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Abstract
This paper is a study on Venit Vanit, a Thai translation of William Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice. It attempts to deconstruct a tendency among Thai critics and theatre practitioners to regard Venit Vanit as a story about the “greedy” Jew and the “merciful” Christians. This paper argues that this reading is part of a political project to promote a unified, exclusive identity for the nation. By emphasizing and exaggerating the evil of Shylock and the virtues of Christian characters, the translated play is used to construct a misleading image of “the others” who are trouble makers and deserve to be discriminated and punished. In turn, this perception justifies discriminatory treatments and injustice that people from minority groups are facing in reality. The paper then demonstrates that it is possible to read Venit Vanit in another way and use the play to encourage social justice for people from different backgrounds.
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Introduction

The word “justice” refers to not only fairness but also the system of laws established to judge and punish people, and it is a truism that the legal system does not necessarily go hand in hand with fairness.

Thomas Paine was one of early thinkers on social justice. For Paine, God endowed this fertile earth for every human being. Hence, it is an injustice to let anyone live in poverty. The state should distribute an adequate amount of wealth to everyone not as an act of charity but because it is people’s inalienable rights (Paine, 1995). John Rawls is another thinker who helped to develop the concept of social justice. According to Rawls (1999), justice is achieved when everyone has basic rights, and social and economic inequality is managed for everyone’s benefit. Inequality is acceptable if it is for the benefit of the most disadvantaged members in society.

To sum up, social justice is a condition in which everyone has equal rights and opportunities. People are entitled to receive help from the state and every social management should be conducted for the benefit of the most disadvantaged people.

This paper focuses on social justice in terms of culture and race. Tariq Modood (1999) maintains that inequality between cultures and races is a form of injustice. This injustice is manifested in many forms, including verbal abuse, discrimination and forced assimilation. Racial discrimination restrains people from achieving their full potential and creates a sense of alienation. It undermines respect that people have towards one another and thwarts political participation. To achieve cultural justice, everyone should be allowed to participate in every important activity and have a right to decide whether to retain their cultural identity or to assimilate to the mainstream culture. Iris Marion Young (1990) believes that, in order to create a fairer society, we need a cultural revolution which questions cultural hegemony, accepts the diversity of cultures and deconstructs negative stereotypes of people from different cultural backgrounds. Raising people’s awareness, and recognizing the suffering of people from minority groups in a discriminatory society, are ways to achieve cultural justice. In this paper, racial and cultural justice means a condition in which one is free from cultural and racial discrimination, and when one gains equal rights and opportunities regardless of one’s religion or cultural heritage.

This paper studies the issues of racial and cultural justice represented in Venit Vanit, a Thai translation of William Shakespeare’s The Merchant of Venice and, by using Thailand as a case study. It suggests how academics and theatre practitioners should use Venit Vanit to promote racial and cultural justice in society. I review how Thai academics, educators and theatre practitioners usually interpret Venit Vanit and argue that most of the interpretations are within the framework of mainstream Thai ideology and, as a result, they often discriminate minority figures like Shylock. This paper then suggests ways that one can use Venit Vanit to promote cultural and racial justice.

The Merchant of Venice: An Anti-Semitic Play?

Before discussing the racial issues in Venit Vanit, it is useful to briefly explore what The Merchant of Venice has to offer concerning these issues. History brutally confirms the fact that The Merchant of Venice can be used to advocate antisemiticism.
In 1775, Georg Christoph, a German intellectual, came to London and attended a production of *The Merchant of Venice* in which Charles Macklin played Shylock as a cunning and malicious man. Christoph admits that “the sight of this Jew suffices to awaken at once, in the best regulated mind, all the prejudices of childhood against this people” (quoted in Shapiro, 2019, p. 89). Nazi Germany used productions of *The Merchant of Venice* to propagate the discriminatory idea that Jews are inhumane (Bonnell, 2008).

Nevertheless, there are also a number of critics and theatre practitioners who present Shylock positively. By about 1900, character studies started to portray Shylock as a tragic hero (Mahood, 2003). In the early twentieth century, as Westfall (2008, p. 134) maintains, sympathy for Shylock increased:

Directorial concepts that increase audience sympathy for Shylock seem to have increased markedly after the turn of the twentieth century, when public outcry against Jewish stereotyping began to emerge, and certainly after the Second World War, when the Holocaust forever changed the historicity of *The Merchant of Venice*. [...] Thereafter, every director who mounts Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* and every spectator who views it have to choose an interpretation that acknowledges power negotiations between dominant and subjugated populations.

One of the most influential Shylocks was presented by Henry Irving, a famous Victorian actor. Ellen Terry, who played Portia for Irving, writes that “Henry’s Shylock was quiet. [...] His Heroic saint was splendid” (1908, p. 179). William Winter (2000, pp. 124-126) describes Irving’s performance as follows:

In making his exit from the Court Shylock moved slowly and with difficulty, as if he had been stricken by fatal weakness and were opposing it by inveterate will. At the door he nearly fell, but at once recovered himself, and with a long, heavy sigh he disappeared. The spectacle was intensely pathetic, awakening that pity which naturally attends upon despoiled greatness of character and broken, ruined power.

Irving’s performance was very successful. He played this role 250 times until his retirement (Hughes, 1972). The last time that he played Shylock to Terry’s Portia was on 19 July 1902 at the Lyceum in London (Hartnoll, 1983).

One of the playgoers who witnessed that farewell performance was Vajiravudh, the future King Rama VI of Siam. According to Pin Malakula (1996), a former page to King Vajiravudh, the future King was in London and attended a production of *The Merchant of Venice* on 19 July 1902. That production must have made a good impression on the King since, in 1916, the King translated *The Merchant of Venice* and published it under the name *Venit Vanit*.

**Venit Vanit in the Time of King Vajiravudh**

The King gave a reason for translating *The Merchant of Venice* as follows:
Considering that Shakespeare’s plays have already been translated into most European languages, even in Japanese, I feel a bit ashamed for the fact that we have not yet had any translated texts (of Shakespeare’s works) in Thai. (Paradee Tungtang’s translation, 2011)

It is quite clear that the King did not do it merely to entertain himself. His writings often contain political agendas. Patama Chancharoensuk (2011) believes that translating Shakespeare was the King’s attempt to advocate his role as a ruler who civilizes the country and makes it equal to the West. Thep Boontanondha (2016) argues that, under the disguise of being fictional, the King often wrote plays to satirize and criticize people who were not on his side.

The Chinese living in Siam were a minority group that the King constantly criticized at the time before the publication of Venit Vanit, since some of them were advocating for republicanism (Saichon Sattayanurak, 2008). Moreover, the existence of a large number of Chinese people in Siam was in contradiction with the King’s imagination of the “Thai” nation, which consisted of people who came down from the same ancestors. The King’s imaginary “nation” was part of his project to have his subjects embrace the concept of “Thainess”.

In his pamphlet, The Jew of the Orient, Asvabhahu (the King’s penname) expresses his concerns about the Chinese in Siam by comparing them to Jewish people. For him, both Jews and Chinese were not trustworthy companions because they were too proud of their ancestors. Like Jews, the Chinese regarded people from different cultural and racial backgrounds as “uncivilized”. They would never be honest when dealing with “Thai” people (Asvabhahu, 1985).

It does not look like a coincidence that the first play of Shakespare that the King translated has a Jewish character who tries to harm people from the majority group. It also seems reasonable to assume that the Shylock that the King wants to present might be different from the one he saw on the stage in London. Although the King never performed Venit Vanit in his lifetime, the play and, undoubtedly, the King’s ideology have been widely passed on to the public, since Venit Vanit is part of the Thai curriculum in a compulsory reading list for Thai language and literature subjects.

**Venit Vanit as a Means to Discriminate Minority Group**

As mentioned, Venit Vanit was part of a project to construct “Thainess”. This ideology usually propagates a narrative that Thais are peaceful and independent. It is always non-Thais who create problems but, eventually, a virtuous, meritorious and merciful ruler emerges and Thai people live in unity and independence again (Thongchai Winichakul, 2003). This is the ideology that Thai education tirelessly indoctrinates its students. Thus, it is not surprising that Thai people often read Venit Vanit as a play about the mercy of people in power and the untrustworthiness of a person from the minority group. For example, Nawaporn Rungsakul (2017) says that, after reading Venit Vanit as a young student, she was impressed by Portia’s cleverness and appalled by the “Jewness” of a loan shark like Shylock. Nawaporn wrongly uses the word “Jew” to describe a character’s personality. Another example can be found in Yuporn Sangtaksin’s discussion on the lessons in Venit Vanit. According to Yuporn (2005), the play teaches us that adhering to one’s race and religion too firmly is a
factor which might disturb social harmony. Since Christian characters insult Jews too severely, they are in constant conflict. Hence, the lesson to be learnt is that we should not insult other people too severely because they will seek revenge. It is noteworthy that the critic clearly takes the side of the “we” who insults “other” people. She seems to suggest that insulting Jews can be acceptable if it does not cross the line and bring on revenge. Reading the play under the ideology that customarily labels “the other” as a threat can easily lead to racial bias.

A number of criticisms on *Venit Vanit* unwittingly reproduce the image of evil “others” and rightful “us”. As Yuporn (2005) maintains, the play ends as most Thais expect. In the end, the good man is rescued and emerges victorious and the bad man is defeated and punished. There is no doubt that the good man here means Antonio and the bad man is Shylock, whose unpleasant characteristics are highlighted by many critics. Nawaporn (2017) says that Shylock is wealthy but behaves as if he was penniless. He lives a frugal life. *Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan Rueang Venit Vanit* (Department of Curriculum and Instruction Development, 1984)\(^2\) [Handbook for Reading *Venit Vanit*], created for Thai students, describes Shylock as a greedy and stingy man who values money higher than anything.

These critics reproduce a greedy Shylock by ignoring information which does not fit with their perception. *Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan* (1984) condemns Shylock for valuing money over his own daughter, who takes his money and elopes with Lorenzo, her Christian lover. It is true that Shylock has said that he would see her dead rather than lose his money, but he says this terrible thing when he is “madly outragoues” [เหยียดหยาม] (2. 8. 91).\(^3\) It is not reasonable to take what a person, who is in a disturbed state of mind, says as an indubitable indication of that person’s true nature.

Shylock is often accused of being hateful. The synopsis provided in *Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan* (1984) says that Shylock hates Antonio because the latter is a free interest lender who ruins his business, and Antonio hates Shylock because he is a loan shark, an aspect of Shylock which is emphasized in the translated play. By merely stating that Shylock hates Antonio because Antonio always “insults and scolds him” [ตื่นตระหนกและลำบากเพราะได้รับความทูต] without giving any other details, the synopsis downplays the fact that what Antonio commits is actually a hate crime. Antonio repeatedly insults Shylock in public by calling him a dog, spitting on his beard and kicking him (1. 3. 43). Spitting on the beard is a serious insult for Jews since they consider growing a beard as a way to demonstrate their unique identity according to teaching in the Old Testament (Peterkin, 2001).

Another grave criticism against Shylock is that he is merciless. This is an accusation which Thai academics sometimes use to convince people not to sympathize with Shylock. *Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan* (1984, p. 11) states: “As Shylock shows no mercy [during the trial scene], we lose our sympathy for him. Hence, when Shylock is punished, we feel that such a heartless man deserves to be fully punished” [My
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1. After this, the handbook is refered to only by its title and publication year.
2. Vajiravudh, King of Siam. (2005). *Venit Vanit* [The Merchant of Venice]. Bangkok: Aksancharoenth. All subsequent quotations from or references to the translated play will be to this edition and will be referenced parenthetically.
In the same way, Yuporn (2005) insists that the reader’s sympathy for Shylock should not outweigh his hateful and cruel nature.

It is noticeable that critics, who insist that Shylock deserves the punishment, often refuse to discuss in detail what his punishment actually is. Yuporn (2005, p. 220) merely says that Shylock “loses everything except his life” [สูญเสียทุกสิ่งทุกอย่างยกเว้นชีวิต]. Even though Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan (1984) mentions the fact that Shylock is forced to convert to Christianity, some details of this punishment are inaccurate. Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan states that Shylock consents to convert so the Duke would not confiscate half of his property. In fact, Shylock consents not to save his property but to save his life, since the Duke declares that if he does not, he would be executed.

When Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan (1984, p. 13) writes that, in the end of the play, “eventually everyone is happy” [ในที่สุดทุกคนก็มีความสุข], “everyone” here excludes not only Shylock, who leaves the stage defeated and sick at heart, but also, perhaps, Jessica, Shylock’s daughter. Jessica expresses her anguish while living with Shylock as follows:

I am deeply ashamed
To be a daughter of his, what a shame!
Although I am a daughter of his blood,
My heart is unlike his.
Lorenzo, my beloved,
If your love is true,
My fate would change
Since I will become a Christian.

[My translation]

Jessica obviously does not want to be a Jew and tries to lose that identity by conversion. However, losing one’s identity is not as easy as changing clothes. After her conversion, Gratiano still calls her “the Jewess” [นางยิว] (3. 2. 127). Launcelot also insists that although she is married to a Christian, she still has to “go to Hell” [ตกนรก] if her father is a Jew (3. 5. 145). For the Christian characters, Jessica is always an outsider. In a society which does not value multiculturalism, the members of minority groups, whether they are rebellious like Shylock or compliant like Jessica, suffer from injustice, and a criticism on Venit Vanit which does not recognize this fact regrettably fails to redress that injustice.

**Productions of Venit Vanit in Thailand Today**

Michael Radford’s film in 2004 was one of the most well-known and far-reaching productions of Shakespeare’s *The Merchant of Venice* in the early 21st century. In this film, Christians were clearly unjust. The first scene showed a large group of Christians breaking into Jewish houses, destroying their property and hurting the residents. Al Pacino’s Shylock was portrayed as a dignified, much wronged, old man. The image of him crying his heart out and holding a necklace in the form of a sanctuary lamp, when being forced to convert to Christianity, was unequivocal in its
condemnation of anti-Semitism. This interpretation was in line with John Sichel’s *The Merchant of Venice* (1970) in which the trial scene ended with a pitiful howl of Laurence Olivier’s Shylock which moved every Christian character. After the Second World War, people in the West became noticeably more sensitive to the injustice that Jews suffered in the long and difficult history of their religion.

Unfortunately, mainstream media in Thailand are less sensitive to racial and religious conflicts in *Venit Vanit*. In 2006, only two years after Radford’s heart-mov ing film, Broadcast Thai Television presented the trial scene of *Venit Vanit* as a play within a play in *Jan Aey Jan Jao*, a Thai drama series. In this series, *Venit Vanit* was presented as a didactic play. Worathep, Jan Jao’s grandfather, told her that the play shows the danger of being vengeful and how vengeful people like Shylock are inevitably punished. As the story was taken out of context, the series unintentionally created the image of Shylock as “the other” who is unreasonably evil.

The status of Shylock as “the other” was emphasized again when Jan Jao and her schoolmates performed the trial scene in a school production. Without a proper introduction to the racial intension and discrimination against Jews, Shylock became a blood-thirsty monster and the punishment that he suffered was justified. The reactions of actors, who acted as spectators in the school production, indicated that they took Portia’s side. They applauded when Jan Jao’s Portia delivered the famous “mercy speech”, and did that again to show their approval when Shylock was defeated and went to his knees. These reactions might have had an impact on the audiences at home and persuaded them to identify with the Christian characters and condemn Shylock.

Stage productions in Thailand also often ignore the issues of racial conflicts and discrimination in *Venit Vanit*. In 2015, students at the College of Dramatic Arts, Bunditpatanasilpa Institute, performed the trial scene. Before the performance, a summary of the story was narrated through audio. This narration emphasized Shylock’s hateful nature and cruelty without explaining that he hates Antonio because the racist Antonio often abuses him verbally and physically.

This summary would have made spectators take the Christians’ side. In this production, the “otherness” of Shylock was emphasized through his costumes and gestures. Shylock was a hunch-backed, strange man who wore a blond wig and a witch-like nose. He was an alien to other characters and the spectators. During the performance, he usually stood apart from the other characters. This characterization is traditional in Thailand:

The role of Shylock in particular, when performed by a Thai actor trained in the dance drama tradition, becomes something very different from the original script. The Thai interpretation of the role of Shylock originated when the play was performed in the early twentieth century by court dance dramatists. There is a story that circulated within a circle of traditional dance dramatists that the role of the Thai Shylock was firstly performed by a local dance drama master who based the character of Shylock on the famous character of Jujaka, a greedy old Brahmin beggar from *Vessantara Jataka* – the story of Buddha’s past life (which is very well-known to most Buddhist Thai audiences). Shakespeare’s Shylock who was a rich but mean Jewish moneylender, therefore became a guileful, ill-mannered and disgusting villain. When
performed by a student from the Thai Dance Academy by getting into the habit of scratching his body (his bottom, his neck, his head, etc.) while conversing with other characters, to give an impression to the audiences that he was a discourteous, filthy old man. (Tunthang, 2011, pp. xxvi-xxvii)

In this case, the localization of Shakespeare is problematic. The identification of Shylock to Jujaka makes it difficult to deconstruct the stereotype of Jews as greedy people, and to portray Shylock as a man with dignity as Irving did.

The audiences who attended the College of Dramatic Arts’ production unsurprisingly took the Christians’ side against the Jujaka-like Shylock. The spectators laughed when Gratiano mocked Shylock, when it was clear that the law was not on the Jew’s side. Laughter could still be heard even for a harsh and offensive statement like Gratiano’s “You, pagan, your time is up” [ขย่มจัญถิภูมิ มึงถึงทั้งที่].

Shylock was also portrayed as a villain in a production of Venit Vanit by the Phaya Thai Palace Preservation Foundation and Women’s Professional Association at the Phaya Thai Palace, Bangkok, in 27 February 2016. In this production, Shylock entered the stage with an ominous sound effect usually used in Thailand to signal the approach of evil beings. His entry changed the blue background into a red one, signifying blood, violence and danger. He dressed and walked like a villain. These elements were enough to confirm to the audiences that this being was an alien who could not be trusted. As a result, for the audiences, it might have seemed justifiable that, after being forced to converse, every character yelled at the alien and forced him to leave the stage. In this performance, racial discrimination was hardly questioned.

**Venit Vanit as a Force for Racial and Cultural Justice**

Reading Venit Vanit through the ideology which harbours suspicions of “the other” often leads to the reproduction of the evil “other” and the virtuous “us”. Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan (1984, p. 22) maintains that Portia and Shylock are totally different and their differences highlight each other “like a white spot in a black cloth” [ดุจเดียวกับสีขาวเด่นอยู่บนพื้นดำฉะนั้น]. This perception produces a biased reading which, by ignoring information which does not fit with the reading framework, idealizes the virtuous “us” and justifies an aggressive act against that evil “other”. To create social justice, it is necessary to deconstruct this binary opposition and recognizes that, in fact, “we” and the “other” are not that different.

There are many pieces of information in Venit Vanit which support this approach. Shylock is often accused of being mercenary like Jews allegedly are. Nevertheless, in this play, Christians are also apparently mercenary. Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan (1984) justifies Bassanio’s motivation for going to Belmont as an act of love. In fact, Bassanio never says that he loves Portia. On the contrary, he accepts quite bluntly that he wants to marry Portia because she has “a large heritage” [มรดกมากมวลสิน] (1. 1. 23) which is enough to pay his debts. It is not easy to judge, between a man who makes a living by taking interest from loans and a man who marries in order to get rich, who is more mercenary.
A number of Thai critics condemn Shylock as a vengeful and merciless man when he refuses to drop his case against Antonio, but characterize Gratiano, who threatens to hang and behead Shylock in the trial scene, as merely a “funny” [ตลก] man (Yuporn, 2005, p. 224). It is not hard to imagine that if Gratiano was Shylock and had a chance to take a revenge, he would do exactly what Shylock does. Moreover, to take Gratiano’s verbal abuses as only “funny” jokes might mislead the readers into thinking that it is acceptable to use dehumanizing language, such as “you, dog” and “you, Jewish devil”, against a person from a different culture.

A dividing line between merciful Christians and heartless Jews becomes blurry when one thinks of Shylock’s accusation in the trial scene:

Your Grace, please listen.  
These men own slaves  
That they buy from the market, and shave their heads,  
Use as dogs or mules,  
Without any shed of mercy  
As these slaves have prices.  

[My translation, 4. 1. 157]

The will to sacrifice mercy for economic interests is certainly present in every human being, regardless of his or her race.

To regard Portia as an impeccably virtuous lady is an exaggeration. If one condemns Shylock of being too proud of his race, one also needs to condemn Portia. This is her response to the news of the Prince of Morocco who comes to attend the three casket ceremony in which the person who chooses the right casket will get Portia as his wife: “Even if he is a saintly man but has this mean complexion of the devil, I would rather he gives his blessing and makes me a nun than to marry him” [ถ้าเขามีคุณสมบัติเป็นสัตบุรุษนักบุญ แต่ผิวพรรณทารุณเหมือนหน้าผี ฉันก็เห็นจะต้องการให้เขาให้ศีลให้ฉันบวชดีกว่าที่จะเป็นภรรยา] (2. 2. 33). After the Prince has chosen a wrong casket, Portia says the following statement in relief: “If people of this kind come again, I wish them to choose the same” [คนพวกนี้มาอีกครั้งก็ ขอให้ได้เลือกสรรเช่นวันนี้] (2.7.89). She is undeniably racist.

Furthermore, as Portia is the one who delivers the “mercy speech”, Nang Sue An Kawi Niphan (1984) claims that she is merciful and, in the trial scene, tries her best to persuade Shylock to show mercy. Nawaporn (2017) states that she learnt at a very young age from Portia about a sense of justice and a due respect to law. However, the law that Portia practices is blatantly unjust and discriminatory against Jews. Moreover, it is interesting that, before delivering the “mercy speech”, she assures Shylock that his case is lawful and Antonio is in a disadvantageous situation (4. 1. 163). After this, she reassures him again that if he presses his case, Antonio will inevitably lose (4. 1. 166). This assurance naturally encourages Shylock to press his case because he believes he is going to win. Thus, it is reasonable to regard her speech as a trap. Portia knows perfectly well that, no matter what Shylock decides, he would not get it his way. What she does in the trial scene is far from being merciful, just and
honest. The play shows that the Jew and Christians do what they do not because they have ‘inherent’ nature which sets them apart from other people. The examples above demonstrate that when difficult situations arise, people, no matter what their races are, can do terrible things. All of them can be mercenary, deceitful and unforgiving.

When one emphasizes this message, Venit Vanit can be a means to advocate a perception which is helpful in making people from different races or cultures live with dignity and in harmony. People sometimes act and see things differently from what we do because of their particular socially constructed experiences. When society changes, these shared experiences change as well. The potential of using Venit Vanit to change people’s attitudes towards “the other” was well illustrated in the production of this play by the students of the College of Dramatic Arts. As mentioned above, the synopsis provided before the performance was unfair for Shylock and, at the beginning, the spectators evidently took the Christians’ side. However, their feelings seemed to change when Shylock was really in trouble and everyone else seemed to enjoy his pain. The audiences’ laughter was perceptibly quieter when Gratiano’s threat sounded more and more serious. And they went into complete silence when Gratiano called for an executioner to hang “this damned” [้ฮ็ฉัฟ科幻]. This production ended with an image of a heart-broken old man collapsing at the center of the stage, being surrounded by hostile, powerful Christians who were supposed to be impartial law enforcers. It is impossible to know whether this pitiful image was enough to make the spectators redress their prejudice against “the other”, but it evidently moved their sympathy. I agree with Pachee Yuvajita (2009) who believes that the trial scene often makes the readers/spectators sympathize with the loser and this feeling is a first step in creating a compassionate society.

To achieve cultural and racial justice, we need to encourage a reading and performance of Venit Vanit which values the complexity of human beings and appreciate the seriousness of racial discrimination. We need to acknowledge the “evil” in us and understand “the others” and the situations that they are facing. It is only when we have real social justice that people from different backgrounds can find a peaceful solution of any conflicts they might have. Unlike the characters in this play, we know that we need a change.
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