structured and as many as they were in the first session. But follow-up questions emerged in the course of the interviews themselves. The reason for this is that I intended to gain as much as possible information and insights regarding what had influenced Tej to continue to keep these records in a long term. By making the interviews more conversation-like, it was possible to ask the interviewee to reflect on his early life and career, which resulted in a better understanding about his recordkeeping habit and practice.

Table 4.4. List of interview questions for session 1, 25 June 2014

Context of Tej Bunnag's private papers	1.	What were the motivations which made you decide to keep these records?
	2.	You regarded these records as your private papers, but why did you deposit them at the Siam Society?
	3.	When these records were in use, where did you keep them?
	4.	How did you organise them?
	5.	How did these documents reach you?
	6.	Who else did you allow access to these documents when you were the Honorary Editor of JSS?
JSS Honorary Editor	7.	Did you have any experience of editorial work before you became the Honorary Editor of JSS? Where? When?
	8.	As a historian by training, as well as a diplomat at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, how did all that impact/influence your editorial work for JSS?
Modus operandi of the Siam Society	9.	What were the roles of the Society Council?
	10.	Did the Council influence your work as the Honorary Editor in any way? Please explain.
	11.	How was the Siam Society operated on a day-to-day business?

By the time of the fifth session, key themes of the data analysis were already identified. The questions were, therefore, designed for probing and clarifying certain points relating to the themes, although there were also a few miscellaneous questions.

Table 4.5 presents the list of the main questions prepared for the fifth interview

session. The data collection was, in fact, wrapped up in this session, although there turned out to be a follow-up session. The sixth session aimed for clarifications of certain details regarding particular events or activities. A set of relevant records from Tej's private papers collection was selected and sent to Tej prior to the interview. He was asked to recall details of the events or activities associated with those records.

Table 4.5. List of interview questions for session 5, 27 April 2017

Keeping for future reference	1.	How did you retrieve a document from your files?
	2.	How long did it take before you kept a document into a file/ring binder?
	3.	Did you have any finding aid?
	4.	Was there any difficulty in retrieving a given item/document?
Sharing information	5.	Did anyone else have access to your papers? Who? For what purpose?
	6.	What made you decide to keep the documents with you (rather than at the Siam Society) in the first place?
	7.	What was the practice of the previous JSS editor (Michael Smithies)?
	8.	Why did you eventually decide to deposit these four volumes of records in the Siam Society Library?
Building legacy	9.	How often did you use these papers?
	10.	Under what circumstance would you access to/consult these papers?
	11.	Do you have any intention to dispose any of the papers? Why/why not?
Miscellaneous questions	12.	Where did you learn to file your documents alphabetically and chronologically?
	13.	What was the system that inspired you?
	14.	Why did you mostly keep correspondence?
	15.	How about your other collections that you have kept? What do you keep mainly?

The recording of all interview sessions were transcribed for analysis and reference. It should be noted that I did not include the orality (e.g. tones of voice, pauses, and repetition) in the transcripts. This is deemed acceptable because the main purpose of the interviews was to gain contextual information and understanding to support and, on occasions, to make sense of the data from extracted from Tej's private papers. Also worth noting is that I am aware of the criticisms of the reliability and subjectivity of memory. This is particularly significant when in this study Tej is the only interviewee. Yet, it is argued that the so-called unreliability of memory could be considered an advantage, and the subjectivity a clue of how the past was interpreted

and remembered (or forgotten) individually and collectively.¹² Among others, these are key features, according to Alessandro Portelli, that make oral history stand out as a research method in its own right. Although this study does not seek to chart an oral history, it is reasonable to take Portelli's thoughts into account, as the interviews dealt, in part, with life stories of the interviewee based on his memory. Furthermore, the factual information from the interview could be crosschecked and verified through documentary research.

4.3.3 *Documentary research*

As the majority of the private papers under scrutiny are about Tej's editorial work for the JSS, it is beneficial to have an overall impression of the journal under his editorship. Therefore, I extracted from the JSS issues which Tej edited key bibliometric data.¹³ These data were gleaned manually, as there was no database indexing the JSS. This tedious process is but crucial, as the bibliometric data helps to contextualise other sets of data.

For the context of the times covered by Tej's private papers, I consulted both primary and secondary documentary resources. The Minute Books of the Council of the Siam Society was the major primary source. They have, since 2013, been inscribed on the UNESCO Memory of the World Register.¹⁴ In particular, I referred to the Minute Book numbers 10, 11 and 12, covering the Siam Society Council meetings

¹² Alessandro Portelli, 'The Peculiarities of Oral History', *History Workshop* 12 (Autumn 1981): 97–107.

¹³ These data include number of articles (and other contributions), characteristics of authorship, productivity, and subject concentration. Apart from being contextual information regarding Tej's editorship, they were also used as reference for Tej to reflect on his editorship. Therefore, not all data are presented in this thesis. Only those relevant to the results of the study are included (see chapter 6).

¹⁴ For details, see <http://www.unesco.org/new/en/communication-and-information/memory-of-the-world/register/full-list-of-registered-heritage/registered-heritage-page-8/the-minute-books-of-the-council-of-the-siam-society-100-years-of-recording-international-cooperation-in-research-and-the-dissemination-of-knowledge-in-the-arts-and-sciences/>

from 1964 to 1989. The secondary sources consulted were published works on the history of Thailand, as well as the history of the Siam Society.

With regards to information on Tej's life story and career, a number of written accounts are available. As there is no comprehensive account of Tej's biography, I recruited works in which reflections on his life and work would be available, especially those that he wrote himself. For example, on the occasion of Michael Smithies' eightieth birthday anniversary, the Siam Society published a commemorative volume,¹⁵ for which Tej wrote a felicitation. In it, he recounts his collaboration with Smithies in the Siam Society that started in 1969. In addition, in the cremation volume¹⁶ of his mother, Tej wrote a brief reflection, recalling certain parts of his early life. It is this kind of writing that provide recollections and reflections of Tej's life and work, and that I tried to recruit.

4.3.4 *Reflection on interaction with data and the interviewee*

In this study, the data analysis (described below) was an iterative process which necessitated intervals for further data collection before the analysis resumed. In a similar manner, the process of collecting data took several stages over the years. As shown in table 4.6, the data collection took place with intervals during which the data analysis was carried out. Such an iterative process of data analysis did allow me to gradually develop themes from what I had previously collected through the three methods described above. In this manner, one should not overlook the interaction between the researcher and sources of data (including the interviewee). Such an

¹⁵ Michael Smithies, *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations* (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012).

¹⁶ Cremation volumes, or *nangsu anuson ngansop* (in Thai), are printed works published and distributed as gifts on the occasion of cremation ceremonies. The idea began by influential people in the nineteenth century with the introduction of printing press into Siam, and caught on ever since. For details see <https://www.nla.gov.au/thai/cremation-volumes> or Grant A. Olson, 'Thai Cremation Volumes: A Brief History of a Unique Genre of Literature', *Asian Folklore Studies* 51, no. 2 (1992): 279–294.

Table 4.6. Chronology of data collection

		Document Analysis (Tej's private papers)	Interviews	Topic of Documentary Research
2013	Oct – Dec			• Tej's biography (1)
2014	Jan – Mar	• Processing Tej's private papers		• Historical context of Thailand in 1970s
	Apr – Jun	• Reading of vols 1 and 2 (1)		• Siam Society in 1970s
	Jul – Sep		• Session 1 (25 Jun) • Session 2 (31 Jul)	
	Oct – Dec	• Reading of vols 1 and 2 (2)	• Session 3 (29 Oct)	• Bibliometric analysis of JSS under Tej's editorship (1)
2015	Jan – Mar	• Reading of vols 3 and 4 (1)		• Historical context of Thailand in 1980s
	Apr – Jun	• Reading of vols 1 and 2 (3)		• Tej's biography (2)
	Jul – Sep			
	Oct – Dec	• Reading of vols 3 and 4 (2)		• Siam Society in 1980s
2016	Jan – Mar	• Reading of vols 1 and 2 (4)		
	Apr – Jun	• Reading of vols 3 and 4 (3)		• Researching Tej's biography (3)
	Jul – Sep		• Session 4 (26 Jul)	
	Oct – Dec	• Reading of vols 3 and 4 (4)		
2017	Jan – Mar	• Reading of vols 3 and 4 (5)		• Bibliometric analysis of JSS under Tej's editorship (2)
	Apr – Jun	• Reading of vols 1 and 2 (5)	• Session 5 (27 Apr)	
	Jul – Sep			
	Oct – Dec			
2018	Jan – Mar	• Reviewing vols 1–4	• Session 6 (8 Feb)	

interaction, in one way or another, not only directed the trajectory of data collection, but also shaped the data collected. However, I have found that this interaction was advantageous especially to the interview on personal matters. In order for the

interviewee to feel comfortable to speak about his personal life, there required a certain level of trust and collaboration, which could not be developed instantly. On the other hand, the rapport, which had been forged over time, made me feel more comfortable to ask certain questions that would not be appropriate for the earlier meetings. Besides, as I had collected, interacted with, and made sense of data from different sources, I was able to develop interview questions to probe or follow up in the subsequent meetings or through correspondence with Tej. On top of that, there were occasions on which Tej pointed out to other sources of information that he felt might be relevant to this study. In this light, the process of data collection could be considered an interplay between the researcher and the data sources. As such, in this study, I acknowledge the roles I played in the collaborative effort that shaped the data collected.

4.4 Data analysis

Although there are three sets of data collected through three methods outlined above, the design of this research has made them interrelated and inform one another. In terms of forms, they are not initially similar, as the interviews started life in an audio recorder. Nonetheless, they were transcribed, and hence appearing as texts for analysis. Thus, qualitative content analysis was used as the method for analysing the data previously collected. Developed to explore meanings underlying physical messages, this inductive method is suitable for analysing various sorts of recorded communication and information.¹⁷ In the case of textual data, it ‘goes beyond merely counting words or extracting objective content from texts to examine meanings,

¹⁷ Philipp Mayring, ‘Qualitative Content Analysis’, *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1, no. 2 (2000). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385>; see also Mayring’s *Qualitative Content Analysis* (Klagenfurt: Leibniz Institute for Social Research, 2014), 43. Retrieved from <https://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>

themes and patterns that may be manifest or latent in a particular text. It allows researchers to understand social reality in a subjective but scientific manner'.¹⁸ In addition, this method allows for purposive selection of samples or texts that can inform research questions being investigated. It produces 'descriptions or typologies, along with expressions from subjects reflecting how they view how they view the social world'.¹⁹

In this study, the open coding was initially based on background knowledge and contextual information from the documentary research, the interviews, as well as the literature review. This process allowed me to see patterns in the data collected from Tej's private papers. Based on the theoretical framework of this study, themes and categories were identified. Codes were grouped together according to the themes and categories they belong to.

The data from interviews and documentary research were collected to support the data extracted from Tej's private papers. In that case, they were assigned codes in accordance with the data they were meant to support.

4.5 Consideration on research ethics

A nature of archive as unpublished materials lends ethical questions to researchers who use archival sources in their work, especially when they come across data with sensitivity. The fact that archival repositories of their choice provide access to the archival materials in their custody does not simply mean the researchers are free to extract anything for citation. As Marek Tesar reflects, archival repositories, as well as archivists who work there, differ in terms of their policies regarding access and

¹⁸ Yan Zhang, and Barbara M. Wildemuth, 'Qualitative Analysis of Content', in *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*, ed. Barbara M. Wildemuth (Westport, CY: Libraries Unlimited, 2009), 222.

¹⁹ Ibid., 223.

control. One can have highly strict access policies with archivists being rather uncooperative, while another can be lenient and archivists very helpful.²⁰ In the case of the latter, it could seem that researchers have much more freedom to use whatever data they find in the archives. Yet, Tesar opines that it is ‘dangerous freedom’.²¹ Indeed, no matter how much freedom they have, the researchers themselves have responsibilities to all parties impacted by their use of data extracted from the archival materials of their choice.

Although the repository where the object of this study is kept is of the latter kind Tesar refers to, research ethics is not taken for granted. In fact, ethical considerations also arise from the fact that Tej’s private papers are a personal archive, consisting of works of more than one person. Tej is not the sole creator of all records kept in this collection. As such, two key points on research ethics are worth discussing: consent and privacy.

In general, as Heidi McKee and James Porter point out, how materials got into an archive in the first place and under what conditions are essential questions for archival researchers.²² It would seem that the main point is that researchers need to be aware of whether the archival collection they are using was received properly and that the creators of the documents or records contained within the collection had not been forced, in anyway, to have their documents or records included in the collection. The situation can be more complicated in the case of vulnerable populations. Livia Iacovino, for instance, examines questions of consent regarding materials collected by Australian government from the Stolen Generations – the Aborigine children taken from their families and communities as a result of government policy enacted from

²⁰ Marek Tesar, ‘Ethics and Truth in Archival Research’, *History of Education* 44, no. 1 (2015): 109-110.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 109.

²² Heidi A. McKee, and James E. Porter, ‘The Ethics of Archival Research’, *College Composition and Communication* 64, no. 1 (September 2012): 66.

1909 to 1969. Now that the materials of and about these children and their families are in the archives, Iacovino casts doubts on who has the authority and right to access and use these archival records, collected without the consent of those affected by the policy.²³ This similar question has also been asked in the cases of other vulnerable populations, such as indigenous people, people of colour, people who identify as LGBTQ, people with disabilities, and people of lower economic status. Informed consent may not to the ultimate answer, but at least researchers should be aware of how the materials they are (or are about to be) consulting came into the custody of the archives. Such an awareness will, in turn, play a part in aiding the researchers to make a sensible decision whether they should or should not use any particular archive (or part of it) in their research.

In the case of Tej's private papers, consideration has been made with regards to consent, as mentioned above. Although the contents the personal archive under scrutiny are the work of many original creators, they came into Tej's possession through identifiable channels. Furthermore, it is less likely that any of the creators of these contents, including Tej himself, are a part of vulnerable populations. On top of that, the research questions were developed to focus on Tej's purposes and uses of his personal archive. Consequently, informed consent was obtained from Tej as the creator, owner and depositor of the collection. In addition, the Siam Society Library (through the Society's general manager) also agreed to give access to Tej's private papers. Still, these informed consents only mean that this personal archive can be

²³ Livia Iacovino, 'Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities', *Archival Science* 10, no. 4 (December 2010): 353–372. It is worth noting that Iacovino works on an assumption that these records should remain in the archives. As such, the solution to the issue on consent and right to access and use is proposed in the form of participatory model. However, McKee and Porter push the issue to another extreme, asking 'should those materials be in government hands at all? Perhaps the files – or at least some materials in them – should be given back to the children, their descendants, or communities from whom the children were stolen?' See, their 'The Ethics of Archival Research', 68.

studied. The fact that the contents were created by many different individuals leads to questions on privacy.

With regards to issues of privacy, McKee and Porter suggest two main questions. The first is about the rights of the people – dead or living – represented in the archives. The second is about researcher’s justifications in exposing private and sensitive information.²⁴ As Heather MacNeil points out, it is important to balance ‘the right to know’, or the rights of the society to benefit from the findings of research, with ‘the right to privacy’, or the personal rights of an individual to be let alone and to not have his or her private life made public.²⁵ McKee and Porter provide a general solution. Archival researchers should not address these questions alone. Rather they should engage, interact, consult or even negotiate with stakeholders and audiences.²⁶ As Cheryl Glenn and Jessica Enoch suggest, they have to ‘participate in a reciprocal cross-boundary exchange, in which [they] talk *with* and listen *to* Others, whether they are speaking ... in person or via archival materials’.²⁷

In this case study, the research was designed to facilitate a triangulation of data from the archive, published sources and interviews with Tej as a subject expert. This not only benefits a cross-checking of information, but also allows for sensitive information or matters to surface, which help to determine how much (if at all) information regarding certain event(s) or individual(s) should be disclosed or reported in this thesis.

²⁴ McKee and Porter, ‘The Ethics of Archival Research’, 69.

²⁵ Heather MacNeil, *Without Consent: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information in Public Archives* (Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1992), 61–63.

²⁶ McKee and Porter, ‘The Ethics of Archival Research’, 61 & 74.

²⁷ Cheryl Glenn, and Jessica Enoch, ‘Invigorating Historiographic Practices in Rhetoric and Composition Studies’, in *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process*, eds. Gesa E. Kirsch and Jacqueline J Royster (Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008), 24. (Emphasis original).

In this chapter, the choice of case study as the research framework for examining Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library has been justified. It is suitable to take such the research framework as it allows for the use of multiple methods to explore a single object of study, whose description has also been provided. The chapter has also described the three methods of data collection and their processes, as well as the process of data analysis. The final part has discussed ethical issues appertaining to this research.

CHAPTER 5

TEJ BUNNAG AND HIS PRIVATE PAPERS

AT THE SIAM SOCIETY LIBRARY

In academic circles of Thai studies and particularly of early modern Thai history, Tej Bunnag is known for his book, *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892–1915: The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab*, published in 1977, by Oxford University Press¹. It explores a key aspect of the modernisation of Siam, which, Tej believes, contributed greatly to the survival of the country as she confronted the imperialist powers in the late nineteenth century. But, in fact, he is well known beyond academia. A simple way to testify is through a search of his name from search engines on the internet. For instance, the Thai version of Wikipedia provides a brief account of his educational background and life career as a leading diplomat.² Although now he works for the Thai Red Cross Society, Tej previously served the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, from 1969 to 2004. He held posts as ambassador in China, the United Nations in Geneva, France, and the United States, between 1986 and 2001. His last post in the ministry was that of the Permanent Secretary for Foreign Affairs, which he held until March 2004, before assuming the position of advisor at the Office of His Majesty's Principle Secretary. In 2008, he was appointed the Minister of Foreign Affairs, even though he resigned after 39 days in office.

Indeed, Tej has been a key personality in the Thai diplomatic circle. As such, it is less likely that one would remember him as an Honorary Editor of an oldest learned journal ever published in Thailand. The reason for this, probably, is that the achievement in his diplomatic career has outstood his original training as historian, as

¹ Tej Bunnag, *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892–1915: The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1977).

² https://th.wikipedia.org/wiki/เตจ_บุญนาถ

well as his involvement in the academic sector back in the 1970s. Based on data from interviews and documentary research, this chapter will provide an overview of Tej's early life and early career as a diplomat. Then, it will explore Tej's editorships of the JSS, outlining the context in which the editorial work was carried out. The last section will consider the private papers collection that Tej kept during both of his editorships as evidence and memorialization of his life.

5.1 Early life and early career of Tej Bunnag

Tej Bunnag was born on 25 November 1943, to an aristocrat family with a history dating back to the Ayutthaya Kingdom (1350–1767).³ His grandfather, Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri (Tom Bunnag, 1884–1937)⁴ served as a judge in the Civil Court before transferring to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, where he served in many positions including, among others, Minister to Italy, Spain and Portugal, Thai representative at the General Assembly of the League of Nations, Minister of Foreign Affairs, Minister to Washington D.C. Tom was a member of the Senate, and between 1948 and 1949 was the Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary to the Republic

³ By origin, the Bunnag family were traders from Persia, settling at Ayutthaya in the seventeenth century. In late Ayutthaya, they had become close associates and marital relatives with the Chakri family (which, in 1782, became the Chakri Dynasty). In the 1820s, these dynastic links enabled members of the family to secure appointments as the head of the Phra Khlang (Treasury), and in the royal warehouse. From these offices, they were able to secure supplies of tradable goods. The elder of the family, Dit Bunnag, owned five junks and was the largest operator in the private junk trade. His son, Chuang Bunnag, was the first to build and operate one of the larger European-style trading ships. Tej's grandfather – Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri (Tom Bunnag) – was a great grandson of Chuang. A brief account on the Bunnag family and Chuang Bunnag (also known as Somdet Chao Phraya Borom Maha Srisuriyawong) can be found in Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand*, 3rd ed. (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2014), 308 & 302. For details on roles of the Bunnag family in the early Bangkok era, see, for example, Pasuk Phongpaichit and Chris Baker, *Thailand: Economy and Politics* (Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995), 92, 96–99, 212 & 217.

⁴ With regards to Thai titles, prior to their abolition in 1942, it was common practice for those who held position in the Thai bureaucracy (both in the civil and military services) and government to be granted uninherited titles, which also acted as names. The hierarchy of the old feudal titles, from highest to lowest, were as follows: Somdet Chao Phraya, Chao Phraya, Phraya, Phra, Luang, Khun, Muen and Phan. These titles and names would change, depending on one's position and role and were bestowed for life. In the case of Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri, he began his career as Luang Nontpanya, before being promoted and becoming Phraya Sunthonkit, Phraya Abhibalprapeni, and finally Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri.

of China in Nanking.⁵ His father, Tula Bunnag (1918–1990), worked for the same ministry before transferring to the Bureau of the Royal Household. His mother, Chancham Bunnag (née Intusophon, 1921–2003), was a granddaughter of Phra Sophon-aksonkit (Lek Samitasiri), the owner of Sophonpipattanakorn Press, which was among the best printing houses, due to its publishing technology, manpower and expertise, in Siam during the reign of King Vajiravudh (Rama VI, r. 1910–1925).

In his early childhood, Tej lived with his parents in Phraya Aphibalrajamaitri's house, which, as he recalls, 'was No. 285 on Silom Road that had been graciously bestowed upon [his grandfather] in his position as the head of a family by His Majesty King Vajiravudh'.⁶ In this house, three generations lived 'in the traditional way': '[t]he grandparents lived upstairs, while the children and grandchildren lived on the ground floor'.⁷ Tej continues, at length, to describe the household in which he grew up:

I recollect with happiness my grandfather playing croquet on the front lawn. Grandmother would grow tomatoes at the kitchen garden to the side of the house. In the winter, grandmother would wake up when it was still dark to prepare breakfast for grandfather. Grandfather would drive a blue Morris Minor to see his friends, while his friends would come to the house to drink whiskey with him in the evenings. My grandparents would make merit on their birthdays, as an old monk walk through the mists.⁸

Tej went to a kindergarten not very far from Silom Road, called Pavarolan Wittaya School, before moving to his mother's alma mater, Rajini School, for primary education. 'When I was in Rajini School, some of my mother's friends were teachers there', Tej remembers, regarding his time there as a good one. 'Some of the schoolmates at Rajani School remain best friends to this day ... Our parents were also friends. ... As such, I must say that I was a Thai kid of an old time who grew up in a

⁵ Tej Bunnag, foreword to *Report regarding some aspects of the situation in Nanking*, by Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri (Tom Bunnag), trans. Apisake Monthienvichienchai (Bangkok: Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Foundation, 2016), 68–69.

⁶ Ibid., 76.

⁷ Ibid.

⁸ Ibid.

social circle in which people would know one another, and were like-minded'.⁹ After three years, Tej moved to Vajiravudh College¹⁰, a boy boarding school, where he and some other schoolmates formed themselves into 'a gang' of students who 'didn't like to play sports', but had in common an interest in 'bookmaking, drawing ... history, ... and are friends for the whole of our lives'.¹¹

Besides, Tej enjoyed many of his weekends in Sophonpipattanakorn Press, when he visited his mother's father who lived in a house on the premises of that printery. As Tej recalls, 'I grew up in the literary circle. ... I had played in the printing house since I was a kid. Therefore, books and me, they cannot be detached from each other'.¹² Indeed, he has since his young age cultivated his liking for books and printed matters.

In 1954, Tula was posted to work as Second Secretary at the Royal Thai Embassy in London. Chancham left her job at the United States Information Service, while Tej and his brother left their school, to accompany Tula to England. There, Tej went to Malvern College, where his penchant for reading¹³ and interest in history

⁹ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 31 July 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

¹⁰ Established by King Rama VI as the Royal Pages School in 1910, it was founded based on the system of public school in England, where Rama VI had been educated. Students are accommodated in boarding houses, while studying in classes comprising students from different houses. The school was later renamed Vajiravudh College by King Rama VII in honour of its founder.

¹¹ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 31 July 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

¹² Ibid.

¹³ Tej admits it was his mother who cultivated it and was also a great influencer. His mother was a good reader. In a reflection on his mother, Tej notes:

The period of mother's greatest influence on intellectual development of her son was during the two to three years between O and A Levels, in which her son read the most in his life. Father and mother had returned to Bangkok, but mother would write to her son regularly, telling stories of relatives, cousins and friends ... At the same time, mother would suggest books to read. Most interestingly, the majority of the books that mother recommended were not classical literature, since she might realise that her son would certainly have to read them for the O and A Levels. On the contrary, mother recommended the works from the period in between the two World Wars, which might be her favourite reads when she studied the English literature in America, [and] which during that time were very much progressive, and contemporary in the time that her son was in school, namely those by the American Hemingway and Scott Fitzgerald, and the English Christopher Isherwood and Aldous Huxley.

further developed. Upon completing the GCE Ordinary Level, he won a scholarship from the Thai government to study in the United Kingdom. So, he continued to live there to study, even though his father transferred to the Bureau of the Royal Household in 1959.

Figure 5.1. Tej Bunnag by Piriya Krairiksh
12 Harrington Gardens, London, 1961
Pencil on paper 17cm x 24.5cm

Source: Piriya Krairiksh, *Reminiscence: From Corfu to Bhubing, 1961–1964* (Bangkok: Piriya Krairiksh Foundation, 2014), 18.

Tej (figure 5.1) continued at Malvern for another two years to complete his GCE Advanced Level, after which he read history at Universities of Cambridge

Tej Bunnag, 'Dae...Mae' [For mother], in *Anusorn ngan phraratchathanploengsop Chancham Bunnag* [Cremation volume of Chancham Bunnag] (Bangkok: Amarin Printing and Publishing, 2007), 29.

(King's College) and Oxford (St Antony's College), for his Bachelor's and doctoral degrees, respectively. It was during this time that he read widely and consulted other materials of high quality in the libraries of these Oxbridge institutions. In the atmosphere of the post-Second World War expansion of interest in the Far East region¹⁴, Tej developed his interest in modern history in general and modern Thai history in particular. St Antony's College at Oxford also has a reputation for studies and research on Africa, Asia, Europe, Japan, Latin America, the Middle East, Russia and Eurasia. Perhaps, Tej's particular interest in Thai history manifested itself in his DPhil thesis,¹⁵ which examines the creation of the centralised system of provincial administration in Siam in the late nineteenth century. This was, Tej believes, an important aspect of Siam's modernisation of her government and administration and was 'one of the factors which helped that country to survive as an independent nation in the age of European imperialism'¹⁶.

As with any other recipient of the Thai government scholarship, it was clear to Tej that on returning home he would have to join the civil service. Since the scholarship was allocated to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, on completion of his doctoral degree at Oxford Tej returned to Thailand in 1969 and started his career at that ministry, as Second Secretary attached to the Department of Information. During

¹⁴ See, for example, John Bowen, 'The Contributions Development of Southeast Asian Studies in the United States', in *The Politics of Knowledge: Area Studies and the Disciplines*, ed. David Szanton (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2004), 386–425; Ian Brown, *The School of Oriental and African Studies: Imperial Training and the Expansion of Learning* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016), chapter 4.

¹⁵ Submitted in Michaelmas Term 1968, it was later published as a monograph entitled *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892–1915: The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab*. The approach that Tej took in his work has been criticised, but Tej maintains his position as he allowed the book to be translated into Thai, which has been published three times. For criticism of Tej's work, see, for example, Thongchai Winichakul, *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994).

¹⁶ Tej Bunnag, 'The Provincial Administration of Siam from 1892 to 1915: A Study of the Creation, the Growth, the Achievements, and the Implications for Modern Siam, of the Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanuphap' (DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1968).

his early years at the ministry, he ‘had plenty of time’ to himself.¹⁷ As such, and also to keep himself up with the academic circle, Tej accepted invitations to be a guest lecturer at Srinakharinwirot University and Chulalongkorn University. It was also in this period that he began his association with the Siam Society. Tej was co-opted onto the society’s council as the Honorary Librarian in the same year that he returned from England.

From around 1972, however, Tej became busier at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, as he transferred to the Division of East Asia, Department of Politics. The division was responsible for the affairs of China, Japan, Korea, Mongolia, Australia and New Zealand. He was appointed to be in the China Section, around the time when Thailand was to establish its diplomatic relation with the People’s Republic of China. Tej was involved in the lengthy process of the normalisation of the relation between the two countries from 1973 to 1975.¹⁸ The work involved several trips to Beijing before an agreement could be reached and the diplomatic relation was established on 1 July 1975. With the heavy workload at the ministry, Tej had to relinquish his guest lectureship at both universities. He expressed regret, for he ‘liked to teach very much’.¹⁹

5.2 Tej Bunnag and his editorships of the JSS

The year 1969 was a year of great change to the Siam Society. Following the ‘tumultuous’ annual general meeting, as Tej describes²⁰, in March of that year, the

¹⁷ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 27 July 2016, Siam Society, Bangkok.

¹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹ Ibid.

²⁰ According to the minutes of the 1969 annual general meeting of the Siam Society, there turned out to be disagreements over the course of the event. The election of the new council did not go as smoothly. In the end, there was a nomination of a whole new team which was co-opted en bloc.

new council came into office. Michael Smithies became the Honorary Editor of the JSS. Tej notes:

[a]fter the sudden death of the new President, Phraya Anuman Rajadhon, in July 1969, and the resignation of Khunying Maenmas Chawalit, I was co-opted on to the Council to replace the latter as Honorary Librarian and thus began my own association with the Society and collaboration with Michael on the *JSS* and the Publication Committee.²¹

Having known each other since 1962, when Smithies persuaded Tej to help with the journal, Tej agreed promptly.²² In part, this was because he wanted to keep up with academia.²³ And, in part, this was because of his liking for printed matters and publication.²⁴ Since then, they collaborated in the transformation of the JSS from ‘a house magazine’ into ‘a journal of international standing’.²⁵ Both Smithies and Tej called ‘on a wide circle of friends, colleagues and acquaintances of different age-groups and varied academic disciplines, both to review articles and to write reviews for the *Journal*’.²⁶ It was the book reviews that Tej was responsible for, as he recalled ‘when [Smithies] was the Honorary Editor ... I was the Reviews Editor’.²⁷ Previously, the review section of the journal had, Tej opined, served as a mere introduction of new publications, and hence the attempt to recruit contributors to write critical reviews of books in the same manner as academic journals.²⁸ It was not easy, but when the ‘overhaul was complete’, contributions to the JSS ‘reflected more contemporary concerns, new authors were sought and found, quality and quantity rose, advertisement

²¹ Tej Bunnag, felicitation to *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*, by Michael Smithies (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012), VII.

²² Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 17 May 2012, Siam Society, Bangkok.

²³ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 29 October 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

²⁴ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 31 July 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

²⁵ [4/182] Tej Bunnag’s letter of recommendation for Michael Smithies, 29 April 1985.

²⁶ Tej, felicitation, VII.

²⁷ [2/132] Tej Bunnag’s open reference for Michael Smithies, 21 April 1976.

²⁸ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 17 May 2012.

were introduced to off-set higher costs, even the cover was given a brighter and more attractive design'.²⁹

In late 1971, Tej replaced Smithies who left Bangkok to work for the University of Hong Kong. This was around the same time as when he transferred to the Department of Politics, at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Soon, he was promoted to be the Head of Division. In 1972, he began the work on the normalisation of the relation between Thailand and the People's Republic of China. As a result, he became very busy and had to travel to Beijing several times until such the mission was accomplished in mid-1975.³⁰ However, having worked with the previous Honorary Editor since 1969, Tej could handle the workload and work flow. Indeed, he carried out editorial works, ranging from reading manuscripts that came in, and looking for relevant peer-reviewers, to proofreading, and corresponding with contributors. Still, book reviews were not easy to find. One of his recurring contributors once noted 'I hadn't realized until your letter just how desperate you were for the book review'.³¹ Further, Tej found the 'peer-review process was onerous but necessary', as there were 'some memorably and truly difficult contributors and contributions'. 'Despite some complaints and objections', he believes 'the process was worthwhile in the long run'.³²

Apart from the diplomatic duties, the social and political context of the time also made it difficult to publish articles on contemporary or recent concerns. Indeed, the 1970s were not an easy time for Thailand. Early in that decade, Thai students, like their counterparts in the West, began to display a concern over the country's political situation. This began with relatively small protests, but escalated until, in October 1973, a massive demonstration led to blood-shedding street battles, the fall of the

²⁹ [4/182] Tej's letter of recommendation for Smithies.

³⁰ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 July 2016.

³¹ [2/207] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 14 August 1975.

³² Tej, felicitation, VIII.

military government, and the exile of three of its leaders. There followed three turbulent years of frequently changing governments, labour disputes, and a widening gap between conservatives and reformists, played out against the alarming background of Communist victories within the region. The unrest culminated with a violent attack on student demonstrators at Thammasat University in Bangkok, on 6 October 1976,³³ and the installation of a government determined to root out all real or suspected communist sympathisers. ‘Subversive’ books were banned and burned, journals closed, publishers harassed, and political meetings outlawed.³⁴ This consequently kept the JSS out of any matters that could be deemed too sensitive. Despite Tej’s remark that overall the articles reflected more contemporary concerns, issues on contemporary politics of the country were kept away from the pages of the JSS. Articles, therefore, concentrated on history, traditional arts, and the like.³⁵ Furthermore, Thai scholars might have hesitated to make their work visible, although Tej would like to encourage

³³ After fifteen years under the dictatorial regimes of Field Marshal Sarit Thanarat (1958–1963) and Field Marshall Thanom Kittikachorn (1963–1973), in early October 1973, Thai students and people began to call for a new constitution. Over a period of less than two weeks, the initial call by a small number of people grew into protests of several hundred thousand people in the streets in Bangkok and provinces around the country. The protests climaxed with clashes between the people and state forces on 14 October, after which Thanom and his two deputies left the country. During the next three years, elections were held. A democratic constitution was written. A range of previously marginalised groups, including students, workers, farmers and many others organised and demanded their rights and the transformation of Thai society. By late 1974, a backlash to this open politics began in the form of state and para-state attacks on activists. For an overview of the period, see Charnvit Kasetsiri and Thamrongsak Petchlertanan, eds, *Chak sipsee thung hok tula* [From 14th to 6th October] (Bangkok: Foundation for the Promotion of Social Sciences and Humanities Textbooks Project, 1998); David Morell and Chai-anan Samudavanija, *Political Conflict in Thailand: Reform, Reaction, Revolution* (Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, 1981). For an analysis of the farmers’ movement, its revolutionary potential, and the backlash it engendered, see Tyrell Haberkorn, *Revolution Interrupted: Farmers, Students, Laws, and Violence in Northern Thailand* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011). For an analysis of one of the para-state groups active during this period, the Village Scouts, see Katherine Bowie, *Rituals of National Loyalty: The State and the Village Scout Movement in Thailand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997). For a timeline of events on 6 October 1976, see Puey Ungpakorn, ‘Violence and the Military Coup in Thailand’, *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 9, no. 3 (July–September 1977): 4–12. For an analysis of how the events on that day have entered into social memory and history, see Thongchai Winichakul, ‘Remembering/Silencing the Traumatic Past: The Ambivalent Memories of the October 1976 Massacre in Bangkok’, in *Cultural Crisis and Social Memory: Modernity and Identity in Thailand and Laos*, eds. Shigeharu Tanabe and Charles F. Keyes (London: Routledge, 2002), 243–283.

³⁴ For more details, see Chris Baker and Pasuk Phongpaichit, *A History of Thailand*, 3rd ed. (Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2014), chap. 6.

³⁵ See William Warren, *The Siam Society: A Century* (Bangkok, The Siam Society, 2004), chapter 6.

them to write for the Journal. Indeed, although the most productive author during Tej's first editorship was Thai, the overall number of Thai authors was still much lower than that of foreigners. As shown in tables 5.1 and 5.2, the top twenty authors in terms of their productivity, during Tej's both tenures as the Honorary Editor were mostly foreigners.³⁶

Overall, no matter how busy he was from the diplomatic duties, and despite certain difficulties in seeking contributions of good quality, Tej enjoyed his editorial work, remarking 'I never had difficulty managing my time doing several things at the same time'.³⁷ By the time he was posted to station in Jakarta as the First Secretary at the Royal Thai Embassy, in 1976, Tej had edited nine issues of the JSS, totalling 3,340 pages. Overall, there were 243 contributions, including articles, review articles, notes and book reviews, from 125 contributors. Extracted from the JSS issues of January 1972 to January 1976, table 5.3 presents the breakdown of contributions to the journal, by their type.

During Tej's absence, the JSS editorship was taken over by Nisa Sheanakul and then Kim Atkinson. After four years of stationing in Jakarta, Tej returned to Thailand in late 1980. Concurrently, Atkinson was leaving Thailand to work overseas. As such, Tej resumed his editorship in 1981, for his interest in academic work. But the early 1980s was a much busier time for him, as he progressed in his diplomatic career, reaching the ambassadorial rank in 1983, and then becoming Deputy Permanent Secretary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

³⁶ In this case, productivity is simply measured by numbers of pages that authors contributed to the JSS, as the page layout of the journal were consistent throughout the editorship. The credibility of this bibliometric measure may be debatable, but at least it provides a general idea, for a simple comparison, of how much content each contributor produced for the JSS. Benno Torgler and Marco Piatti also use this measure, among others, in their thorough study of an economic journal; see their *A Century of American Economic Review: Insights on Critical Factors in Journal Publishing* (Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013).

³⁷ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 17 May 2012.

Table 5.1. Top 20 contributors to JSS, January 1972 – January 1976.

	Number of pages contributed	% of total pages
MC Chand Chirayu Rajani*	263	7.87
A B Griswold	206	6.17
Prasert na Nagara*	188	5.63
Anthony R Walker	171	5.12
Michael Vickery	98	2.93
H E Kauffman	70	2.10
Charnvit Kasetsiri*	64	1.92
Kennon Breazeale	59	1.77
Henry D Ginsburg	50	1.50
Charles F Keyes	50	1.50
Thamsook Numnonda*	50	1.50
Benjamin A Batson	49	1.47
Peter Bee	47	1.41
David P Chandler	40	1.20
Donald K Swearer	40	1.20
Andrew Turton	39	1.17
James B Pruess	38	1.14
Laurence D Stifel	38	1.14
David K Wyatt	35	1.05
Michael Smithies	34.5	1.03
Total	1,629.5	48.79

* Thai contributors

Table 5.2. Top 20 contributors to JSS, 1981 – 1985.

	Number of pages contributed	% of total pages
Anthony R Walker	59	4.11
Aye Kyaw	46	3.20
Kobkua Suwannathat-Pian*	45	3.13
Suriya Ratanakul*	42	2.92
Erik Cohen	37	2.58
Malinee Dilokwanich*	36	2.51
Cyril Skinner	36	2.51
Betty Gosling	35	2.44
Philip Hughes	35	2.44
Roger Kershaw	33	2.30
David L Gosling	32	2.23
William Y Dessaint	31	2.16
Richard P Lando	28	1.95
Phan-ngam Gothamasan*	26	1.81
Larry Sternstein	25	1.74
John Black	22	1.53
Michael Vickery	22	1.53
Bennet Bronson	21	1.46
S Singaravelu	21	1.46
Barend Jan Terwiel	21	1.46
Total	653	45.47

* Thai contributors

Table 5.3. Breakdown by type of contributions to JSS, January 1972 – January 1976.

	1972		1973		1974		1975		1976	Total
	Jan (Vol 60.1)	Jul (Vol 60.2)	Jan (Vol 61.1)	Jul (Vol 61.2)	Jan (Vol 62.1)	Jul (Vol 62.2)	Jan (Vol 63.1)	Jul (Vol 63.2)	Jan (Vol 64.1)	
Articles	11	9	9	6	7	10	9	8	10	79
Notes	2	-	-	3	2	2	1	4	1	15
Review articles	-	1	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	14
Reviews	16	15	15	12	15	17	15	15	15	135
Total	29	25	27	22	27	30	27	28	28	243

For the Siam Society, it still felt a side effect of the political turmoil during the 1970s, namely, the reduction in international funding, particularly from the United

States. Also, the Society lost its income in other ways,³⁸ and, therefore, needed to be careful on its spending. Although he just resumed the editorship, it was not long before Tej realised the budgetary constraint. He revealed to a contributor whose article was to be published in 1981 that '[h]owever, I am not quite sure when in the course of 1981, the article will come out, as we may have to limit the JSS to only one volume next year due to budgetary limitations'.³⁹ His supposition did come true. In 1981, the JSS was published once a year, instead of twice, in what could be called a double issue.⁴⁰ The financial situation seems to have persisted throughout the editorship. In 1984, Tej wrote in reply to an author who had asked if she could have more than one complimentary copy of the JSS: 'authors received one copy of the Journal in which their articles appear plus 30 offprints free of charge. Can you please therefore pay for the two other copies you requested ... I am sorry about this but the finances of the Society are such that we have to think about every baht and satang'.⁴¹ It is worth noting, however, that despite the constraints, the Society Council still tried its best to allocate sufficient budget for printing the JSS, 'because the Journal is the lifeblood of the Society'.⁴²

Besides, with more work he had from the ministry, Tej had to multitask in his office, and had fewer opportunities to go to work at the Siam Society.⁴³ However, he continued to edit the journal for another five years, despite all the busyness from the positions he held at the ministry. This time, he edited five double issues of JSS,

³⁸ Warren, *The Siam Society*, 118.

³⁹ [3/39] Tej Bunnag to William Y. Dessaint, 21 October 1980.

⁴⁰ Technically, the JSS remained a two-part periodical, as it was printed on the cover that the issue included parts one (January) and two (July). The practice had continued through to the subsequent editorship (of Sulak Sivaraksa, from 1986 to 1988), in which no indication of parts one and two appeared on the cover. In 1989, under the presidency of Piriya Krairiksh, the serial was published separately in two parts again. Nonetheless, the one-issue-a-year resumed after five volumes (1989–1993). The JSS has, since 1994, been published once a year as a single-part periodical.

⁴¹ [4/155] Tej Bunnag to Natalie V. Robinson, 13 June 1984. Note that in the Thai currency system, one baht is made up of 100 satang.

⁴² Minutes of the 773rd Council Meeting, 11 May 1982, Minute Book No. 11.

⁴³ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 27 April 2017, Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok.

totalling 137 contributions from eighty-seven contributors, and counting 1,436 pages. Gleaned from the JSS issues of 1981 to 1985, table 5.4 gives the breakdown of contributions to the journal by their type. It should be noted that there were 18 contributors, who had previously published in the JSS during Tej's first editorship. As such, Tej welcomed altogether 194 contributors to the journal during his two tenures as the Honorary Editor.

Table 5.4. Breakdown by type of contributions to JSS, 1981–1985.

	1981 (Vol 69)	1982 (Vol 70)	1983 (Vol 71)	1984 (Vol 72)	1985 (Vol 73)	Total
Articles	9	10	10	10	12	51
Notes	2	2	1	1	3	9
Reviews	16	18	20	16	7	77
Total	27	30	31	27	22	137

It is evident that in spite of the workload arising from his diplomatic career which had constantly kept him busy over the years, Tej put a substantial effort to do his editorial work for the Siam Society. It is also clear that he was passionate about and enjoyed the work. As he once remarked, 'I love the Society, I love the library, and I love the journal'.⁴⁴ In addition, editing JSS was an opportunity for him to keep up his academic interest in history. It was the way for him to maintain 'a balance between me as a career diplomat working on old daily and long-term problems of Thai foreign policy, and ... the other side of me, which was still trying its best to keep up with academe. That's why I enjoyed it'.⁴⁵ Above all, perhaps, his utmost hope was to build and pass on a body of scholarly work, as he expressed it in 2012 when Smithies became an octogenarian: 'Most of what Michael and I published in the years we were

⁴⁴ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 17 May 2012.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

responsible for the *JSS* in one way or other will, I sincerely believe, stand the test of time as enduring scholarship'.⁴⁶

5.3 Tej Bunnag's Private Papers 'on Deposit to the Siam Society Library'

During both times of his editorship, Tej filed a great number of private papers for his personal use, supposedly in his capacity as the Honorary Editor of the *JSS*. The papers from each tenure of his editorship were put into one collection, comprising four volumes, and kept at the Siam Society Library at present. The collection came into its current repository, as Tej put it 'on deposit to the Siam Society Library'. These words are taken as written on the spines of the four ring binders that hold the documents. Figure 5.2 shows details of the wordings in Tej's handwriting. As the figure illustrates, Tej states clearly that the files contain his personal records 'kiaokap kanpenbannathikankittimasak nitayasan sayam samakom lae uen uen', literally meaning 'regarding the honorary editorship of the Journal of the Siam Society, etc' (figure 5.2 (1a)). The collection is 'fak kep wai thi hongsamut sayam samakom', literally meaning 'on deposit to the Siam Society Library' (figure 5.2 (1b) and (1c)). As such, although the majority of the records in this collection are concerned with Tej's editorial work at the Siam Society, there are records of other matters, as the 'etc' on every file suggests.

Nevertheless, the fact that the content of the collection are from the periods of Tej's editorship provides a basis for a better understanding about the collection itself. That is, it implies what activities Tej might be involved in, what roles he might be playing, or what responsibilities he might be taking, at the times when these documents were created and captured into the collection. This leads to the beginning

⁴⁶ Tej, felicitation, VIII.

(1) Vols. 1 and 2

(2) Vols. 3 and 4

Figure 5.2. Details of spines of four ring binders holding Tej Bunnag's private papers
(Photograph by Chirabodee Tejasen)

step which Sue McKemmish suggests when archivists consider personal recordkeeping as a form of evidencing and memorialising a life. She instructs that they should ask such fundamental questions as ‘What records of the activities associated with these various roles do individuals want or need to capture, and in what documentary form? Why do they need to capture them? How long do they need to keep them and why?’⁴⁷ In order to address these questions, it is important to understand the context in which the personal records under scrutiny were created and captured in to the recordkeeping system, which, in the case of Tej’s private papers collection, has been outlined in the preceding section.

As seen in the previous section, it is evident that in both tenures of the JSS editorship, Tej divided his time in carrying out duties as a career diplomat and as the editor of a learned journal. As the Honorary Editor who had a career elsewhere, Tej worked in his own time and in a place of his own choice, which usually was not the Siam Society.⁴⁸ This is why documents pertaining to his editorial work were kept with him, and not at the Siam Society.

A close look at the manner in which Tej organised these documents reveals an actor-based execution of tasks. That is, each correspondent was treated as an actor in the functions of publishing the JSS. Each actor had a ‘place’ in the file, which was divided alphabetically (from A to Z). The documents of or regarding each actor were kept in the alphabetical division that corresponded to his or her name⁴⁹ (usually with the more recent ones on top of the older ones). In dealing with a case of an author, for instance, Tej would file (i.e. capture) relevant records based on the author’s name, even if that author might have contributed to the JSS more than once. It is, therefore, possible to find records about different contributions by one author filed in the same

⁴⁷ Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of me’, *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 176.

⁴⁸ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 25 June 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

⁴⁹ Surname in the cases of foreigners, and first name in the cases of Thais.

(alphabetical) ‘place’ in the file. Had the execution of the editorial tasks been project-based, the records could have been filed at the level of contributions (e.g. articles, notes, or reviews), or issues (e.g. January 1971 or July 1971). According to Tej, this actor-based filing was the most practical way for him to retrieve these papers at the time he used them to perform his role as the editor. It allowed him easy access to a given document once needed.⁵⁰

As with any editors of scholarly serials, Tej’s roles and responsibilities aimed at getting the JSS published, in his own words, ‘reasonably on time’.⁵¹ In order to achieve such a goal, Tej had to prepare contents for the journal and passed them to the printers who would lay texts onto pages. It is obvious, as Tej himself once noted, that getting the JSS published was ‘largely a co-operative effort’⁵² in which various stakeholders were involved, and effective communications were required. As such, Tej had corresponded with this stakeholders (or actors) who played their part in the course of producing the journal, thus creating a body of documents in the form of correspondence (i.e. letters that were exchanged between stakeholders). These documents were the means through which the editorial works were executed. Consequently, they needed to be captured into Tej’s recordkeeping system, so that he could continue to function as the editor.

Nevertheless, since Tej played an active role in calling ‘on a wide circle of friends, colleagues and acquaintances’ to contribute to the JSS, he did not correspond with authors in this circle exclusively on the JSS-related matters. There were also contributors who began their association with Tej as the Honorary Editor, but eventually became friends and regular correspondents with the editor. It is arguably natural for friends or acquaintances to exchange, to a certain extent, notes on personal

⁵⁰ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 July 2016.

⁵¹ [1/286] Tej Bunnag to J[ohn] R. Marr, 2 September 1972.

⁵² [2/170] Tej Bunnag to Suriya Ratanakul, 20 November 1974.

matters, as they contact each other. Indeed, this has surfaced in Tej's private papers. Therefore, while these private papers are an evidence of the official functions Tej performed as the JSS Honorary Editor, they are also a testimony to his other roles and activities as an individual.

Since these private papers were captured into the collection as evidence of Tej's various functions and activities in various capacities, it is not easy to determine for how long they need to be kept. On the one hand, as Tej's editorships already ended, there seems to be no compelling reason for a long-term retention on Tej's part. It is less likely that he would have to consult these records on a regular basis as it was during each editorship itself. On the other hand, these records also contain non-JSS matters. As such, the end of the editorships is not the only factor determining what records managers refer to as disposal schedule for Tej's private papers. Moreover, even Tej himself did not find it necessary to consider discarding these papers soon after his editorships had ended. Rather he had continued to keep the papers with him for an extended period, until he eventually decided to put this collection 'on deposit to the Siam Society Library'.⁵³ He did not place any conditions, thus allowing anyone to gain access to the collection, as he regarded it 'historical evidence'.⁵⁴ Yet, by putting the collection 'on deposit', it can be inferred that Tej might wish to assert his rights to 'withdraw' the collection, at his discretion, in the future.

In sum, this section has considered Tej's private papers collection at the Siam Society Library as evidence and memorialisation of his life, against the key questions McKemmish has suggested archivists to ask when dealing with personal recordkeeping. It has shown that Tej needed to capture into his collection

⁵³ Tej could not recall exactly when he gave the collection to the Siam Society Library. It could be sometime between when he returned to Thailand in 2001 after his last overseas post as the ambassador of Thailand to the United States, and the accidental fire that consumed the old library building of the Siam Society in November 2009.

⁵⁴ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

correspondence between him and the various actors who were involved in the business of publishing the JSS. However, he had kept these papers beyond his editorships as they also contained non-JSS matters. In addition, Tej does not seem to have an intention to dispose these records. While the collection is now with at the Siam Society Library, being ‘on deposit’ means Tej may, at any time, ‘withdraw’ it.

This chapter has provided an overview of Tej’s early life and early career after he completed his DPhil and returned to Bangkok in 1969. It also reviewed Tej’s two editorships of the JSS, with reference to his roles and the activities associated with these roles, the context in which he was working to produce this learned serial, and the overall outcome of his editorial effort. Finally, it has looked at Tej’s private papers collection ‘on deposit to the Siam Society Library’ as evidence and memorialisation of his life. In short, the chapter has set the private papers collection under this current study into the context, before analysing it in the framework of ‘evidence of *me*’ as outlined in chapter 3 above. The results of such an analysis will be discussed in the next chapter.

CHAPTER 6

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS

This chapter will present result of the analysis of Tej Bunnag's private papers held at the Siam Society Library, and discuss the findings of the study. The first section will address the first research question which deals with the purposes of Tej's personal archive. The second section will address the second research question which traces how the archive was used. The last section discusses the findings, hence addressing the research objective of elucidating the relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive.

6.1 Functions as purposes: What is the archive for?

Despite being a career diplomat, Tej has done many other different jobs. What is reflected in the pages of his personal papers held at the Siam Society Library, is only a part of his personal archive which he has kept over the years. It is highly likely for anyone who has various roles to play, with multiple duties to be responsible for, to have different goals and uses of the records he or she keeps. Tej is not an exception. Indeed, an examination of Tej's private papers collection at the Siam Society Library and the interviews with him show that he has kept his records for more than one reason, revealing therefore multiple functions of his personal archive.

6.1.1 Keeping for future reference

As the Honorary Editor of the JSS, Tej saw a large number of articles, notes and reviews through the process of getting them published from the beginning to the end. Inevitably, he had to deal with many different stakeholders involving in this process,

such as contributors, peer-reviewers, printers and the Siam Society Council. In the course of his association and interaction with these parties, paper documents and records were consequently created. This was the nature of the work during the time when Tej was the Honorary Editor. As shown in the previous chapter (see tables 5.3 and 5.4), the amount of contributions to the JSS was not small. It was, therefore, important that these records were well kept and ready when he needed to refer to them. Tej explained that it was impossible for him to remember everything, ‘especially when I do various jobs’.¹ Thus, one reason why Tej had to keep these private papers was, in his own word, ‘for future reference’.²

As the Honorary Editor, Tej worked with many contributors towards the publication of their manuscripts in the Journal. Editorial work was time-consuming, and it required good communication between the editor and authors. In order to keep track of the communication, Tej realised ‘the necessity to keep the correspondence [between him and the authors], as there were on-going matters’.³ To illustrate, Tej referred to the case of Alexander B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, whose contributions⁴ had been published, as the Epigraphic and Historical Studies (EHS) series, in the JSS before he took over the editorship from Michael Smithies. Tej explained:

¹ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 29 October 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

² Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 27 April 2017, Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok.

³ Ibid.

⁴ See, for example, A. B. Griswold and Prasert na Nagara, ‘Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 10: King Lōdaiya of Sukhodaya and his contemporaries’, *JSS* 60, no. 1 (January 1972): 21–152; ‘Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 11 Part I The Epigraphy of Mahādharmarājā I of Sukhodaya’, *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 71–182; ‘The Epigraphy of Mahādharmarājā I of Sukhodaya. Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 11 Part II’, *JSS* 61, no. 2 (July 1973): 91–128; ‘Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 12, Inscription 9’, *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 89–122; ‘Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 13, Inscription of Wat Pra Yün’, *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 123–142; ‘Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 14, Inscription of Siva of Kambeñ Bejra’, *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 223–238; ‘Inscription of Vāt Khemā: Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 15’, *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 127–142; ‘Inscription of Vāt Braḥ Stec, near Sukhodaya: Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 16’, *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 143–160.

I must keep the letters from Mr. Griswold regarding his articles, but I don't have any correspondence between me and Dr. Prasert na Nagara ... because I would drive to meet Dr. Prasert and discuss with him, relaying what Mr. Griswold said [in his letters], and asking "What would you say?" Then, I will reply to Mr. Griswold, until we could agree on what to publish.⁵

In Tej's opinion, Griswold and Prasert's articles were difficult in several aspects, as they involved the decipherment and interpretation of the Sukhothai inscriptions.

Besides, Tej had to take the role of 'mediator, facilitator, [and] messenger'⁶ between the two authors, because Griswold usually lived in Baltimore, Maryland, while Prasert worked and lived in Bangkok. Take for instance the case of Griswold and Prasert's articles published in the JSS issue of January 1975, whose manuscripts were submitted in August 1974,⁷ while Tej was away from Thailand. Once he received the manuscripts, Tej went to see Prasert for comments, then responded to Griswold. In his reply of 12 September 1974, Tej noted:

I hope you have received my letter from England by now, for as I said there, I was sure I would find letters from you waiting for me in Bangkok. I was not disappointed. ... EHS Nos. 15 and 16 have also been seen by Dr. Prasert who made a few minor corrections. They are now ready for the press.⁸

This case shows that keeping good track of correspondence was key to enabling Tej to perform his role as the editor who, as a career diplomat, would have to travel abroad on official duties. Otherwise, it would have been difficult for him to keep up with the on-going issues and matters arising from the editorial work.

Apart from the example of a difficult case which Tej encountered as the JSS Honorary Editor, there were other occasions when the 'on-going issues' simply mean they went on over an extended period of time. This was, in part, owing to the nature of

⁵ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

⁶ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 29 October 2014.

⁷ [1/162] Alexander B. Griswold to Tej Bunnag, 15 August 1974; [1/160] Alexander B. Griswold to Tej Bunnag, 21 August 1974.

⁸ [1/159] Tej Bunnag to A[lexander] B. Griswold, 12 September 1974.

editorial work which, particularly for the JSS as Tej noted, was ‘largely a co-operative effort where each author takes care of his own article and I restrain my editorial hand to maintaining direction’.⁹ In this way, editing a manuscript could take a varying amount of time, depending partially on the co-operation of the author(s). Consequently, the editor needed to keep his records well so that he would readily be able to track the progress of each article he was handling, no matter how long it took to get an article published in the JSS.

For example, in editing a manuscript from a Cornell University PhD candidate, Benjamin A. Batson, which was submitted in December 1973, Tej started corresponding with the author, presumably, from early 1974. He extensively commented on the manuscript in a four-page long, handwritten note.¹⁰ In return, Batson on 17 March 1974 responded to Tej’s comments in details.¹¹ Figure 6.1 illustrates how Tej and Batson corresponded on the manuscript. Batson’s article was eventually published in the JSS issue of July 1974,¹² after the collaborative editorial work had been finalised, as evidenced in Batson’s aerogramme dated 16 April 1974. Still, on that occasion Batson suggested four minor corrections to the final proof that he assumed Tej ‘may have already made’, but finally reminding ‘(1) is definitely wrong; (2), (3) & (4) I leave to your discretion’.¹³

It might not seem necessary that Tej would have to retain his correspondence for a long time, when such an article as that of Batson could be published within a year after the manuscript had been submitted. However, there were occasions on which the authors had to be kept awaiting before a decision could be made. Depending on the

⁹ [2/170] Tej Bunnag to Suriya Ratanakul, 20 November 1974.

¹⁰ [1/10] A copy of Tej Bunnag’s note on a manuscript [by Benjamin A. Batson], no date.

¹¹ [1/9] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 17 March 1974.

¹² Benjamin A. Batson, ‘The Fall of the Phibun Government, 1944’, *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 89–120.

¹³ [1/4] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 16 April 1974.

1

中国北京饭店
PEKING HOTEL, CHINA

p. 2. can you please give evidence for using the word
"preserved", otherwise it sounds a bit strong.

3 1 second word "rather" is unnecessary, I think.

3 14 can I please insert "presumably" between "upward"
and "aimed".

4 14-18 "Thus Thai of all political persuasions" sounds too
strong. Can I suggest something like "Thus it would
seem that..." or "Thus most Thai of different political
persuasions..." etc.

5 9 cut out "the precincts of". It was actually signed
in the Temple. There are many photographs of the area.

7 19 "clandestinely" is a little spooky. Many people
had to shoot war values and others regularly to RSC
news, like my parents. It was "clandestine", I suppose.
I am not suggesting any change here; it's just that it
doesn't read right. I step and question it, you know.

9 4 "Buddhist city". By city, you mean something like
the Vatican City, then it's all right. The expression
"no war an enclave, well, but I think "city" is O.K.

12 10-11, and also ... in the past. can you please supply
concrete evidence for this, please. I'd rather leave
it.

14 The point is clear as in footnote 20, p. 33

(a)

5/4.1

March 17, 1974

Dear Tej,

Thank you again for your detailed comments and suggestions
on the Phibun thing, almost all of which I agree with. I'm
sorry to be slow to answer but it's taken a while to check
things and I've also been busy with other things and out of
town for a few days as well.

To go down your list:

p. 2 1.19 I don't think "measured" is really inaccurate-- there were
mass meetings of converts, reported discrimination against
non-Buddhist officials, etc. (cf. Kan To Su, pp. 74-76).
However, perhaps "encouraged" sounds better-- can we change
"measured" to that?

p. 3 1.1 I've checked the references again-- in the interest of
greater accuracy I've changed "measured" to "encouraged".
I've also changed "measured" to "encouraged" in the earlier
had begun January 1." to "a dubious argument purporting
to show that the ancient Thai year had begun on (or about)
January 1."

p. 3 1.14 Change "reference aimed" to "reference presumably aimed".
p. 4 1.17-18 How about changing to "Thus Thai of most political
persuasions..." or "Thus Thai of various political persuasions..."

p. 5 1.9 Delete "the precincts of" ✓

p. 7 1.13 Since you think its OK I would leave "clandestinely" in. ✓
p. 9 1.4 "Buddhist city"-- you indicate that n. 20 makes it clear.
It was going to have gates, etc.

p. 17 1.10-11 "and also... in the past." There are sources-- e.g.
Kuang, Kan To Su, chapter 6, "Vijayavada (Vijaya)",
especially p. 87, Thawee in Portraits of Thai Politics,
p. 94, and Fridl in Bangkok, pp. 60-61. My vagueness
here was intentional, but perhaps it's too strong. How
about changing "with" to "displeasure"?

p. 17 1.11 Change "He doubted..." to "He probably doubted..." ✓
p. 18 1.12 I'm willing to delete "glib" but I don't much like "witty"
alone. How about using "a witty and resourceful speaker"
or something similar.

p. 24 1.20-21 Leave out the sentence in parentheses (and move the
"66" to the end of the previous sentence.)
As I wrote before I had doubts about this aside. Thank
you very much for the information about Khun Miew and the
Hajedammern buildings, of which I was unaware. I don't think
Hajedammern is an architectural success, but perhaps the
fault is more in the materials and construction than in the design.

(b)

Figure 6.1. Communication between Tej Bunnag (a) and Benjamin A. Batson (b) on editing a manuscript
(Reproduced by courtesy of the Siam Society Library)

decision made, any further action could then be taken. For instance, on 8 January 1981, Tej rejected a manuscript submitted in August 1980. The reason why it had taken more than a quarter before Tej reached such a decision was that the author cited a copyrighted material, and that the editor needed expert's opinions. He wrote:

Further to my letter of 9 October, I wish to inform you that, in a letter dated 12 November 1980, the A.U.A.¹⁴ informed the Society that they had no objection to your using some sections of their Language Center Thai Course, Book I ... in the article, "Notes on the So Language", which you had submitted for publication in the Journal of the Siam Society.

I then sent your article to a Reader. I regret to have to inform you that the Reader, having consulted other specialists, did not recommend your article for publication in the JSS. I am therefore returning it to you herewith.¹⁵

It should be noted that Tej filed together all records pertinent to this submission. These include the cover letter from the author, a copy of his letter acknowledging the submission, the copyright clearance from the A.U.A., a letter from the peer-reviewer, and a copy of his letter of rejection. Likewise, this is also the recordkeeping practice applied to several other cases which spanned over an extended period of time. As an example, it is worth looking at a case that involved delays.

When the Mon scholar, Nai Pan Hla, submitted a manuscript in early 1984, Tej was not able to get it published in the same year, as the 'printers ... are winding up their business. They regret that they are not able to print your article because it has so many diacritical marks. I have had therefore to withdraw your article ... from JSS 1984, and put it into JSS 1985'.¹⁶ The delay led the author to get his American friend to read the manuscript for comments and corrections.¹⁷ However, by June 1985 when the JSS issue of that year went to press, Tej still did not have the manuscript back. As

¹⁴ The American University Alumni Language Center, in Bangkok, Thailand.

¹⁵ [3/113] Tej Bunnag to Raymond S. Kania, 8 January 1981.

¹⁶ [4/118] Tej Bunnag to Nai Pan Hla, 22 August 1984.

¹⁷ [4/116] Nai Pan Hla to Tej Bunnag, 12 December 1984.

a result, he wrote to Nai Pan Hla: ‘your article will have to wait for JSS 1986, I am sorry to say’.¹⁸

From the examples discussed above, it is clear that had he not kept relevant records well, Tej would not have necessary information at hand when treating with the contributors. Thanks to the very nature of editorial work which was carried out mostly through extensive exchange of letters, good and consistent recordkeeping practice was required. Tej explains, ‘we can’t guess when we would need to use [these] documents [again]. And then, sometimes there happens to be occasions on which I have to retrieve far back to answer what people have asked me’.¹⁹

To illustrate, Tej referred to a request to reprint an article which had been published in the JSS about a decade earlier. It was the case he could ‘remember well’. It was the case of ‘an Australian couple’, with the surname ‘Hinton’, who both previously contributed to the JSS.²⁰ He remember retrieving from his private papers collection some related records, and ‘finally could find the original records and then replied to the requestors’.²¹

The records in his private papers collection show that on 20 November 1984, the School of Human Ecology, Howard University, requested to reproduce the article entitled ‘The Dress of the Pwo Karen of North Thailand’, by E. M. Hinton.²² It happened that the article was published in 1974 during Tej’s first editorship. In order to process this request, Tej consulted his records of the 1970s before writing to Peter Hinton, addressed to his office in the University of Sydney:

¹⁸ [4/117] Tej Bunnag to Nai Pan Hla, 18 June 1985. The article was finally published as Nai Pan Hla, ‘Remnant of a Lost Nation and their Cognate Words to Old Mon Epigraph’, *JSS* 74 (1986): 122–156.

¹⁹ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

²⁰ Ibid.

²¹ Ibid.

²² [4/76] Emma Jean Mettam to JSS, 20 November 1984.

A look at the files shows that I last wrote to you on 11 November 1972²³ and to your wife on 20 November 1973.²⁴ Now, more than ten years later, can “E. M. Hinton” please consider the enclosed copies of request to use quotations or her article in full. When you notify your approval, I will sign the original and send it back to Howard University.²⁵

The reason why Tej sent his letter to Peter Hinton was that he could not verify if the address of E. M. Hinton had changed since his last correspondence with her. He explain: ‘I apologise for not writing directly. I don’t know whether you have moved from Elgin Street, Woolwich. It seems safest to write to this official (sic) address’.²⁶ Tej was successful in this case. E. M. Hinton granted her approval on 4 January 1985.²⁷

It is evident that he place much priority on the informational and evidential values of his personal archive. Perhaps, he is right that no one knows when he or she will need to use a particular record again. The final example above shows that recordkeeping was key to Tej in being the JSS Honorary Editor, for he needed to refer to the original records, as and when necessary. In other words, he felt it was important for him to have old records available for reference in the future.

6.1.2 *Sharing information*

Despite Tej’s vision of keeping private papers for his personal reference, which implies long-term retention under his custody, later he put ‘on deposit to the Siam Society Library’ (see figure 5.2), four volumes of his records curated during the two times when he was the JSS Honorary Editor. The initial intention was to make available his private papers to those working in the Society’s office or the subsequent

²³ [1/216] Tej Bunnag to Peter Hinton, 11 November 1972.

²⁴ [1/215] Tej Bunnag to E.M. Hinton, 20 November 1973.

²⁵ [4/75] Tej Bunnag to Peter Hinton, 6 December 1984.

²⁶ Ibid.

²⁷ [4/74] Approval of Request signed by E.M. Hinton, 4 January 1985.

editors, who might need to know what he had done as the editor.²⁸ When asked what made him decide to ‘deposit’ these papers, he explained: ‘there came the time when it was not required for [my] daily use anymore. ... My editorship had ended. I was the editor for two times, and I could not afford to do it anymore. So, it was like the business of my editorship had ended up. It finished already. There was a closure [to it]’.²⁹ As such, he felt that keeping these papers at the Society would be more useful. It is obvious that Tej considers the informational and evidential values the most important, and therefore would like to share his personal papers with others who, in his opinion, may need them.

It is worth noting that Tej himself also kept some records of Michael Smithies and Kim Atkinson during the transition from their editorships to Tej’s in 1971 and 1980, respectively. These were included in the collection which Tej presented to the Siam Society Library. For example, a browse through the first volume reveals some of the correspondence between Michael Smithies and Peter Bee, as well as E.H.S. Simmonds on the JSS issue devoted to contributions from the School of Oriental and African Studies (SOAS), University of London. This was Smithies’ initiative that bore fruit during Tej’s first editorship. The SOAS number of JSS was published in July 1972. In the editorial of that issue, Tej noted:

It was in the middle of 1969 that the former Honorary Editor, Mr. Michael Smithies, began discussions on the publication of a School of Oriental and African Studies number of the Journal with Professor E.H.S. Simmonds, Head of the Department of Southeast Asia and the Islands at S.O.A.S., who was on one of his fleeting visits to Bangkok. Substantive plans for the number were later made with the aid of frequent correspondence between the two parties and during Professor Simmonds’ subsequent visits to this country.³⁰

²⁸ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, Siam Society, Bangkok, 25 June 2014.

²⁹ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

³⁰ Tej Bunnag, ‘Editorial’, *JSS* 60, no. 2 (July 1972): v.

As Tej took over from Smithies the JSS editorship, it was important that he knew what Smithies had done up to the time of the takeover, even though both of them had previously worked together on the publication of the Journal. Particularly for the SOAS number, which was a kind of ‘projects [that] have a notorious reputation for failing to appear in time or indeed to materialise at all’,³¹ Tej felt the need to have sufficient understanding of the situation in order to continue from what Smithies had initiated to its fruition. Actually, it is evident that he had consulted the correspondence – which, as he mentioned in the editorial, was ‘the aid’ in making plans for the publication – between Smithies and Simmonds. Clearly, he wrote in his first letter to Simmonds: ‘I am writing with reference to the SOAS number of the Journal of the Siam Society, July 1972. I am referring to your last letter on this matter to Michael Smithies dated the 6th May 1971’.³²

Similar examples can be found in the third volume, which covers the transition from Atkinson to Tej as the JSS Honorary Editor in 1980. Although they are not the records of a particular subject matter as those regarding the SOAS number of the JSS left by Smithies, they should have provided Tej with sufficient understanding on the context of the work which he was taking over from Atkinson. For instance, there is a series of correspondence between Roger Kershaw (of University of Kent at Canterbury) and Atkinson, from October 1978³³ to August 1980³⁴. Atkinson had worked with Roger on the latter’s contributions which appeared in the Journal.³⁵ By the time when Tej replaced Atkinson, there was one submission from Kershaw for Tej

³¹ Ibid.

³² [1/345], Tej Bunnag to E.H.S. Simmonds, 19 August 1971. Simmonds’ letter which Tej referred to here is included in the collection [1/346], E.H.S. Simmonds to Michael Smithies, 6 May 1971.

³³ [3/141] Roger Kershaw to Kim Atkinson, 9 October 1978.

³⁴ [3/122] Roger Kershaw to Kim Atkinson, 18 August 1980.

³⁵ Roger Kershaw, ‘Menace and Reassurance in Malay Circumcision: A Note on Some Attitudes of Kelantan Thais’, *JSS* 67, no. 2 (July 1979): 116–122; Roger Kershaw, ‘Frontiers within Frontiers: The Persistence of Thai Ethnicity in Kelantan, Malaysia’, *JSS* 68, no. 1 (January 1980): 145–158.

to process.³⁶ This probably was why this series of records was passed to Tej, who included it in his private papers collection.

This, once again, points out to the fact that Tej placed such a high significance on the informational and evidential values of the records that he kept. In addition, it reaffirms Tej's liking to referring to evidence when dealing with on-going issues, as it appears in the case of his first letter to Simmonds. However, this is not to suggest that Tej presented his editorship records to the Siam Society, for the continuation of the practice of passing on relevant records to the subsequent JSS Honorary Editor. In fact, his collection is the only one of its kind currently held by the Siam Society Library. Rather, it is likely that Tej saw the potential usefulness of his records to the Siam Society, and therefore decided to put the collection 'on deposit' as mentioned above.

Nevertheless, Tej himself realises that his filing system can cause difficulties to future users,³⁷ for they may not understand the context in which his private papers were filed. As the editor who curated his own records, Tej was familiar with his own filing system, which embraced alphabetical and chronological orders. During his editorship, he should not have much difficulty in accessing and retrieving his own papers. Key to retrieving a certain document from his collection is the positional memory. As the creator and regular user of the collection, Tej could remember where in the file he had kept the records. However, Tej admitted it became more difficult to retrieve a given document (or set of documents) from the files after he had not used it for a long time.³⁸ Even so, the organisational structure of the collection still makes retrieval possible. In addition, it seems that Tej leaves it to any future users to find their own way to use his private papers. He did not provide any finding aid, but at the

³⁶ This submission did not finally appear in the JSS.

³⁷ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

³⁸ Ibid.

same time imposed no restrictions on the collection in terms of access and use.³⁹ In this light, though it is not known if there has been any request to consult Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library prior to this current study, it is not impossible to regard the 'deposit' of his private papers there as a deposit of information resource for a purpose of sharing.

6.1.3 *Building a legacy*

When asked if there is a planned disposal of any of his private papers, Tej replied with a negative answer. 'Not yet', Tej said promptly, 'definitely not. I only think about how to manage and organise them'.⁴⁰ Furthermore, he insists on their informational and evidential values. A historian by training, he believes that 'documents are important, because they will tell [us] a lot of things. ... That I used to collaborate with Michael Smithies to make JSS and was the editor for two times, I am glad in that I have kept as many documents as possible, and preserve them for the younger generation, or academics [or] researchers like you to be able to learn what the editor had to do [back then]'.⁴¹ This motivated Tej to give this collection of his personal records to the Siam Society. In fact, there was no need for Tej to use these records on a regular basis anymore. Nonetheless, it is not clear whether the Siam Society would have to refer to them frequently in the course of any of its current business. Even so, Tej still regards these papers as crucial, without a plan of disposal as they 'have been selected' for long-term preservation.⁴² This point is worth looking at more closely in order to understand Tej's reasoning.

³⁹ Ibid.

⁴⁰ Ibid.

⁴¹ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, Siam Society, Bangkok, 25 June 2014.

⁴² Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

In their examination of personal archives, Joseph Kaye and his colleagues⁴³ found that academics kept archives not only to find them later, but also to document their life's work. They 'kept everything, but rarely went back to those files to retrieve' for any particular item therein.⁴⁴ However, they had no plan for discarding anything in the archives, as 'these were testament to [their] "life work", a self-constructed permanent record of the achievements and movements of the archiver'.⁴⁵ These archives were categorised as 'legacy archives', of which their keepers were proud, as the archives represented 'the unified body of materials that reflected their career trajectory'.⁴⁶

As with the personal archives examined by Kaye and his colleagues, Tej's private papers collection at the Siam Society Library can be regarded as a legacy archive. Having seen the whole collection again in 2014 – years after he had presented it to the Siam Society – Tej was delighted, for 'it is a part of my life'.⁴⁷ He added that it gave him a relief that the collection was not lost in the fire that consumed the old library building in November 2009. That Tej regards these papers as a part of his life probably means they are a form of testimony to his life. Indeed, they, in one way or the other, document Tej's life in different times and in different capacities. It is, therefore, possible to treat this collection of private papers as a documentation of Tej's life especially as the JSS Honorary Editor. As such, when presenting these papers to the Siam Society, Tej did not only pass on the information resource regarding his editorial work, but also left a documentary legacy of his life's work. In fact, he did not deny that, in a way, he was leaving something behind for posterity: 'I want people to

⁴³ Joseph 'Jofish' Kaye et al., 'To Have and to Hold: Exploring the Personal Archive', in *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems* (Montréal, Québec, Canada, 22-28 April 2006), 275–284.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 277.

⁴⁵ Ibid.

⁴⁶ Ibid.

⁴⁷ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 25 June 2014.

have evidence, to have documents [for] research on what people in the past did'.⁴⁸

After all, Tej concluded, 'they are historical evidence'.⁴⁹ Indeed, anyone who is interested in the history of the JSS under Tej's editorship will find his private papers relevant and useful. However, those consulting Tej's archive will not only find information and evidence, but also get 'a sense of coherence and grander narrative'⁵⁰ of his life's work, inextricably embedded in the collection.

6.1.4 *Constructing identities*

It has become increasingly clear that Tej's personal archiving was not a mere means of filing and retrieving records for personal use. Apart from being a form of life documentation – making Tej's private papers collection a legacy archive – it would seem that Tej's personal archiving was used as an expression and crafting of identities reflected in the records contained in the collection. Based on Erving Goffman's idea of 'identity kit',⁵¹ Kaye and others observed that '[t]he personal archive is also a kind of "identity kit": materials reflect and describe the owner', and ... 'Items in the archive serve as "tokens", indicating who the archiver is and what they have achieved'.⁵² Fittingly, it is possible to regard the identity construction and maintenance as one of the functions that Tej's private papers collection serves. On the one hand, the collection content certainly records transactions in which Tej was involved or played a part during the timeframe that the collection covers. On the other hand, it also reflects who Tej was, what he did and achieved.

⁴⁸ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 April 2017.

⁴⁹ Ibid.

⁵⁰ Kaye and others, 'To Have and to Hold', 278.

⁵¹ Erving Goffman, *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* (London: Penguin, 1959), cited in Kaye and others, 'To Have and to Hold', 279.

⁵² Kaye and others, 'To Have and to Hold', 279.

As the Honorary Editor of the JSS, Tej showed himself through his private papers to be scrupulous and hardworking. This can be evidenced in the way his editorial work was carried out. Indeed, Tej's private papers collection includes other correspondence between the editor and authors that show not only how demanding the editorial work was, but also how much attention the editor paid in editing a manuscript. As soon as a submission was accepted, Tej would make a recommendation (on top of what the peer-reviewer(s) might have already suggested) on the presentation of the article, as well as the style. Take Benjamin Batson's article⁵³ as an example. When editing the manuscript, Tej questioned not only on the language usage, but also on the use of evidence. As shown in figure 6.1, first of all, Tej asked for an evidence which led Batson to use the word 'pressured', which in his opinion was strong for the context in which Batson was referring to.⁵⁴ Further, Tej commented on Batson's use of the adverb 'clandestinely' in a sentence which read: 'A great deal of news from Allied sources circulated clandestinely, but it was not necessary to have access to these illegal sources to judge the true situation'. Tej found it 'a little spooky', and went on commenting: 'Many people had short wave radio and listened regularly to BBC news, like my parents. It was "clandestine", I suppose. I am not suggesting any change here; it's just that it doesn't sound right. I stop and question it, you know'.⁵⁵

Batson's article is but one example. In fact, according to Tej, he did the same to every author. He was aware, however, that the choice or comment he made was subjective, depending on, as he put it, one's 'predilection, ... *if one were to be meticulous about the language usage*. ... I and Michael Smithies would do the same to

⁵³ Batson, 'The Fall of the Phibun Government, 1944', available online: http://www.siamese-heritage.org/jsspdf/1971/JSS_062_2e_Batson_FallOfPhibunGovernment1944.pdf

⁵⁴ See Batson, *ibid.*, 90.

⁵⁵ [1/10] (Tej's undated notes on Batson's manuscript.) (Underline original).

every one [contributor]’.⁵⁶ His personal records give such an impression that he was true to his words in terms of how much attention he paid and effort he put to make sure that the articles were well presented on the pages of the Journal.

Another example is when Tej edited an article by Thamsook Numnonda⁵⁷ (of Chiangmai University). Despite having acquainted with the author since when she studied in England,⁵⁸ Tej maintained his editorial hand as he did with other contributors. For instance, Tej asked for an ‘exact reference’⁵⁹ which presumably was lacking or incomplete in the manuscript. There were also requests for changes of words, such as that when Thamsook used the word ‘sentimental’ in her manuscript. It was suggested that ‘touching’ was a better choice. Tej’s reason was that ‘nowadays the word “sentimental” is unfortunately not a good word, in the same way as the word “pious”, for instance’.⁶⁰ Thamsook agreed to the change.⁶¹ As a result, the sentence appears in the Journal as ‘There were also many touching episodes that showed the sincere and close relationship between King Chulalongkorn and Strobel’.⁶²

Also evident in the private papers is that Tej was a hardworking editor. As a career diplomat, he worked for the Ministry of Foreign Affairs with increasing duties that require high responsibility over the years.⁶³ However, he committed himself to making the JSS appear ‘reasonably on time’, as ‘the Society has obligations to its members’.⁶⁴ This was the point he made in the correspondence with John Marr whose

⁵⁶ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, Siam Society, Bangkok, 31 July 2014. (Emphasis added).

⁵⁷ Thamsook Numnonda, ‘The First American Advisors in Thai History’, *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 121–148, available online http://www.siamese-heritage.org/jsspdf/1971/JSS_062_2f_ThamsookNumnonda_FirstAmericanAdvisersInThaiHistory.pdf

⁵⁸ Thamsook read history for her PhD at the School of Oriental and African Studies, University of London. She graduated in 1966.

⁵⁹ [2/184] A copy of Tej Bunnag’s note on a manuscript [by Thamsook Numnonda], no date, 1.

⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 4.

⁶¹ [2/183], Thamsook Numnonda’s reply to Tej Bunnag’s note on her manuscript, [15 March 1974], 4.

⁶² Thamsook, ‘The First American Advisors in Thai History’, 144.

⁶³ Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 27 July 2016, Siam Society, Bangkok.

⁶⁴ [1/286] Tej Bunnag to J[ohn] R. Marr, 2 September 1972.

article⁶⁵ required corrections with diacritical marks in several places. The article was to appear in the SOAS number of the Journal, and was ‘the only article outstanding; the rest of the number has been printed sometime ago and only await binding’.⁶⁶ Later Tej approved the printing of Marr’s article without waiting further for the proofs, which failed to be received on time. As a result, most of the corrections had to be listed at the end of the article. Tej explained the situation at length in his reply to Marr:

Please accept my apologies for my letter of 2 September 1972. I had been under some pressure to produce the Journal and could not withstand it long enough. As a result, I was unable to incorporate all your corrections on the proofs of your article because most of it had been printed by the time your letter arrived. Nevertheless, I was able to insert a page of corrigenda immediately after your article, a copy of which is enclosed for your perusal. You will notice that I was able to correct the mistakes on pp. 66–72, as well as the footnote on p. 72. These had not been printed by the time I reached the printers at half past two on the afternoon of the 5th September.

Please rest assured that the faults lie entirely with the Bangkok end of the correspondence. Your letter was posted on the 24th August, reached Bangkok on the 26th but did not reach the Siam Society until midday of the 5th September! I do not know what happened. I received the letter at two o’clock that afternoon, rushed to the printers, but was too late.⁶⁷

Although Marr did not sound fully satisfied, he appreciated the situation that Tej would ‘have to print it “warts and all” as we say, and I fully understand that’.⁶⁸

Another demanding task which Tej himself mentioned was proofreading. He ‘never hired a proofreader’, but did it himself before sending the proofs to the contributors for the final proofreading.⁶⁹ This certainly added to the editor’s workload but Tej felt it was necessary as he would like to ensure the accuracy of the printed text which would appear in the Journal, especially when translation (from Thai into

⁶⁵ J. R. Marr, ‘Some Manuscripts in Grantha Script in Bangkok – II’, *JSS* 60, no. 2 (July 1972): 61–86.

⁶⁶ [1/287] Tej Bunnag to J[ohn] R. Marr, 20 August 1972.

⁶⁷ [1/283] Tej Bunnag to J[ohn] R. Marr, 9 September 1972.

⁶⁸ [1/280]. J[ohn] R. Marr to Tej Bunnag, 7 September 1972.

⁶⁹ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 31 July 2014.

English) was involved. Take the case of Cyril Skinner (of Monash University) as an example. His article⁷⁰ was published in the *JSS* issue of 1984. The author did the final proofreading, while Tej ‘proof-read the Thai text against the text typed by the National Library [of Thailand] as well as against photographs of the original. Your “selective modernisation” is fine as the National Library has done the same. ... I will do my best to put the dashes in place. The printers have always been very bad about this’.⁷¹ In the concluding paragraph of his letter, Tej opined, as requested by Skinner: ‘[t]here are no criticisms and only one comment. Yours is the kind of work I like the most to publish in *JSS*. It contributes to our knowledge of history; it is a real service to historians. It makes me very happy to have been of help to you’.⁷²

In the correspondence with Skinner, apart from reflecting himself as a meticulous and hardworking editor, Tej also expressed the historian bit of himself. That is, Tej believes that documentary evidence is key. It is crucial for historians to have sufficient primary sources for their studies.⁷³ An examination of Skinner’s article reveals that it is an annotated translation of a Burmese source material recounting the last serious attack that the Burmese made to Siam in 1809–1810. The original account was written from a different perspective, thus providing an alternative view to that found in the Thai sources. Certainly, this was why Tej, on the first reading of the manuscript, wrote to Skinner: ‘I enjoyed your paper very much and would like to put it into *JSS* 1984’. He even proposed ‘that we put in the Thai texts for the two documents. It would be useful’.⁷⁴

⁷⁰ Cyril Skinner, ‘The Interrogation of Zeya Suriya Kyaw a Burmese Account of the Junk Ceylon (Phuket) Campaigns of 1809-1810’, *JSS* 72 (1984): 59–94.

⁷¹ [4/177] Tej Bunnag to C[yril] Skinner, 20 November 1984.

⁷² Ibid. (Underline original)

⁷³ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 July 2016.

⁷⁴ [4/180] Tej Bunnag to C[yril] Skinner, 6 September 1983.

Previously, Tej also commended an article by Michael Vickery, in which the author reinterpreted Khmer inscriptions.⁷⁵ To understand Tej's identity as a historian, it is worth considering his comment on Vickery's manuscript in full length (below).

It is the very kind of article that I would like to see published in the Journal of the Siam Society. You have used your epigraphic and philosophical skills with telling effect to elucidate an aspect of 15th century Southeast Asian history. In my opinion, you have satisfactorily challenged the conventional wisdom regarding these inscriptions. This is all the more creditable when it is the thesis of the legendary Coedes⁷⁶ that you have questioned. I feel that if historians do not constantly go over the primary sources but are content to regurgitate accepted interpretations, the discipline will become sterile indeed. I am glad that your reinterpretation will now make other historians again about these Tenasserim inscriptions.⁷⁷

In addition to the identities as a scrupulous and hardworking editor, and as a historian, there is also an identity as a diplomat reflected in Tej's private papers collection under this current study. In fact, Tej realised that it was difficult for him to compartmentalise his life into parts as a career diplomat, as a historian or as the JSS editor. 'After all, I was a government official, and also a diplomat'.⁷⁸ This was a critical aspect which influenced the way Tej fulfilled his editorial work, as he noted that he 'was rather careful that there would not be any impact on international relations ... or even the personal relationship'.⁷⁹ In fact, Tej's reply to Marr (above) explaining the circumstance under which he was working towards the printing of that last article could to some extent be considered diplomatic. Although it would seem reasonable that the editor should be responsible for errors in his journal, for this instance the author was so late in sending his corrections that the editor felt he should not wait

⁷⁵ Michael Vickery, 'The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation', *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 51–70.

⁷⁶ George Coedès (10 August 1886 – 2 October 1969) was an influential French scholar of South East Asian archaeology and history.

⁷⁷ [1/432] Tej Bunnag to Michael Vickery, 24 June 1972.

⁷⁸ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 25 June 2014.

⁷⁹ Ibid.

anymore. However, Tej did not mention at all it was because Marr was late in the first place, but that ‘the faults lie entirely with the Bangkok end of the correspondence’.⁸⁰

Nonetheless, there is also evidence of Tej’s identity as a career diplomat working in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is more obvious in the third and fourth volumes of the collection, which covers the time period from 1980 to 1986, during which Tej stopped filing his private papers separately. For instance, Tej kept a note dated 30 June 1983, sent to him by George P. Shultz, then the United States Secretary of State. Shultz thanked Tej and his colleagues for arranging the 1983 ASEAN Post-Ministerial meetings.⁸¹ Details can be found in figure 6.2.

On 1 October 1982, Tej gave a talk entitled ‘Thailand and ASEAN’, in the Conference on Thailand, at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University. That talk was given in his capacity as the Deputy Director-General of the Office of ASEAN-Thailand. The text of the speech is five-page long, and is kept in the fourth volume of the collection.⁸² According to Tej, that was the first occasion on which he expressed his views on contemporary issues to an academic community.⁸³ In this talk, he emphasised the role Thailand had played in the formation of ASEAN, placing it in the historical context of 1960s that led to the birth of that Association. Tej also offered his perspectives, as a diplomat, on the position of Thailand in the economic cooperation and industrial development in the ASEAN community.⁸⁴ Later, his friend and professor at the Fletcher School, Alan K. Henrikson, wrote a letter ‘to tell you how much I enjoyed our conversation at the final lunch of the “Thailand”

⁸⁰ [1/283] Tej Bunnag to J[ohn] R. Marr, 9 September 1972.

⁸¹ According to Tej, the Post Ministerial meetings were held immediately after the ASEAN Ministerial Meeting. In these meetings, the ASEAN ministers of foreign affairs met their dialogue partners from such countries as Japan and the United States. Tej Bunnag, interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 8 February 2018, Siam Society, Bangkok.

⁸² [4/218] Thailand and ASEAN: A Talk by Tej Bunnag, 1 October 1982.

⁸³ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 8 February 2018.

⁸⁴ [4/218] Thailand and ASEAN.

3/208

THE SECRETARY OF STATE
WASHINGTON

June 30, 1983

Dear Mr. Tej:

The success of our trip to Thailand for the 1983 ASEAN Post-Ministerial meetings is due largely to the efforts of you and your colleagues in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs who arranged for a relaxed and forthright exchange of views. The meetings reaffirmed my strong belief in the dynamism and unity of ASEAN.

I want to take this occasion to thank you for the hard work which you contributed to making our visit such a success.

Sincerely yours,

George P. Shultz

Mr. Tej Bunnag,
Deputy Director-General,
Office of the ASEAN-Thailand,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Bangkok.

Figure 6.2. Letter from George P. Shultz to Tej Bunnag, 30 June 1983
(Reproduced by courtesy of the Siam Society Library)

conference’, ending with a postscript ‘I have read the text of your speech at Fletcher--with pleasure and profit’.⁸⁵

Apart from write his own speech, Tej took a responsibility of preparing one for the Minister of Foreign Affairs – Air Chief Marshal Siddhi Savetsila – to be given at the dinner following the annual ministerial meeting, on 24 June 1983. About a month later, his friend who attended the dinner wrote from Bonn, Germany, complimenting ‘[i]t was a delightful speech. When I was asked about it on the flight back home to Germany in June I believed I knew the author. In reading the text again it became obvious to me that it must have been you who was behind the scene ... I want to congratulate you on your superb talent as a ghost writer’.⁸⁶ In his reply, Tej admitted ‘I wrote most of it at one o’clock in the morning of that day. It was based on a draft of a colleague, so I cannot claim I was the author of the whole thing. I tried it out on him that night, but he was too tired to laugh, poor man. In fact, we were both exhausted’.⁸⁷ Nevertheless, reflecting on his involvement in drafting this speech, Tej expressed delights as he could deliver the job in a timely manner, and that the job was appreciated.⁸⁸

In fact, that was not the only occasion when Tej prepared a statement for the Minister. When General Carlos Romulo, a former Philippines minister of foreign affairs passed away on 15 December 1985, Tej – then the Deputy-Permanent Secretary of the Ministry – was assigned to draft a tribute to be presented under the name of the Minister. He finished the draft and presented it to the Permanent Secretary. It was then

⁸⁵ [3/107] Alan K. Henrikson to Tej Bunnag, 8 December 1982.

⁸⁶ [4/52] Berthold von Pfetten-Arnach to Tej Bunnag, 22 July 1983.

⁸⁷ [4/51] Tej Bunnag to Berthold von Pfetten-Arnach, 19 September 1983. The purpose of this dinner speech was to welcome the ASEAN ministers of foreign affairs, and to reflect on the relationship among the ASEAN ministers of foreign affairs. The text of the speech can be found in [4/53] Dinner Speech by Air Field Marshal Siddhi Savetsila at the Sixteenth Annual Ministerial Meeting, 24 June 1983.

⁸⁸ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 8 February 2018.

4/158.1

(a)

General Carlos P. Romulo: A Tribute
from Air Chief Marshal Siddhi Savetsila,
Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand.

(b)

Long before he passed away on Sunday morning 15 December 1985

at the ripe old age of 86, General Carlos P. Romulo wrote an autobiography which he called "I Walk with Heroes". The title is appropriate but what it does not tell us is that the author himself was a heroic figure in his own right.

General Ramulo bestride the international stage with rare distinction for more than forty years. He was a signatory of the United Nations Charter in San Francisco in 1945. On that occasion, he contributed a famous insertion in Article 76 of the Charter, which ensured that the basic objectives of the trusteeship system shall be in accordance with the Purposes of the United Nations as laid down in Article 1 of the Charter, which includes respect for the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

General Romulo was a man of his word and swore by the Purposes and Principles of the United Nations Charter for the whole of his life. His constant advocacy of the United Nations earned him the title of "Mr. UN". He certainly left his mark on the world body. He was the first Asian to be elected President of the United Nations General Assembly. He twice chaired the UN Security Council. He would have been the first Asian United Nations Secretary General in 1952 but for a Soviet veto. From 1979 to 1983, he vigorously condemned Vietnam's occupation of

Kampuchea ...

- 4 -

General Romulo had a zest for life. He always said he was too busy and had no time to grow old. He had more energy than most people half his age. At 80, he could still chair all-night sessions of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development when it met in Manila in 1979. We can but stand respectfully in awe before this great statesman, mentor and guide, colleague and friend, whose advice and judgment could always be trusted. He was a hero of our times, who had dedicated himself to world peace, practiced the art of the possible, diplomacy, with outstanding success, based on what is right and just for the benefit of his countrymen and mankind as a whole. It is hard to believe that he has departed on a journey from which he shall not return. His memory will always be cherished with his own epitaph: "General Romulo, Author, Educator, Soldier, Diplomat, Leader, Citizen of the World". May he rest in peace.

(d)

Figure 6.3. Traces of correspondence on a draft of a written account prepared for the Minister of Foreign Affairs by Tej Bunnag
(Reproduced by courtesy of the Siam Society Library)

presented to the Minister who did not require any change. The draft is included in the fourth volume of Tej's private papers collection.⁸⁹ Next to the draft, there are news clippings on Romulo, suggesting how Tej did a research before write the tribute. Figure 6.3 shows the first and last pages of the draft with handwritten minutes (in Thai). Tej proposed the draft as assigned (a). The draft was first read by the Permanent Secretary⁹⁰ (b). After that, it was presented to the Minister whose handwriting was difficult to read (c), but was 'deciphered' above. The draft was complimented as 'the best possible' (d).

The four examples above obviously show that Tej was a diligent diplomat, satisfied by his colleagues, and proud of what he did. The case of the tribute to Romulo, which he prepared for the Minister is probably the most evident that he was so pleased that he kept the draft with the compliments of his supervisors written on it. Indeed, in his reflection on this piece of work, Tej remarked: 'I am very proud of it'.⁹¹

It has become clear that Tej's personal archiving served a function of identity construction. The collection of his private papers reveals his identities in relation to his various capacities. As the JSS Honorary Editor, Tej presented himself as meticulous and hardworking. As a historian, Tej liked to be critical with the interpretation of primary sources. As a career diplomat, Tej was diligent and highly responsible for what he did. These are the identities that his personal records capture and describe.

This section of the chapter has discussed the functions of Tej's personal archiving, based on the goals and uses of the records contained in the private papers collection at the Siam Society Library. As an individual who has played various roles, with multiple

⁸⁹ [4/158] General Carlos P. Romulo: A Tribute from Air Chief Marshal Siddhi Savetsila, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand.

⁹⁰ At that time, Mr. Arsa Sarasin was the Permanent Secretary.

⁹¹ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 8 February 2018.

duties to be responsible for, Tej has kept his personal archive for more than one reason. Four functions are identified, namely, (1) keeping for future reference, (2) sharing information, (3) building a legacy, and (4) constructing identities.

Tej puts an emphasis mostly on the informational and evidential values of his private papers, and therefore tends to regard his archiving as keeping for future reference. As the editor of a learned journal in the 1970s and 1980s, Tej had to keep track of the records regarding his work for his own use as and when necessary in the future. In great part, this was due to the nature of the editorial work that went on over time. As a result, Tej needed to have sufficient information ready for reference so that he could keep up with and follow up on the progress of the editorial work. Therefore, these records were kept for the purpose of his personal use, thus being Tej's private papers. However, Tej later deposited these records to the Siam Society Library, believing that they might be useful to the Society or the subsequent JSS editors. As such, the deposit of this private papers collection was made with an intention of sharing information contained in these records with others who might need it. Although there is no clear record of use after the deposit was made, Tej's intention remains. For him, these records contain information which may be relevant to the Siam Society or the subsequent editors of the JSS. As such, he should make them available for others to refer to as and when needed, just as when they were in his personal possession. In fact, Tej has gone beyond the purpose of information sharing, especially when he has never thought of disposing his personal archive, implying a long-term retention and preservation. Tej was building a legacy archive for posterity, regarding it as historical evidence. Indeed, those interested to know what he did in various capacities will have documentary evidence to which they can refer. As a form of life documentation, Tej's private papers are a testament to his life's work or, at

least, a part of it. Finally, Tej's private papers collection also reflects and describes its curator. That is, it is a 'site' for constructing and maintaining identities. In his private papers, Tej presented himself as a meticulous and hardworking editor of the JSS, as a critical and knowledgeable historian, and as a diligent and highly responsible career diplomat.

6.2 Functions as uses: How and for what purposes was the archive used?

Due to the nature of the editorial work, which is a collaborative effort of different people, it is not surprising that the majority of the documents in the collection are correspondence. By corresponding with contributors, peer-reviewers and printer, among others, Tej performed his role as the JSS Honorary Editor. In order to reach the goal of publishing the JSS, it was crucial that Tej maintained relationships with these people who played their part in the making of the Journal. Nevertheless, despite being the private papers collection regarding Tej's editorship of the JSS, as he put it on the spine of each ring binder containing these papers, there are documents (or parts of the documents) created for other purposes. Consequently, as with the functions of Tej's personal archiving, those of the records in the Tej Bunnag Private Papers Collection are also manifold.

6.2.1 Performing roles of the JSS Honorary Editor

In his capacity as the Honorary Editor of the JSS, Tej had various roles. Apart from producing sufficient number of articles and reviews for each issue of the Journal, he made certain editorial policies. Such the policies would shape up what would be included in the Journal under his editorship. Further, when requested and deemed appropriate, Tej allowed reproduction of some articles originally published in the JSS,

to increase their utility and accessibility. All these roles were performed by way of correspondence, which is evidenced by the private papers he deposited to the Siam Society Library. Key examples from the Collection will be discussed below.

6.2.1.1 Producing contents of the JSS

In order to publish such a learned periodical as the JSS or, in fact, any publication, there needs to be contents produced in a cooperative effort as mentioned above. Although authors would have to write and make a submission in the first place, it is the editor who makes a selection whether or not to include which articles in his or her serial. Besides, it is the printers who arrange texts and images onto the pages of the journal. As such, the production of a given journal that appears in its own format is not the work of a single party. Rather, it is a collaborative effort, in which the editor plays an important role, as Brendan Luyt⁹² asserts, in bringing every party together to produce a journal.

In the case of the JSS under Tej's editorship, he brought together as many as 194 authors, among others, to contribute to the Journal (see tables 5.3 and 5.4 for the breakdown of contributions by type). Tej himself recalled his involvement in producing the contents of the Journal started when a manuscript was received. Once a decision was made, he would reply to the author to inform whether or not his or her submission was accepted for publication in the JSS.⁹³ As with any other journals, the decision could be either positive or negative. In his letters, Tej would put it as straightforward as: 'Now, I have the pleasure of informing you that your timely article will appear as the sixth item in J.S.S. July 1973',⁹⁴ or 'I regret, however, to have to inform you that, after due consideration, your article was not accepted for publication

⁹² Brendan Luyt, 'Producing Knowledge about Malaya: Readers, Contributors, Printers, Editors, and the Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in the 1950s', *Library & Information History* 28, no. 1 (March 2012): 41–57.

⁹³ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 31 July 2014.

⁹⁴ [1/201] Tej Bunnag to James A. Hafner, 26 June 1973.

in the Journal of the Siam Society'.⁹⁵ Sometimes, he would refer to comments from the peer-reviewers, such as: 'I regret to have to inform you that our anthropology readers' reports on your article were far from favourable'.⁹⁶

Nonetheless, more often than not, the acceptance was conditional. For example, on accepting an article by John B. Murdoch (of Cornell University), Tej wrote, on 6 March 1972, he 'enjoyed reading it very much ...' however

[h]aving said all that and wishing to assure you my enthusiasm for your paper, I regret to have to tell you that I cannot publish it for you until January 1974. The July 1973 number of J.S.S. has already bursted (sic) its seams. So, do please write to tell me whether or not you can wait until 1974, if you cannot do please withdraw it for resubmission elsewhere ...⁹⁷

In this case, Tej's proposal was successful. Murdoch wrote he 'would rather wait and see it published in the Journal of the Siam Society than submit it to another journal'.⁹⁸

Another common condition that Tej placed when accepting manuscripts was revision. The cases of Batson's and Thamsook's articles discussed above are good examples in which Tej required amendments to the manuscripts prior to their appearance on the pages of the JSS. They do not only show the degree of Tej's meticulousness, but also emphasise his involvement in the production of the contents of this journal.

Take Batson's article as an example again. On 14 April 1974, Batson wrote in reply to Tej's letter of 9 April:

On p[age]. 10, l[ine]. 5: the change from "megalomania" to "vision of grandeur" or "illusion of grandeur" is all right with me. I can't think of anyone who uses the English 'megalomania' ...

Sorry I couldn't find the reference about the bridges – it does exist, but it's a lot of material to go through again.⁹⁹

⁹⁵ [1/203] Tej Bunnag to Kay Hanschar, 26 June 1973.

⁹⁶ [1/400] Tej Bunnag to Berend-Jan Terwiel, 29 November 1972.

⁹⁷ [1/298] Tej Bunnag to John B. Murdoch, 6 March 1972.

⁹⁸ [1/297] John B. Murdoch to Tej Bunnag, 28 March 1973.

Coupled with the correspondence shown in figure 6.1, it is obvious here that Batson that he still maintained his authorship, despite the questions and suggestions from the editor.

On the one hand, the conditional acceptance can be considered ‘a cooperative effort’ in which the editor and the authors worked together to the same end of getting the JSS published. On the other hand, it can be regarded as a negotiation in which the editor exercised, to a certain extent, his editorial power over the contributor. No matter what the conditional acceptance is deemed, Tej’s correspondence with the authors served as a ‘site’ for cooperation/negotiation. It was in this site where the editor and the authors cooperated/negotiated as they produced contents for the JSS.

Apart from submitting a complete article, certain authors proposed an article and only prepared a manuscript after the editor expressed an interest. For instance, William F. Strobridge proposed an article based on diaries of Cora Lee King who was wife of the United States Minister to Siam from 1898 to 1912. He wrote ‘I have in mind an article on Siam in 1906 based on editing Mrs. King’s diary for that year. ... Please let me know if such an article might be of interest to you. If you believe it may be of some use to the Journal, I will edit the 1906 diary and forward the article to you’.¹⁰⁰ Tej replied from Beijing, but did not keep a copy of that letter. However, Strobridge’s response to that letter reveals that Tej was interested in the proposal but suggested the diary from 1911 rather than 1906. Strobridge agreed on grounds that: ‘You are much better acquainted with the current membership than I am, and thus I take seriously your suggestion that JSS readers might be more interested in diary entries for the year 1911’.¹⁰¹ Eventually, Strobridge’s article appeared in the JSS issue

⁹⁹ [1/5] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 14 April 1974.

¹⁰⁰ [2/150] William F. Strobridge to Tej Bunnag, 2 January 1974.

¹⁰¹ [2/149] William F. Strobridge to Tej Bunnag, 2 March 1974.

of January 1975.¹⁰² This case was a true negotiation in which Tej was successful. In his second letter to Strobridge, he explained:

My interest in your work springs from the fact that I am an historian of the period myself. That is why I would like to see as much primary sources published as possible. It would be interesting, for instance, to know whether the diplomatic community knew long in advance of King Chulalongkorn's illness, or of the traumatic effect of his death on the Thai people. The funeral and the coronation are of course of intrinsic interest; but in 1911/1912 there was also a plot against King Vajiravudh, and I wonder if Mrs. King was aware of it.¹⁰³

Tej was clearly exercising his editorial hand remotely on the site of negotiation, which resulted in an article which he (rather than the author) saw fit appearing in the *JSS*. This reaffirms the editor's involvement in the production of the contents of the *JSS*, which occurred through the correspondence with the author who, in this case, was writing remotely in the United States.

Another way of producing contents was by solicitation. This was the case especially for book reviews. Tej explained in his letter of 28 July 1973, to Donald K. Swearer (of Swarthmore College, Pennsylvania): 'As you know, during the past four years, we have been developing the review section of the *JSS*. Unfortunately, reviews are very hard to obtain as far as we are concerned. It isn't that there aren't books to review but it's difficult to find reviewers for the books'.¹⁰⁴ In the end, he asked: 'I wonder if you join us in this effort and consider writing a review or reviews for us of any book of your choice'.¹⁰⁵ It is worth noting that by then, Tej had already seen Swearer's paper which he decided to publish in the *Journal*.¹⁰⁶ He consequently thought that Swearer could potentially write a book review in the way he would like to

¹⁰² William F. Strobridge, 'Mrs. Hamilton King's Bangkok Diary, 1911', *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 86–104.

¹⁰³ [2/148] Tej Bunnag to William F. Strobridge, 16 March 1974.

¹⁰⁴ [1/386] Tej Bunnag to Donald K. Swearer, 28 July 1973.

¹⁰⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁶ Donald K. Swearer, 'Myth, Legend and History in Northern Thai Chronicles', *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 67–88.

see in the JSS. So, Tej asked Swearer, in his own words, ‘I was wondering if you could possibly consider doing a favour for me’.¹⁰⁷ Swearer eventually did Tej ‘a favour’. His review of a book appeared in the JSS issue of January 1975.¹⁰⁸

Tej did not solicited contributions only from authors with whom he had already been acquainted. Occasionally, it came out of serendipity. For instance, when Batson was doing his data collection for his doctoral thesis in Bangkok, he observed several discrepancies in an obituary of Prince Sithiporn Kridakara, published in the JSS.¹⁰⁹ He wrote to the Honorary Editor to notify his observation, and offered to ‘provide a biographical note on Prince Sithiporn’s prewar career’.¹¹⁰ Tej accepted the offer, explaining that the ‘note can be either entirely factual or it can take the form of a review article of the funeral volumes published on the occasion of the Prince’s cremation’.¹¹¹ On the same note, he asked ‘if there are any books which you would like to review for the J.S.S., do please let me know. I welcome new contributors and reviewers to the J.S.S. always’.¹¹² Batson’s case was a success. His review article was published in the JSS issue of January 1973.¹¹³ Since then, Batson became a regular author, contributing articles, review articles, reviews and notes to the JSS every year until the end of Tej’s first editorship.

Despite the success exemplified above, reviewers were still hard to find. At times, the reviewers submitted their work at their leisure, while Tej could do nothing but wait for the manuscript to arrive. For example, in reply to Tej’s letter dated 13

¹⁰⁷ [1/386] Tej to Swearer, 28 July 1973.

¹⁰⁸ Donald K. Swearer, review of *The Destiny of a King*, by Georges Dumezil, trans. Alf Hiltelbeitel, *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 298–299.

¹⁰⁹ ‘His Serene Highness Prince Sithiporn Kridakara’, *JSS* 60, no. 2 (January 1972): 470–473.

¹¹⁰ [1/19] Benjamin A. Batson to Honorary Editory of JSS, 30 June 1972.

¹¹¹ [1/18] Tej Bunnag to Benjamin G. Batson, 17 July 1972.

¹¹² *Ibid.*

¹¹³ Benjamin A. Batson, ‘M.C. Sithiporn Kridakara Memorial Volume’, *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 302–309.

May 1975, 'asking about my review of Prasert's (sic) books for the July '75 JSS',¹¹⁴ David K. Wyatt (of Cornell University) wrote on 7 July of the same year: 'Sorry: you'll recall that I agreed to review them when I could, without deadline. I expect that I'll be getting to them in the next month or so'.¹¹⁵ Four weeks later, upon his return from holiday Wyatt updated: 'I did get through Prasert's three books over the past week, and will try to get my review written in the next week or so, while they are still fresh in my mind'.¹¹⁶ The aforementioned review was finished ten days later. Wyatt's letter accompanying his submission reveals 'I hadn't realized until your letter just how desperate you were for the book review. This evening I (admitting this shamefully) wrote the enclosed review in just three hours'.¹¹⁷ Tej did not keep a copy of his letter here. So, it is not clear 'how desperate' he was, but at least Wyatt's review did materialise¹¹⁸ after the negotiation for the time to work on it. There were occasions on which Tej could only hope to have a book review, but, in truth, never received one.

6.2.1.2 Setting editorial policies

A general guideline for contributors is available in every issue of the JSS. As shown in figure 6.4, the statements were meant for the author to prepare a manuscript for submission. They are far from being specific or detailed, especially when compared with the recent guideline given under the current editorship of Chris Baker (figure 6.5). However, Tej's private papers show that he did make editorial policies at his discretion, which informed what would or would not appear on the pages of the Journal under his editorship. These policies did not appear as a comprehensive list

¹¹⁴ [2/210] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 1 July 1975.

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶ [2/209] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 4 August 1975.

¹¹⁷ [2/207] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 14 August 1975.

¹¹⁸ David K. Wyatt, review of *Hariphunchai Nirat, edited from a Chiangmai Manuscript, The Code of Mangrai, edited in Modern Language, and Researches in Thai History*, by Prasert na Nagara, *JSS* 63, no. 2 (July 1975): 411–414.

anywhere, but some of them surfaced in Tej's correspondence. Three sets of examples are worth exploring in details.

First, with reference to the scope of articles which could be included in the JSS, every editor has always referred to the 'Rules of the Siam Society' originally set at its foundation in 1904, stating '[t]he objects of the Society shall be the investigation and encouragement of Art, Science and Literature in relation to Siam and neighbouring countries'.¹¹⁹ Such a broad statement as this is always subjected to interpretation. For Tej, he posited clearly in 1972, when rejecting an article entitled 'King Mallikarjune (1447 A.D. to 1456 A.D.)' from B.V. Srinivasa Rao (of First Grade College, India) that the 'Journal publishes articles on Asian countries other than Thailand only when they bear direct relevance to our Country'.¹²⁰ Earlier in that year, he had already returned a manuscript focusing only on Laos.¹²¹ It would seem this had become his frame of reference, as he continued such the principle when he took over the editorship from Kim Atkinson in 1981. Tej did not accept for publication in the JSS a paper on Nora Chatri in Kedah, in which the author attempted at attracting 'readers interested in traditional theatre and in the Thai cultural impact upon Malaysia'.¹²² While the reason for such a rejection was that the 'article would need much research before it would be ready', Tej's concluding sentence read: '... as it stands, it would be better to try and get it published elsewhere rather than in a *specialist journal of Thai studies*'.¹²³

Apart from the geographical coverage, Tej was also careful about the approach the contributors employed in their articles. For instance, upon receiving a manuscript

¹¹⁹ 'Rules of the Siam Society', JSS 1, no. 1 (1904): III.

¹²⁰ [1/321] Tej Bunnag to B.V. Srinivasa Rao, 9 May 1972.

¹²¹ [1/251] Tej Bunnag to Howard Kaufman, 7 March 1972.

¹²² [3/281] Ghulam Sarwar Yousof to Tej Bunnag, 2 March 1981.

¹²³ [3/280] Tej Bunnag to Ghulam Sarwar Yousof, 15 August 1981. (Emphasis added).

Contributions

Contributions to the *Journal* should be sent by registered mail to the Honorary Editor on single sides of quarto paper, typed and with double spacing. Footnotes should appear at the end. All contributions must be accompanied by a short biographical note about the author. The deadline for the January issue is 1 August and for the July issue is 1 February.

EDITORIAL AND PUBLICATIONS COMMITTEE

Chairman : Dr. Tej Bunnag, Honorary Editor,
Journal of the Siam Society

Editorial Assistant : Sarah W. Trench
Advertising Manager : Mr. Euayporn Kerdchouay

ADVERTISING RATES

Full page : 1,000 baht per issue
Half page : 600 baht per issue
Quarter page : 400 baht per issue
Page size : $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 7''$

Text to be submitted by 1st October for January issue, 1st April for July issue

(a) 1970s

Contributed manuscripts should be typed **double-spaced** on quarto paper (approximately 8×11 inches), with generous margins. The top copy should be submitted. All notes and references should be similarly typed double-spaced. References should include name of author(s), title, name and volume of periodical or relevant publication series (where applicable), date and place of publication (or nature of reference, if unpublished), and pagination (where appropriate). Page-proofs of Articles and Review Articles are normally sent to authors; proofs of Notes, Reviews and other contributions will be sent to authors on request only. Originals of illustrations will be returned on request.

Authors of published contributions receive 30 offprints free of charge. Additional copies will be supplied at cost price, but must be paid for in advance.

The Siam Society encourages readers to communicate to the Honorary Editor any differing opinion on, or corrections to, material which appears in *JSS*. Suitably documented correspondence will be published as a Communication, bearing the writer's name.

Manuscripts, books for review, and all correspondence should be sent to the Honorary Editor, *Journal of the Siam Society*, G.P.O. Box 65, Bangkok, Thailand.

Subscription and membership enquiries, and publications orders, should be addressed to the Administrative Secretary, Siam Society, G.P.O. Box 65, Bangkok, Thailand.

Exchange copies of periodicals should be sent to the Honorary Librarian, Siam Society, G.P.O. Box 65, Bangkok, Thailand.

(b) 1980s

Figure 6.4. Notes for contributors to the JSS under Tej's editorships

romanized Thai followed by a translation into English in parentheses. Romanization in general follows the system of the Royal Institute.

If in doubt concerning form or how to reference non-standard sources, please consult the *Chicago Manual of Style* (most recent edition), or *Hart's Rules for Compositors and Readers at OUP* (most recent edition). If in doubt over spelling, use the *Concise Oxford Dictionary* (most recent edition), taking the first entry where variants are allowed.

STYLE—Each paper should follow a consistent form of dating, capitalization (to be kept to a minimum), and other aspects.

Numbers below 100 are to be written out, i.e. ninety-nine, whereas centuries are to be listed in numerical form, i.e. 19th century. Date forms should be day-month-year, without contractions, e.g. 13 April 2007. Acronyms must always be spelled out when first used, e.g., National Economic and Social Development Board (NESDB). Measurements should be metric, not imperial.

Non-native speakers of English are strongly advised to have their contributions checked by a native speaker before submission. Both British and American English variants are admitted, but an article must be internally consistent in the use of whichever is selected.

ILLUSTRATIONS—Do not embed any graphics in the text, but send them separately as image files (jpg, tiff, gif, etc.). Scans should be at least 400 dpi. A list of captions to the illustrations must be provided separately.

Authors must obtain approval, before submission, for the reproduction in JSS of illustrations or other material not their own.

Redrawing or lettering of maps or figures cannot be undertaken by the Siam Society or the editor, who may omit or return standard work for re-presentation.

PROOFS AND COPIES—Proofs will be sent to authors if time allows. Authors are reminded that proofs are intended for checking, not rewriting: substantial changes to the text at this stage will result in the contribution being rejected. Failure to respond about corrections by the required date may lead to substitution of the editor's corrected proofs.

One copy of the *Journal* and a pdf of the article or review will be supplied free to authors on publication of the issue in which their contribution is included.

REVIEWS—Unsolicited book reviews are not normally accepted. Offers to write reviews should be directed to the Editor, JSS.

Reviews should normally be 1,000–3,000 words in length, written in English and supplied in the same form as for articles. Full bibliographic details about the book under review must be supplied, including ISBN, number of pages and price, if known.

DISCLAIMER—The opinions expressed in the JSS are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the views of the Siam Society.

The editor's decision is final in all disputed issues.

NOTES FOR CONTRIBUTORS

The *Journal of the Siam Society* welcomes original articles and notes of a scholarly nature in conformity with the principles and objectives of the Siam Society, of investigating the arts and sciences of Thailand and neighbouring countries.

ARTICLES—Articles should be primarily in English, and must be accompanied by an abstract in English (of fewer than 200 words) and a brief biographical note about the author(s). The word length of the manuscript contribution must be given in a covering letter, with full postal and e-mail addresses. The author(s) must confirm that the article has not been published elsewhere in any form, nor is currently under consideration for publication elsewhere. Articles submitted to JSS are subject to review by external referees. Articles should not normally exceed 10,000 words (including footnotes and references). They may be sent by email or mailed on a CD to the Society, preferably as an MSWord® document, with an accompanying pdf of the same content.

Contributors using special fonts, such as for various Asian languages, should be prepared to supply the appropriate font files. Citations in the text should, where possible, follow the author-date system (e.g., Jones 1970: 82) and full details should appear in the list of references at the end of the article. These references must be complete bibliographical entries and include the full name of the author(s), title, and publication data, including the place of publication, publisher and date of publication (including the original date of publication, if the item is a reprint). Titles of the books and periodicals should, of course, be italicized. N.B. Thai authors are to be cited and listed according to their first name (not their surname, as most non-Thai authors are). Follow these examples:

Dodd, William, Clifton, 1996 [1923]. *The Tai Race: Elder Brother of the Chinese*. Bangkok: White Lotus Press.

Ames, Michael, 1990. "Cultural Empowerment and Museums: Opening Up Anthropology through Collaboration." In Susan Pearce (ed.), *New Research in Museum Studies*, vol. 1. *Objects of Knowledge*, pp. 158–73. London: Athlone.

Liang Yongjia, 2011. "Stranger Kingship and Cosmocracy: or, Sahlins in Southwest China." *The Asia Pacific Journal of Anthropology*, 12, 3: 236–254.

Suda Parivattitram, 1991. "Sapha kachat Thai: kannaet lae phattanakhan phuthasakkarat 2436–2485" [Thai Red Cross, origin and development 1893–1942]. MA thesis, Chulalongkorn University.

Stamatopoulou, Elsa, 2004. "Why Cultural Rights Now?" Presentation in Carnegie Council on Ethical and International Affairs. At <http://www.carnegiecouncil.org/resources/transcripts/5006.html> (accessed 8 March 2012).

Footnotes are to appear as such, not as endnotes, and should be numbered consecutively. References to articles or books written in Thai should include the title in

Figure 6.5. Notes for contributors to the JSS (current version)

from his friend, Nigel Brailey, Tej commented in his handwriting on the cover letter¹²⁴ (figure 6.6), implying a rejection which he eventually made officially. Tej wrote ‘I think an article such as this would be better published in a British journal rather than in the JSS’.¹²⁵ Although it was not clear what the article actually discussed or argued, Tej’s rejection implied that, in his opinion, diplomatic or colonial history written in a Eurocentric manner was not suitable for publication in the JSS.

Second, with regards to book reviews, Tej took no obligation ‘to review books sent for review in the Journal. Reviews in the Journal are either volunteered or by invitation’.¹²⁶ This was the answer Tej gave frankly when an author enquired on ‘the dispositions your journal has taken about reviewing the book’.¹²⁷ On another occasion, Tej refused a review copy of a book offered by its publisher, on grounds that ‘I do not usually solicit complimentary copies of books for review in The Journal of the Siam Society’.¹²⁸ Besides, no matter how difficult it was to find a reviewer for books, Tej still keep up with a standard of his own. He did not accept a review, regardless of its quality, ‘as it is not appropriate to publish a review of a book in which the reviewer is also a contributor’.¹²⁹

Last, there were certain general editorial rules which seemed to apply to all articles submitted for consideration for publication, but were not published or publicised like the note on contributions (see figure 6.4). However, Tej mentioned them to a member of the Society, who proposed an article and asked for further information regarding the editorial policy. Tej wrote:

¹²⁴ [4/22] Nigel Brailey to Tej Bunnag, 9 September 1983.

¹²⁵ [4/21] Tej Bunnag to Nigel Brailey, 21 October 1983.

¹²⁶ [4/169] Tej Bunnag to M. Sarkisyanz, 15 March 1984.

¹²⁷ [4/170] M. Sarkisyanz to Tej Bunnag, 15 February 1984. It was noted at the foot of this letter, by the Siam Society Library assistant, that the review copy did not reach her.

¹²⁸ [4/89] Tej Bunnag to Triena Ong, 2 June 1984.

¹²⁹ [4/29] Tej Bunnag to Buddhadasa P. Kirthisinghe, 3 December 1983.

UNIVERSITY OF BRISTOL

Telephone Bristol 24161

Department of History
Wills Memorial Building
Queens Road
Bristol BS8 1RJ

The Hon. Editor,
The Siam Society,
131 Soi 21 (Asoke) Sukhumvit,
P.O. Box 65, Bangkok, Thailand.

Dear Tej,

I have not yet, I fear, lighted upon a suitable volume to review for you in response to your kind invitation back in January, but enclose herewith something I trust you will find quite as interesting.

For the last year, I have been working on two Foreign Office memoranda concerned with Siam in the 1890s, hopefully for publication by Cornell as a data paper, by R.L. Morant and Prince Pritsdang Chumsai, great-uncle of M.L. Manich. A month ago, I sent David Wyatt a substantial draft introduction to them, which he is presumably now considering. In previous correspondence, he seemed quite enthusiastic, and I am therefore very hopeful that the project will go ahead.

But in the process of preparing the above, I found myself turning to the Scott Diaries at the India Office Library. To begin with, I confined myself to the volumes for Scott's stay in Siam, in 1893-94, which proved useful enough. But it was only when I eventually turned to Mrs. Mitton's book that I began to appreciate the odd nature of his career, and also to suspect the great deal that she had omitted. That turned me back to a rather broader investigation of the diaries, discovery of Scott's own description of his first wife's death made a particular impact on me, and I was then also able to locate the magazine articles etc. The Black and White feature includes photographs of both the Scotts.

My principal anxiety now is to have this article published as quickly as possible, in advance of the data paper, as a sort of introduction to it. I think its publication in Thailand would be most appropriate, because that is where I feel advance notice of the data paper would be most desirable. I also think that it is in Thailand where the country's 1890s vulnerability is least appreciated (along maybe with America), and that, perhaps, is the main burden of the article. On the other hand, I was only recently told that Modern Asian Studies at Cambridge would be very interested in getting hold of an article of this sort, and if they were to prove the best outlet for the prompt appearance of the article, I would feel very tempted to turn to them instead. Of course, its length might still prove a problem, hopefully less so with you, but again, your programme as already planned may prove intractable. I look forward to hearing from you, and your opinions on the article.

Best Wishes,

Nigel Brailey

Figure 6.6. Letter from Nigel Brailey to Tej Bunnag, 9 September 1983
with notes in Tej's handwriting
(Reproduced by courtesy of the Siam Society Library)

1. Please submit your proposed article ... for consideration for publication in the Journal of the Siam Society 1985.

2. The earlier your manuscript is submitted, the sooner will it be considered. Publication is on a first-come-first-served basis, as we have a constant back-log (sic) of manuscripts waiting for publication.

3. There is no initial limit to length, although too lengthy a manuscript may mean that it will have to be held over for later publication.

4. It is possible to include a reasonable number of photographs.¹³⁰

It is clear that Tej did make editorial policies, which informed what he would publish in the JSS. Under his editorship, Tej positioned the JSS as a specialist serial of Thai studies. Articles were not limited by word count, and could be accompanied by photographs. They should be directly relevant to the geographical theme of Thailand. Book reviews were volunteered or by invitation. These rules were not written comprehensively anywhere, but were expressed as or when necessary, in Tej's correspondence such as those discussed above.

6.2.1.3 Disseminating the JSS contents

The major channel for disseminating contents of JSS has always been through the distribution of printed copies, of which every member of the Society is entitled to having one. There are also a number of subscribers to the Journal. However, the 'Rules of the Siam Society' allows reproduction of articles published in the JSS, by permission of the council.¹³¹ When Tej was the Honorary Editor, he represented the council in granting permissions to various individuals and organisations wishing to reprint articles from the JSS. The case of 'E. M. Hinton' mentioned above is a mere example. There were many other occasions on which Tej agreed that contents from the JSS could be reproduced and disseminated. This, in turn, helped promoted the

¹³⁰ [4/113] Tej Bunnag to Roland Mischung, 15 March 1984.

¹³¹ 'Rules of the Siam Society', III.

visibility of the Journal in general, for the condition on which Tej granted these permissions was that due citations to the original publication in the JSS must always be given in full. Among the many requestors were the Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies at the University of Michigan,¹³² Schenkman Publishing Company (USA),¹³³ the Harry S. Truman Research Institute for the Advancement of Peace at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem,¹³⁴ Somdet Phrapinklaochaoyuhua Fund Club (Bangkok, Thailand),¹³⁵ and Maha Vajiravudh School (Songkhla, Thailand).¹³⁶

By corresponding with various individuals, Tej performed roles of the JSS Honorary Editor. The correspondence enabled him to function as the editor of a learned journal whose stakeholders were from different places. Inevitably, through the exchange of these letters, Tej developed certain kinds of relationships with his correspondents. Many were a mere instrumental relationship which was necessary for the tasks of the editor to be done, but many others were to become personal. Consequently, Tej's records in his private papers collection at the Siam Society Library also served another function in maintaining personal relationship with his correspondent.

¹³² [1/288] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 16 June 1975; [1/289] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 9 June 1975; [1/290] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 9 June 1975; [1/291] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 20 May 1975; [1/292] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 20 May 1975; [1/293] Forrest McGill to Permissions Department, Journal of the Siam Society, 20 May 1975. Note that these letters, signed by McGill, were sent under the letterhead of Center for South and Southeast Asian Studies, University of Michigan, each requesting for permission to reproduce an article previously published by the Siam Society.

¹³³ [1/302] Virginia B. Savage to Journal of the Siam Society, 30 May 1974; [1/301] Clark D. Neher to Jane Bunnag, 4 July 1974; [1/300] Tej Bunnag to Virginia [B.] Savage, 3 August 1974.

¹³⁴ [4/39] Norma Schneider to Tej Bunnag, 23 May 1984.

¹³⁵ [4/192] Tej Bunnag to Somsak Chantanasiri, 4 May 1984.

¹³⁶ [4/196] Tej Bunnag to Sripat Meenakanit, 28 September 1985.

6.2.2 *Maintaining personal relationships*

In fact, as Tej himself once mentioned, in soliciting contributions for the JSS, he ‘called on a wide circle of friends, colleagues and acquaintances of different age-groups and varied academic disciplines’.¹³⁷ This means he had known a number of contributors to the JSS prior to his tenures as the Honorary Editor. As a result, accounts or mentions of personal matters in the correspondence between Tej and certain contributors were not uncommon.

One of the most prominent examples is Benjamin Batson, who began his contact with Tej as a keen reader of the JSS. The first letter Batson sent to Tej was written by hand, but in a formal manner, to report the inaccuracies he had noticed in Prince Sithiporn’s obituary as discussed above. The letter was addressed to the Honorary Editor, with a standard salutation ‘Dear Sir’, and ended with ‘Sincerely yours, Benjamin A. Batson’.¹³⁸ It was Batson’s handwriting which gave an impression that the initial of Batson’s middle name was G. In his reply, Tej consequently addressed the letter to ‘Mr. Benjamin G. Batson’.¹³⁹ Tej and Batson not long afterwards befriended with each other. Although it is not clear since exactly when they became more acquainted, traces in their correspondence show that they exchanged notes on their personal matters. For instance, on 29 July 1973, Batson wrote to Tej that he gathered from the news report that Tej was about to leave for China. After congratulating and giving his well wishes for Tej’s visit on his diplomatic mission of normalising the relations between Thailand and the People’s Republic of China, Batson wrote: ‘... I plan to leave for Cornell about the middle of September, and I wonder if you have an “assignment” for me for the next JSS (especially if it’s

¹³⁷ Tej Bunnag, felicitation to *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*, by Michael Smithies (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012), vii.

¹³⁸ [1/19] Benjamin A. Batson to the Honorary Editor of JSS, 30 June 1972.

¹³⁹ [1/18] Tej Bunnag to Benjamin G.(sic) Batson, 17 July 1972.

something better done in Bangkok than Ithaca.) If you are in the market for something other than reviews I have one possibility. ...'¹⁴⁰ About half a year later, Batson wrote from Ithaca, following up on a manuscript, which he had earlier submitted and would appear in the July 1974 JSS.¹⁴¹ There had been a loss of mail prior to this letter, and thus Batson requested 'if/when you do get both it and the review if you could send me a note confirming their arrival it would allay my doubts about our communications'.¹⁴² The remainder of this letter was personal, including brief accounts on Batson's Christmas-New Year's holidays and research in Washington D.C. Then, he shared about his other work he intended for the JSS. Towards the end, Batson showed his enthusiasm about Tej's career and Thailand's internal affairs at that time: 'I am intrigued to hear that you have been to China again, and wish I could hear a detailed account of your present work for King and Country and how the change in government has affected your Ministry and Thai foreign policy'.¹⁴³ Although Tej rarely kept a copy of his letters, the majority of which were presumably handwritten, it is sufficiently evident that they did not only discuss their work on contributions to the Journal, but also matters of their personal interests, exchanging notes on thoughts and experiences to keep themselves up-to-date on both ends of the correspondence. This was a typical manner in which Batson and Tej corresponded, which continued through to the 1980s, as evidenced in the third and fourth volumes of Tej's Private Papers Collection. For example, Batson once wrote Tej to congratulate on Thailand being elected as a non-permanent member of the UN Security Council during the thirty-ninth session of the United Nations General Assembly (1984). With the same letter enclosed a book review by Batson from the *Pacific Affairs*. Batson added 'it's not a very good

¹⁴⁰ [1/15] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 20 July 1973.

¹⁴¹ Batson, 'The Fall of the Phibun Government'.

¹⁴² [1/14] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 16 January 1974.

¹⁴³ Ibid.

xerox; also the final paragraph was “revised” by an editor--without my knowledge or approval--and the version as published varies considerably from my original’.¹⁴⁴

Another similar example of an instrumental relationship that developed into a long-term, personal one is Michael Vickery, whose first academic paper¹⁴⁵ was published in the JSS under Tej’s editorship. According to Tej, Vickery had had difficulties in finding an outlet for this article.¹⁴⁶ However, Tej did see value of Vickery’s approach to reexamining such primary sources as the Khmer inscriptions whose original decipherment and interpretation had been widely accepted and well established. As such, Tej did not only accept the manuscript for publication in the JSS, but also regarded Vickery’s effort as ‘a real service to historians’,¹⁴⁷ as mentioned earlier. Upon returning to the United States, Vickery wrote Tej a letter, mentioning an error in the manuscript, and allowed Tej to make the change or ‘wait for me to do it when I read the proofs, however, you prefer’. On the same occasion, he recounted his ‘rather frustrating summer in Europe – I never was able to get into the library of the Ecole Francaise’, and also told ‘[t]here are few old faces at Yale now, which is perhaps just, as well, for there will be no social activities to distract me from writing the thesis’.¹⁴⁸ Their personal relationship has since sustained. Tej recalled an occasion on which Vickery paid him a visit in Paris when he was Thai ambassador to France in the mid-1990s. They had a dinner together, where Vickery revealed how grateful he was to Tej for accepting his article for publication which provided him a place to launch his work. Tej is also proud to have helped Vickery on that difficult article.¹⁴⁹

¹⁴⁴ [4/7] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 7 November 1984.

¹⁴⁵ Vickery, ‘The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim’.

¹⁴⁶ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 25 June 2014.

¹⁴⁷ [1/432] Tej to Vickery, 24 June 1972. In fact, Vickery continued a regular contributor to the JSS until the 1990s. See <http://michaelvickery.org>, for lists of Vickery’s publications.

¹⁴⁸ [1/425] Michael Vickery to Tej Bunnag, 16 October 1972.

¹⁴⁹ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 27 July 2016.

Apart from individuals whose personal relationship with Tej developed from that of an instrumental nature and maintained through correspondence, there were also those who had been friends or acquaintances with Tej prior to his takeover of the JSS editorship. This means their relationships had been, to a varying degree, personal. Therefore, they occasionally included certain personal matters in their letters, although they were working on contributions to the JSS. Of the several individuals whom Tej had known before and upon whom Tej called for contributions to the JSS, four particular correspondents are worth discussing: Kennon Breazeale, Hiram W. Woodward, Thamsook Numnonda and David K. Wyatt.

Originally from the University of Hawaii, Kennon Breazeale was one of Tej's graduate students at Chulalongkorn University when he was a guest lecturer teaching a graduate seminar course in Thai history. Later in 1971, Breazeale became a research student at St Antony's College, Oxford, reading Thai history. He was among the earlier circle upon which Tej called for contributions to the JSS. Fluent in Thai, Breazeale reviewed a Thai book entitled 'Prawatsat Isan' [a history of northeast Thailand] for the first issue of JSS published under Tej's name as the Honorary Editor (January 1972),¹⁵⁰ and subsequently contributed more to the Journal. He and Tej exchanged letters to carry out editorial work for the former's contributions. As friends, they also exchanged notes on their personal matters in their correspondence. For instance, on following up on the page-proofs of his article, Breazeale told that he would be away 'on a coach tour for three weeks to Paris, Zurich, Rome, Côte d'Azur, and Madrid'. On the same note, he gave an update on his thesis, which was 'coming along well. It is completely organized from beginning to end in outline form, but will require another 2 months at least for writing everything in full and in smoothly

¹⁵⁰ Kennon Breazeale, review of *Prawatsat Isan* [A history of northeast Thailand], by Toem Wiphakphotchanakit, *JSS* 60, no. 1 (January 1972): 413–415.

flowing English'.¹⁵¹ The page-proofs were sent to Kennon and was returned to the Siam Society before the coach tour.¹⁵² As the editor, Tej acknowledged the receipt of the page-proofs, but also asked something not related to the editorial work at the end of the letter. The paragraph reads: 'I wonder if you have received my letter of 2nd July in which I informed you that I have sent a reference for you to the A.N.U. on the 5th June. You have not acknowledged this. Since then, I have sent another reference for you to Singapore University on 3rd July'.¹⁵³

Since the 1960s, Tej became acquainted with Hiram W. Woodward through Alexander B. Griswold. An art historian of South East Asia, Woodward was also in the circle upon which Tej called for contributions to the JSS. Indeed, he wrote for the Journal on several occasions. At that time, Woodward taught at the University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. As with Breazeale, he corresponded with Tej to work on his submissions, but at the same time he spent paragraphs in his letters on matters other than those of the editorial work. For example, in a letter which seemed to be personal in the beginning, Woodward also included his request for some changes to a submission he had made earlier. He started by telling his personal interest in the then new site of archaeological excavation in northeast Thailand, and then mentioned his teaching duty at that moment: 'I just have one class here, as is customary for newcomers in the department. There are about twenty bewildered students. ... I must say all sorts of absurd & outrageous things to keep the flock awake'.¹⁵⁴ Towards the end, with reference to his article which would appear in the JSS issue of January 1973,¹⁵⁵ Woodward asked if Tej would 'mind making some changes in my

¹⁵¹ [1/37] Kennon Breazeale to Tej Bunnag, 30 June 1974.

¹⁵² [1/36] Kennon Breazeale to Tej Bunnag, 8 July 1974.

¹⁵³ [1/34] Tej Bunnag to Kennon Breazeale, 16 July 1974.

¹⁵⁴ [1/442] Hiram W. Woodward to Tej Bunnag, 27 September 1972.

¹⁵⁵ Hiram W. Woodward, Jr, 'The Buddha's Radiance', *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 187–192.

incomprehensible article' and listed three items needing amendments.¹⁵⁶ Such the request arrived at Tej's office after the manuscript had gone to press, but a month later Woodward wrote, '[u]nfortunately, there is another change'.¹⁵⁷ Then, he went on that he had had an enjoyable lunch with a Thai graduate student, 'although the food was terrible, nothing to match a Bunnag-Woodward luncheon in Bangkok', as well as other stories of his personal interests.

As mentioned earlier, Tej had known Thamsook since the 1960s when they were in England. In the letters regarding her article,¹⁵⁸ Thamsook not only replied to Tej's questions on her manuscript, but also told about her recent duties and preoccupation, as well as the current happenings at Chiangmai University to keep Tej up-to-dated, for he used to be a guest lecturer there, as well.¹⁵⁹

When he was with SOAS, University of London, David K. Wyatt was Tej's co-supervisor at St Antony's College, Oxford. Tej, however, worked closely with Wyatt for the latter's expertise in the early modern history of Siam/Thailand matched the subject matter of Tej's DPhil thesis. Certainly, Wyatt was among the first acquaintances whom Tej asked for contributions to the JSS, from the time he began his collaboration with Smithies in the effort to redesign and revitalise the Journal in 1969. Wyatt first wrote a book review for the first issued of JSS edited by Smithies (July 1969). Under Tej's editorship, Wyatt subsequently contributed more works to the Journal. As with the other three correspondents above, Wyatt and Tej wrote each other both about the unavoidable editorial work, and about their personal lives. With the intimacy supposedly nurtured during their close teacher-student association, Wyatt – an avid letter writer – seemed to have shared with Tej relatively in greater depth about

¹⁵⁶ [1/442] Woodward to Tej, 27 September 1972.

¹⁵⁷ [1/441] Hiram W. Woodward to Tej Bunnag, 28 October 1972.

¹⁵⁸ Thamsook, 'The First American Advisors in Thai History'.

¹⁵⁹ [2/181] Thamsook Numnonda to Tej Bunnag, 15 March 1974, and [2/180] Thamsook Numnonda to Tej Bunnag, 10 April 1974.

his personal life in his correspondence. For instance, when following up with Tej, who by that time became fully engaged with his diplomatic mission, on a manuscript, Wyatt wrote:

Promises, promises--and no letters from you save notes promising a letter later! You must be preoccupied with all sorts of things; or perplexed as to what to do about the van Vliet.¹⁶⁰

I got briefly back to working on the van Vliet this evening, sufficiently so to re-do two footnotes, which should be substituted for those of the same numbers in the original typescripts. ...

Nothing much doing here right now, beyond the usual petty irritations and aggravations of daily life. Just two and one-half weeks more of classes, and then I am on leave for fifteen months. ...

To give you an example of the things sitting on my desk right now, awaiting action: an M.A. thesis from Michigan, on Thai law in the reign of Chulalongkorn, requiring comments before it is published; a partial translation, synoptic, of the annals of Ayudhya, requiring comments; Michael Vickery's Yale thesis, or portions of it, requiring comments; a pile of library catalog cards of Lao books, requiring romanizations; the manuscript of a book by a professor at another university, which I must read before recommending that he be promoted; my book on Nakhon Si Thammarat, now nearly done--I drew two maps last week; ... my usual file of "letters to be answered" ...

Anyway, so much for now. Let me hear from you soon?¹⁶¹

It took slightly more than a month before Tej could write to Wyatt. In his reply, Wyatt wrote:

Many thanks for your good letter of 28 May, which reached me with remarkable speed on the 31st. I am both delighted and relieved with the news about the van Vliet, which I am anxious to get settled soon as that I can cease having to remind myself to do something about it.

I have no experience on the basis of which to advise you about the quantity to be printed, but should imagine that one thousand copies would be quite sufficient. ...

¹⁶⁰ Wyatt referred to a manuscript of a book of which he was the editor and which the Siam Society would eventually publish in 1975 as Jeremias van Vliet, *The Short History of Kings of Siam*, trans. Leonard Andaya, ed. David K Wyatt (Bangkok: Siam Society, 1975).

¹⁶¹ [2/223] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 24 April 1974.

And we will have some considerable problems with proofreading, especially with the Dutch text. It will save on expenses if the printer can be asked to run a set of proofs (two sets) on onionskin paper for airmailing to me.

Yes, I have seen the January JSS, though my own copy has not yet arrived. (I saw Griswold's copy last week.) I was disappointed at how the map in the Murdoch article came out--the printer overexposed it. But it's an excellent issue. ...

I'll write another letter to send with the cheque for the Breezewood subsidy--till then, best wishes form an idyllic Ithaca where summer has arrived and the students have departed!¹⁶²

As promised, Wyatt posted the cheque through a registered mail, with a letter:

I just returned from a two-week holiday (on Cape Cod) to find that the subsidy check to the Siam Society, for the publication of the van Vliet Chronicle, had been issued; and I am happy to enclose it with this letter. Please acknowledge its receipt.

... The check is written to The Siam Society to under write the publication by the Society of the shortened chronicle of the Kings of Siam by Jeremias van Vliet. It is mutually understood that the Society will publish it in a manner commensurate with its usual high standards; and that the original Dutch text will be included in the volume.

The rest, of course, is up to you as Honorary Editor of the Society's publications. I am sitting in my study facing my set of the Society's publications, and just a moment ago I was struck again by the extraordinary improvement in their quality and quantity since you took over responsibility of them. Congratulations!

... We didn't have much of a holiday--it rained nearly every day, and was terribly cold even when it cleared up. ...¹⁶³

The excerpts from these three letters are evidence of how such a correspondent as Wyatt blended personal matters into his correspondence with Tej. Despite the lack of Tej's letters in reply to those of Wyatt in most cases, it is likely that he might have written something personal to his former co-supervisor, as well.

It has become more obvious that the records Tej's private papers collection contains did enable Tej to maintain personal relationships with different individuals.

¹⁶² [2/221] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 2 June 1974.

¹⁶³ [2/219] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 4 July 1974.

There are more documents of this kind from the third and fourth volumes of the collection which cover the period from 1980. This is because after Tej came back from his posting in Jakarta, he began to keep most of his personal papers altogether. As a result, the records from these two volumes are diverse in terms of their subject matters, not restricted to those regarding the JSS as it is in the first two volumes. Among these private papers are the personal records and correspondence that bear no direct connection Tej's editorial work at the Siam Society, although they might have been created by or sent from those who had previously contributed to the Journal. To illustrate, it is worth considering a letter from Wyatt, supposedly the first one typed on a computer. Wyatt hinted, 'I have also devoted an inordinate amount of concentration and energy over the past year in coming to terms with twentieth-century technology, *as this letter itself will attest*'.¹⁶⁴ That is, this letter was written with a word processor, rather than a typewriter as it had usually been. The paragraph continues: 'It took me nearly a year to make up my mind, and to do sufficient study of this matter to be ready to make a (expensive) decision. Right now I am still in the early stage of learning how actually to use the thing, but already I am convinced that it makes work a great deal easier'.¹⁶⁵ In fact, the letter was entirely personal, with nothing relating to the JSS. Earlier, Wyatt thanked for a card Tej had sent him, and shared about what he had been spending time doing in the previous year. He ended with an information of his upcoming sabbatical leave.

Another example is a letter Tej sent to his friend, Craig J. Reynolds (then, of University of Sydney), whose first academic article and book review appeared in the JSS through Tej's solicitation. At first, Tej thanked Reynolds for sending his article,¹⁶⁶

¹⁶⁴ [4/233] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 19 January 1983. (Emphasis added).

¹⁶⁵ Ibid.

¹⁶⁶ Craig J. Reynolds, 'Marxism in Thai Historical Studies', *The Journal of Asian Studies* 43, no. 1 (November 1983): 77–104.

commending '[i]t's most useful'.¹⁶⁷ He went on: 'You have done what you did earlier with your article on K.S.R. Kulap for JSS – open things up. I admire your painstaking patience in ploughing through the literature to produce so succinctly such a comprehensive article'.¹⁶⁸ Then, Tej recounted his experience at the Annual General Meeting of the Historical Association. The last paragraph reads:

I am sorry we did not meet at the beginning of the year. I was on my way to a meeting in Jakarta at the time. ... The rumour that I was going to be our first Ambassador in Brunei was a year and half old. It didn't say much for The Nation for printing it. I will probably be in Bangkok for at least another year and wish, as always, that you would write something else for the JSS - - at least a review.¹⁶⁹

It might seem that Tej was attempting, in his last sentence, at soliciting from Reynolds a contribution to the Journal. Judging, however, from the way the letter was written with that clause emerging suddenly at the end, it is only likely that, at most, he probably meant to say he would welcome anything from his friend to be considered for publication in the JSS. As such, in writing this letter, Tej's purpose was to keep in touch with Reynolds. The same can be said for Wyatt's purpose of his letter mentioned recently.

In a similar manner, Tej corresponded with several other individuals to sustain his personal relationship with them. This can be evidenced by letters in his private papers collection at the Siam Society Library, such as, among others, those from Phan Wannamethee,¹⁷⁰ Andrew Forbes,¹⁷¹ Ralph K. Blumenau,¹⁷² and Milton Osborne,¹⁷³ as well as Tej's letter to Nigel Greenwood.¹⁷⁴

¹⁶⁷ [4/151] Tej Bunnag to Craig J. Reynolds, 4 April 1984.

¹⁶⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁰ [4/141] Phan Wannamethee to Tej Bunnag, 15 August 1983. Phan was one of Tej's senior colleagues at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. In 1983, he was Thai ambassador to the United Kingdom. From 1984 to 1986, he served as the sixth General-Secretary of ASEAN. He is now the Secretary General of the Thai Red Cross Society, where Tej serves as Assistant to the Secretary General for Administration.

¹⁷¹ [3/60] Andrew Forbes to Tej Bunnag, 15 October 1984.

In addition to maintaining personal relationships by exchanging notes on personal matters, Tej also achieved the same end by means of extending his helping hand to his friends, colleagues or acquaintances, through the correspondence. The most concrete assistance Tej provided was writing letters of recommendation. Most of the time he did so in the capacity of the JSS Honorary Editor, but it was not likely that Tej would have taken it as a task the editor was obliged to do for any contributor. On the contrary, Tej should personally know the person for whom he was a referee to the extent that he was confident to provide a reference upon request. Although the purposes for which a reference was required were various, Tej only acted as a referee for the individuals whom he personally knew or was acquainted with. Indeed, the reference letters kept in his private papers collection at the Siam Society Library were all prepared for those whom he had befriended or been directly associated with. In addition, there were occasions on which Tej drafted or jotted down what he was to include in the actual document, as it shows in his private papers collection. Five key examples will be discussed below.

On acknowledging that he had received Breazeale's corrected page-proofs (as discussed above), Tej also mentioned the reference he previously had written for Breazeale's job application to the Australian National University (ANU) and to the University of Singapore.¹⁷⁵ These two letters of recommendation are almost identical in the content, which includes Tej's comments on Breazeale's academic work and

¹⁷² [4/17] Ralph K. Blumenau to Tej Bunnag, m3 April 1984; and [4/16] Ralph k. Blumenau, 10 January 1985. According to Tej, he has been exchanges with Blumenau who was his history teacher at Malvern College, since he left that school up to the present.

¹⁷³ [4/144] Milton Osborne to Tej Bunnag, 4 August 1983; [4/136] Milton Osborne to Tej Bunnag, 1 August 1984; and [4/135] Milton Osborne to Tej Bunnag, 11 December 1985. All of Osborne's letters bear the letterhead of the Office of National Assessments, Canberra, where he served as the Head of the Asia Branch.

¹⁷⁴ [4/57] Tej Bunnag to Nigel Greenwood, 29 August 1985. See also, [4/59] Nigel Greenwood to Tej Bunnag, 21 June [1985]; and [4/58] Nigel Greenwood to Tej Bunnag, 19 August 1985.

¹⁷⁵ [1/34] Tej to Breazeale, 16 July 1974.

personal attributes.¹⁷⁶ In fact, this was not the first time Tej was asked to be a referee. Previously, he wrote a letter in support of Breazeale's application to study at St Antony's College, University of Oxford. In that letter, Tej recalled Breazeale took his class on Thai history at 'the Graduate School of Chulalongkorn University in the 1969-1970 academic year. I was also in regular contact with him about his research into Prince Damrong Rachanuphap and Thai historiography which is the subject of his Master's dissertation at Hawaii'.¹⁷⁷ Furthermore, Tej opined that Breazeale's 'knowledge of Thai, written and spoken, is one of the very best among western research students I have come across in Bangkok'.¹⁷⁸ Had they not been 'in regular contact' as claimed, Tej would not have been able to comment in ways that he did, both in 1971 and 1974.

Incidentally, in 1974, Batson asked Tej 'for a favor'. In his letter to Tej, he explained:

[t]he Career Center here [at Cornell University] keeps a file of information and recommendations for graduate students (despite the present bleak job prospects.) The recommendations I have are mostly from professors at Cornell, and it might be a good idea to have an 'outsider'. I wonder if you would be willing, in your capacity as JSS editor, to do one of these forms ...¹⁷⁹

Tej was willing to do Batson 'a favor'. He wrote his 'confidential statement', as remarked on the form Batson mentioned, whose copy¹⁸⁰ is kept next to the letter in Tej's private papers collection. This was not the only time Tej did this for Batson. In 1976, when Batson applied for a research fellowship at the School of Pacific Studies of ANU, Tej was named one of his referees.¹⁸¹ At the request of ANU's Academic Registrar, Tej provided an extensive statement in support of Batson's application,

¹⁷⁶ [2/30] Tej Bunnag to G. E. Dicker, 5 June 1974; [2/29] Tej Bunnag to Ong Jin Soo, 3 July 1974.

¹⁷⁷ [2/28] Tej Bunnag to Secretary of St Antony's College, 20 January 1971.

¹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*

¹⁷⁹ [2/24] Benjamin A. Batson to Tej Bunnag, 29 March 1974.

¹⁸⁰ [2/23] Tej Bunnag's Confidential Statement on Benjamin A. Batson, 24 April 1974

¹⁸¹ [2/17] G. E. Dicker to Tej Bunnag, 12 March 1976.

showing his ‘very high opinion of Dr. Batson’s qualification and ability’.¹⁸² Despite writing in his capacity as the JSS Honorary Editor, Tej included in this four-page reference his opinions beyond the editorship. For instance, a paragraph reads,

There is in Dr. Batson’s work a rigour which reflects the fact that he is a multi-disciplinary man. As he is both a mathematician and an historian, so to his historical sensitivity is added an extra precision which gives a special depth to his work. His mathematical background means that he can buttress his interpretation of political events with economic and financial data with ease.¹⁸³

Without knowing Batson personally, as well as his academic training and interest, it would have been difficult for Tej to write the above statement without reservations.

Inclusion of his personal knowledge about the person whom he was recommending also appears in Tej’s reference for Thamsook, who was applying for a research fellowship at the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies (ISEAS),¹⁸⁴ Singapore, in 1975. Apart from discussing the potential benefits of Thamsook’s proposed research project, and her suitability for the fellowship, Tej added, before concluding his recommendation, ‘I am sure Dr. Thamsook will publish a report of her findings. Since she was a student, she had never hoarded her knowledge or allowed her notes to languish in files. On the contrary, she had been most generous in sharing the fruits of her research through regular publication’.¹⁸⁵ Tej made it clear here that he had known Thamsook ‘since she was a student’, and could assure that she would definitely get the results of her study published, which, to him, was ‘all the more praiseworthy given a local tradition of reluctance to record opinions or to display learning’.¹⁸⁶ He would not have been able to make such a bold statement without his long-standing personal association with Thamsook.

¹⁸² [2/16] Tej Bunnag to G. E. Dicker, 10 April 1976.

¹⁸³ Ibid.

¹⁸⁴ Now, ISEAS-Yusof Ishak Institute, Singapore.

¹⁸⁵ [1/413] Tej Bunnag to Director of Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 21 October 1975.

¹⁸⁶ Ibid.

Apart from his academic colleagues such as Breazeale, Batson and Thamsook, his academic supervisor also named Tej as a referee. On 23 September 1974, Michael Kammen of the Department of History, Cornell University, wrote to Tej:

David K. Wyatt, currently associate professor of Southeast Asian history in this department, is being considered at this time for promotion to full professor. I would be very grateful to you for a letter evaluating the quality and impact of his scholarly work, his standing and contributions to your discipline.¹⁸⁷

At that time, Tej had been preoccupied with his diplomatic duties, and so only replied to Kammen on 14 November 1974, hoping ‘that my contribution is not too late for your consideration of David K. Wyatt’s promotion’.¹⁸⁸ Undoubtedly, Tej gave high opinions on every aspect Kammen had asked for. To end his three-page letter, Tej summed up that ‘[i]n promoting David K. Wyatt to full professor in your department, Cornell University will be the envy of all universities where history and Asian studies are taught’.¹⁸⁹ What is more interesting, however, is that Wyatt’s choice of Tej as his referee was deliberate, but he did not inform Tej beforehand. This can be evidenced by Wyatt’s letter to Tej, dated 28 February 1975. At the time the letter was written, the promotion had been approved at the department and college levels, and was pending final approval from the university’s Board of Trustees. So, Wyatt only revealed on that occasion he nominated Tej the referee from Thailand, on grounds that Tej was the Honorary Editor of the JSS and should be able to provide a well-rounded evaluation of his quality and suitability. As Wyatt put it,

I should have given you some advance warning in the promotion business--but on the other hand I don’t like getting friendly letters from someone just before a letter arrives asking me whether the chap should be promoted. Anyway, the history department approved the promotion; then an ad hoc committee appointed by the Dean of the College of Arts and Sciences approved it; now it goes to the Board of Trustees ... Many thanks for your

¹⁸⁷ [2/215] Michael Kammen to Tej Bunnag, 23 September 1974.

¹⁸⁸ [2/214] Tej Bunnag to Michael Kammen, 14 November 1974.

¹⁸⁹ Ibid.

reference: it must have helped. As a matter of principle, I wanted someone in Thailand to write an assessment. I had to rule out the older generation (certainly Rong!), and that left only my own students; and of those, I consider you the best historian, the most active, and the most able (because of your role in the JSS) to see my work in the context of what is being done in the field.¹⁹⁰

Although Tej's statement was confidential, Wyatt was right in that Tej would be able to do what he had wished.¹⁹¹

Nevertheless, this does not mean that Tej only wrote references and the like only if they were treated with confidentiality. In 1976, when Michael Smithies, for instance, applied for a job at the Institute of Education, University of London,¹⁹² he asked for Tej's 'open Testimonial', which he 'can make photocopies of - use official paper and titles etc'.¹⁹³ In his letter, Smithies explained 'I need it immediately for a post I've put in for at the Inst. of Ed. in London but it may come in handy anyway. I've never been asked to send copies of testimonials as opposed to giving names of referees before'.¹⁹⁴ In less than three weeks, Smithies received the document he had requested, typed on papers bearing the Siam Society's letterhead and signed by Tej as the Honorary Librarian.¹⁹⁵ Smithies acknowledged the receipt of Tej's 'brilliantly glowing testimonial [which] has just come and a thousand thanks. I hardly recognise

¹⁹⁰ [2/213] David K. Wyatt to Tej Bunnag, 28 February 1975.

¹⁹¹ By naming Tej as his referee, in his capacity of the editor of JSS – a reputable publication of Thai studies – Wyatt managed to parry criticisms from 'the older generation' of Thai historians such as Rong Sayamanonda, whose work had previously been critically reviewed by Wyatt himself. However, it is worth explaining that this is not to question the late Wyatt's quality or suitability in any way. It is reasonable to imagine that Wyatt's concern was partially due to the lack of the culture of criticism within Thai academia. More importantly, Tej submitted his evaluation without any advance communication with Wyatt on this matter – a good cause to believe that Tej's very high opinion of Wyatt was given as he saw fit. For Wyatt's review of Rong's *A History of Thailand* (Bangkok: Thai Watana Panich, 1971), see David K. Wyatt, review of *A History of Thailand*, by Rong Sayamananda, JSS 60, no. 2 (July 1972): 288–291.

¹⁹² Formerly a constituent college of the University of London, the Institute has merged with the University College London (UCL), University of London, in 2014. Since the merger, it has been a constituent faculty within that College, and is referred to as the UCL Institute of Education.

¹⁹³ [2/134] Michael Smithies to Tej and Jane Bunnag, 8 April 1976. (Underline original)

¹⁹⁴ Ibid.

¹⁹⁵ At that time, it was confirmed that Tej would be posted to station in the Royal Thai Embassy in Jakarta. Nisa Sheanakul was appointed the new JSS editor, while Tej became the Honorary Librarian. He, however, wound up the editorial work for articles to be published in the January JSS issue of January 1976.

myself in it'.¹⁹⁶ Obviously, Tej included his personal views on Smithies' works and contributions since 1962 when they first became acquainted with each other. He emphasised '[a]lthough the period of our direct association was short, my appreciation for what Mr. Smithies has done in Thailand is of long standing'.¹⁹⁷ The account continues:

From 1962 to this day, what strikes me as Mr. Smithies' outstanding characteristics are his boundless energy, dedication to perfection, love of learning and teaching, organizational ability and talent for administration, enthusiastic interest in diverse environments and committed participation in intellectual activities.
...

Michael Smithies' editorship of The Journal of the Siam Society holds an honoured placed (sic) in the history of the Siam Society (founded in 1904) ...

The foregoing is an all too brief testimonial to Mr. Smithies' qualities. Nevertheless, I hope that I have succeeded in painting an impression of a man who is unique for his ability to make contributions in so many fields. I have enjoyed his company and wish that he were going back to Bangkok.¹⁹⁸

It is worth noting that Tej's appreciation appears to be truly 'of long-standing'. This can be evidenced by subsequent statements Tej wrote of Smithies, such as his letter in support of Smithies' application for an appointment as the Director of the University Press, University of Hong Kong (1980),¹⁹⁹ and his felicitation on Smithies becoming an octogenarian (2012).²⁰⁰

The examples above have shown that Tej maintained his relationships, through correspondence, with his friends or colleagues by writing letters of recommendation, and the like, as they needed them for various purposes. Many of them were successful in their pursuit for which Tej provided his reference. As the records show, Breazeale

¹⁹⁶ [2/131] Michael Smithies to Tej Bunnag, 27 April 1976.

¹⁹⁷ [2/132] Tej Bunnag's open reference for Michael Smithies, 21 April 1976.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid.

¹⁹⁹ [3/226] Tej Bunnag to the Secretary-General, Association of Commonwealth Universities, 19 June 1980.

²⁰⁰ Tej Bunnag, felicitation to *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*, VII–IX.

studied in St Antony's (and eventually was awarded a DPhil), and Wyatt was promoted to full professor. In addition, Batson was appointed as a Research Fellow, at ANU. Nonetheless, whether or not they could achieve the goal of their pursuits is not as important as that Tej could sustain his relationships with them by doing what they asked for when he was in a position to do so. On the one hand, this can be considered a form of service Tej provided in a wider context of Thai studies community, to which, he felt, he belonged. On the other hand, at a personal level, giving positive comment on candidates who happened to be his friends or (academic) colleagues could be considered a form of assistance he provided to them. In this light, it can be seen as an attempt of Tej at maintaining the personal relationships.

In short, apart from enabling Tej to carry out his work as the editor of the JSS, Tej's private papers were also a means through which Tej maintain his personal relationships with friends, colleagues and acquaintances. To achieve this end, Tej exchanged notes on personal matters with, as well as extended his hand to assist the individuals whom he knew personally. The evidence from his private papers collection at the Siam Society Library reveals that on top of personal letters, there are records both documenting the editorial work and containing personal matters in the same items. Furthermore, to sustain the personal relationships with certain individuals, Tej also acted as a referee when they needed one. This means he wrote letters of recommendation and the like in support of their various pursuits, such as job application and promotion.

6.2.3 *Representing self*

It is worth looking at Tej's private papers, especially those he personally created and presented to other individuals, from Tej's own perspective. As something personal,

when creating these documents, it was highly likely that Tej would put himself into them. An individual with such different ‘selves’ as a career diplomat, an editor of a learned journal of Thai studies, a friend, etc, Tej would make a choice of how he would like to be seen by others. That is, depending on the ultimate purpose he was fulfilling, Tej would express himself in ways he saw fit. As such, it is possible to consider Tej’s private papers to function as a ‘site’ for Tej to represent himself.

The most obvious example which appears in most correspondence is the designation after Tej’s signature (if any), which unsurprisingly, in most cases, is ‘Honorary Editor’. This is because he created these documents in his capacity as the JSS Honorary Editor. On other occasions, documents were signed by him with a designation he held at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is also not surprising, as the letterhead of these papers reveals that they were created in the course of the Ministry’s business.

Nonetheless, this is not the only testimony to how Tej represented himself in these records. In fact, apart from expressing himself as the Honorary Editor or a government official attached to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Tej also represented himself variously on different occasions and in different places. For instance, at the end of Tej’s letter in support of Breazeale’s application to St Antony’s, he wrote that he was an alumnus of the College himself. The sentence reads: ‘It should go without saying - but I am writing this recommendation as a loyal alumnus of St. Antony’s with the interest of the College very much in mind’.²⁰¹ Then, he listed various designations after his name (figure 6.7). Albeit not prevalent in his private papers collection at the Siam Society Library, Tej also showed himself as a private individual. An example worth mentioning is his personal letter to Nigel Greenwood, who, in 1985, expected to

²⁰¹ [2/28] Tej to Secretary of St Antony’s College, 20 January 1971.

2/28.2

It should go without saying, - but I am writing this recommendation as a loyal alumnus of St. Antony's with the interests of the College very much in mind.

Yours sincerely,

(Tej Bunnag)
M.A. (Cantab.) D.Phil. (Oxon.)
Special Lecturer in History,
Graduate School, Chulalongkorn University,
Second Secretary, Public and Cultural Affairs Division,
Information Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,
Honorary Librarian and Member of the Editorial Committee
of the Siam Society under Royal Patronage.

Figure 6.7. Last page of Tej Bunnag's letter to Secretary of St Antony's College,
20 January 1971
(Reproduced by courtesy of the Siam Society Library)

meet Tej on his transit in Bangkok International Airport. Failing to turn up at the airport, Tej wrote:

Please forgive me for not inclining to show up at the airport to see you on the Bangkok-leg of your round-the-world trip via Palawan. It's a long way to go for a chat during the rainy season with wife and baby at home. I wish you a safe journey back to London, Curzon Road, and home. We will see each other when we have more time.²⁰²

It seems, however, that the most prominent self-representation is that as a historian. One of the most outstanding evidence for this is in Tej's letter to Strobridge, already mentioned earlier, in which he revealed that his interest in Strobridge's work 'springs from the fact that *I am an historian of the period myself*'.²⁰³ In addition, there are also other forms of representation less obvious than such a proclamation made in the letter to Strobridge. For instance, when Tej wrote letters of recommendation, he usually had to express his personal views on the individuals he was recommending, as well as their works. Although he was writing these letters as the Honorary Editor of the JSS, he did not confine himself to such the position. Rather, he commented in a manner of a historian who always kept up with the state of the art in his area of expertise. Three examples will be discussed below.

Firstly, on recommending Thamsook's research proposal entitled 'The Impact of Japanese Occupation on Thailand, 1942–1945) for a grant from the Ford Foundation, Tej wrote in favour for its originality. He provided evidence that there had been no study employing such an approach proposed by Thamsook. Tej wrote:

By placing the emphasis on the Japanese impact on Thailand, she will be among the first to concentrate on Thai primary sources for a study of the period. Thadeus Flood's pioneering work, which took the story up to 1941 ... used Japanese primary sources but mostly secondary Thai sources. Two recent articles in the Journal of the Siam Society, Charnvit Kasetsiri, ... and, Benjamin A. Batson, ... used only secondary sources. There are a few post-graduate

²⁰² [4/57] Tej Bunnag to Nigel Greenwood, 29 August 1985.

²⁰³ [2/148] Tej to Strobridge, 16 March 1974. (Emphasis added).

students beginning research in this area, but they are based in the U.S.A. or England and are using British and American rather than Thai primary sources.²⁰⁴

The fact that Tej emphasised the importance of a balanced use of primary sources from different places suggests that he was writing from a historian's perspective, rather than that of a scholarly journal's editor.

Secondly, on request of Cornell University's Department of History, Tej wrote of Wyatt in support of his suitability for promote to full professor. One of the key points he highlighted was that Wyatt's 'work is characterised by *the highest degree of professionalism and objectivity*'.²⁰⁵ This was the quality preferred in historical study in the time after the Second World War. Before the concluding paragraph, Tej once again mentioned the significance of objectivity in historical study which was reflected in Wyatt's contribution to the book *In Search of Southeast Asia: A Modern History*, edited by David Joel Steinberg. 'This co-operative effort towards a new understanding of modern Southeast Asia breaks entirely virgin ground and is the first *truly objective history of the region*'.²⁰⁶ Tej made it clear that he was evaluating Wyatt work in accordance with the current standard of history as an academic discipline.

Lastly, on recommending Batson to the ANU's School of Pacific Studies, Tej added towards the end: '[m]y recommendation has an ulterior motive in that I am keen to use the new facts which I am sure he will unearth and to test my own theories of Thai political development against his interpretation. Dr. Batson's work will fill a gap in the study of the formative period of contemporary Thai history'.²⁰⁷

In these three cases, Tej was writing of Thamsook, Wyatt and Batson, respectively. But, he was also representing himself as a historian. This can be

²⁰⁴ [1/414] Tej Bunnag to the Representative of the Ford Foundation, Bangkok, 15 October 1974.

²⁰⁵ [2/214] Tej to Kammen, 14 November 1974. (Emphasis added).

²⁰⁶ Ibid. (Emphasis added).

²⁰⁷ [2/16] Tej to Dicker, 10 April 1976.

evidenced by the fact that he valued a balanced use of primary sources, a high degree of objectivity in historical research, and an importance of fresh interpretations of history – all of which are key elements of historical studies.

Furthermore, there was also another case in which Tej was asked by the Editor of the Oxford University Press' East Asian Branch, for opinions as a subject expert on a manuscript entitled *Prince Vajirananavarorasa: The Life of a Thai Prince-Patriarch*, which it was considering publishing. Having been in the process of publishing Tej's book (which was based on his doctoral thesis), the Editor was aware of his expertise, and believed his opinion would be helpful.²⁰⁸ In his reply, Tej began 'Prince Wachirayan (the diminutive of his title and how it is pronounced colloquially) was one of the King Chulalongkorn's half-brothers. Like Prince Damrong, whose career as Minister of the Interior I studied and you are publishing, he was very distinguished',²⁰⁹ clarifying that the Prince was not unknown. Then, he went on to highlight the significance of the Prince, especially his place in the modern history of Thailand. Towards the end of the three-page letter, Tej emphasised '[the Prince's] life is the success story of how one spiritual individual Asian man reached to the complex dilemmas which confronted him when his country had to reform and adapt itself rapidly to the changing world outside', and concluded that by 'making available in English a biography of Prince Wachirayan, the Oxford University Press would be contributing to the enrichment of the historical heritage of Asia as a whole', emphasising.²¹⁰ He also reminded:

Distinguished Indians, Chinese, and Japanese of comparable stature have found their biographers, but Southeast Asians have not been so well served. Now that there is an interest in Indonesia, and

²⁰⁸ [2/121] M[argaret] Lee to Tej Bunnag, 14 April 1976.

²⁰⁹ [2/119] Tej Bunnag, to M[argaret] Lee, 8 May 1976.

²¹⁰ Ibid.

no doubt in Vietnam and the other countries in Indochina, I would urge that Thailand should not be neglected.²¹¹

It is evident that Tej focused on making available in English a source material, which would attract and benefit a wider readership. This reflects his personality as a historian whose major source of data is primary documents. Although Tej's appeal here was not successful,²¹² it is apparent that he had tried his best as a historian to convince the Press that the manuscript was worth publishing.

The examples above have shown how Tej represented himself, in his correspondence, as a professional historian. Albeit not as obvious and direct as it is in Tej's letter to Strobridge, it is sufficiently evident that Tej was writing from a historian's perspective, and thus not representing himself as a historian.

In brief, Tej used his private papers not only to perform the tasks of the JSS Honorary Editor and to maintain personal relationships with his correspondents, but also to represent himself, as illustrated above. Especially for those documents Tej created and presented to other individuals, it was inevitable that he would put himself into them. As such, these papers were a 'site' for Tej to insert one (or more) of his many selves (e.g. an editor, a historian or a private individual), and present it to their audience. Yet, it should be noted that this function of Tej's private papers is different from the notion of personal archives as a 'site' for constructing identities, which considers the archives more collectively, and is more inward-looking. In other words, it looks at Tej's private papers collection as a whole. The focus is on the identities that Tej constructed of himself through curating the contents of this archival collection. On the contrary, the function of representing self, on the other hand, considers records more individually. The focus is on Tej's self/selves represented in a particular record.

²¹¹ Ibid.

²¹² The book was eventually published by the University of Ohio Press in 1979, as Prince Vajirañāṇavarorasa, *Autobiography: The Life of Prince-Patriarch Vajirañāṇa of Siam, 1860-1921*, trans. and ed. Craig J. Reynolds (Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979).

The two sections above have described functions of Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library. The first section has covered four functions as serving the purposes of (1) keeping for future reference, (2) sharing information, (3) building a legacy, and (4) constructing identities. The second section has included three functions as how Tej used his private papers (1) to perform tasks of the JSS editor, (2) to maintain personal relationships, and (3) to represent his multifaceted self.

However, it is worth noting that despite the possibility to distinguish these functions, they do not exist exclusively or independently. Rather, it is possible to draw a certain level of interrelation among them. For instance, Tej would not have been able to maintain his person relationship with many of his correspondents such as Batson, Breazeale and Thamsook, had it not been through the editorial work that they were doing. The correspondence would not have been generated, and Tej would have no records to keep (for future reference) or to pass on (to others). Similarly, Tej would not have been able to express himself as a historian of late-nineteenth-and-early-twentieth-century Thailand, if Strobridge had not written him to propose an article for the JSS. Besides, the functions of constructing identities and representing self could also be regarded as interrelated, although they focus on different aspects of Tej's personal archiving, as mentioned above.

To summarise, the previous two sections have addressed the two research questions on functions of Tej's private papers. The next section will discuss the finding, hence addressing the research objective of explaining the relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive.

6.3 Discussions

6.3.1 *Functionality of a personal archive revisited*

Central to the framework of ‘evidence of *me*’ is the functionality of a personal archive, which, according to Sue McKemmish, is ‘its capacity to witness a life’.²¹³ The degree to which a personal archive can witness a life depends on ‘how systematically we go about the business of creating our records as documents, capturing them as records (that is, ordering them in relation to each other and “placing” them in the context of related activities), and keeping and discarding them over time (that is, organising them to *function* as long-term memory of significant activities and relationships)’.²¹⁴ Key to this explanation is that records (like any other document as Lindsay Prior²¹⁵ suggests) have their own functions to perform. It is these functions of records that reflect the roles and activities of an individual, hence evidencing his or her life. In other words, the personal archive an individual keeps bears witness to the individual’s life.

Following its introduction in 1996, McKemmish’s concept received criticisms from Verne Harris²¹⁶ for not accounting for the characteristics of personal archives, which might not be addressed by traditional archival theory focusing on functionality. Catherine Hobbs²¹⁷ has echoed Harris’ comments and also lamented that the focus on functionality is not suitable for an archive created outside organisational contexts. Rather, she suggests, archivists should look at a personal archive as a site of revelation, where personalities and characters of its creator could be seen. That is, the focus should be on the psychology and personality of the records’ creator. Since then,

²¹³ Sue McKemmish, ‘Evidence of *me*’, *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 175.

²¹⁴ *Ibid.* (Emphasis added).

²¹⁵ Lindsay Prior, ‘Using Documents in Social Research’, in *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*, ed. David Silverman, 3rd ed. (London: Sage, 2011), 96.

²¹⁶ Verne Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger: Deconstructive Possibilities in “Evidence of Me”’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 8–21.

²¹⁷ Catherine Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals’, *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 126–135.

Hobbs' idea seems to have taken the stage, receiving constant citations, while rendering McKemmish's 'evidence of *me*' at the side. Recently, Jennifer Douglas²¹⁸ has expressed a disagreement with Hobbs, and proposed that a personal archive should be seen as a site of self-construction. Her suggestion focuses on a variety of agents and (their) actions that shape the structure and meaning of a personal archive.

This study has brought the 'evidence of *me*' back to rethink the focus on functionality of a personal archive through an examination of Tej Bunnag's private papers held at the Siam Society Library. It has shown that his personal archive has functions to perform, and that multiple functions of Tej's private papers are the witness to and evidence of Tej's multiple roles and their related activities.

The results of the study suggest that the theoretical framework drawn from the concept of 'evidence of *me*' can be used to analyse a personal archive, despite its criticisms. It is suggested here that the framework brings more aspects of a personal archive into consideration than its counterparts, thus yielding a more encompassing analysis.

It would seem that McKemmish's suggestion to analyse the roles of individuals and activities associated with these roles might lead to those arising from formal or official business. Yet, it depends on what the content of private papers includes, as the term 'functions' is not limited to business functions in an organisational context. Other contexts need to be taken into consideration. Here, a key characteristic of the records continuum theory does allow for multiple contexts to come into play – namely, the concept of multiple provenance. Indeed, as explained earlier in chapter 3, such a concept brings in parties participating or involved in the transactions and interactions

²¹⁸ Jennifer Lynn Douglas, 'Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives' (PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013).

that a record documents, hence placing that record in different contexts of creation, capture, organisation and pluralisation.²¹⁹

In this study, the multiple contexts could be seen through the roles and activities related to Tej in his multiple capacities, be they official or personal. By placing Tej's private papers in various, multiple contexts, his multiple roles and their related activities could, in turn, be identified. As the results of this study have shown, apart from the roles arising from his official capacity as the Honorary Editor of the JSS, there are roles relating to his other capacities revealed within the theoretical framework of 'evidence of *me*'. As such, the proposition that the 'evidence of *me*' would deviate archivists from the very characteristics of a personal archive that are different from those of an organisational archive would have to be reconsidered. It is evident in this study that Tej's private papers were kept and used also for purposes beyond the functions relating to the business of getting the JSS published, such as constructing identities and representing self. This in itself reflects a different nature of personal papers from that of organisational records.

The functions of constructing identities and representing self also represent what would be found through the frameworks focusing on the character and personality of the creator. In other words, the personal archive as 'evidence of *me*' has already included the aspects that Hobbs²²⁰ accuses of lacking.

Furthermore, Douglas' concept of archive as a site of self-construction could also be seen through McKemmish's analytical lens of 'evidence of *me*'. Douglas is right in highlighting the variety of agents and actions shaping the structure and

²¹⁹ Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World', in *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*, ed. Christopher A. Lee (Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011), 123; Sue McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum: An Australian Tradition', in *Research in the Archival Multiverse*, eds. Anne L. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau (Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017), 147.

²²⁰ Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives'.

meaning of an archive, which could, in fact, be seen through the analysis of roles and activities of an individual in relation to others in his or her society. Indeed, this resonates with McKemmish's notion that by recognising the existence of records co-creation and multiple provenances, 'individual participants in the transactions and interactions documented in the records' become 'participatory records agents'²²¹ (as opposed to subjects of the records in the practice that recognises only a single records creator).

As shown in this thesis, one of the functions of Tej's private papers is to maintain relationships, be they instrumental or personal. The interaction(s) between Tej and other(s) involved in a relationship would affect the way Tej played his role in maintaining that relationship, which eventually shaped the structure and meaning of his personal archive. For instance, with reference to the case of David K. Wyatt's promotion to full professor, Tej received a request by Michael Kammen²²² to evaluate Wyatt's performance and suitability. I have argued that by responding to the request, Tej did not only contribute to the decision-making process of the promotion committee, but also maintain his relationship with Wyatt. In this case, Tej's letter²²³ in reply to that of Kammen regarding Wyatt's performance and suitability was shaped by the relationship between him and Wyatt. It is also worth noting that although he was corresponding with Kammen, Tej regarded these letters as concerning Wyatt. This could be evidenced by that fact that Tej filed his correspondence with Kammen under the W division (rather than K), in the Wyatt subdivision.

In the example above, there are three records agents – namely, Tej, Kammen and Wyatt – each participating in the creation (that is, dimension 1 in the records continuum model (see figure 3.1, in chapter 3)) of Tej's letter in reply to Kammen.

²²¹ McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum', 147.

²²² [2/215] Kammen to Tej, 23 September 1974.

²²³ [2/214] Tej to Kammen, 14 November 1974.

Immediate context around the creation was the promotion of Wyatt to full professor, in which Tej was only corresponding with Kammen, because Wyatt did not inform Tej in advance. In the same context, the letter was used by the promotion committee in consideration for granting Wyatt professorship. The use here falls under pluralisation (dimension 4), in the records continuum term. So, the context of Wyatt's promotion informed the creation and pluralisation of Tej's letter to Kammen. However, when it came to the capture (dimension 2) and organisation (dimension 3), this letter was kept, together with Kammen's request letter, under the Wyatt subdivision. This obviously reveals another context of pluralisation (dimension 4), in which Tej was trying to maintain his personal relationship with Wyatt, hence putting all the records documenting that relationship together.

The case above is but one example that shows how capable McKemmish's concept of 'evidence of *me*' is as an analytical framework to examine a personal archive. In order to make use of the capability, its focus on functionality must be defined in a different way from what traditional archival theory would do. In this thesis, functions are interpreted as purposes and uses, in accordance with the idea that every document has functions of its own. The analysis of the purposes and uses of a personal archive has shown how a body of private papers reflects various roles an individual played in certain time periods. This is how these private papers are evidence of the life of that individual.

6.3.2 *What is personal?*

The object of this study has posed a problem on what it means by personal archive. As mentioned earlier, Tej refers to his personal archive as 'private papers', and marks the subject matters as 'JSS editorship, etc'. Skimming through the four volumes would

initially lead to a conclusion that these papers should, in the first place, have been kept at the Siam Society, since they form a part of the working files of the Honorary Editor. But the nature of Tej's honorary editorship (that is, voluntary and not full-time) did allow him to keep all these papers to himself, on top of the fact that the 'etc' part of these private papers is 'non-JSS editorship'. On the one hand, if the so-called 'JSS Honorary Editor working files' were to exist, Tej might have had broken the series of the files, rendering an incomplete body of records at the Siam Society office. On the other hand, he was simply keeping what he perceived to be 'about' himself. In turn, this leads to a fundamental problem regarding the divide between institutional and personal archive.

In fact, according to traditional archival theory, there is a stark contrast between organisational and personal records. There have been archival thinkers arguing for this sharp difference.²²⁴ Frank Burke, for instance, remarks that '[a]rchives are methodical, organized and structured, stretching over many generations, and pragmatic in their subject matter and intent of their creation. Personal papers are subjective, idiosyncratic, emotional, contemporary and narrow by focus'.²²⁵ Hobbs stresses the individuality, character, freedom and psychology that prompt individuals to create and keep records.²²⁶ As such, the formal recordkeeping in an organisational context is not relevant, and the ideas from traditional archival theory, such as transactionality, recordness and evidence are not appropriate.

In the case of Tej's private papers, they are not the work of one person, reflecting Tej's various capacities, such as the Honorary Editor, a diplomat, or a

²²⁴ See Graeme T. Powell, 'Archival Principles and the Treatment of Personal Papers', *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 7 (August 1976): 259–268; Frank G. Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition* (Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1997); Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives'; and Catherine Hobbs, 'Reenvisioning the Personal: Reframing Traces of Individual Life', in *Currents of Archival Thinking*, ed. Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil (Santa Barbara, CA: Libraries Unlimited, 2010), 213–241.

²²⁵ Burke, *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*, 11

²²⁶ Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives'.

friend. But one commonality among these papers is that they are about Tej, no matter how diverse the body of these papers is in terms of genres and subject matters.

Take the ‘open testimonial’²²⁷ that Tej wrote at the request of Smithies as an example.²²⁸ It could be argued that Tej did according to Smithies’ request and so the records came under the Siam Society’s letterhead. As it stands, it bears a trace of being an official letter, signed by Tej in his official capacity at the Siam Society. However, in terms of the content, it does not align with any business of the Siam Society. In fact, as I have argued, Tej used this reference letter to maintain his personal relationship with Smithies. More examples could be found in many of the letters from the contributors to the JSS who knew Tej personally, such as Batson, Thamsook and Wyatt. In these letters, both JSS and personal matters appear, and they were used and kept by Tej both to perform his role as the editor and to maintain personal relationships. What can be done to categorise the records of this kind properly?

In fact, archivists have faced such a dilemma especially when dealing with a personal records whose creation and maintenance involve third parties. Susan Thomas and Janette Martin, for instance, in dealing with contemporary politicians’ private papers, have found that ‘matters are further complicated by the potential for overlap between the content preserved in a personal archive and that contained in official records preserved under legislative requirements’.²²⁹ Paul Dalglish has also been in a similar situation when dealing with personal papers of politicians in Australia:

Once a person acts in an official capacity in an organisation it becomes an issue of drawing the boundaries between the personal records and the records of an organisation. The records from the Minister’s office can be conceived of as the records of the Minister, Ms X, the records of the Office of the Minister for Y, or the records

²²⁷ [2/132] Tej Bunnag’s open reference for Michael Smithies, 21 April 1976.

²²⁸ [2/134] Michael Smithies to Tej and Jane Bunnag, 8 April 1976.

²²⁹ Susan Thomas and Janette Martin, ‘Using the Papers of Contemporary British Politicians as a Testbed for the Preservation of Digital Personal Archives’, *Journal of Society of Archivists* 27, no. 1 (April 2006): 40.

of Portfolio Z. The ‘official person’ is rarely the sole direct creator of the records under his or her immediate control.²³⁰

As Dalglish points out, it is the issue of drawing boundaries. Nevertheless, it is still unclear that even with the boundaries being drawn, and the territories of the ‘personal’ and the ‘official’ demarcated, whether it be practically possible for a person to follow the lines and not step over them at all. That is, would it be the case that Tej’s friends who also contributed to the JSS send him two separate letters on the same occasion – one on JSS and another personal?

Albeit all of that, it does not mean archivists will have no frame of reference. This, in fact, lies in the issue of drawing boundaries. Recently, McKemmish and Michael Piggott have reflected on perspectives on archives and manuscript tradition in Australia and reached a definition of personal archive that challenges what they refer to as the ‘binary opposition between personal and corporate archive’. Taking a continuum-based view of archive, they broaden the definition of a personal archive

to include all forms, genres, and media of records relating to that person, whether captured in personal or corporate recordkeeping systems; remembered, transmitted orally, or performed; held in manuscript collections, archival or other cultural institutions, community archives, or other keeping places; or stored in shared digital spaces.²³¹

Central to this definition is the phrase ‘relating to that person’. That is as long as it a record ‘about’ that person, it could be considered personal no matter how it was created, how it appears, and where it is kept. When applied to the case of Tej’s private papers in this current study, these papers are his personal archive, as they relate to one (or more) of Tej’s various capacities.

²³⁰ Paul Dalglish, ‘The Appraisal of Personal Records of Members of Parliament in Theory and Practice’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 88.

²³¹ Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice’, *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 113.

However, the application of a continuum-based definition of a personal archive only serves to address the issue of drawing boundaries. In other words, it addresses what constitutes a personal archive, whose frontier is expanded, and which becomes more encompassing, under McKemmish and Piggott's frame of reference. This facilitates a better understanding about the nature, as well as different aspects, of Tej's private papers. But in order to account for Tej's recordkeeping practice, one needs to refer to other aspects of the records continuum theory. As with the case of Tej's letter to Kammen discussed above, multiple contexts must be taken into consideration. Similarly, the participatory records agents need to be identified. This will, in turn, allow for the contexts of the records to be seen. It will, then, be possible to address the questions why and how a record was created, captured and organised in Tej's private papers collection. Understanding of these contexts will also point to how the records were utilised (i.e. pluralised) by the various records agents.

Take the case of 'General Carlos P. Romulo: A Tribute from Air Chief Marshal Siddhi Savetsila, Minister of Foreign Affairs of Thailand'²³² as an example. As shown in figure 6.3, the traces of the correspondence on the first and last pages of the document make it possible to identify the records agents participating in its creation. In the organisational context of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Thailand, this note needed to be released under the name of the minister to pay respect to his Filipino counterpart. Tej was assigned with the task of drafting this statement, which was eventually accepted and praised. It is unclear how this document was captured and organised in the recordkeeping system of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Nevertheless, the purpose and use of this document were clearly of official nature in this context. On the contrary, Tej's purpose and use for keeping this same document

²³² [4/158] General Carlos P. Romulo.

were personal. In his private papers collection, Tej filed it under the R division, as the document is Tej's writing on Romulo. As I have suggested, this record reflects Tej's identity as a proud diplomat, whose work was appreciated by the permanent secretary and the minister. Indeed, in his reflection on this particular job of drafting this tribute for the minister, Tej recalled he 'was very touched [by the minister's comment, and] very proud' of this task.²³³ So, in Tej's personal context, the purpose and use of this same document were not of official nature.

The example above shows that there are multiple contexts in which records are created, captured, organised and pluralised. In order to identify these contexts, one has to recognise the existence of record co-creation and multiple provenances. Such the recognition makes it possible to take into consideration co-creators (as opposed to a single creator) of records. Once the participatory records agents, as McKemmish²³⁴ calls them, are identified, different contexts can, in turn, be seen. These contexts will inform the creation, capture, organisation and pluralisation of the records.

In addition, the different contexts are also dependent on different aspects of the records. In the case of Tej's private papers, there are, as the results of this study have shown, records of both organisational and personal functions curated into the body of a personal archive. But, regardless of their functions, they are records about Tej in one (or more) of his various capacities, be they official or personal. These aspects make it difficult to understand this body of personal archive from a traditional archival theoretical perspective. This is mainly because traditional archival theory supports the dichotomy between organisational and personal recordkeeping, and recognises only a single context of a single records creator.²³⁵ However, from a continuum-based perspective, one can explicate different aspects of a personal archive in multiple

²³³ Tej, interview by Chirabodee, 8 February 2018.

²³⁴ McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum', 147.

²³⁵ McKemmish, 'Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World', 123.

contexts of multiple records co-creators. In other words, it is possible to place an archive in different contexts, which shape its structure and meanings, as exemplified above in the cases of Tej's letter to Kammen, and the tribute to Romulo.

In turning back to the opening question of this section – what it means by a personal archive – it seems that a definitive answer could hardly be determined. When boundaries between organisational and personal records are permeable,²³⁶ it is not straightforward to address the questions: to what extent it is really a question of the 'evidence of *me*', and to what extent Tej's private papers could actually be characterised as an organisational archive of an editor of the JSS. The answer possibly lies in the fourth dimension of the records continuum model (see figure 3.1). That is, it depends on the context(s) of how the archive is pluralised. Nonetheless, what is more important is the practical implication of this problem. As the personal archive becomes more encompassing under the continuum-based definition, and with various records agents involved, archivists should work in ways that support 'a more extensive suite of rights for all those who participate in or are directly impacted by the events or actions documented in the records creation process'.²³⁷ It is also crucial to develop holistic approaches to archival practice that include 'a broader spectrum of rights, responsibilities and obligations relating to appraisal, description, management, accessibility and use of records in and through spacetime'.²³⁸ Such approaches will enable archivists to 'meet the archival needs of individuals to access – and even participate in the management of – their personal archive in the broadest sense'.²³⁹

²³⁶ McKemmish and Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse'; McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum'.

²³⁷ McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum', 147.

²³⁸ Ibid., 147–148.

²³⁹ McKemmish and Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse', 143.

6.3.3 *Records continuum theory and personal archive*

Harris has accused McKemmish of mistakenly applying the continuum thinking, which was developed for institutional recordkeeping, on personal archives in her ‘evidence of *me*’.²⁴⁰ Hobbs also questions: ‘Must the models for government and corporate record-keeping, such as focussing (sic) on functional transactions, life cycle, and continuums *always* been (sic) transposed, by implication anyway, to personal archiving?’²⁴¹ Ultimately, it is probable that the answer to Hobbs’ question would be ‘no’. However, the current study has shown that a continuum-based theoretical framework can be applied to a personal archive. In other words, the relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive has been observed in this study.

To begin with, such a relationship could be seen through the definition of personal archive, which McKemmish and Piggott put forward.²⁴² In its continuum-based definition, a personal archive takes many forms and can have multiple provenances. As mentioned in chapter 3, such a definition is based on experiences from Australia, where McKemmish, Piggott and their colleagues have tried to find ways to embrace different recordkeeping traditions especially those of the marginalised or vulnerable communities – whose archives may not take the forms privileged by the dominant recordkeeping traditions in that continent.²⁴³ To achieve

²⁴⁰ Harris, ‘On the Back of a Tiger’

²⁴¹ Hobbs, ‘The Character of Personal Archives’, 130. (Emphasis added).

²⁴² McKemmish and Piggott, ‘Toward the Archival Multiverse’, 113; see also, McKemmish, ‘Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World’.

²⁴³ See, for example, Sue McKemmish, Shannon Faulkhead, Livia Iacovino, and Kristen Thorpe, ‘Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Embracing Multiple Ways of Knowing and Keeping’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 38, no. 1 (May 2010): 27–50; Michael Piggott, ‘Towards a History of Australian Diary Keeping’, *Archivaria* 60 (Fall 2005): 145–166; and Fiona Ross, Sue McKemmish, and Shannon Faulkhead, ‘Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities’, *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 2 (November 2006): 112–151. For examples of research by their colleagues, Shannon Faulkhead, ‘Narratives of Koorie Victoria’ (PhD diss., Monash University, 2008); Shauna McRanor, ‘Maintaining the Reliability of Aboriginal Oral Records and their Material Manifestations: Implications for Archival Practice’, *Archivaria* 43 (Spring

that end, they have drawn from the continuum theory's concepts of records plurality and multiple provenance to expand the scope of what a personal archive encompasses. A finding of this study – in which Tej's private papers as a body of personal archive was examined – shows that the continuum-based definition of personal archive does not restrict itself to cases from Australia. Although the studied archive does not take multiple forms (as its content is all paper-based), the collection does comprise different types of records – both organisational and personal – kept by one person. As discussed earlier, the commonality among these records is that they are perceived as related to Tej (regardless of their provenance), and therefore are kept in this collection. These two aspects of Tej's private papers signify the relationship between personal archive and the records continuum theory in a sense that the latter provides a basis for the former to exist as it stands, due to the blurring boundaries between organisational and personal archives.²⁴⁴ That is, there is, in the records continuum theory, room to accommodate private papers containing various types of records, with multiple records creators, but kept together as a body of personal archive, like the one examined in this study. It would have been otherwise under a framework drawn from traditional archival theory, which supports a stark contrast between organisational and personal archives.

The relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive also manifests itself in the analysis of Tej's private papers through the conceptual framework of 'evidence of *me*'. By focusing on the functionality (discussed above),

1997): 64–88; and Livia Iacovino, 'Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities', *Archival Science* 10, no. 4 (December 2010): 353–372.

²⁴⁴ See McKemmish and Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse'. The instability of the binary opposition between the organisational and personal archives has, as early as 1977, been felt by Chris Hurley. Tej's private papers collection is not less complicated than Hurley's example of the personal papers of an individual who has run a family property, been a minister of state and become secretary of a local golf club. See C. Hurley, 'Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles', *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 8 (February 1977): 362 & 364.

purposes and uses of the studied archive were examined. This became a basis for the various agents participating in the creation, capture and organisation of the archive to be seen, and their actions and interactions identified. Clearly, the concept of multiple provenance has played a great part in enabling such the analysis, which generally covers the first three dimensions of the records continuum model (see figure 3.1): create, capture and organise, respectively.

Furthermore, apart from the actions of and interactions among the participatory records agents, the records continuum theory also enables an examination of how a personal archive is used by these agents. In fact, as the results of this study suggest, the analysis of how a personal archive is utilised by its keeper alone has touched upon the fourth dimension of the records continuum model (pluralisation). My analysis of Tej's personal archive shows that Tej did actually pluralise his private papers, for the fact that he used them in many different ways, and for different purposes. Consequently, for Tej himself, his personal archive has different meanings. These meanings are dependent upon the way the archive is used. This is what McKemmish means by records are of perduring nature: they persist through constant renewal,²⁴⁵ or, as Frank Upward explains: records have 'multiple lives in space time as the contexts that surround their use and control alter and open up new threads of action'.²⁴⁶

As mentioned in chapter 3, the current study falls into the second generation of continuum thinking, according to Heather Soyka's categorisation (see table 3.1). As such, it focuses more on the first three dimensions of the records continuum model. Even though it has touched upon the fourth dimension, the focus is on Tej's different ways of using his personal archive. However, McKemmish's framework can be

²⁴⁵ McKemmish, 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum', 139.

²⁴⁶ Frank Upward, 'Modelling the Continuum as Paradigm Shift in Archiving and Recordkeeping Processes, and Beyond: A Personal Reflection', *Records Management Journal* 10, no. 3 (December 2005): 119.

extended to cover other records agents, who participate in the transactions and interactions documented in the records, and who would likely have their own ways of using and interpreting the same archive. This is where the overlap between Soyka's second and third generations is. Once a similar treatment is applied to other records agents, the result would potentially reveal, in Upward's words, the 'multiple lives' of a single archive when it is used by different individuals.

It is not impossible, for instance, to speculate that, in his own context, Smithies might have treated the open testimonial that he requested from Tej differently. As mentioned in his letter to Tej, the testimonial would firstly be used in support of his application for a job at the then Institute of Education, University of London. He might make photocopies for use elsewhere. It is difficult to guess whether Smithies has kept the letter; and what it means to him, if he does keep it to this day. But it is reasonable to surmise that back in 1976 when the letter was in use, Smithies would have kept it for his job applications.

A more complicated situation could be the case for Tej's letter to Kammen in which he recommended Wyatt for full professorship at Cornell University. Wyatt needed a reference letter from Tej, whose name was consequently given to the promotion committee. Tej wrote a letter evaluating Wyatt's performance and suitability for the promotion, and sent it upon Kammen's request. I have pointed out earlier that Tej, Kammen and Wyatt are all records agents in this case. Yet, Wyatt did not have a chance to see the letter that he needed. Tej and Kammen were the direct users of this letter, each in their own contexts. While Kammen used it in an organisational context where a faculty member was being considered for promotion, Tej used it to maintain his personal relationship with Wyatt. In spite of not having a

chance to see the letter, Wyatt was using this letter, as well. He used it with a hope for career advancement.

Although there are possibly more examples to consider, the two cases above are sufficient to show how records can be used in different manners, by different records agents, depending largely on their contexts. It is clear here that when placed in different contexts, the same record can have different utilities, as well as different meanings. More importantly, these different contexts and perspectives should not, according to McKemmish, be ignored when a record is captured and organised,²⁴⁷ so that a personal archive can move beyond the ‘evidence of *me*’ to ‘evidence of *us*’.

As with the capacity to witness the life of its keeper, a personal archive can bear witness to the lives of those involved or participating in the transactions and interactions documented in it. In this light, Tej’s personal archive is his ‘evidence of *me*’, where the *me* is Tej himself. At the same time, Tej’s private papers can be ‘evidence of *others*’, where the *others* are those (institutions and persons) whose interactions or association with Tej are documented in Tej’s ‘evidence of *me*’. When put together, they become the ‘evidence of *us*’, where the *us* comprises both *me* and *others*. This is probably why McKemmish refers to the move from ‘evidence of *me*’ to ‘evidence of *us*’ as the move *beyond*,²⁴⁸ and not *away*. Despite the move, the *me* remains, as the pronoun ‘us’ connotes. That is, even though Tej’s private papers can potentially be regarded as witness to others’ lives, such witness is to be found in relation to interactions or associations between those others and Tej.

In the discussion above, the relationship between the records continuum theory and personal archive is elucidated, based on observations from the examination of Tej’s private papers collection at the Siam Society Library, hence demystifying some

²⁴⁷ McKemmish, ‘Recordkeeping in the Continuum’, 147.

²⁴⁸ McKemmish, ‘Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World’, 128.

doubts on the relevance of the theory to this type of archive. In general, the theory could be used to analyse and explain bodies of personal archive that cover multiple types of records with multiple provenances. In this study, the choice of conceptual framework is McKemmish's 'evidence of *me*', central to which is functionality of personal archive. Through this framework, purposes and uses of the studied archive, as well as participatory agents whose transactions and interactions are documented in the archive, could be identified. Multiple contexts around the creation, capture and organisation, could also be seen. This means such a framework that focus on functionality as 'evidence of *me*' is relevant and applicable to studying personal archive, so far as the transactions and interactions among the records agents are concerned. The framework also allows a move from personal to collective memories. By moving beyond, 'evidence of *me*' becomes 'evidence of *us*', in which transactions and interactions are considered in contexts and from perspectives other than those of the keeper of the personal archive himself or herself. As such, in terms of applicability, there is a tendency that McKemmish's 'evidence of *me*' will work well in analysing personal archives for the purposes and uses of those archives by multiple records agents involved in all four dimensions of the records continuum model. Bodies of personal archive similar to that of Tej's private papers – comprising records of professional transactions, personal correspondence, letters and miscellaneous records – would be compatible with this framework. Several roles, activities and relationships of an individual to which those personal archives bear witness will be revealed.

Nevertheless, this does not mean that Hobbs' question on the applicability of 'evidence of *me*' to personal archives can now be addressed with an absolute, positive answer. Through the lens of 'evidence of *me*', one may experience difficulties in analysing functionality, or purposes and uses, in cases of an archive documenting less

or unclear transactions and interactions. It is the transactions and interactions which provide traces and point to other parties participating in the creation, capture, organisation and pluralisation of the archive. For instance, one may find much depth from Hobbs' approach when examining autobiography or diaries for personalities and characters embedded in them. Notwithstanding, aside from the current study, what is worth noting is that results of recent studies show that the continuum thinking can be applied to the explication of personal information management²⁴⁹ – a related field of personal recordkeeping. This, to a certain extent, is reassuring about the general applicability of records continuum theory to personal archives.

²⁴⁹ Isto Huvila, Jon Erikson, Eva-Maria Häusner, and Ina-Maria Jansson, 'Continuum Thinking and the Context of Personal Information Management', *Information Research* 19, no. 1 (March 2014). Available at <http://www.informationr.net/ir/19-1/paper604.html#.WZ21EOQUn4g>

CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

7.1 Summary of the study

This research is a case study of Tej Bunnag's private papers that he put 'on deposit to the Siam Society Library', in Bangkok, Thailand. These papers were curated during the two times (1969–1976 and 1980–1986) when Tej was deeply involved in publishing the flagship periodical of the Society – the JSS (published since 1904). They form a complex body of personal archive of the sort that is underrepresented in, if not absent from, the archival theory. The study takes a concept in the records continuum theory that was developed for examining personal archive, namely the concept of 'evidence of *me*', to examine Tej's private papers. The central idea of this concept lies in the 'functionality of a personal archive' or 'its capacity to witness to a life'.¹ Guided by the notion that documents have functions and are used for purposeful ends,² the term 'functions' are interpreted as purposes and uses.

Based on this framework, this study aims to examine the case of Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library with regards to their purposes and uses. In particular, the research questions are (1) for what purposes Tej's private papers were kept? and (2) how and for what purposes did Tej use his private papers?

In order to answer these questions, the research was designed to employ three methods, namely, document analysis, interviews with Tej and documentary research. The first method was employed to extract data from Tej's papers. The second and third methods were used to collect contextual information for a better understanding of data collected from the first method. Based primarily on the interviews and documentary

¹ Sue McKemmish, 'Evidence of *me*', *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 175.

² Lindsay Prior, 'Using Documents in Social Research', in *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*, ed. David Silverman, 3rd ed. (London: Sage, 2011), 96.

research, Tej's early life and early career, as well as his association with the JSS were charted (in chapter 5) to set the stage for the analysis of his private papers.

The results of document analysis have revealed multiple functions of Tej's private papers. In terms of purposes, Tej kept his private papers (1) for future reference, to (2) share information, (3) build a legacy and (4) construct identities. In terms of uses, Tej used these papers (1) to perform roles of the JSS Honorary Editor, namely, producing contents for the JSS, setting editorial policies, and disseminating the JSS contents, (2) to maintain personal relationships and (3) to represent his self.

In this study, it has been found that, despite the criticisms, the idea of functionality is applicable to personal archive, when functions are operationalised as purposes and uses. As the results of the study have shown, Tej's private papers bear witness to his life in various aspects. This can be evidenced by the various functions that his private papers have, as a result of his various roles, activities and relationships.

The findings have given rise to the question what it means by 'personal'. The issue is resolved by referring to a broader definition of a personal archive under the continuum thinking,³ which challenges the binary opposition of the personal and organisational archive, and expands the frontier of personal archive. In short, a personal archive is virtually 'everything' that relates to that person, no matter how it was created, how it appears, and where it is kept.

The findings of this study have also addressed the question whether or not such the model as records continuum which was developed for corporate recordkeeping would be applicable to personal archiving.⁴ It is argued that under the condition of the current study, the continuum theory provides a framework for examining a complex

³ Sue McKemmish and Michael Piggott, 'Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice', *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 113.

⁴ Catherine Hobbs, 'The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals', *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 130.

body of private papers that comprises records of professional transactions, personal correspondence, letters and other miscellaneous records. This framework allows for several roles, activities and relationships of an individual to which his or her personal archive bears witness to be revealed.

7.2 Limitations of the study

7.2.1 Object of study

Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library are only a part of the whole collection that Tej has kept. There is a gap between the two time periods that these private papers cover. Although the data from interviews and documentary research can bridge the gap, the data from the private papers themselves are incomplete. Also, they are mainly about the JSS editorship of Tej. As a result, they only represent fractions of Tej's roles, activities and relationships.

7.2.2 Research methods

The only subject expert identified in this study was Tej himself. The data from interviews, therefore, are subjected to his memory. Even though factual data that he provided in the interviews were correct (after cross-checking with other sources of information), other data, especially opinions, may be single-sided.

7.2.3 Theoretical framework

In the framework of the 'evidence of *me*', personal records are analysed for roles, activities and relationships to which they are witness. By focusing on roles, activities and relationships, other aspects which may not require an interaction between individuals can be difficult to surface.

7.3 Suggestions for future work

In the course of the study, it was found out that Tej, in fact, had been keeping private papers since 1969. As such, those studied in this research was just a part of the whole collection. It would be interesting to study his personal papers in a longer, and continuous period of time, and compare the results with those of this current study. It is worth noting that Tej still keeps every item in hard copies. His case will be a good example of paper-based personal archive in times of increasing digital personal archiving.

As mentioned earlier, this study has contributed to filling the gap in the archival literature, but it is important to find more cases to apply the framework. In selecting the case, it will be beneficial if it is one that is different from Tej's private papers at the Siam Society Library. This will not only add to the diversity of examples in the literature, but also help to better understand the conditions in which the continuum thinking, in general, and the 'evidence of *me*', in particular, will work the best, which will in turn pinpoint the weaknesses of the theory.

Furthermore, consideration could be taken to explore aspects of Tej's private papers in relation to the fourth dimension of the records continuum model. For instance, it is possible to pay attention to how these papers might be pluralised by other users, hence contributing to the construction of societal memories at large.

Alternatively, it is also possible to take the continuum thinking as a framework to examine Tej's archiving behaviour from the perspective of personal information management. Indeed, recent studies have shown that the records continuum thinking is applicable in the field of personal information management.⁵ Tej's papers will

⁵ Isto Huvila, Jon Erikson, Eva-Maria Häusner, and Ina-Maria Jansson, 'Continuum Thinking and the Context of Personal Information Management', *Information Research* 19, no. 1 (March 2014). Available at <http://www.informationr.net/ir/19-1/paper604.html#.WZ21EOQUn4g>

potentially contribute to this field as a case of a paper-based information management system.

As information resources, Tej's papers will be useful to historians of scholarly publishing. There has been no previous study of the JSS – which is the oldest serial publication of Thai studies – based on a personal archive of an Honorary Editor. Tej's private papers constitute a rich pool of information for research of various topics such as Tej and his personal archive as active agents of Thai studies.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Archival materials

Minute Books of the Council of the Siam Society, Siam Society Library, Bangkok
Tej Bunnag's Private Papers, Siam Society Library, Bangkok

Published works

- Anderson, Clara. 'Blagden Papers at the Royal Society'. *Notes and Records of the Royal Society of London* 61, no. 2 (2007): 237–238.
- Atherton, Jay. 'From Life Cycle to Continuum: Some Thoughts on the Records Management-Archives Relationship'. *Archivaria* 21 (Winter 1985-1986): 43–51.
- Baker, Chris, and Pasuk Phongpaichit. *A History of Thailand*. 3rd ed. Melbourne: Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- Batson, Benjamin A. 'M.C. Sithiporn Kridakara Memorial Volume'. *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 302–309.
- Batson, Benjamin A. 'The Fall of the Phibun Government, 1944'. *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 89–120.
- Bellmore, Audra, Claire-Lise Bénéaud, and Sever Bordeianu. 'J.B. Jackson, cultural geographer: evolution of an archive'. *Collection Building* 31, no. 3 (2012): 115–119.
- Berkeley, Jr, Edmund. 'Appraisal of Current Private Papers and Collection Development'. *The Midwestern Archivist* VI, no. 1 (1981): 59–71.
- Biber, Katherine. 'In Jimmy Governor's archive'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 42, no. 3 (2014): 270–281.
- Blumenberg, Hans. 'Light as a Metaphor for Truth: At the Preliminary Stage of Philosophical Concept Formation'. In *Modernity and the hegemony of vision*. Edited by David Michael Levin, 30–62. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 1993.
- Bowen, John. 'The Development of Southeast Asian Studies in the United States'. In *The Politics of Knowledge: Area Studies and the Disciplines*. Edited by David Szanton, 386–425. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press, 2004.
- Bowie, Katherine. *Rituals of National Loyalty: The State and the Village Scout Movement in Thailand* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1997).
- Breazeale, Kennon. Review of *Prawatsat Isan* [A history of northeast Thailand], by Toem Wiphakphotchanakit. *JSS* 60, no. 1 (January 1972): 413–415.
- Brown, Caroline. Introduction to *Archives and Recordkeeping: Theory and Practice*. Edited by Caroline Brown, XI–XXIII. London: Facet Publishing, 2014.

- Brown, Ian. *The School of Oriental and African Studies: Imperial Training and the Expansion of Learning*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2016.
- Buenrostro, Iyra S. 'Preserving the Postwar Archives Heritage and Collective Memory of Bulacan: Local Government Records and Practice'. *Journal of Philippine Librarianship* 30, no. 1 (2010): 56–74.
- Burke, Frank G. *Research and the Manuscript Tradition*. Lanham, MD: Scarecrow, 1997.
- Burrows, Toby. 'Personal electronic archives: collecting the digital me'. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspective* 22, no. 2 (2006): 85–88.
- Charnvit Kasetsiri and Thamrongsak Petchlertanan, eds, *Chak sipsee thung hok tula* [From 14th to 6th October] (Bangkok: Foundation for the Promotion of Social Sciences and Humanities Textbooks Project, 1998).
- Chirabodee Tejasen. 'Historical Bibliometric Analysis: A case of the *Journal of the Siam Society*, 1972–1976'. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 53, no. 1 (2016).
- Clémentin-Ojha, Catherine, and Pierre-Yves Manguin. *A Century in Asia: The History of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient 1892–2006*. Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2007.
- Collins, Julie. 'A "powerful, creative history": the reticence of women architects to donate their professional records to archival repositories'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 40, no. 3 (November 2012): 181–190.
- Cook, Terry, and Joan M. Schwartz. 'Archives, Records, and Power: From (Postmodern) Theory to (Archival) Performance'. *Archival Science* 2, no. 3–4 (September 2002): 171–185.
- Cook, Terry. 'Fashionable Nonsense or Professional Rebirth: Postmodernism and the Practice of Archives'. *Archivaria*. 51 (Spring 2001): 14–35.
- Cox, Richard J. 'Archival Ethics: The Truth of the Matter'. *Journal of the American Society for Information Science and Technology* 59, no. 7 (2008): 1128–1133.
- Cox, Richard J. 'The Records in the Manuscript Collection'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 46–61.
- Cox, Richard J. *Personal Archives and a New Archival Calling: Readings, Reflections and Ruminations*. Duluth, MN: Litwin Books, 2008.
- Cunningham, Adrian. 'Ghosts in the Machine: Towards a Principle-Based Approach to Making and Keeping Digital Records'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 78–89. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Cushing, Amber L. 'Self Extension and the Desire to Preserve Digital Possessions'. *Proceedings of the Association for Information Science and Technology* 48 (2011): 1–3.
- 'Dinner to Colonel Gerini'. *JSS* 3, no. 1 (1906): 49–50.
- Dalglish, Paul. 'The Appraisal of Personal Records of Members of Parliament in Theory and Practice'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 86–101.

- Davies, Elisabeth. 'The Script as Mediating Artefact in Professional Theatre Production'. *Archival Science* 8, no. 3 (2008): 181–198.
- Davis, Bonnie. *The Siam Society under Five Reigns*. Bangkok: The Siam Society, 1989.
- Dikötter, Frank. *Mao's Great Famine: The History of China's Most Devastating Catastrophe, 1958-1962*. New York: Walker Publishing, 2010.
- Dingwell, Glenn. 'Life Cycle and Continuum: A View of Recordkeeping Models from the Postwar Era'. In *Currents of Archival Thinking*. Edited by Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil, 139–161. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2010.
- Emerson, Robert M., Rachel I. Fretz, and Linda L. Shaw. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. 2nd ed. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 2011.
- Enniss, Stephen. 'In the Author's Hand: Artifacts of Origin and Twentieth-Century Reading Practice'. *RBM: A Journal of Rare Books, Manuscripts and Cultural Heritage* 2, no. 2 (Fall 2001): 106–120.
- Evans, Joanne, Sue McKemmish, Elizabeth Daniels, and Gavan McCarthy. 'Self-Determination and Archival Autonomy: Advocating Activism'. *Archival Science* 15, no. 4 (December 2015): 337–368.
- Fisher, Rob. 'Donors and Donor Agency: Implications for Private Archives Theory and Practice'. *Archivaria* 79 (Spring 2015): 91–119.
- Fisher, Rob. 'In Search of a Theory of Private Archives: The Foundational Writings of Jenkinson and Schellenberg Revisited'. *Archivaria* 67 (Spring 2009): 1–24.
- Flynn, Sarah J. A. 'The Records Continuum Model in Context and its Implications for Archival Practice'. *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 22, no. 1 (2001): 79–93.
- Frankfurter, O. 'The Aims of the Society'. *JSS* 1 (1904): 1–6.
- Gallen, Katherine. 'Archiving and Memorialising the Taboo'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 36, no. 1 (May 2008): 46–74.
- Garfinkel, Harold. "'Good" Organizational Reasons for "Bad" Clinic Records'. Chap. 6 in *Studies in Ethnomethodology*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1967.
- Gilliland, Anne J. 'Archival and Recordkeeping Traditions in the Multiverse and Their Importance for Researching Situations and Situating Research'. In *Research in the Archival Multiverse*. Edited by Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J. Lau, 31–73. Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017.
- Gilliland, Anne J., Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau. Preface to *Research in the Archival Multiverse*. Edited by Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish and Andrew J. Lau, 16–29. Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017.
- Glenn, Cheryl, and Jessica Enoch. 'Invigorating Historiographic Practices in Rhetoric and Composition Studies'. In *Beyond the Archives: Research as a Lived Process*. Edited by Gesa E. Kirsch and Jacqueline J Royster, 1–72. Carbondale, IL: Southern Illinois University Press, 2008.
- Goffman, Erving. *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life*. London: Penguin, 1959.
- Greene, Mark. "'The Surest Proof": A Utilitarian Approach to Appraisal'. *Archivaria* 45 (Spring 1998): 127–169.

- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 10: King Lödaya of Sukhodaya and his contemporaries'. *JSS* 60, no. 1 (January 1972): 21–152.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 11 Part I The Epigraphy of Mahādharmarājā I of Sukhodaya'. *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 71–182.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 12, Inscription 9'. *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 89–122.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 13, Inscription of Wat Pra Yün'. *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 123–142.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 14, Inscription of Siva of Kambeñ Bejra'. *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 223–238.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Inscription of Vāt Braḥ Stec, near Sukhodaya: Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 16'. *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 143–160.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'Inscription of Vāt Khemā: Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 15'. *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 127–142.
- Griswold, A. B., and Prasert na Nagara. 'The Epigraphy of Mahādharmarājā I of Sukhodaya. Epigraphic and Historical Studies, No. 11 Part II'. *JSS* 61, no. 2 (July 1973): 91–128.
- 'His Serene Highness Prince Sithiporn Kridakara'. *JSS* 60, no. 2 (January 1972): 470–473.
- Ham, F. Gerald. 'The Archival Edge'. *The American Archivist* 38, no. 1 (January 1975): 5–13.
- Ham, F. Gerald. *Selecting and Appraising Archives and Manuscripts*. Chicago, Society of American Archivists, 1993.
- Harper, Richard H.R. *Inside IMF: An Ethnography of Documents, Technology and Organisational Action*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1998.
- Harris, Verne. 'On the Back of a Tiger: Deconstructive Possibilities in "Evidence of Me"'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 8–22.
- Harris, Verne. 'Record-keeping and Records Continuum Thinkers: Examining a Seminal Australian Text'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 2 (November 2005): 160–170.
- Harrison, Rachel V., and Peter A. Jackson, eds. *The Ambiguous Allure of the West: Traces of the Colonial in Thailand* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2010).
- Henderson, Margaret. 'Archiving the Feminist Self: Reflections on the Personal Papers of Merle Thornton'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 41, no. 2 (2013): 91–104.
- Herzfeld, Michael. 'The Absent Presence: Discourse of Crypto-Colonialism'. *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, no. 4 (Fall 2002) 899–926.
- Hobbs, Catherine. 'New Approaches to Canadian Literary Archives'. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 109–119.

- Hobbs, Catherine. 'Reenvisioning the Personal: Reframing Traces of Individual Life'. In *Currents of Archival Thinking*. Edited by Terry Eastwood and Heather MacNeil, 213–241. Santa Barbara: Libraries Unlimited, 2010.
- Hobbs, Catherine. 'The Character of Personal Archives: Reflections on the Value of Records of Individuals'. *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 126–135.
- Hodder, Jake. 'On Absence and Abundance: Biography as Method in Archival Research'. *Area* 49, no. 4 (December 2017): 452–459.
- Hodson, Sara S. 'In Secret Kept, In Silence Sealed: Privacy in the Papers of Authors and Celebrities'. *The American Archivists* 67 (Fall/Winter 2004): 194–211.
- Hong, Lysa. 'Archival materials in Singapore: Where are the documents?'. *Thammasat University Archives Bulletin* 17 (June 2013-May 2014): 15–25.
- Hurley, C[hris]. 'Personal Papers and the Treatment of Archival Principles'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 8 (February 1977): 351–365.
- Hurley, Chris. 'Beating the French'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 12–18.
- Hurley, Chris. 'Parallel Provenance: (1) What, If Anything, is Archival Description?'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 1 (May 2005): 110–145.
- Hurley, Chris. 'Parallel Provenance: (2) When Something is *Not* Related to Everything Else'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 33, no. 2 (November 2005): 52–91.
- Huvila, Isto, Jon Erikson, Eva-Maria Häusner, and Ina-Maria Jansson. 'Continuum Thinking and the Context of Personal Information Management'. *Information Research* 19, no. 1 (March 2014). Available at <http://www.informationr.net/ir/19-1/paper604.html#.WZ21EOQUn4g>
- Iacovino, Livia. 'Multi-Method Interdisciplinary Research in Archival Science: The Case of Recordkeeping, Ethics and Law'. *Archival Science* 4, no. 3–4 (December 2004): 267–286.
- Iacovino, Livia. 'Rethinking Archival, Ethical and Legal Frameworks for Records of Indigenous Australian Communities: A Participant Relationship Model of Rights and Responsibilities'. *Archival Science* 10, no. 4 (December 2010): 353–372.
- Jenkinson, Hilary. *A Manual of Archive Administration*. New and revised ed. London: Percy Lund, Humphries & Co, 1937.
- Jimerson, Randall C. 'The Future of Archives and Manuscripts'. *OCLC Systems & Services: International Digital Library Perspectives* 20, no. 1 (2004): 11–14.
- Johnston, Leslie. 'Making It Usable: Developing Personal Collection Tools for Digital Collections'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 257–279. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Kaplan, Diane E. 'The Stanley Milgram Papers: A Case Study on Appraisal of and Access to Confidential Data Files'. *American Archivist* 59 (Summer 1996): 288–297.
- Kaye, Joseph 'Jofish', Janet Vertesi, Shari Avery, Allan Dafoe, Shay David, Lisa Onaga, Ivan Rosero, and Trevor Pinch. 'To Have and to Hold: Exploring the Personal Archive'. In *Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human*

- Factors in Computing Systems*, 275–284. Montréal, Québec, Canada, 22–28 April 2006.
- Kershaw, Roger. ‘Frontiers within Frontiers: The Persistence of Thai Ethnicity in Kelantan, Malaysia’. *JSS* 68, no. 1 (January 1980): 145–158.
- Kershaw, Roger. ‘Menace and Reassurance in Malay Circumcision: A Note on Some Attitudes of Kelantan Thais’. *JSS* 67, no. 2 (July 1979): 116–122.
- Klett, Jo. ‘From Private Horde to Public Collection: Cataloguing the Archives of the Liverpool Poets’. *SCONUL Focus* 50 (2010): 83–85.
- Krippendorff, Klaus. *Content Analysis: An Introduction of its Methodology*. 3rd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2013.
- Kullada Kesboonchoo Mead. *The Rise and Decline of Thai Absolutism*. London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004.
- Langdon, John. ‘Describing the digital: the archival cataloguing of born-digital personal papers’. *Archives and Records* 37, 1 (2016): 37–52.
- Lee, Christopher A. ed. *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Lee, Christopher A. Introduction to *I, Digital Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 1–26. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Lee, Christopher A. ‘Collecting the Externalized Me: Appraisal of Materials in the Social Web’. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 202–238. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Lian, Zhiying. ‘A History of Archival Ideas and Practice in China’. In *Research in Archival Multiverse*, 96–121. Edited by Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau. Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017.
- Loh, Miaw Ping. ‘The two faces of men in white’. In *The May 13 Generation: The Chinese Middle Schools Student Movement and Singapore Politics in the 1950s*. Edited by Tan Jing Quee, Tan Kok Chiang, and Hong Lysa, 227–242. Petaling Jaya: Strategic Information and Research Development, 2011.
- Lohr, Eric. ‘The Papers of Grigorii N. Trubetskoi’. *Cahiers du Monde russe* 46, no. 4 (October–December 2005): 851–854.
- Loos, Tamara. *Subject Siam: Family, Law and Colonial Modernity in Thailand*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006.
- Luyt, Brendan. ‘Producing Knowledge about Malaya: Readers, Contributors, Printers, Editors, and the Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in the 1950s’. *Library & Information History* 28, no. 1 (March 2012): 41–57.
- Luyt, Brendan, and Natalie Pang. ‘For the Record: Document and Record Sensibilities of Art Conservators in the Philippines’. *Archives and Manuscripts* 43, no. 2 (July 2015): 131–145.
- Macías, Teresa. ‘Between Violence and its Representation: Ethics, Archival Research, and the Political of Knowledge Production in the Telling of Torture Stories’. *Intersectionalities* 5, no. 1 (2016): 20–45.

- MacNeil, Heather. *Without Consent: The Ethics of Disclosing Personal Information in Public Archives*. Metuchen, NJ: Scarecrow Press, 1992.
- Marr, J[ohn] R[alston]. 'Some Manuscripts in Grantha Script in Bangkok – II'. *JSS* 60, no. 2 (July 1972): 61–86.
- Marshall, Catherine C. 'Challenges and Opportunities for Personal Digital Archiving'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 90–114. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011).
- McCree, Mary Lynn. 'Good Sense and Good Judgment: Defining Collections and Collecting'. In *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*. Edited by Maygene F. Daniels, and Timothy Walch, 103–113. Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Services, 1984.
- McKee, Heidi A., and James E. Porter. 'The Ethics of Archival Research'. *College Composition and Communication* 64, no. 1 (September 2012): 59–81.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Evidence of me'. *The Australian Library Journal* 45, no. 3 (August 1996): 174–187.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Evidence of Me ... in a Digital World'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 115–148. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Placing Records Continuum Theory and Practice'. *Archival Science* 1, no. 4 (December 2001): 333–359.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Recordkeeping in the Continuum: An Australian Tradition'. In *Research in Archival Multiverse*, 122–160. Edited by Anne J. Gilliland, Sue McKemmish, and Andrew J. Lau. Clayton: Monash University Publishing, 2017.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Traces: Document, Record, Archive, Archives'. In *Archives: Recordkeeping in Society*. Edited by Sue McKemmish, Michael Piggott, Barbara Reed, and Frank Upward. Wagga Wagga: Centre for Information Studies, Charles Sturt University, 2005.
- McKemmish, Sue. 'Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow: A Continuum of Responsibility', *Proceedings of the Records Management Association of Australia 14th National Convention*, 15–17 September 1997. Accessed on 19 April 2016 at <http://www.infotech.monash.edu.au/research/groups/rcrg/publications/recordscontinuum-smckp2.html>
- McKemmish Sue, and Michael Piggott, eds. *The Records Continuum: Ian MacLean and Australian Archives First Fifty Years*. Clayton: Ancora Press, 1994.
- McKemmish, Sue, and Michael Piggott. 'Toward the Archival Multiverse: Challenging the Binary Opposition of the Personal and Corporate Archive in Modern Archival Theory and Practice'. *Archivaria* 76 (Fall 2013): 111–144.
- McKemmish, Sue, Shannon Faulkhead, Livia Iacovino, and Kristen Thorpe. 'Australian Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Embracing Multiple Ways of Knowing and Keeping'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 38, no. 1 (May 2010): 27–50.

- McRanor, Shauna. 'Maintaining the Reliability of Aboriginal Oral Records and their Material Manifestations: Implications for Archival Practice'. *Archivaria* 43 (Spring 1997): 64–88.
- Mayring, Philipp. 'Qualitative Content Analysis'. *Forum: Qualitative Social Research* 1, no. 2 (June 2000). Retrieved from <http://www.qualitative-research.net/index.php/fqs/article/view/1089/2385>
- Mayring, Philipp. *Qualitative Content Analysis*. Klagenfurt: Leibniz Institute for Social Research, 2014. Retrieved from <https://nbn-resolving.de/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-395173>
- Meehan, Jennifer. 'Rethinking Original Order and Personal Records'. *Archivaria* 70 (Fall 2010): 27–44.
- Moore, Caitlin, and Lyn Robinson. 'The Monty Hyams Archive: A new resource for the information history of the late twentieth century'. *Journal of Documentation* 73, no. 2 (2017): 357–367.
- Morell, David and Chai-anan Samudavanija. *Political Conflict in Thailand: Reform, Reaction, Revolution*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn and Hain, 1981.
- Muller, S., J.A. Feith, and R. Fruin. *Manual for the Arrangement and Description of Archives*. 2nd ed. (1940). Translated by Arthur H. Leavitt. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003.
- 'Ordinary General Meetings of the Society'. *JSS* 2, no. 1 (1905): 84–106.
- Olson, Grant A. 'Thai Cremation Volumes: A Brief History of a Unique Genre of Literature'. *Asian Folklore Studies* 51, no. 2 (1992): 279–294.
- Palmer, Susan. 'Sir John Soane: Rewriting a Life'. *Libraries & the Cultural Records* 44, no. 1 (2009): 65–81.
- Pasuk Phongpaichit and Chris Baker. *Thailand: Economy and Politics*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1995.
- Peleggi, Maurizio. *Lords of Things: The Fashioning of Siamese Monarchy's Modern Image*. Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002.
- Perry, Adele. "'Is your Garden in England, Sir": James Douglas's Archive and the Politics of Home'. *History Workshop Journal* 70, no. 1 (Autumn 2010): 67–85.
- Piggott, Michael. 'Towards a History of Australian Diary Keeping'. *Archivaria* 60 (Fall 2005): 145–166.
- Piriya Krairiksh. *Reminiscence: From Corfu to Bhubing, 1961–1964*. Bangkok: Piriya Krairiksh Foundation, 2014.
- Pollard, Riva A. 'The Appraisal of Personal Papers: A Critical Literature Review'. *Archivaria* 52 (Fall 2001): 136–150.
- Portelli, Alessandro. 'The Peculiarities of Oral History'. *History Workshop* 12 (Autumn 1981): 97–107.
- Powell, Graeme T. 'Archival Principles and the Treatment of Personal Papers'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 6, no. 7 (August 1976): 259–268.
- Powell, Graeme. 'The Collecting of Personal and Private Papers in Australia'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 62–77.

- Prior, Lindsay. 'Using Documents in Social Research'. In *Qualitative Research: Issues of Theory, Method and Practice*. Edited by David Silverman, 93–110. 3rd ed. London: Sage, 2011.
- Puey Ungpakorn. 'Violence and the Military Coup in Thailand'. *Bulletin of Concerned Asian Scholars* 9, no. 3 (July–September 1977): 4–12.
- Punch, Keith. *Introduction to Social Research: Quantitative and Qualitative Approaches*. London: Sage, 1998.
- 'Rules of the Siam Society'. *JSS* 1, no. 1 (1904): III–VI.
- Reynolds, Craig J. 'Marxism in Thai Historical Studies'. *The Journal of Asian Studies* 43, no. 1 (November 1983): 77–104.
- Reynolds, Craig J. 'The Case of K.S.R. Kulap: A Challenge to Royal Historical Writing in Late Nineteenth Century Thailand'. *JSS* 61, no. 2 (July 1973): 63–90.
- Ross, Fiona, Sue McKemmish, and Shannon Faulkhead. 'Indigenous Knowledge and the Archives: Designing Trusted Archival Systems for Koorie Communities'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 34, no. 2 (November 2006): 112–151.
- Schellenberg, T.R. *Modern Archives: Principles and Techniques*. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2003.
- Schwartz, Joan M., and Terry Cook. 'Archives, Records, and Power: The Making of Modern Memory'. *Archival Science* 2, no. 1-2 (March 2002): 1–19.
- Scott, Peter J. 'The Record Group Concept: A Case for Abandonment'. *The American Archivist* 29, no. 4 (October 1966): 493–504.
- Silverman, David. *Doing Qualitative Research: A Practical Handbook*. 3rd ed. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2010.
- Skinner, Cyril. 'The Interrogation of Zeya Suriya Kyaw a Burmese Account of the Junk Ceylon (Phuket) Campaigns of 1809-1810'. *JSS* 72 (1984): 59–94.
- Smithies, Michael. *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012.
- Southcott, Margaret, Neil Thomas, and Roger Andre. 'Theory, Practice and Pragmatism: Arrangement and Description of Personal Papers in the Mortlock Library of South Australia'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 1 (May 1996): 102–115.
- Spurgin, Kristina M. "'Three Backups is a Minimum": A First Look at Norms and Practices in the Digital Photo Collections of Serious Photographers'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 151–201. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Stake, Robert E. 'Case Studies'. Chap. 5 in *Strategies of Qualitative Inquiry*. 2nd ed. Edited by Norman K. Denzin and Yvonna S. Lincoln. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 2003.
- Stewart, Virginia. 'A Primer on Manuscript Field Work'. In *A Modern Archives Reader: Basic Readings on Archival Theory and Practice*. Edited by Maygene F. Daniels, and Timothy Walch, 124–138. Washington, DC: National Archives and Records Services, 1984.

- Stoler, Ann Laura. *Along the Archival Grain: Epistemic Anxieties and Colonial Common Sense*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2009.
- Stoler, Ann Laura. 'Colonial Archives and the Arts of Governance'. *Archival Science* 2, no. 1–2 (March 2002): 87–109.
- Strobridge, William F. 'Mrs. Hamilton King's Bangkok Diary, 1911'. *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 86–104.
- Swearer, Donald K. 'Myth, Legend and History in Northern Thai Chronicles'. *JSS* 62, no. 1 (January 1974): 67–88.
- Swearer, Donald K. Review of *The Destiny of a King*, by Georges Dumezil, translated by Alf Hiltelbeitel. *JSS* 63, no. 1 (January 1975): 298–299.
- 'The Foundation of the Society'. *JSS* 1, no. 2 (1904): 1–2.
- 'The Joshua A. Fishman and Gella Schweid Fishman Family Archive'. *Anthropological Linguistics* 37, no. 1 (Spring 1995): 91–92.
- 'The Siam Society'. *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (July 1904): 547.
- Tecter, Amy. 'The Almost Accidental Archive and its Impacts on Literary Subjects and Canonicity'. *Journal of Canadian Studies* 40, no. 2 (Spring 2006): 96–108.
- Tej Bunnag. 'Dae...Mae' [For mother]. In *Anusorn ngan phraratchathanploengsop Chancham Bunnag* [Cremation volume of Chancham Bunnag], 28–31. Bangkok: Amarin Printing and Publishing, 2007.
- Tej Bunnag. 'Editorial'. *JSS* 60, no. 2 (July 1972): v.
- Tej Bunnag. Felicitations to *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*, by Michael Smithies, VII–IX. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012.
- Tej Bunnag. Foreword to *Report regarding some aspects of the situation in Nanking*, by Phraya Abhibalrajamaitri (Tom Bunnag). Translated by Apisake Monthienvichienchai, 67–77. Bangkok: Princess Maha Chakri Sirindhorn Foundation, 2016.
- Tej Bunnag. *The Provincial Administration of Siam, 1892–1915: The Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanubhab*. Kuala Lumpur: Oxford University Press, 1977.
- Tesar, Marek. 'Ethics and Truth in Archival Research'. *History of Education* 44, no. 1 (2015): 101–114.
- Thamsook Numnonda. 'The First American Advisors in Thai History'. *JSS* 62, no. 2 (July 1974): 121–148.
- Thomas, Nicholas, and Richard Eves. *Bad Colonists: The South Seas Letters of Vernon Lee Walker & Louis Becke*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1999.
- Thomas, Susan. 'Curating the I, Digital'. In *I, Digital: Personal Collections in the Digital Era*. Edited by Christopher A. Lee, 280–305. Chicago: Society of American Archivists, 2011.
- Thomas, Susan, and Janette Martin. 'Using the Papers of Contemporary British Politicians as a Testbed for the Preservation of Digital Personal Archives'. *Journal of the Society of Archivists* 27, no. 1 (April 2006): 29–56.

- Thongchai Winichakul, 'Remembering/Silencing the Traumatic Past: The Ambivalent Memories of the October 1976 Massacre in Bangkok'. In *Cultural Crisis and Social Memory: Modernity and Identity in Thailand and Laos*, 243–283. Edited by Shigeharu Tanabe and Charles F. Keyes. London: Routledge, 2002.
- Thongchai Winichakul, 'Siam's Colonial Conditions and the Birth of Thai History', in *Southeast Asian Historiography Unravelling the Myths: Essays in Honour of Barend Jan Terwiel*. Edited by Volker Grabowsky, 20–41. Bangkok: River Books, 2011.
- Thongchai Winichakul. *Siam Mapped: A History of the Geo-Body of a Nation*. Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1994.
- Torgler, Benno, and Marco Piatti. *A Century of American Economic Review: Insights on Critical Factors in Journal Publishing*. Houndmills, Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan, 2013.
- Tyrell Haberkorn, *Revolution Interrupted: Farmers, Students, Laws, and Violence in Northern Thailand* (Madison: University of Wisconsin Press, 2011).
- Upward, Frank. 'Modelling the Continuum as Paradigm Shift in Recordkeeping and Archiving Processes, and Beyond – A Personal Reflection'. *Records Management Journal* 10, no. 3 (December 2000): 115–139.
- Upward, Frank. 'Structuring the Records Continuum – Part One: Postcustodial Principles and Properties'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 24, no. 2 (November 1996): 268–285.
- Upward, Frank. 'Structuring the Records Continuum – Part Two: Structuration Theory and Recordkeeping'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 25, no. 1 (May 1997): 10–35.
- Upward, Frank, and Sue McKemmish, 'In Search of the Lost Tiger, by Way of Sainte-Beuve: Reconstructing the Possibilities in "Evidence of Me..."'. *Archives and Manuscripts* 29, no. 1 (May 2001): 22–42.
- Vajirañāṇavarorasa, Prince. *Autobiography: The Life of Prince-Patriarch Vajirañāṇa of Siam, 1860-1921*. Translated and edited by Craig J. Reynolds. Athens, OH: Ohio University Press, 1979.
- Veinot, Tiffany C. "'The Eye of the Power Company': Workplace Information Practice of a Vault Inspector'. *Library Quarterly* 77, no. 2 (April 2007): 157–79.
- Vickery, Michael. 'The Khmer Inscriptions of Tenasserim: A Reinterpretation'. *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 51–70.
- Vliet, Jeremias van. *The Short History of Kings of Siam*. Translated by Leonard Andaya, edited by David K Wyatt. Bangkok: Siam Society, 1975.
- Warren, William. *The Siam Society: A Century*. Bangkok: Siam Society, 2004.
- Williams, Caroline. 'Personal Papers: Perceptions and Practices'. In *What Archives? Cultural and Theoretical Perspectives: A Reader*. Edited by Louise Craven, 53–67. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2008.
- Williams, Caroline. 'Records and Archives: Concepts, Roles and Definitions'. In *Archives and Recordkeeping: Theory and Practice*. Edited by Caroline Brown, 1–29. London: Facet Publishing, 2014.

- Williams, Peter, Jeremy Leighton John, and Ian Rowland. 'The personal curation of digital objects: A lifecycle approach'. *Aslib Proceedings* 61, no. 4 (2009): 340–363.
- Woodward, Jr, Hiram W. 'The Buddha's Radiance'. *JSS* 61, no. 1 (January 1973): 187–192.
- Wyatt, David K. Review of *A History of Thailand*, by Rong Sayamananda. *JSS* 60, no. 2 (July 1972): 288–291
- Wyatt, David K. Review of *Hariphunchai Nirat, edited from a Chiangmai Manuscript, The Code of Mangrai, edited in Modern Language, and Researches in Thai History*, by Prasert na Nagara. *JSS* 63, no. 2 (July 1975): 411–414.
- Zhang, Yan, and Barbara M. Wildemuth. 'Qualitative Analysis of Content'. In *Applications of Social Research Methods to Questions in Information and Library Science*. Edited by Barbara M. Wildemuth, 222–231. Westport, CT: Libraries Unlimited, 2009.

Theses and dissertations

- Bass, Jordan Leslie. 'Getting Personal: Confronting the Challenges of Archiving Personal Records in the Digital Age'. Master's thesis, University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg, 2012.
- Chirabodee Tejasen. 'An Oral History of the Journal of the Siam Society'. Master's diss., Nanyang Technological University, 2012.
- Davies, Elisabeth. 'Epistemic Practices of Theatre Production Professionals: An Activity Theory Approach'. PhD diss., University of Western Ontario, 2007.
- Douglas, Jennifer Lynn. 'Archiving Authors: Rethinking the Analysis and Representation of Personal Archives'. PhD diss., University of Toronto, 2013.
- Gibbons, Leisa. 'Culture in Continuum: YouTube, Small Memories and Memory Making'. PhD thesis, Monash University, 2015.
- Kim, Sarah. 'Personal Digital Archives: Preservation of Documents, Preservation of Self'. PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin, 2013.
- Lau, Andrew J. 'Collecting Experiences'. PhD diss., University of California, Los Angeles, 2013.
- Sander, Leah. 'Collecting Our Thoughts and Re-collecting Our Stories: The Collection of Personal Records in Archival Institutions'. Master's thesis, University of Manitoba/University of Winnipeg, 2004.
- Faulkhead, Shannon. 'Narratives of Koorie Victoria'. PhD diss., Monash University, 2008.
- Soyka, Heather Ann. 'Records as Force Multiplier: Understanding the Records Continuum as a Framework for Examining the Role of Records in a Community'. PhD diss., University of Pittsburgh, 2015.

Taylor, Karyn. 'From Paper to Cyberspace: Changing Communication Technologies and the Implications for Personal Records Archivists'. Master's thesis, University of Manitoba, 2002.

Tej Bunnag. 'The Provincial Administration of Siam from 1892 to 1915: A Study of the Creation, the Growth, the Achievements, and the Implications for Modern Siam, of the Ministry of the Interior under Prince Damrong Rajanuphap'. DPhil thesis, University of Oxford, 1968.

Interviews

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 17 May 2012, Siam Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 18 June 2012, Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 25 June 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 31 July 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 29 October 2014, Siam Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 26 July 2016, Siam Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 27 April 2017, Thai Red Cross Society, Bangkok.

Tej Bunnag. Interview by Chirabodee Tejasen, 8 February 2018, Siam Society, Bangkok.

APPENDIX A

THE SIAM SOCIETY AND ITS JOURNAL: AN OVERVIEW

The late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries witnessed an increased and intense European colonial influence in the Far East, with more expatriates entering the region than ever before. It was in this context that a number of Orientalist societies were founded to address the lack of European knowledge about the region. For instance, in 1878, the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society was established in British Malaya by a group of senior colonial administrators.¹ In late 1898, the *École française d'Extrême-Orient* was founded in French Indochina.² Both published their own serial – the *Journal of the Straits Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society* and the *Bulletin d'École française d'Extrême-Orient* – the contents of which were designated by geographical themes rather than any specific subject. Siam (as Thailand was known until 1939) was not an exception. Although it managed to parry colonial takeover, and retained official sovereignty, recent studies³ point out that the country could not, in fact, avoid colonial conditions. It was in this context that the Siam Society was founded in February 1904, as a counterpart of such Orientalist societies. This can be seen in the notification of the Society's foundation published in the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society*. It was stated clearly that the Society was founded by 'a general

¹ Brendan Luyt, 'Producing Knowledge about Malaya: Readers, Contributors, Printers, Editors, and the Journal of the Malayan Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society in the 1950s', *Library & Information History* 28, no. 1 (March 2012): 41–57.

² Catherine Clémentin-Ojha, and Pierre-Yves Manguin, *A Century in Asia: The History of the École Française d'Extrême-Orient 1892–2006* (Singapore: Editions Didier Millet, 2007).

³ Rachel V. Harrison, and Peter A. Jackson, eds., *The ambiguous allure of the West: traces of the colonial in Thailand* (Hong Kong: Hong Kong University Press, 2010); Michael Herzfeld, 'The absent presence: discourse of crypto-colonialism', *The South Atlantic Quarterly* 101, no. 4 (Fall 2002) 899–926; Kullada Kesboonchoo Mead, *The rise and decline of Thai absolutism* (London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2004); Tamara Loos, *Subject Siam: family, law and colonial modernity in Thailand* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2006); Maurizio Peleggi, *Lords of things: the fashioning of Siamese monarchy's modern image* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2002); Thongchai Winichakul, 'Siam's colonial conditions and the birth of Thai history', in *Southeast Asian historiography unravelling the myths: essays in honour of Barend Jan Terwiel*, ed. Volker Grabowsky (Bangkok: River Books, 2011), 20–41.

meeting of foreign residents, including also a few Siānese', that the 'objects' of the Society were 'similar to analogous societies in the Far East, in so far as Siām and neighbouring countries are concerned', and that it 'already counts upwards of 120 members, including most of the chief foreign residents, besides several prominent Siānese'.⁴

The aims of the society were 'to acquire knowledge for our mutual benefit and to diffuse it for the benefit of others' and 'to see that only sound knowledge and well authenticated facts be accepted and diffused'.⁵ Later, what the Society focused on was christened as 'Siamology'.⁶ Although the term did not catch on, it could be considered the forerunner of what is known today as Thai studies.

As with many other scholarly societies, one of the activities the Siam Society has continued since its foundation is the publication of its journal – JSS. It was a major means of communication among members of the society. Initially, it documented activities and transactions of the society throughout the year, such as the annual general meeting, and the ordinary general meetings in which papers were read before members attending. In addition, the JSS was a channel through which results of the 'research and investigation in matters appertaining to Siam'.⁷ were disseminated. In fact, this has since been the major function of the JSS, whose centenary volume was published in 2012. It is noteworthy that the journal is nowadays still published by its original publisher – the Siam Society – unlike many other periodicals which at some point in their history have given their production, sales and marketing to larger publishers (or corporations) to help them face competition and to move into

⁴ 'The Siam Society', *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland* (1904): 547.

⁵ 'Ordinary General Meetings of the Society', *JSS* 2, no. 1 (1905): 85.

⁶ 'Dinner to Colonel Gerini', *JSS* 3, no. 1 (1906), 49.

⁷ 'The Foundation of the Society', *JSS* 1, no. 2 (1904): 1.

international markets.⁸ So, the JSS has for more than a century been disseminating works of scholarly interest in order for knowledge appertaining to Siam in every aspect to flourish. It was remarked that the Society's members were regarded as 'workmen to collect the materials on which the master builder may at some future day erect the edifice, in the shape of an encyclopedic work on Siam'.⁹ Throughout the decades since its first edition appeared in 1905, the JSS continued to publish learned articles, many of which were the first of their kind, such as the ethnography of minority peoples in Northern Thailand.

The two World Wars suspended the publication of the JSS between 1916 and 1917, and in 1946, but the research continued and appeared in the pages of the JSS throughout. Publishing the journal was the only activity it could continue to do during the war.¹⁰ The Society survived the Second World War under the presidency of Prince Dhani Nivat, the first Thai to take this position (1940–1944 and 1947–1965). The prince devoted himself very much to the Society throughout his presidency. In fact, he had constantly contributed a large number of articles and notes to the JSS, since the 1930s. However, the Society was affected by the Second World War in many ways which led to its doldrums due to inactivity of its members.

In March 1969 with a new Council elected in the 'tumultuous Annual General Meeting' instigated by Sulak Sivaraksa,¹¹ the Siam Society entered a new era, under the presidency of Phraya Anuman Rajadhon. With more Council members of a younger generation, the Society was revitalised. The new team devoted themselves to

⁸ For example, the *Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society* has since 1991 entered its third series, being published by the Cambridge University Press. Moreover, it has been rare for a journal devoted to publishing scholarly works about particular areas, especially those in South East Asia, to have survived. The *Journal of the Burma Research Society*, for instance, discontinued in 1980, after having been in service since 1911.

⁹ O. Frankfurter, 'The Aims of the Society', *JSS* 1 (1904): 1.

¹⁰ Bonnie Davis, *The Siam Society under five reigns* (Bangkok: The Siam Society, 1989).

¹¹ Tej Bunnag, felicitations to *Seventeenth Century Siamese Explorations*, by Michael Smithies (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2012), vii.

making the Society a vibrant community of those interested in the artistic and cultural affairs of Thailand and its neighbouring countries.¹² The JSS has continued to be one of the major serial publications reflecting the scholarly interests of the Society as a learned institution to this day.

¹² William Warren, *The Siam Society: A Century* (Bangkok: Siam Society, 2004).