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Chapter 5
Conclusion

This dissertation has examined Siamese aristocrats’ conception of civilization—siwilai—in relation to parallel transformations in architecture and architectural practice in Siam, with the assumption that there was a major intellectual shift in the mid-nineteenth century. Prior to that, aristocratic status in the Siamese context was maintained in traditional symbolic, patronage, and economic systems that were open to cultural exchanges. Prior to the nineteenth century, this kind of openness was limited to the neighboring regions of South and East Asia. Siam’s position between the two cultural and political spheres of India and China gave her aristocrats the ability to maintain political and social supremacy through control over the importation and localization of foreign forms of culture for local consumption. As discussed in Chapter 2, architecture and urban design was the key medium through which the Siamese aristocrats annotated their public image, sending out non-verbal messages about their relative superiority through both traditional and foreign architectural forms. The urban structure of the new capital at Bangkok, for example, was intentionally planned to resemble that of the former capital of Ayutthaya. Symbolically elaborate architectural language was revived in an attempt to proclaim the political stability of the newly-established House of Chakri.

Equally important during this period was the revived tradition of the royal master builders, whose service had been crucial to the fabrication of Siamese aristocratic architecture during the late-eighteenth century to the mid-nineteenth century. Through a traditional patronage system and strong familial networks, the royal master builders enjoyed a virtual monopoly over major building projects during the reigns of King Rama I through Rama IV. This virtual monopoly, however, did not mean that their work was
impervious to change. On the contrary, as their patrons expressed an openness to foreign forms of culture, royal master builders had to provide new designs to accommodate new tastes and styles. This led to the emergence of *chinoiserie* as an architectural preoccupation during the reign of Rama III (r. 1824 – 1851), and to an early phase of Europeanized architecture during the reign of Rama IV (r. 1851 – 1868).

By the mid-nineteenth century, all of this began to change after the growth of a globalized colonial network began to encircle Siam. As Siam’s neighboring kingdoms successively succumbed to European imperial powers, even though (or perhaps because) Siam was never formally colonized, Europe quickly replaced India and China as the new center of civilizational excellence, in the minds of Siamese elites. Unlike the glacial flow of cultural transfer during the pre-modern period, the pace of change under the period of high imperialism was comparatively rapid, its impact vast and forceful. As a transcultural project, Siamese aristocrats’ construction of *siwilai* was unambiguously syncretic, an uneven adaptation of Western measures of civilization to existing Siamese norms.

As was examined in Chapter 3, this syncretism was particularly evident in the architecture and urban design of the early years of Rama V’s reign, from 1868 to 1889. During this period, the young monarch had to prove his mettle to both local and global audiences, and architecture became a key media through which Young Siam claimed their legitimacy. The Victorian/colonial ecumene brought the king and civilizing aristocrats on journeys to see with their own eyes modernization efforts in European colonies in South and Southeast Asia; in return, it brought European builder-contractors to work for the progressive Siamese aristocrats, creating *siwilai* façades for the Chakri Reformation, the extensive modernization of the kingdom’s bureaucracy. During this period, royal master builders initially collaborated with European builder-contractors on equal basis. However, as the progressive Siamese aristocrats’ tastes became increasingly Europeanized, royal master builders began to lose control over the architectural scene. Finally, their centuries-old, prolific career was brought to its end when the Chakri Reformation took off during the late 1870s. Without the privileges that came with traditional patronage systems and close-knit familial networks, the royal master builders gradually lost their livelihood, left with only monastery renovation projects and some
quaint garden pavilions on which to practice their craft. For their part, the European builder-contractors also lost business to the Public Works Department (PWD), which since 1889 had monopolized all governmental projects in the centralized Chakri Reformation system.

Another significant development can be traced to 1897, when Rama V returned from his first journey to Europe. After his early reforms took effect, the king enjoyed unprecedented political stability. With his administrative machinations ready, the king and aristocrats intensified their efforts to fashion their vision of Siamese siwilai. As discussed in Chapter 4, this was most evident in the Dusit Park project, a major urban extension that was characterized by sweeping urban vistas, eclectic historicism in architecture, and civic pageantry of unprecedented scale. Its direction and rationale unchanged from those of the early years of Rama V’s reign, the Siamese elite’s quest for siwilai only intensified toward the latter part of his rule, especially after the turn of the twentieth century. Meanwhile, the syncretic character of siwilai was maintained, even magnified by the increasing disparity between European architectural forms and indigenous spatial practice, between traditional and modern institutions. As a result, there were sites of contention, of zones that were seemingly civilized but not quite, of an ambiguous syncretism that we have examined above in case studies of the princely residences, newer monastic architecture, and Rama V’s spectacular civic pageantry. Indigenous and foreign architectural forms and spatial practices were juxtaposed, pastiched, and fused into new cultural forms that defied easy binaries like traditional/modern, Siamese/European, civilized/uncivilized.

In highlighting this ambiguous boundary, the mutual role that the West and the non-West played in global cultural change during the late-nineteenth century, this dissertation has sought to go beyond the usual “Westernization” hypotheses that many scholars of Thai architectural history use to explain architecture of Rama V’s reign. Too often the wonderfully varied architecture of this period has been described simply as a variation of the European/Western prototype. Often, this conclusion was arrived at largely on an analysis of building façades or the external appearance of buildings. As an alternative, this dissertation inquires deeper into architectural form and spatial practice,
going beyond *siwilai* façades to elucidate the very nature of syncretism in Siamese architecture during this exciting period.

In tracing the establishment of the PWD, for example, I argue against a simple “Westernization” hypothesis to show that the very production of architecture was collaborative in nature, with Siamese project owners, administrators, and Italian architects and engineers, not unlike the collaboration between Siamese royal master builders and the European builder-contractors a generation earlier. To complicate the matter further, it is clear that European architect/builders working in Siam can be divided into three non-identical groups: the builder-contractors (Joachim Grassi, Stefano Cardu, John Clunis); the transitional figures (Carlo Allegri, Carl Sandreckzki); and the PWD Italians (Mario Tamagno, Emilio Giovanni Gollo, and Annibale Rigotti). The differences in their social backgrounds, academic training, and professional outlooks certainly contributed to the nuanced transformation in Siamese architecture they helped bring about.

For the Siamese counterparts to these Europeans, this dissertation attempts to differentiate the Hongsakul school of master builders from those of Prince Naris. By looking at the Chakri Reformation and its bureaucratic impacts on the royal master builder system, I argue that there was a break, a complete disruption even, between traditional Siamese architecture of the Hongsakuls, and the “modern” Siamese architecture of Prince Naris and his disciples. Given his early training and career at the PWD, Prince Naris was perhaps more familiar with the PWD Italians’ design methodology and architectural visualization than the Hongsakuls were. To put it differently, in Prince Naris’ “modern” Siamese architecture–since then highly acclaimed as the masterpieces of modern Thai architecture–we can see more vividly the imprint of the Italians than that of the Hongsakuls.

### 5.1 Syncretic Siwilai

In examining in particular the ambiguous, hybridized nature of *siwilai* architecture and architectural practice, this dissertation uses architecture as a platform to address the syncretic nature of modern Siam’s culture and identity. The notion of hybridity has been used in explaining Siamese cultural formation since the early
twentieth century, beginning with a much-quoted 1927 lecture by Prince Damrongrachanuphap, Rama V’s younger brother. In the lecture given to the Society of Lecturers (Samakkhayachan samakhom), the prince identified the major characteristics of the Thai nation as the love of independence, toleration, and the power of assimilation. Indeed, the prince’s acknowledgment of the extensive cultural borrowing, the adoption and adaptation of foreign cultural forms shows how syncretism had always been central to the Siamese elite’s intertwined projects of national formation and the creation of aristocratic self-identity. Interestingly, the prince was vague in terms of agency: it was unclear who was responsible for “selective adaptation,” for instance, and then again towards what end? Although Prince Damrong made his statement from a Siamese aristocrat’s position, it was quite clear that the prince was portraying the entire Siamese populace as a single social body, cohesively moving together towards the path of siwilai, though perhaps with the elite at the forefront.

As has been argued in recent research by the scholars Thongchai Winichakul, Maurizio Peleggi, Tamara Loos, and Peter A. Jackson, and Penny van Esterik, among others, there was no such thing as a socially cohesive vision of siwilai. Thongchai is quick to point out that siwilai as an elite project was aimed at both local and global consumption, which necessarily led to the syncretic, imprecise nature of the whole undertaking. It was the elite who put together indigenous and foreign elements to create cultural artifacts that could be rendered as “civilized” by both European and Siamese audiences. In his study of the Siamese rulers’ manipulation of material culture to fashion a modern public image, Peleggi begins to question the success of the whole attempt. By highlighting the negative accounts of unsympathetic European visitors to the court of Bangkok, Peleggi goes beyond the “success story” of selective adaptation often found in standard, state-endorsed historical narratives. This dissertation seeks to follow the same line of inquiry by trying to listen as much as possible to contemporary feedback—including travelers’ accounts and newspaper editorials—on the Siamese elite’s
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building projects, positive and negative alike. Admittedly, in this dissertation one still does not hear much of the voice of the local populace, perhaps largely due to the elite-centered nature of the archival materials. The space of local agency is a particularly rich site for future research. In her study of the Siamese Government’s legal organization of the Malay Muslim states in the South, Tamara Loos correctly points out the Siamese elite’s role as colonizers, as Siam at that time sat at the nexus of colonialism and imperialism. Internal colonization, Loos argues, was one of the major causes of the restive, politically volatile nature of present-day South, and her role as a historian has been to uncover the genealogy and evolution of internal colonization by interviewing locals, since archival materials are still inaccessible to researchers due to the long-standing sensitivity regarding Bangkok’s role in the area. In his study of the rise of popular culture in early-twentieth century Bangkok, Scot Barmé interestingly focuses on the role of commoners as the harbingers of political and social change, initiating and implementing their own ideas about siwilai. According to Barmé, the overthrow of the absolutist monarchy in 1932 was predicated on the growing urban middle class’ increasing political discontent with the ruling aristocrats, since by then both social groups had equal access to Western forms of culture to fuel their syncretized modernity.

Although this dissertation primarily examines the Siamese elite’s representative architecture of palaces and temples, their self-civilizing mission went well beyond the palace walls and touched upon the domains of the local populace. The dissertation begins to address the possible dialogue between the rulers and the ruled in urban spaces like Saranrom Gardens, Ratchadamnoen Avenue, or the civic pageants towards the end of Rama V’s reign; but of course the Siamese aristocrats’ attempts to “civilize” their own people went far and wide, in the establishment of sanitary systems and regulations, the construction of new streets lined with two-storey shophouses, the establishment of new hospitals, department stores, crematoria, housing, and other building types. How did the local populace respond to the Siamese elite’s siwilai projects as they transformed their
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daily lives? This is one of the least explored topics in Thai historiography, and is
unfortunately beyond the scope of this dissertation.

Apart from the question of agency, another problematic notion in Prince
Damrong’s idea of selective adaptation is the degree to which the *siwilai* projects
rendered lasting effects. By some accounts, the Siamese elite’s self-civilizing mission
was designed merely create a performative effect, a façade of modern “civilization.”6 For
others, the Chakri Reformation left a significant impact, the repercussions of which still
resonate today.7 In the case of Siamese architecture, this dissertation suggests that
changes occurred simultaneously on two levels. On one hand, transformation occurred at
the relatively superficial level of architectural style and fashion; on the other hand, there
were also major changes in Siamese architecture during the nineteenth century, such as
the decline of traditional building crafts, the introduction and use of European-style
furniture, and the weakening of traditional belief in vertical hierarchical order of space,
among other things. This dissertation does not seek to measure Siamese architectural
modernity against any Eurocentric model in terms of degrees of resemblance; instead, it
has explored the complex and multifaceted syncretism that was the key feature in its
architecture. By looking at the ambiguous, syncretic nature of the sites and scenes of
*siwilai*, I support a model of unstable and fluid transfer underlaying cultural identities.

5.2 Semicolonial Hybridity

By looking at the historical contexts that gave shape to Siamese aristocrats’
hybrid *siwilai* building projects, this dissertation is a part of a growing body of literature
that questions Siam’s “unique” ability—among non-Western nations—to maintain
independence during the nineteenth century. Since the 1950s, Thai Marxist historians
have argued that Siam was actually a semicoloncy, its ruling class merely agents of the
European imperialists who thrived on the surplus of import and export trade dominated
by colonial economic network.8 In 1978 Benedict Anderson put the issue into focus in a
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6 Maurizio Peleggi, *Lords of Things: The Fashioning of the Siamese Monarchy's Modern Image*,
3. See also Peter A. Jackson, “The Performative State: Semi-Coloniality and the Tyranny of Images in
8 Ibid., 14.
seminal article, where he asked whether the “fact” that Siam was not colonized was, in fact, an unqualified blessing. In other words, perhaps it was unfortunate that Siam was not colonized, as its alleged uniqueness left its history uncritically written. In Thai historiography this revisionist perspective was diametrically opposed to a state-sponsored, national historical narrative that glorifies the monarchy as the central force that maintained the kingdom’s sovereignty through the centuries. After Anderson, scholars have productively inquire into the Siam’s status as a semic colony. During the 1980s, economic historians pointed out that Siam’s economy had always been dependent on foreign powers, and especially so during the colonial period in Southeast Asian history. More recently, Thongchai Winichakul’s work reveals how Siam’s ruling class had always used the threat of foreign invaders to justify their local consolidation of power. Through his study of Siamese elite’s geographical consciousness, Thongchai argues that colonialism engendered, rather than endangered, modern Siam as a “geo-body,” thereby destabilizing the core rationale of the state-sponsored, national historical narrative. In a subsequent study, Thongchai has examined the ways that Bangkok elites organized their subjects along a scale of “civilization” through the borrowed colonial techniques of ethnography.

Other scholars have questioned the term *semi* in “semicolonial,” moreover, as the term continues to foreground a eurocentric notion of modernity, one that places Siam at the half-way point between the colony and the metropole. Michael Herzfeld, for example, argues for the use of the term “crypto-colonialism,” to attend to the complex and multiple power hierarchies at play in his comparative study of Greece and Thailand. According to Herzfeld, crypto-colonialism defines “the curious alchemy whereby certain
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countries, buffer zones between the colonized lands and those yet untamed, were compelled to acquire their political independence at the cost of massive economic dependence."¹⁴

Herzfeld’s model resonates with my own findings, especially in relation to the fabrication of “civilized” Siamese architecture, a construction that catered to both global and local consumption. It was exactly the paradoxical syncretism, the mixed messages sent through either a single building or the entire building program, that invoked both traditional Siamese and “European” architectural elements. In this respect, this dissertation is also indebted to postcolonial theoretical perspectives on colonial hybridity, especially the work of Homi Bhabha and Néstor García Canclini. For Bhabha, hybridity was a form of subaltern resistance, a creative interaction between the colonies and the imperial powers. For García Canclini, it was the means by which the non-Western elites inpostcolonial historical contexts define their contemporary position through selective appropriations of indigenous and Spanish cultural forms.¹⁵ Both theoretical perspectives contribute to the construction of Siam’s revisionist history: Bhabha’s notion of hybridity provides a way to evade Eurocentric intellectual traps, while García Canclini’s mestizaje, with its contemporary, postcolonial theoretical context, provides a framework through which one can re-examine Siam’s royal-centric forms of hegemony and internal colonization. In the end, the assumption that “selective appropriation” or cultural syncretism is exclusively unique to the case of Thai history is proven false, as Benedict Anderson had predicted. The ideological technique of legitimization through symbolic appropriation was common across Southeast Asia, from premodern times to the present.¹⁶

The dynamics of cultural syncretism and semicolonialism outlined in this dissertation reveal a richly textured experience of “modernity” and “civilization” in Siam during the reign of Rama V, with significant repercussions for the present situation. The dissertation is but an initial inquiry, one that begins to interrogate the state-sponsored, national historical narrative, and especially its assumptions about Siamese essentialism

and royal-centrism. By demonstrating that Siamese architecture during the reign of Rama V was not merely a hybrid, but a hybrid cultural product with specific historical and hegemonic contexts that were at the nexus of colonialism and imperialism, this dissertation provides an alternative narrative of modernity that is attentive to both the global phenomenon and local specificity.
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