

A Control over Chinese Schools by the Thai State from the Period of Constitutional Monarchy to Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's Administration (1932 – 1944)

Penpisut Intarapirom

Abstract

The purposes of this article are to study the causes and factors which the Thai state since the period of constitutional monarchy in 1932 to Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration (1938 – 1944) considered in treating the Chinese schools more strictly and seriously; and to study the actions of the Thai state which affected the Chinese during that period. The assumption of this study is that, due to the Thai state since the conversion of the regime until the first government of Prime Minister Phibul Songkram had the "Nationalism" idea, it treated the Chinese more strictly and seriously. The Thai state's actions on the Chinese schools were various; both of policies and practises.

The findings reveal that the Thai state since the conversion of the regime until the era of Prime Minister Phibul Songkram treated the Chinese schools more strictly and seriously because the Thai state during that period thought about "Nation" and "Thai Nationalism" in the different way. The Thai state used the "Thai Nationality" in classifying population, so the Chinese were obviously different from "Thais". In addition, the Thai state considered the Chinese schools as an unresolved problem because of their engendered relations with China. The children, who were educated in a Chinese style, were typically aware of their being Chinese citizens all the time. On the other hand, Chinese schools

made the children who should be “Thai” to have “Sinoism” (being Chinese) mingled with “Thaism” (being Thai). Therefore, the Thai state treated the Chinese schools strictly and seriously both of policies and practises. As a result, almost all the Chinese schools were closed during that time and couldn’t re-establish throughtout the period of the Prime Minister Phibul Songkram’s administration.

Key Words: Prime Minister Phibul Songkram; Thaism; Chinese Schools

Introduction

A Control over Chinese Schools before Constitutional Monarchy

Before a change to Constitutional Monarchy or democratic regime in 1932, the Thai state had already initiated some control over Chinese schools in the country. Nonetheless, the control had not been so stringent and severe as it was during the period of Constitutional Monarchy. Virtually, a control over Chinese schools during absolute monarchy could be divided into 2 periods, the first one was before an enactment of the Private School Act of 1918 while the second one was after the promulgation of the 1918 Act.

During the first period, though there was an evidence that the first Chinese School was established during the reign of King Rama I, which was set up in Koh Rian (Extraordinary Education Department, 1935: p.1), of which no detail was available. Afterwards, a story of the school vanished until the reign of King Monkut (King Rama IV), when an evidence of the Chinese school emerged once again. Nonetheless, this time the school was founded by American missionaries on September 30, 1852. It was a boarding school of which students were taught in the Chinese language. A Chinese teacher among the missionaries named Sinsae Sinkiang Kwa Sin was its teaching manager (The Private School Association, 1957: p.31). However, he died in 1860. A teacher

who took over the teaching job completely changed the Chinese-language teaching to Thai teaching. This Chinese teaching school was thus dissolved ever since (The Private School Association, 1957: p.34).

However, since “a school” understood currently as a Western school style in which the school curricula and educational level classification were clearly defined had not been established before the reign of King Rama V (Assist. Prof. Vorawit Vasinsarakorn. (Collected and Revised), 1967: p.18), it was, therefore; assumed that the two Chinese schools mentioned earlier might have been the learning and teaching of the Chinese in a traditional way, and an accumulation of a small group of the Chinese people. Thus, it was likely that the teaching concerned the Chinese traditions and culture rather than the systematics teaching of the West, like the Chinese school in the later period. In fact, most Chinese at the time preferred to assemble together to learn at a Chinese shrine. In a case of wealthy families that could afford to hire a teacher to teach their children at home or send them back to study in China, the latter case could have made the school a medium for the relationship between the Chinese offsprings born in Thailand, and their motherland, but in fact that had not occurred at the time. Consequently, it stands to reason that the kind of Chinese school with the learning and teaching system related to one in China, similar to a Chinese school in a subsequent period, had neither emerged. Thus, this traditional pattern of Chinese schooling in Thailand was not then a problem in the eye of the state. In sum, there was no need to control a Chinese school in the country at that time (Extraordinary Education Department, 1935: p.1).

Later in the reign of King Rama V, during which a school in the Western style was initially founded, the Chinese in Thailand had also established Chinese schools in accordance with those of a Western pattern. This resulted from the fact that the Chinese wanted their offsprings to get educated. Furthermore, there was a political conflict in China, which made various political factions in China

and launch political campaigns in Thailand to get a support from the Chinese in the country. This, in turn, encouraged the Chinese to become more and more aware of “Chinese Nationalism” and provided assistance to those political factions in order to carry out political activities in China. The political group that had played a key role in an establishment of a Chinese school in Thailand was a political faction of a revolutionist movement led by Dr. Sun Yat-sen. In this connection, the Meng Hui Association, which was an organization of the revolutionist movement in Thailand, had advocated to found a Chinese school in 1908 called “Hua Iah,” meaning a school for the benefits of the Chinese. The school was in Captain Bush lane, on Charoen Krung Rd, Bangkok. Virtually, it was set up with a political reason related to China’s internal politics. Nonetheless, since the school was of the new type with the Western style schooling concentrating on giving practical knowledge within a short period of time, it was immediately very much appreciated by the Chinese when established in Thailand (Skinner, 1977: p.171). This had of course, motivated the Chinese in the country to establish a Chinese school of their own.

Unfortunately, Hua Iah School was subsequently abolished when its teachers had no time because they had to travel to different places so as to promote their support for the Chinese revolutionist movement. Nevertheless, when the revolution in China terminated with success in October, 1911, these teachers returned to China to assure their public service positions there (Extraordinary Education Department, 1935: p.2). The Chinese in Thailand, therefore, founded Chinese schools later on. Typically, the schools during this period were established by the Chinese’s spoken-language associations starting with Sin Min School in 1911. The school was supported by the Chinese of 5 principal language groups in Thailand, namely, Teow Chao, Hainanese, Hokkien, Cantonese and Hakkah. Nevertheless, since the school’s teaching had to be done through one language only, it chose to use Teow Chao for teaching. As a consequence, the school’s students and

teachers were mostly Teow Chao, who took control over the school's management later. It thus could not respond to the need of the population of other language groups.

Accordingly, each language group had established its own school and taught through its language. It was found that the Hakkah Association founded Jin Tor School, the Cantonese Association founded Ming Tor School, the Hokkien Association founded Poui Yuan School and the Hainanese Association founded Aew Ming School in 1913, 1914, 1916 and 1921, respectively (Skinner, 1977: p.171).

As the number of Chinese School in Thailand had been increasing and got involved in political activities in China, the Thai government during the reign of King Rama VI was well aware of the need to take control over Chinese schools. Nevertheless, a control in the incipient stage was not so strict and Chinese schools were only required to be enrolled in order to get the government subsidy. Via this approach, the state was able to inspect and control them. However, since not all schools were enforced to be enrolled, there were only a few enrolled ones. Based on the statistics of private schools enrolled throughout the country in 1917, there were only 24 of them. Out of this number there were not any Chinese schools requesting for an enrollment with the government (The Private School Association, 1957: p.83 and 87).

Therefore, it was noted that a control over Chinese schools by the Thai state during this period still lacked an obvious regulation leading to a strict control. Besides, there was no policy to control their management and academic work. Nevertheless, during this period there was an example of establishing the government's guideline for a more comprehensive control over Chinese schools. A request for setting up a Chinese school in Phuket in 1912 was a case in this point. This school was known for its ardent support for the Chinese revolutionist movement and Phya Rassadanupradit, the governor of Phuket, realised that it would instigate the Chinese to have faith in a government of the republic, which was quite

different from the one in Thailand, engendering animosity against Thailand among the Chinese in the country (Prince Damrong Rajanuphab, 1961: pp.28 – 33).

As a result, Prince Damrong, then the Minister of Interior Affairs, had set up a guideline to control the aforesaid Chinese school by having it be registered with the state so that the state could supervise it and prevent the schooling from including a political ideology or encouraging the Chinese children to detest the Thai people and government. In addition, the school had to admit both the Chinese and Thai students, as well as teach both the Chinese and Thai languages all the same. As far as the teaching was concerned, it was required that the school teach Chinese one hour daily and Thai four hours daily (Prince Damrong Rajanuphab, 1961: p.31). At the beginning, this Chinese school was satisfied with the government supervision initiated by Prince Damrong. Subsequently, in the reign of King Prajadhipok (Rama VII) when Prince Damrong followed the King to Phuket, the school committee failed a request to the Prince to increase more teaching of the Chinese language. The request was finally taken into consideration for appropriateness (Prince Damrong Rajanuphab, 1961: p.33). But there was no evidence how much the Chinese teaching was augmented.

Nevertheless, a guideline for a control over the Chinese school in Phuket had indicated that the state at that time realized the importance of a Chinese school being used as a medium to disseminate the events in China that would motivate the Chinese offsprings in Thailand to maintain their “Sinoism” (being Chinese). Accordingly, the state introduced a guideline for a control by focusing on the study of the Thai language among them so that they increasingly became in harmony with “Thaism” (being Thai). However, the state during that period was also indulgent when the Chinese requested for more teaching of the Chinese language. This was entirely different from the Thai government after the coup of 1932, which ended the rule of absolute monarchy and constituted

a system of constitutional monarchy, and during which there was no compromise on such matter.

In the second period or after the coup of 1932, the state had a more distinct approach of controlling Chinese schools because the state in an earlier period had had no tight control, which made these schools teach their students in the manner like those in China. Thus, the teaching of the Thai language was normally ignored, while in some schools students were even incited to believe that those who knew Thai would be conscripted to serve in the army (Extraordinary Education Department, 1935: p.4). As a result, the state perceived that such implementations were not appropriate because the Chinese offsprings in Thailand would grow up Thai citizens. So, the Private School Act was passed in 1918 stipulating that all private schools had to be enrolled and under the supervision of the Education Ministry. Article 14 of the Act stipulated the schooling in a private school that its students must

- (1) Be able to write and comprehend Thai fairly fluently
- (2) Have to study civic duties as well as instill loyalty to Siam and knowledge of landscape, including town chronicle and geography, at least (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1927: p.112)

Furthermore, private schools' teachers were required to know Thai and the state had authority to forbid usage of textbooks or educational instruments that were derogatory to population, or that made one distracted or lose one's social etiquette (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1927: p.115).

Though the above stipulations were generally applied to private schools, the state could also enforce them upon Chinese schools. This might have been regarded as the first guideline formulation of a systematic control over Chinese schools. The stipulations established had pointed out that the Thai state at this period not only culled to discourage the schooling in a Chinese school to maintain their Chinese traditions and "Sinoism" but also to teach stories of "Thaism" because students would grow up in

Thai society. However, stipulations in the aforesaid Act were not so stringent and did not identify a definite number of hours for teaching Thai. In addition, foreign teachers were only required to know Thai, which enabled the Chinese school to hire teachers educated in China as before. For this reason, the state was not able to effectively control Chinese schools.

This might have resulted from the fact that the state during the period of absolute monarchy wanted to control Chinese schools not only to prevent them from training their students to be solely aware of “Sinoism” but also to encourage the teaching of stories of Thaism, which went in accordance with King Prajadhipok’ statements delivered while paying a visit to Jin Tek School in 1927.

For your school, you may teach your students to love your motherland of China. This is very normal and should be encouraged. But apart from teaching them to adore China, I sincerely anticipate that they should be taught to love Thailand as well since all of you here have all the privileges as the Thai people do (King Prajadhipok, 1964: pp.238 – 240).

This might have been coupled with the fact that this was the inchoate stage of a Chinese school control. If the state took too strict a measure, this might bring about dissatisfaction among the Chinese and lead to a chaos in Thailand, which had occurred when the state raised the public service to 6 bahts despite the fact that this was applied to all nationals including the Thais. Those, of course, made the Chinese dissatisfied and used it as the pretext for a strike in June 1910, which had a considerable impact on the Thai economy and people (Savitree Tuppasut, 1984: pp.205 – 206). Consequently, the state during this period chose to compromise for a control over Chinese schools. Typically, they were allowed to teach mostly the Chinese language and hired teachers coming from China. Meanwhile, the state did not make much inspection of school’s curricula or performance.

Study

A Control over Chinese Schools from the Coup of 1932 to before Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's Administration (1932 – 1938)

The Thai state after a change from absolute to constitutional monarchy in 1932 had concentrated on building “Thaism” while the Chinese themselves tried to maintain “Sinoism” within their communities. The latter also propagated “Sinoism” among their offsprings through education in Chinese schools, which engendered relations with China. These children, who were educated in a Chinese style, were typically aware of their being Chinese citizens all the time. Or at least, they were made to have “Sinoism” mingled with “Thaism”, which was what the state did not want to materialize.

A crucial issue compelling the state to take a stringent control over Chinese schools was that the state, since the coup of 1932, used “Thai nationality” as a criterion for determining one’s Thai citizenship, who would have apparent legal rights and obligations. It was implicitly assumed that Chinese offsprings born in Thailand were legally Thai citizens. This was also reflected in Prince Wanvithayakorn in his article, “the Nation and Humanity” in Prachachat Newspaper of April 5, 1933 stating on Chinese offsprings’ status that, “these kids, being of Chinese origin, were Siamese and they would all have political rights in Siam” (The Nation and Humanity, 1933). Accordingly, the state could not afford to have Chinese schools implement their schooling in a way that would maintain “Sinoism” among Chinese offsprings.

The state since the coup of 1932, therefore, spared no effort to control educational curricula in Chinese schools initially by enforcing the Elementary Education Act of 1921, which had been previously passed in the reign of King Vajiravudh (Rama VI) but was not widely enforced. The state declared to enforce the Act in Phra Nakorn and Thonburi provinces (currently integrated as Bangkok), where a prodigious number of Chinese resided, in

February 1932*. According to the Act, all elementary schools were required to teach mainly Thai subjects. As to the remaining time, any subjects might be taught (Elementary Education Act of 1921, 1921: p.24). This necessitated Chinese schools that spent most of their time teaching the Chinese language and events on China, which affected the preservation of Chinese offsprings' Sinoism, to reduce hours for Chinese teaching as stipulated by the state. Inevitably, the Chinese could not help thinking that the Act put too much control over them, and thus Sin Min School sent a report to its students' parents to collectively plead the Thai government to allow teaching Chinese and Thai for the equivalent number of hours. Nonetheless, the government did not agree since it thought that the Act was not a new one but was just initially introduced in Bangkok and did not overwhelmingly restrict the right of the Chinese. Similarly, it felt that the school's distribution of the reports was tantamount to an instigation of the Chinese in Thailand to abhor the government. Thus, the leaflet (report) distributor should be punished (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (98/1932), 1932). Based on the government's reaction, it was obvious that the state would not compromise on Chinese school's performance of nurturing "Sinoism" among Chinese offsprings who were regarded Thai citizens by the state.

Though subsequently, there were more Chinese schools' complaints for the government's resilience in teaching Chinese, as revealed in the report on the cabinet meeting on April 28, 1933. It was stated in the report that about 6,000 Chinese had failed a petition to the government to allow teaching Chinese in Chinese schools like before, and requested that the Chinese teachers coming from China did not have to know Thai. Nevertheless, the government thought that it had formulated an identical performance policy for all foreign schools in the country to

*Original Buddhist era in which the New Year started in April.

follow, and thus should not exempt any one particular school from the policy (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (17/1933), 1933). For the above reason, the state was not indulgent with Chinese schools' request. And because the state had enforced the Act, which was more rigid in its control over Chinese schools, those violating the law were closed down. This significantly resulted in a diminishing number of Chinese schools from 271 in 1933 to 193 in late 1934, which were all elementary ones (Department of Secretary General of Council, 1933 – 1934: pp.418 – 419).

That the state was not resilient to its control over the conservation of “Sinoism” through education in Chinese schools was more apparent when it sent a letter to a legion number of Chinese schools, informing that in January 1934, the state would revoke an approval for a comparison of elementary education curricula of schools teaching Chinese, which would be effective on April 1, 1935. For any schools of which students were eligible to derive an official elementary education certificate, they would have to relinquish teaching Chinese and teach Thai instead. As for the revocation of an approval for a comparison of elementary education curricula, the state aimed to control Chinese schools in particular. Virtually, the state had approved such a comparison for such Western schools as Assumption, Saint Gabriel, Saint Paul and so on, which taught English or French as a foreign language ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, March 28, 1934). Nevertheless, for Chinese schools no matter what their owners were: Westerners, Thais or Chinese, if they were found to violate the Elementary Education Act, the state would revoke an approval for a comparison of elementary education curricula for these schools ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, date unidentified).

The state's respond to Chinese schools resulted from the fact that it saw their schooling tremendously involving in politics while they fervently wished to alienate the education of Chinese offsprings born in Thailand including those coming from other countries so that it was similar to that in China and benefited

mainly the Chinese and China ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, March, 1934). In addition, the state also saw that education in Chinese schools played a key role in maintaining “Sinoism” of Chinese offsprings who would become Thai citizens according to the Nationality Act of 1913. This would of course hamper them from being the Thais while the state could not afford to permit an existence of the education type that would break apart the Thais in accordance with the Nationality Act ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24. 2/1, date unidentified). The state thus had to revoke an approval for elementary education curricula in Chinese schools found to violate the law by the state. As a consequence, Chinese schools were considerably affected by such an implementation.

Since the revocation of the approval would deny Chinese students finishing elementary education from a Chinese school to obtain a certificate, which would disqualify them to get a job that required elementary education or further their study or vote in an election. Based on the Revised Election Act of 1933, Volume 2, it stipulated that a Thai national whose father was an alien would be eligible to vote only when he finished Mattayom 3 (junior secondary education), or was in a government service in accordance with the Conscription Act, or entered a government service in other section for the position of a clerk or higher, with a regular salary for at least 5 years ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, date unidentified). This implicitly deprived Chinese offsprings graduating from an elementary school (teaching Chinese and revoked an approval for the curricula comparison) of such a right. This was due to the fact that, without an elementary education certificate, the students could not continue their study in a secondary school or enter a government service in a high position, and were ineligible to run in an election since it was stipulated in the Revised Election Act of 1933, Volume 2, Article 6 that, “those who run for a member of parliament must have knowledge equivalent to elementary education ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, date unidentified).

On the whole, the revocation of an approval for a comparison of elementary education curricula of Chinese-teaching schools had significantly impacted Chinese offsprings in terms of further education, making a living and undermining their right as Thai citizens. This obviously demonstrated that the state after the coup of 1932 (a change to constitutional monarchy) was enormously rigorous on a control over Chinese schools, which was reflected in its uncompromising response to them. As far as the restrictive practice was concerned, though there were some Chinese-teaching schools owned by the Westerners, Chinese and Thais, for instance, Missin Catholic School of Chinese ((2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1, February 14, 1934), Kwong Siew Schools 1 and 2, Soo Yin School, Huang Huang School 2, Sin Min School, Meng Meng School and Tor Min School (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (28/1934), January 21, 1934) had filed a request to the state for an abrogation of the revocation of an approval for the curricula comparison, the state rejected it.

The state's restrictiveness in a control over Chinese schools was more distinct when its implementation of the policy gave rise to a reaction from the Chinese. On May 3, 1935, Chinese newspapers in Hong Kong and Shanghai had reported that China would boycott Thai rice because the Thai government had enforced too harsh a law on Chinese schools (2) Sor Ror.0201.92/9, May 3, 1935). Subsequently, Thai students in China convened to discuss the rise of Thai rice export duty as a retaliation for the Thai state's revocation of an approval for the elementary education curricula while they also notified the state of the retaliation (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (16/1935), May 24, 1935). The reason might be that they wanted the Thai government to abolish such an implementation. Nevertheless, it refused to do so though it was likely that China would actually boycott Thai rice as Thai students in China had notified their government. In this connection, the Thai government stated that it had been informed by reliable Chinese merchants that China had already stopped

purchasing Siamese rice (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (23/1935), June 10, 1935). It, therefore, appointed a committee to find a solution in case China quitted buying Siamese rice (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (23/1935), June 10, 1935).

However, later the Chinese minister to Japan confirmed the rumour that China would stop purchasing Thai rice was not true. Such a rumour might have stemmed from the Chinese's feeling that they were oppressed by the Thai government and this fabricated the story (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (25/1935), June 14, 1935). Nonetheless, the government still believed that such a story had grounds because the performance was made by Chinese individuals. It was also aware that its response to Chinese schools might partly contribute to China's cancellation of a purchase of Thai rice. Consequently, the state had to find a way to resolve such a problem since China was a significant rice market for Thailand and Thai economy would tremendously be impacted if China stopped buying Thai rice. Thailand, therefore, sent its representative, Vilas Osathanon, to investigate the fact in China in July 1935. Vilas subsequently returned and confirmed that the state's policies on Chinese schools had played a key role in China's stopping buying Thai rice (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (47/1935), August 7, 1935). The state believed that an understanding of the Chinese school incident was not good enough and so it would try to promote an understanding among the Chinese in the country. Nevertheless, it would eliminate the policies on Chinese schools whatsoever (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (28/1935), June 21, 1935).

What the state had reacted apparently revealed its uncompromising policies on a control over Chinese schools. Though such policies probably more or less affected the state's interest, it insisted on implementing them while attempting to find a way to resolve the crisis. For example, it had the Chinese Trading Association and Ricemill Association send a telegram to the Siang Huy Association in Hong Kong protesting against its

stoppage of purchasing Thai rice, or sought to find a way to indirectly export rice to China. The latter was carried out by exporting rice to another country where it would be later exported to China. Furthermore, new rice markets were looked for. Meanwhile, the state tried to make the Chinese in the country feel better on it, or see what China had wanted. It would precipitate solving the problem if possible (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (29/1935), June 24, 1935). Apparently, the state's resolution to the crisis could be regarded as fruitful since the committee on the consideration of the case of China's closing the Door on Thai rice was dissolved on March 2, 1935 (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (127/1935), March 2, 1935). This might indicate that the crisis in question had terminated and so there was no need for the committee concerned. Notwithstanding this fact, there was no evidence that the state had relinquished the revocation of an approval of the curricula comparison in any way.

Nevertheless, the state subsequently realized that its policies on Chinese schools engendered a severe reaction from the Chinese while considerably affecting the state's interest. As a consequence, it viewed that the policies to control the preservation of "Sinoism" through Chinese schools should not be too obvious because it would inevitably draw an adverse response. For this reason, after the aforesaid incidence, the state did not try to act conspicuously in its control over Chinese schools.

Accordingly, when the ministerial regulation of the Education Ministry was issued in 1935 based on the Elementary Education Act, not long after the revocation of the comparison of elementary education curricula for Chinese schools, the state was very cautious on the issue since the regulation had something to do with the Chinese. In this regard, the committee on the consideration of the Chinese problems was ordered to scrutinize the issue before the promulgation of the regulation (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (96/1935), December 13, 1935). All things considered, the committee unanimously agreed to delete the word "a Thai

citizen” from the stipulation saying, “A teacher for grade 1 through grade 4 must be a Thai citizen”. This was because it viewed that the statement in the stipulation was too straightforward and demanding, which might adversely affect the Chinese and in turn generate a turmoil later on. Subsequently, the cabinet, during its meeting, agreed to the committee’s opinions and ordered to have the word “A Thai citizen” cut off from the stipulation in the afore-mentioned Act (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (99/1935), December 25, 1935). By this time, it was obvious that the state had done what it could to make the Chinese in the country feel better on it (Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (29/1935), June 24, 1935).

Nonetheless, though the state had augmented its rigour in a control over Chinese schools, the latter could still go on with their schooling by avoiding the law. This was carried out through providing the schooling at a level higher than elementary education so that Chinese offsprings could further their studies at a high level, and would not be deprived of their political right. Some Chinese schools might pretend to comply with the Elementary Education Act in teaching principally Thai as required by the state, but avoided doing so inside their school. In order to resolve this problem, the state therefore passed the Private School Act of 1936 to empower its officials and enhance the strictness in a control over Chinese schools.

The Act stipulated one of the qualifications of the school that would be enrolled as a private school that, “The school must not perform in a way that is or tends to be antagonistic to good morality or peace and order of the public, or against the state law” (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.301). Furthermore, the Act stipulated one of the qualifications of the school headmaster that, “...is a recipient of a certificate for the elementary school teacher, or finishes senior secondary school education of the Education Ministry, or is a teacher of at least equivalent academic status as approved by the Minister” (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.302). Similarly, a qualification of the school

teacher was, "...is a recipient of the teacher certificate, or finishes junior secondary school education of the Education Ministry, or is a teacher of at least equivalent academic status as approved by the Minister" (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.302).

The above stipulation definitely enabled the state to enforce the Act upon a more restrictive control over Chinese schools since some of them were established with the support of political organizations or associations of which the movement involved with the politics in China. As a result, the establishment of these schools, organizations or associations was typically earmarked for the propagation or campaign for a support to their groups. The stipulation of Chinese school's properties, therefore, made it possible for the state not to allow founding any school it thought had a close relation with such political institutions. Likewise, it might use the stipulation as a pretext for not approving setting up a Chinese school, which made its establishment more complicated.

In addition, the state endeavored to control the schooling in Chinese schools by defining the qualifications of their headmasters and teachers to have a Thai educational certificate, which denied teachers coming from China the right to teach in Chinese schools. Since a number of these teachers were normally involved with the movements in Chinese politics and disseminated the feeling of Chinese nationalism among Chinese offsprings in Thailand, the state thus tried to preclude them from the academic circle via its rigorous control over Chinese schools. Additionally, the Private School Act had added a control over a Chinese elementary school by requiring it to comply with the ministerial regulation with respect to its teachers, academic semesters, curricula, schooling, educational equipment and managerial regulations (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.304). Meanwhile, the teaching had to be carried out in Thai except for any teaching for which the Minister of Education allowed using other languages in that particular class (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.304).

Such a stipulation had pointed out the state's perseverance to have Chinese schools perform their teaching on events of "Thaism" and concentrate on using the Thai language in all their teaching. This would of course, promote "Thaism" among Chinese offsprings while preventing Chinese schools from teaching events of "Sinoism", which would disunite Chinese offsprings from Thai society as the school had done earlier. In sum, the stipulation was also meant for Chinese schools that frequently violated the Act, and the state had authority to inspect the schools which it suspected of violating the Act and order them closed if found to do so (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: pp.309 - 310).

Besides, the state had stipulated in the Act concerning its authority to close a school which used its compound to perform any illegal actions, or do things that were against good morality or peace and order of the public, or inappropriate for the school activities (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.307). It also had authority to close a school that supported or taught or were prepared to do both in its compound, any doctrines or customs that were illegal or against good morality or peace and order of the public (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: pp.307 - 308). This included those who perpetrated such actions in the school, who were guilty and subject to a fine or imprisonment or both (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.312). Above all, the stipulation was effectively utilized to control the schooling in Chinese schools particularly those which tended to propagate the events in China and persuade Chinese offsprings to support and promote China regime, and which sometimes launched a political campaign against foreign invasion. Of course, this aimed at preventing the kind of teaching that would have an impact on the country's peace and order.

Due to the fact that the Act had a wide-ranging stipulation which was at the discretion of state officials to close a school or revoke a license of its manager, headmaster and teachers (Sathien

Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.309), the Act should have been used to more strictly and effectively control Chinese schools. Nevertheless, there was no clear evidence how many of them were affected by the Act during this period. In contrast, the Act's restrictiveness in a control over Chinese schools was conspicuous in Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration, who applied its stipulations to the control of Chinese schools, which made nearly all of them closed because they had violated one or the other stipulation in the Act, and in turn apparently revealed the rigor in the control over Chinese schools.

During Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's Administration

During Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration it might be regarded as the period when Chinese schools were treated very strictly since the state's control over them made them all closed and unable to ask for a permission to reopen. This was because the state during this period gave so much importance to "Thaism" while Chinese schools taught in a way that would promote "Sinoism" instead, which was an impediment to the integration of Chinese offsprings to become Thais.

Moreover, some Chinese schools were found to violate the law and official regulations. For instance, the school compound was used to do illegal things and some schools had complex rooms and doors that made it hard for officials to make an inspection all over. Similarly, some schools had clandestine rooms for teaching forbidden courses such as political doctrine of Chinese nationalism, or for hiding illicit teachers who were not registered with the government and normally played a role in the political movement in China, or became teachers to propagate their political ideology so that Chinese offsprings in Thailand would become interested in the Chinese regime. Likewise, a prodigious number of Chinese schools had violated official regulations with respect to school curricula, textbooks and so on (National Research Council, p.33 in Phichai Rattanapol, 1969: p.91).

No doubt though the state since the 1932 coup had revised the Private School Act for a more restrictive control over Chinese schools, there was still a violation in practise. Thus, the state during Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration could not allow this to happen any longer. This was reflected in Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's statement during the cabinet meeting on November 1, 1939 that, "Whatever might be done but Chinese schools and Chinese criminal association must not exist" (Minute of the cabinet Meeting (62/1939), November 1, 1939).

Under Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration, the state formulated a guideline for tackling Chinese schools during the cabinet meeting on June 26, 1939. Rear Admiral Luang Sinthu Songkhramchai, the Education Minister, proposed at the meeting that, "As for Chinese schools, we should agree whether we are ready to dissolve them because closing them is not effective" (Minute of the cabinet Meeting (20/1939), June 26, 1939). Apparently, this indicated that though the Private School Act of 1936 was rigorous, its enforcement was a fiasco. Accordingly, to control Chinese schools efficiently, the cabinet agreed in principle that they should not be allowed to exist while it authorized any decision-making to be at the discretion of the Education Minister. This meant if he thought it was appropriate to close any Chinese school, it had to be closed. Once closed, it would not be allowed to reopen again (Minute of the cabinet Meeting (20/1939), June 26, 1939).

Based on the cabinet resolution, the Education Ministry put an effort to have Chinese schools strictly comply with the Private School Act of 1936 (Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), 1936: p.356). Any school found to violate the Act would be closed. According to the Ministry's statistics in 1938, there were 293 private schools teaching the Chinese language throughout the country. Out of this number, 51 schools had spontaneously closed themselves while the Ministry ordered 242 schools to close between 1938 and 1940,

which meant that there were no longer any Chinese schools left*. Apparently, the 1936 Act contained stipulations appropriate for the state to effectively use for a control over Chinese schools. But the schools were able to exist after the promulgation of the Act until Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration because it was not enforced by the Act seriously, it could effectively tackle the problem of Chinese schools.

Apart from the above implementation, the state also had a long-term policy of controlling the Chinese's education. In this connection, it had declared to repeal and revise some articles of the Private School Act of 1936 in order to increase the strictness and extend the state's authority. The revised Act was later promulgated as now Private School Acts such as the Act, copies 2 and 4 of 1941. This aimed at augmenting the strictness in permitting founding a school, and increasing penalty for those violating the law by establishing illicit schools and teaching forbidden doctrines. In this regard, a fine sentence would be replaced by an imprisonment one (Minute of the cabinet Meeting (62/1941), December 3, 1941, p.3). As a result, the Chinese encountered the problem of the state's rigor in not allowing setting up Chinese schools throughout until the end of Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration.

No doubt the Thai state during Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration had enhanced its strictness as well as

* However, based on the Education Ministry's evidence, it appeared that there was one Chinese school remaining, which was a small one named, "Chvenwittayakorn School" . It was believed that the school could still be open since both the manager and the headmaster was a Thai. Later, the school expanded its business extensively and the Teow Chao Association of Thailand took over the school and changed its name to "Kosowittaya School". See detail in educational documents of the Extraordinary Education Department, Volume 7, p.18 cited in Pichai Rattanapol, "The Evolution of A Control over chinese Schools", p.92.

serious implementation on a control over Chinese schools since it well realised that not doing so would just give rise to turmoils and disorders in the country, which might impact the relations between Thailand and China. The former thus could not afford to have the Chinese's subversive or anti-government actions exist, and had done everything possible to suppress them including terminating any derogatory performances of Chinese schools.

Conclusion

Therefore, it is obvious that the Thai state from the Coup of 1932 to Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration was very strictly and seriously in controlling Chinese schools. This decreased the quantity of Chinese schools, and there were no longer any Chinese schools left in Prime Minister Phibul Songkram's administration. According to the foregoing policy of the Thai state, Chinese people were unable to arrange their own education. This caused Chinese people unsatisfied; however, they could not express their dissatisfaction because at that time the Thai state was very strict and China was in the weak situation. After the World War II, China became one of the five most powerful nations. Eventually, the said dissatisfaction was demonstrated in the event called "Lie Pah" when Chinese people injured Thai people in the areas in Bangkok where many Chinese had residency. The said event reflected that the state's administrative treatment to the other group of people in the Thai society should not be too strict because those people may be pressured and unsatisfied. Subsequently, it may lead to the violence which destroys public orders of Thailand.

References

Primary Sources

- (2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1 (March 28, 1934) A Letter from Education Minister to Secretary – General of the Cabinet.
- (2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1 (February 14, 1934) a Letter from the Manager of Mission Catholic School, Bangkok to Co;one; Phya Pahol Polpayuhasena, the Prime Minister.
- (2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1 (March 1934) A Letter from the Permanent Secretary of Education Ministry to Permanent Secretary of Foreign Affairs Ministry.
- (2) Sor Ror. 0201.24.2/1 (date Unidentified) Memorandum of Phra Sarasart Polakan on the Revocation of Elementary Education Curricula.
- (2) Sor Ror.0201.92/9 (May 3, 1935) A Translation from the Taikuangpor Newspaper, Hong Kong.

Government Gazettes

“Elementary Education Act of 1921”, *Government Gazette*, 38: 24.

Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting

- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (98/1932) (3 March 1932) Title: Sin Min School Sent a Report to Its Students’ Parents.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (17/1933) (28 April 1933) Title: Asking the Schools to Perform as Before.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (28/1934) (January 21, 1934) Title: Managers of Chinese Schools Filed a Complaint on the Education Ministry’s Order to Dissolve Elementary Schools.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (16/1935) (May 24, 1935) Title: The Association of Foreign Students Opened a Conference on the Rise of Siamese (Thai) Rice Export Duty.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (23/1935) (June 10, 1935) Title: China Closes the Door on Siamese Rice.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (25/1935) (June 14, 1935) Title: China Closes the Door on Siamese Rice.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (28/1935) (June 21, 1935) Title: A Committee on the Consideration of the Case of China’s Closing the Door on Thai Rice. A Presentation of the Minutes.

- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (29/1935) (June 24, 1935) Title: China closed the Door on Thai Rice.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (47/1935) (August 7, 1935) Title: Vilas Osathanon Reported on Travelling to China.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (96/1935) (December 13, 1935) Title: The Education Ministry's Ministerial Regulation Issued in Accordance with the Statements in the Elementary Education Act.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (99/1935) (December 25, 1935) Title: The Education Ministry's Ministerial Regulation Issued in Accordance with the Statements in the Elementary Education Act.
- Minutes of the Cabinet Meeting (127/1935) (March 2, 1935) Title: Reappointment of Committees and Dissolution of Some Committees.
- Minute of the cabinet Meeting (20/1939) (June 26, 1939) Title: Chinese Schools.
- Minute of the cabinet Meeting (62/1939) (November 1, 1939) Title: The Chinese Problem.
- Minute of the cabinet Meeting (62/1941) (December 3, 1941) Title: The Private School Act Draft (Copy 4) 1941.

Newspapers

“The Nation and Humanity” (5 April 1933) *Prachachat*.

Secondary Sources

- Damrong Rajanuphab, Prince. (1961) *The Prince's Massage*. Volume 3. Kurusapa Commercial Agency, Phra Nakorn.
- Department of Secretary General of Council.(1933 – 1934) *Statistical Year Book of Kingdom of Thailand* No.18.
- Extraordinary Education Department. (1935) “A Private School for Chinese Teaching”, *Educational document of Extraordinary Education Department*, Volume I. Petcharat Publisher, Phra Nakorn.
- Pichai Rattanapol. (1969) *An Evolution of the Control over Chinese Schools*. Master Thesis in Public Administration, NIDA.
- Prajadhipok, King. (1964) “Royal Statements delivered When Visiting A Chinese School”, *Statements and Advice of King Prajadhipok*. Por Pissakee Publishing Company, Phra Nakorn.
- Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected), (1927) “The Private School Act of 1918”, *Annual Law Collection*, Volume 31. Daily Mail, Phra Nakorn.

- Sathien Lailaksana, (Collected) (1937) "The Private School Act of 1936"
Annual Law Collection, Volume 50. Daily Mail, Phra Nakorn.
- Savitree Tuppasut. (1984) *Relationship among the Thai, Chinese and Western Communities in Bangkok from 1765 to 1910*. A Master thesis, History Department, School Of Graduate Studies, Chulalongkorn University.
- Skinner, William G. (1977) *Chinese Society in Thailand: Analytical History*.
Translated by Punnee Chatpolrak. Foundation of Project on Social Science and Humanities Textbook, Bangkok.
- The Private School Association. (1957) *The History of Private Schools and Private Schools Directory*. Mongkol publisher, Phra Nakorn.
- Vorawit Vasinsarakorn. (1967) (Collected and Revised). *The Education of Thailand*. Sanmolchon, Bangkok.