

Communications to the Editor

An Issue in Southeast Asian History

With reference to Donald Emmerson's evaluation of my *History of Post-war Southeast Asia* (*JAS* 40, 1 [Nov. 1980]: 43–68), I would like to call attention to the initial statements in my preface indicating the reasons for presenting a factual narrative of events rather than an attempt at interpretation of post-war changes. The preface runs as follows:

This historical survey of Post-war Southeast Asia . . . does not presume to be a specialized study of the process of political decolonization *per se*, nor an exposition of the economic problems of underdeveloped areas, nor a study of the complicated process of modernization. . . . The preparation of such monographic analyses can better be left to specialists in their several disciplines. . . . A balanced historical treatment can provide a useful setting.

In reply to the query which Emmerson raises concerning the sources I used in writing the final two chapters of my book, covering 1969 to 1971, they were mainly the *New York Times*, the weekly *Far Eastern Economic Review* (Hong Kong), and successive volumes of the *Asian Yearbook* (Hong Kong).

JOHN F. CADY
Ohio University