

may indeed be suggested that his second chapter on the coconut oil trade undermines his case. Bob Currie of Maiana conducted schools before the missionaries arrived. Robert Waters of Vaitupu tried to persuade the Vaitupu people to give up toddy and accept the Gospel. George Durant and in particular Richard Randall were not very different from many of their predecessors, as Mr Maude says, devout and temperate, though polygamous in the local fashion. Randall he thinks probably did more for the ultimate benefit of the Gilbertese than anyone else before or since — even the missionaries, or Grimble or Maude.

Two other chapters deserve brief mention. One is a bit of ethnohistory on the Rarotongan sandalwood trade in which Mr Maude and his collaborator, Mrs Crocombe, show how closely oral tradition can correspond with the European account of an early contact. Chapter VIII is an essay in 'participant history' in which the author describes in endearingly modest terms his part in the resettlement of overcrowded Gilbertese in the Phoenix Islands in 1937-9. As an ex-colonial official responsible for a number of similar ventures he is dubious about their chances of success unless certain criteria are satisfied. He is moreover inclined to think that such schemes can prove only temporary palliatives and that the final answer will probably lie in drastic population control.

All in all, this is a fascinating but frustrating work. Much of it is Pacific history of a kind which should be recorded. But it is preoccupied with *papalangi*, foreigners, who have passed through or lived in the Pacific and so influenced it. These essays as a whole then are thoroughly Eurocentric. Even in the last two chapters Europeans still break through, as if they were utterly essential in the process of change. Mr Maude thus writes of the 'discovery' of endless islands, every one of which was originally discovered and settled by Polynesians or Micronesians. He writes with equal authority of European settlers, whether mutineers, or beachcombers, and ascribes to them an overwhelming importance. The Polynesian has apparently no independent history. His kings are European puppets, kept in place by foreign weapons. Even his religion is a sort of hand-me-down. In short, a Pacific Islander reading this book may well be reduced to despair. And this is a pity for Mr Maude is perhaps better qualified than anyone to write a genuine Pacific history, as his recent essay on the Gilbertese *boti* — not printed here — shows. That history is still quite accessible though time is rapidly running out, and it is of intense interest to the modern Polynesian. What is needed is really only a change of preoccupation, which we must surely look for in Mr Maude's new book on the Gilbertese.

University of Otago

G. S. PARSONSON

*Philippine Nationalism: External Challenge and Filipino Response, 1565-1946.* By Usha Mahajani. University of Queensland Press, St. Lucia, 1971. xv, 530 pp. Price not given.

DR MAHAJANI'S previous book was the well-known *The Role of Indian Minorities in Burma and Malaya* (Bombay, 1960). Her interest in Philippine nationalism arose during a visit of 1963, designed to study U.S. aid programmes (p. vii). 'My observations of the resurgence of Filipino anti-

colonial nationalism led me to make historical explorations of the roots of Philippine nationalism to the Spanish period and beyond . . .' (p. viii). In the present book, the result of these explorations, she rather surprisingly does not cover the period since the granting of independence in 1946, nor, therefore, the neo-nationalism of the 1960s. But she does attempt to contribute to an understanding of them. The conclusion she derives from a survey of Philippine nationalism since the arrival of the Spaniards in the sixteenth century is that in relation to the colonial powers it was of an 'overall collaborationist nature' (p. 491). She contrasts it with that of other Asian countries, where 'at their point of maturity, nationalist movements . . . hit at the very centre of the colonial authorities; whether their agents or agencies were good or bad was immaterial in the basic thesis that no alien people has a right to establish authority over another people . . .' (p. 491). The 'Filipino intellectuals of the 1960s' caustically condemned their forefathers for their attitude. Perhaps it is not quite unfair to suggest that Dr Mahajani's argument is that there was a spirit of 'self-flagellation' abroad in the 1960s because there had been no 'Quit Philippines' movement earlier. No doubt this argument has an element of truth. Yet it rather indicates that Dr Mahajani tends to accept Filipino neo-nationalism at its face-value, if not more. Her analysis seems to lack depth. In particular she neglects the social context of the nationalist movement to an extent that impairs our understanding of it and may be thought to damage her thesis or require its qualification.

In the section of the book devoted to the advent of the Spaniards, Dr Mahajani probably antedates Philippine nationalism. Magellan has been hailed as a Spanish hero; Lapu Lapu as Philippine hero; and, she adds, 'they were' (p. 16). The remark is somewhat qualified in the succeeding paragraph. Yet it seems clear that Dr Mahajani is going beyond a statement that later nationalists adopted Lapu Lapu as a Philippine hero. Nor does she quite dismiss the idea that the Tondo plot of 1588 might be called the 'first Katipunan' (p. 24). The agrarian revolts of the eighteenth century she sees as 'nationalist' (p. 26). Yet she has to witness to the division of the archipelago. The Moro resistance, she says, 'cannot be called a part of the Filipino nationalist response to alien rule', and so she excludes the Moro wars from her book (p. 25n). But for Filipino revolts, suppressed by the Spaniards with the aid of other Filipinos, she introduces a category of 'divided nationalism' (p. 34). The word 'Filipino' is used rather than the word 'native' or 'indio', in relation to a period even before 'nationalist feelings were fully developed' (p. 15n). That, perhaps, is hard to avoid. But in the context it confirms the view that Dr Mahajani is too ready to read back into the past evidence of Filipino nationalism, and even to strain her interpretation in so doing. Filipino nationalism began early compared with other Asian nationalisms: but it should be seen surely as a nineteenth-century development. Dr Mahajani writes, too, of national character. A welcome to the Spaniards stems 'from a Filipino's innate friendship for, and trust in, a foreigner' (p. 21). Surely this is an argument in a circle: in a sense, once it has been admitted, the rest of this interpretative history becomes superfluous.

In this history, there is perhaps a more serious defect, however. No doubt Dr Mahajani wishes to confine her study to political events. Yet she has

gone too far towards excluding social analysis for her political analysis entirely to succeed. Very little is said of the regional differences among the Filipinos, though some Americans were prepared to regard the movement even of the 1890s as a Tagalog revolt. Nor is much made of ethnic differences. Dr Mahajani talks of three communities, 'Filipinos, Mestizos, and Creoles' (p. 51), without apparently recognising the important role in Filipino nationalism played by the hispanised Chinese-indio mestizo elite created during the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (cf. p. 37). Nor is there much discussion of the social divisions of the Filipinos. Dr Mahajani talks, Agoncillo-style, of 'the masses' (pp. 50, 61). But there is little attempt to analyse their role or the changes through which it passed. The Sakdal movement of the 1930s appears as 'the last flicker of militant nationalism fanned by agrarian unrest' (p. 324). It does not appear, though one could argue that it should, as a protest against landlordism and the prospect of indefinite oligarchical rule under a pseudo-independent Commonwealth government. Little attention is given to the ambivalence of the nationalist leaders over landlordism: the Filipinos, we are told, 'shared a distrust of foreign capital and abhorrence of concentration of land in a few hands' (p. 317). The Huks are 'primarily a nationalist and patriotic body' (p. 460). Though there are references to 'agrarian discontent' (e.g. p. 459), there is no real attempt to discuss its social origins. It is not surprising that Taft's unwillingness to hand over the Philippines to the Filipinos is not explained as unwillingness to hand over to an oligarchy (pp. 242-3), though Stimson's similar view is mentioned subsequently. These omissions may weaken Dr Mahajani's thesis. Indeed the conciliatory tone of Filipino nationalism may arise much more clearly from the nature and social background of its leadership than from the national character of the Filipinos or the traditions established in the early Spanish period. Even the neo-nationalism of more recent times needs to be subjected to closer analysis. To some extent it may be seen as the result of the characteristic failure of the independent regime to bring about major social change in the Philippines. Yet it diverts attention from such social change rather than focuses upon it. It is in fact, in its Rectista spirit, an old-fashioned sort of nationalism.

The book is marred by a number of minor errors, such as 'Villabose' (p. 18) for Villalobos, and some misspellings, such as 'ilustrado' for *ilustrado* (and is it proper to describe the *ilustrados* as 'the rich aristocrats' as on p. 61?). There are more misprints than is expected of a university press (*Pansy* for *Panay* in p. 68, the curious dates on pp. 124 and 252, 'Cararte' for Cavite on p. 190). Dr Mahajani has missed a few printed materials, such as Dr Wickberg's *The Chinese in Philippine Life* (Yale U.P., 1965); and there are some theses she could perhaps have used, such as R. M. Stubbs, 'Philippine Radicalism: the Central Luzon Uprisings, 1925-1935', a Berkeley Ph.D. of 1951. But one does not put the book down without recognising that she has made a brave onslaught on a subject that repays study, nor without savouring her real insight into, say, the objectives of Mabini or the relationships between Quezon and Wood. The student of Southeast Asia will want the book in his library.

NICHOLAS TARLING