

## Book Reviews

### Asia

*The disappearing 'Asian' city: Protecting Asia's urban heritage in a globalizing world.*

Edited by WILLIAM S. LOGAN.

Hong Kong: Oxford University Press, 2002. Pp. xxi, 285. Figures, Tables, Notes, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405180187

This volume contains 13 essays written by 20 academics and conservationists and dealing with eight cities in Southeast Asia (Manila, Phnom Penh, Vientiane, Semarang, Yangon, Hanoi, George Town and Bangkok); four in East Asia (Shanghai, Hong Kong, Seoul and Nagasaki); and one in South Asia (Calcutta). The essays are divided into three parts, each prefaced by the editor and framed by his Introduction, which outlines a number of issues underlying the philosophy and practice of urban conservation *vis-à-vis* globalizing and localizing trends, and Conclusion (co-written with Renate Howe), which advocates the consultation and involvement of local communities, rather than the top-down application of Western concepts of conservation, as the key strategy to preserve the unique character of Asia's urban space.

The issue central to most of the case studies is the appreciation of the colonial built heritage as integral to the meaning of a considerable part of the Asian cityscape, historically as well as spatially and architecturally. Underlying this issue are two main dimensions: one, of a pragmatic nature, is the necessity of devising conservation policies that – especially in ex-colonial cities which have become national capitals – will not be an impediment to their development into modern political, administrative and financial centres. The other dimension, of an ideological nature, is the emphasis that conservation agendas place on sites and buildings as embodiments of the 'national', as opposed to the 'colonial', heritage. In fact, the two questions are intertwined, since it is through the implementation of particular conservation policies that certain elements of the historic urban fabric are transformed into 'sites of memory' (to use Pierre Nora's famous phrase) while others are sacrificed in the name of modernisation.

The essays in Part I 'deal with cities where the responsible authorities have opted to develop and implement policies that actively reinforce the trend towards economic globalization' (p. 1). The four case-studies consider the attempt to revitalise Manila's Intramuros (the sixteenth-century Spanish fortified town), which after becoming depopulated in the early 1900s and suffering extensive American bombing during World War Two, degenerated into a shanty town; the creation of 'historical protection zones' in Shanghai (including the Bund along the Huangpu riverfront and the Western concessions district) amidst the massive urban development of the 1990s; the efforts to conserve Phnom Penh's French buildings *vis-à-vis* the modernising push and the emphasis placed on the Khmer heritage as the source of national identity; and the similar tension between urban development and conservation in Vientiane, which the Lao authorities want to

transform into a modern capital city, restricting the role of national heritage landmark to Luang Prabang (a UNESCO World Heritage site).

The essays in Part II explore 'the reactions which Asian societies have had to the colonial impact on their urban environments' (p. 72). This reaction to the colonial heritage is examined in four different contexts. In Seoul, architecture from the period of Japanese occupation in the 1920s–30s is rigorously excluded, if not actively removed (as with the demolition in 1995 of the National Museum building, originally the Japanese government headquarters), from definitions of the city's heritage. In Nagasaki, by contrast, several seventeenth- to nineteenth-century European buildings (including several churches) have been admirably preserved. Calcutta (now Kolkata), saw its architectural heritage as the capital of the British Raj largely dissipate in the post-independence period, but it has recently become the focus of renewed interest among city-dwellers and municipal authorities. In Semarang (Java), Dutch architecture has been preserved amidst the shifting ideological drives of the post-colonial era, leaving open, however, the question of whether such heritage can play a role in recovering the city's 'autonomous history' rather than fitting within larger narratives of the nation.

Finally, the essays in Part III are concerned with cities 'united by the fact that official policies at national and municipal level stress the importance of the local culture and cultural heritage' (p. 143). In Yangon, the conservation of religious structures is dutifully undertaken by an authoritarian government bent on buttressing its power. In Hanoi, the new middle class created by the 1980s economic liberalisation is challenging both the state and private developers on issues of heritage and environmental conservation, though also pursuing its own exclusive interests. Hong Kong, since the resumption of Chinese control in 1997, has witnessed an increase in both the adaptive re-use of historic architecture and the re-creation of historic sites for governmental and commercial uses, but also growing public monitoring and censoring of such initiatives. In George Town (Malaysia), the economic, industrial and urban policies implemented by the federal government, the Penang state and the municipal council have generated a community response which aims at preserving the town's historic as well as social fabric by halting gentrification and invasive tourism developments. Bangkok has witnessed the emergence since the early 1990s of a dialectic between the metropolitan administration and an increasing number of civic associations, which conceive the city's heritage in more inclusive terms than just as royal and Buddhist buildings.

While an alternative organisation of the case studies could have also been possible (grouping together the megalopolises, the somewhat smaller cities and the socialist countries' capitals, so as to highlight common urban conditions faced by conservation projects) and more South Asian cities included (Colombo, to mention just one), this is an important work and W. S. Logan is to be commended for bringing it to fruition. This is not a book interested in theorising, unlike many recent publications on the built heritage and urban space. Its strength lies in the examination of the technical, bureaucratic and legislative issues behind actual conservation policies – though such issues are, in fact, eminently 'political', too. The contributions are uniformly good: all are based on extensive field research; contain valuable data on individual sites, conservation policies, and the actors involved in it; and are abundantly furnished with photographs, maps and statistical tables. This book is necessary reading for both academics and practitioners in the field of heritage studies and conservation, providing them with a range of experiences on which policies elsewhere could (or should not) be based. At the same time, the

case studies also provide material useful for conceptualising the relationship between the tangible heritage and social memory in contemporary Asia. It is thus to be hoped that the publisher will release a paperback edition soon so as to make the book available to a wider readership, particularly in those countries whose efforts in historic conservation it critically, though never unsympathetically, surveys.

MAURIZIO PELEGGI

*National University of Singapore*

*Sharing the blame: Subhas Chandra Bose and the Japanese Occupation of the Andamans 1942–45.*

By T. R. SAREEN.

Delhi: S. S. Publishers, 2002. Pp. xiv, 270. Illustrations, Appendices, Bibliography, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405190183

Senior Indian historian T. R. Sareen seeks in this volume to shed new light on the Japanese Occupation of the Andaman and Nicobar Islands, over which waved the flag of the Azad Hind provisional Indian government of Subhas Chandra Bose from December 1943. Sareen's sources include accounts by Indian participants, a Japanese-sponsored local newspaper and documents from Indian and British archives. Local Japanese records, he reports, were destroyed at the end of the war. The book's title reflects Sareen's argument that corrupt Indian police (who took vengeance on their enemies by accusing them of spying for the British) and the Allies (who cut supply routes to the islands and bombed them) were as much to blame as the Japanese for the wartime sufferings of the islanders. The subtitle has little relation to the contents of the book, as Bose briefly visited the islands only once and played a peripheral role in events there.

The British had long used the Andamans as a penal colony, and until 1937 the islands served as a 'Bastille' for troublesome Indian nationalists. Sareen criticizes the British failure to develop agriculture in the islands, contrasting this unfavourably with earnest, if less than successful, Japanese wartime efforts to attain food self-sufficiency. The book focuses almost entirely on the wartime activities of the Indian residents of the Andamans, as nothing specific is said about how the indigenous tribal peoples were treated by the Japanese. As most of the Indians were convicts, descendants of convicts or civil servants in British employ, Sareen, whose sympathies clearly lie with Bose, casts them in a rather negative light. He cites with apparent approval contemporary assessments that they tended to be untruthful, of less than sterling character, and devoid of nationalist sentiment.

Sareen divides the war years into three periods, the first running from the Japanese landing on 23 March 1942 to the end of the year. He emphasizes that the Occupation and its early programme of Japanization, overseen by a civilian governor, generated no overt opposition, but because the Indian residents were pro-British, efforts to promote the Indian Independence League (IIL) failed to inspire them. The blackest period stretched from the end of 1942 to early 1944, when a tough admiral controlled the administration. In the wake of well-targeted Allied bombing attacks, the Japanese pressured the Indian police they had inherited from the British to ferret out suspected spies. The Japanese and their Indian collaborators tortured scores of suspects and executed at least 43. Sareen

focuses particularly on the case of the first head of the local IIL chapter – Diwan Singh, a prominent doctor who died in police custody. Although others have portrayed Singh as a nationalist martyr, Sareen insists that he, too, was pro-British, though not necessarily guilty of the spying charges against him. A change for the better came, Sareen argues, when Bose's representative reached the islands in February 1944. While the Japanese retained actual control, the ability of the Azad Hind chief commissioner to intervene on behalf of local residents had a positive effect.

Although Sareen does not delve deeply into military issues, it seems that the only thing the Japanese gained from occupying the islands was denying them to the British. The 15,000 occupation troops had little impact on the war as they, like tens of thousands of their counterparts in the South Pacific, eventually were bypassed and stranded. Bose's representative left the island in July 1945 under circumstances not explained, allowing the Japanese free hand to exile several hundred undesirables to Havelock Island in early August 1945. Because most of them died, the incident became a focus of war crimes charges after the British re-occupied the islands in October 1945. Sareen dismisses all such post-war trials as 'victor's justice' tribunals aimed at vilifying Britain's defeated enemies.

Sareen has made a serious attempt to provide new information on a little-studied aspect of World War Two and does not shy away from controversial judgements, but his efforts are undermined by the failure of his publisher to engage a competent proofreader/editor. For example, early in the book the word 'penal' is repeatedly rendered as 'panel', grammatical errors abound, and page 204 offers this sentence: 'It was the outcome of the writings in the Nationalist press when it was given out that British had attached too much of importance to the people in the Andamans who gave the exaggerated stories of Japanese atrocities, but, when they met citizens who had not suffered at all during the Japanese occupation the, British forces had nodded suspiciously "filling them with disquiet and a sense of insecurity".' Its editorial deficiencies make the book so painful to read that only those deeply interested in the subject are likely to persevere in the task.

E. BRUCE REYNOLDS  
*San Jose State University*

Burma

*Birmanische handschriften. Vol. 5: Katalognummern 901–1015.*

Edited by HEINZ BECHER, compiled by ANNE PETERS.

Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2004. Pp. xxix, 159. doi:10.1017/S0022463405200188

It is welcome news that the project of cataloguing Burmese manuscripts in German collections is making good progress, with fresh volumes being published in relatively short sequence. Furthermore, speed apparently has not come at the cost of accuracy this time, since in contrast to the two preceding volumes, the number of obvious mistakes has markedly decreased.

The present volume, with which the description of manuscripts held by the Bayerische Staatsbibliothek in Munich is concluded, contains 115 manuscripts, about half of which are on palm leaf and 41 are black and white *parabaiks*; the others are written

on paper or cloth. As with the previous volumes, a good number of the palm-leaf manuscripts contain Buddhist texts and commentaries that are rarely known outside Burma. With regard to the descriptions, two innovations have to be noted, the first being the absence of longish quotations from the manuscripts, which means that the volume under review is considerably shorter than any of its predecessors. The second change may be regretted by scholars who are unfamiliar with the German language: the descriptions of the manuscripts and comments on them are now in German throughout, and not in English anymore.

As noted, this volume contains substantially fewer mistakes than its predecessors; my perusal in fact yielded only one case that deserves mention here: In the index of the book, the town spelt 'Pakhan-gyi' is identified as the former Burmese capital Pagan (or Bagan nowadays). However, Pagan in Burmese is always spelt 'Pukam' (i.e., with 'k' and never 'kh'), whereas the manuscripts all have Pakhan-gyi (*Pu-khan:-krī:*), so the toponym in question must be identified as the small town on the west side of the Irawadi just north of Pakkoku, which was an important religious centre beginning in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries.

As I am mentioned by name in the introduction to the present volume, a brief personal response seems justified for a conclusion. Firstly, my criticism of the two previous volumes ('inexplicable mistakes') cannot be attributed to any of the various transliteration systems, but referred to misspellings and misreadings which rendered numerous Burmese passages actually meaningless. Secondly, the reviews in question were published, like the present one, in the *Journal of Southeast Asian Studies* and not in the (Tokyo-based) journal *Southeast Asian Studies*.

TILMAN FRASCH

*National University of Singapore*

Indonesia

*Golddiggers, farmers, and traders in the 'Chinese Districts' of West Kalimantan, Indonesia.*

By MARY SOMERS HEIDHUES.

Ithaca: Cornell Southeast Asia Program, 2003. Pp. 309. Maps, Plates, Notes, Bibliography, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405210184

Since the completion of her Cornell dissertation entitled 'Peranakan Chinese Politics in Indonesia' in 1965, Mary Somers Heidhues has continuously published a number of well-documented works about Chinese communities in different parts of the archipelago, contributing admirably to a multifaceted understanding of their social and economic histories. The book under review can be seen as a sequence to her *Bangka tin and Mentok pepper: Chinese settlement on an Indonesian island* (Singapore: Institute of Southeast Asian Studies, 1992) in that it also focuses on the 'unwritten story' of the rural and mining Chinese population on the periphery of Indonesia from a historical perspective, with an aim of challenging the 'prevalent image of Chinese as economically successful businessmen' (p. 11).

*Goldiggers, farmers, and traders* is mainly concerned with three main themes in the history of the Chinese in West Kalimantan from the eighteenth to the end of the twentieth centuries: their changing relationship with Malays and Dayaks (the other two major ethnic communities in the territory) as well as the Dutch colonial regime and the Indonesian state; the role of strong social and cultural institutions in sustaining Chineseness and helping the Chinese tackle external threats; and their transnational linkages with the ancestral homeland and counterparts elsewhere, such as Singapore and Sarawak. The first chapter establishes the setting, highlighting the external environments and demography of the Chinese in West Kalimantan, who were composed of gold miners, farmers or petty traders, and craftsmen and laborers; the majority of them have been Hakkas who 'are defined by their language, but also by their apparent hardiness, clannishness, and willingness to take on back-breaking tasks in mining or agriculture' (p. 37).

The second and third chapters concentrate on Chinese gold mining, Chinese socio-political organizations, and the relationship with the Dutch. After 1740, the Malay rulers imported large numbers of Chinese labourers to mine gold and *kongsis* (syndicates) emerged as the most important Chinese institution prior to the mid-nineteenth century, incorporating elements of commercial, social and religious entities to control and govern sizable territories. As the only 'state' on the West Coast of Borneo, the major Chinese *kongsi* federation wielded considerable powers in the region's political and socio-economic life. Inevitably, *kongsis* posed a major challenge to the Dutch in their attempt to establish and consolidate their foothold in the territory after the early nineteenth century. It was only through three periods of the so-called 'Kongsi Wars' (1822–24, 1850–54, and 1884–85) that the Dutch colonial state was able to finally defeat its true rivals.

The subsequent two chapters analyse the demographic/economic changes and political activities of the Chinese communities between 1860 and 1940. Heidhues contends that the Chinese occupied a 'key position' in the modern export-oriented economy, which was, and has been, 'predominantly agricultural and extractive, dependent on the export of raw materials' (p. 128). With the end of the *kongsi* era, the Hakkas moved to the interior and many were transformed from gold miners to settlers and traders. This not only brought them into direct (some times hostile, sometimes harmonious) contacts with the Dayaks, but also reinforced the critical role of the British colony of Singapore as the focus of West Borneo's export and import trade. On the other hand, the Dutch strengthened their control over the Chinese population by employing Chinese officers as intermediaries, and implemented the policy of 'tax[ing] the Chinese as much as possible in order to meet the administrative costs'; taxes thus became 'the nexus of Dutch–Chinese relations' (p. 174).

Heidhues then examines closely the role of Chinese schools, associations and temples in giving form to the community, arguing that it was these institutions that 'most effectively governed and unified the Chinese communities in West Borneo'. She suggests that Chinese cultural development was related to 'the centrifugality of the residency's economy. Batavia was distant, and for Chinese traders in West Borneo, irrelevant. Their ties were with Singapore, where Chinese was the first language and English the second, and with China' (p. 189).

Following the chapter detailing the impact of the Japanese Occupation and the Indonesian Revolution upon the Chinese community, Heidhues discusses its changing fate at the time of emerging nationalism and the ascending nation-state during the Sukarno and Suharto eras. Here the trajectory of the Chinese in West Kalimantan appeared to be in tandem with their counterparts in other regions of the country where the policies of forced assimilation led to the closure of almost all Chinese schools and other institutions and the banning of Chinese in rural retail trade following a 1959 Presidential Decree. While the percentage of Chinese speaking Indonesians and those who obtained Indonesian citizenship increased significantly, their Chineseness persisted, thanks in part to the strong economic and cultural linkages with the Chinese communities elsewhere.

Heidhues concludes that throughout much of the past two-and-a-half centuries, 'the Chinese minority in West Kalimantan have remained a distinctive group, both within Kalimantan and in comparison with other Chinese minorities'. Attributing the preservation of the ethnic and cultural identities to community organisations in the social, religious, economic and political fields, she argues that 'spatial isolation and economic specialization are probably more important than "Hakka culture" itself in explaining the tendency of West Kalimantan's Chinese to retain their ancestral culture' (pp. 264–5). In the meantime, they have developed an Indonesian national consciousness and 'are Indonesians and see themselves as such, although they are Chinese, too'. At the turn of the twenty-first century, 'they hope to work for their own interests within the Indonesian framework, as do other Indonesians. An elaboration of Chinese community organization would not alienate them from this framework' (p. 270).

Heidhues has given compelling answers to the three central themes raised in the introduction, and this study will be valuable for those interested in the history of Chinese Indonesians and their multilayered interactions with other socio-political players in both the national and transnational frameworks. This book is meticulously documented, relying on Dutch and Indonesian archival materials, accounts by Western visitors, some Chinese secondary sources and interviews. However, in view of the centrality of institutions in the history of the Chinese communities and for the book's key arguments, if the author had included some primary sources from the perspectives of these institutions (such as publications of Chinese schools and associations), her interpretations about the preservation of Chineseness and the changing strategies would have been more convincing.

HONG LIU

*National University of Singapore*

*Islamic nationhood and colonial Indonesia: The umma below the winds.*

By MICHAEL FRANCIS LAFFAN.

London: RoutledgeCurzon, 2003. Pp. Xvi, 294. Plates, Notes, Bibliography, Index.

doi:10.1017/S0022463405220180

This work represents the author's revised doctoral dissertation, taken at the University of Sydney. It evaluates the place of Islam in early Indonesian nationalism, and challenges certain dogmas, especially those which ignore or downplay the role of

Islam and 'transmission of Islamic ideas of nationhood' (p. 6). Michael Laffan initially addresses the Islamisation of Southeast Asia, leading up to the period in focus: the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. He observes that 'in the mid-nineteenth century, there was no clear Jawi [an Arabic term for people from the Malay world] nation but rather an ecumene joined by a common faith and its scholarly networks' (p. 27). He then introduces the Arab world, the other region in focus, by considering the role of the Hajj in reinforcing 'Islamic and Jawi fellowship' (p. 33). Dutch reactions to the Hajj from Indonesia evolved from initial complacency to clear concern, in the context of the evolving quagmire in Aceh after 1870 and increasing Dutch perceptions of Islam as a threat to their rule. For the remainder of the study, the author moves back and forth between the Arab world and Islamic Southeast Asia.

Laffan traces an evolving society in Indonesia under Dutch colonial control. Attention is devoted to the 'collaborating' class among the Indonesian population and Dutch attempts to co-opt Islam. Key figures are considered, including K. F. Holle, a less-known Dutch specialist on Islam, as well as leading Indonesian 'informants' such as Hasan Moestapa. There are also important perspectives on Said Oesman and the Hadramis. The author also considers the important role played by periodicals in stimulating the emerging sense of national and Islamic identity in Indonesia. These include *Bintang Hindia*, *Wazir Indie* (the first paper in the Netherlands East Indies to be published in Jawi [Malay written in Arabic script]), *al-Imam*, *al-Munir* (the journal of the religious *Kaum Muda* movement in Sumatra), and *Al-Islam* (the periodical of Sarekat Islam).

In considering the Arab world context, Laffan initially addresses the Meccan scene, casting the spotlight on Jawi travellers and students as well as the Dutch presence. He places particular focus on C. Snouck Hurgronje in both his years at the Dutch Consulate in Jeddah and his time in Mecca, emphasizing how seminal his record of that city was for later Dutch thinking. Attention falls on the changing nature of Mecca, with the transition from Nawawi al-Bantini to Ahmad Khatib al-Minankabawi as leader of the Jawi community there. Laffan argues that the latter was more radical in terms of anti-colonial views than the former. He then challenges 'the assumption that Mecca and Cairo offered a similar experience to the Jawa set in natural opposition to the educational modes of the West' (p. 114). In focusing on Cairo, Laffan discusses the Afghani-Abduh-Rida triumvirate, the periodical *al-Urwa al-Wuthqa* and the broader context of reformism in Cairo. With the increasingly dynamic scene in Cairo, Laffan suggests that the Meccan-based Ahmad Khatib proposed the Egyptian city to some of his students.

In the concluding chapters, Laffan maps the process of evolution of an indigenous and Islamic Indonesia. He considers the role of Hadji Agoes Salim, identifying his time in the Hijaz as 'the source of Salim's apparent *volte-face* from emancipated Indiër to committed Muslim' (p. 185). He also discusses the Hadrami awakening and its impact on Indies identity. The author also addresses the Turkish abolition of the Caliphate under Attaturk in 1924. That year was doubly significant, with the Wahhabi Sa'udi forces seizing power in Mecca. This event led to an exodus of many Sufi-inclined Jawi from Mecca, as well as some *Kaum Muda* who became disenchanted with the Wahhabism of the Sa'udis.

The shift of focus from Mecca to Cairo for Southeast Asians was complete. Laffan observes that 'Cairo, with its flowering student community and well established links to the communities of Sumatra and the Malay world, was able to take advantage of the

chaos in the Hijaz to shore up its position as the pre-eminent place of study for (Kaum Muda) Indonesians.' The author has thus 'charted the shift from a nineteenth-century (Meccan) discourse of ecumenism to a twentieth-century (Cairene) model of nationhood' (p. 233).

There are multiple angles of originality in this study. Laffan consults a wide scholarly base, including many previously untouched materials. He subjects previous scholarship to critical scrutiny, at times exposing certain scholarly myths and inaccuracies, such as what he sees as a conventional view of a linear development of nationalist sentiment and movements in the Netherlands East Indies. Laffan is quite critical, and rightly so, of studies which ignore Indonesia's place in, and contribution to, the wider Islamic world. The work includes a valuable critical study of Snouck Hurgronje's time in the Arabian Peninsula, providing a crucial window into the context and mind of Snouck, who exerted such an influence on later Netherlands East Indies policy. There are important perspectives on the role of Japan as a model for Southeast Asian Islamic nationalism. There are also valuable insights into the specialised periodicals published by different Islamic groups in both Egypt and Southeast Asia.

Laffan shows himself to be equally comfortable using Arabic-, Indonesian- and Dutch-language sources. The impressive scholarship is enhanced by the inclusion of photos and manuscript facsimiles taken from the book's source materials. This is a work which should be an integral part of university courses dealing with the history of both Islam and nationalism in Southeast Asia.

PETER G. RIDDELL

*London School of Theology*

*Puppet theater in contemporary Indonesia: New approaches to performance events.*  
Edited by JAN MRÁZEK.

Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Centers for South and Southeast Asian Studies,  
Michigan Papers on South and Southeast Asia, No. 50, 2002. Pp. vii, 376.

doi:10.1017/S0022463405230187

This remarkable volume offers a rich array of informative and thought-provoking essays on the current world of puppet theatre (mostly *wayang kulit* and *wayang golek*) in Indonesia (mostly, but not exclusively, Java). The work is an ambitious one, aiming to provide the reader with a comprehensive sweep through the various puppetry genres found from Sunda (West Java) eastward to the island of Lombok and, in that sweep, to concentrate heavily on recent developments. From many perspectives this work could be described as 'dense' – from the sheer number of chapters (25) packed into its 376 pages, to the tiny black-and-white photos appearing in many of the chapters, to the number of words crammed onto each page, with small print and narrow bottom and side margins, no doubt chosen to minimise publication costs without having to omit or (further) shorten existing chapters. In any case, contributing editor Jan Mrázek is to be commended for putting together such an important collection of essays, almost all of which are newly written for this volume, coming from a wide range of currently active scholars. Individual essays offer hitherto unpublished descriptions of one or another puppetry tradition, with emphasis on recent changes, and many draw out issues relating to

traditions (past and present) that help us to think about Indonesia's puppetry in new ways.

Beyond the daunting task of soliciting and editing essays from 22 other writers, Mrázek contributes much with his own writing, starting the book off with a useful seven-page introduction to basic cultural geography and vocabulary pertaining to *wayang* in the Indonesian regions where it is found. This he follows with his own lengthy (38-page) and intriguingly idiosyncratic Introduction to the book, opening with an imagined conversation between 'the God', Wagner, Faust, Mephistopheles, Margaret, Punch and drunken students about *wayang*, followed by a useful though protracted discussion of the main themes that emerge from and link the other essays: 'Changing performances in a changing world'; 'Performance, language, writing'; 'Performance, politics, the entertainment business, and the (changing) life and work of the puppeteer'; 'Performance and local identity'; 'Performance and ritual'; 'Performance and changing aesthetics and values'; 'Performance and the mass media'; and 'Ways of watching wayang'.

The 24 chapters begin with a thoughtful piece by Hendrik Kleinsmiede discussing not the nuts and bolts of *wayang* but the themes of mentalism and writing in the previous scholarship (especially Dutch) on *wayang*, invoking the philosophies of Plato, Aristotle, Descartes, Kant and Spinoza, and stressing *wayang*'s performative and multi-media nature. A. L. Becker, in his nicely crafted essay, reflects on *wayang* and Rudolph Arnheim's notion of images shaping thought outside linguistic determinism (as espoused from Herder to Whorf and Pike, and earlier by Becker himself). From this point onward, the chapters mostly deal with one aspect of one genre of *wayang*, beginning with Kathy Foley's essay on meanings associated with opening gestures and texts, primarily in Sundanese *wayang golek*.

The next few chapters cover political issues. Ward Keeler offers a corrective to what he sees as the exaggeration by recent scholars of the role of the Dutch and, more recently, Indonesian politics in shaping Central Javanese *wayang*. Focusing on one play by one Cirebonese puppeteer, Matthew Cohen questions the widely shared notion of New Order control and co-optation of the arts. Andrew Weintraub argues similarly with reference to Sundanese *wayang golek*, citing passages from several performances.

From politics we move to focus on particular puppeteers. Richard Curtis traces the rise of Enthus Susmono, one of the most successful of the new 'entrepreneur' puppeteers in Java, stressing his breaking of *wayang* conventions and his appeal to the common people (*wong cilik*). Suratno, himself a puppeteer and musician, describes the packaging 'tactics' of another entrepreneur puppeteer, Ki Warsena Slenk. Rene Lysloff follows with a comparative look at two rival puppeteers from Banyumas (west Central Java): Sugito, a self-conscious preserver of local tradition, and Sugino, a puppeteer possessed during performance, drawing on inspirations and influences from many Javanese traditions. Focusing on the work and ideas of Sukasman, inventor of *wayang ukur* (unusually shaped versions of the standard *wayang* characters used in non-conventional performances), Hardja Susilo lays out, point by point, the probable reasons for this genre's failure to gain even modest popularity.

Beginning with Tony Day's chapter on local identity and reinvented ritual in East Java, we are introduced to a range of local *wayang* traditions outside the Sundanese and Javanese mainstream: W. Setiodarmoko's description of *wayang golek Menak* (centring on the adventures of Arabian hero Amir Hamzah) from the south Central Javanese region of Kebumen; Judith Ecklund's coverage (dating from the late 1970s) and Philip

Yampolsky's addendum (1996) on *wayang Sasak* from Lombok; M. Misbahul Amri's description of *wayang Mbah Gandrung*, a ritual form using flat wooden puppets (*wayang klithik*) from Pagung, East Java, followed by Clara van Groenendael's photographic essay on the same genre; and Brita Heimarck's consideration of changes in Balinese *wayang kulit*, with focus on the music. Prior to the two essays on *wayang Mbah Gandrung* is Stephen Headley's study, also of ritual *wayang* (*ruwatan*) in post-Suharto Solo.

The remaining chapters cover a range of broader issues, primarily with reference to Central Javanese *wayang*: Marc Benamou's subtle and convincing reconsideration of the *alus-kasar* (refined-coarse) dichotomy; Helen Pausacker's comparison of female clown scenes in the 1970s with those in recent years as evidence of changing status of women; Sarah Weiss's analysis of the conflation of dichotomies relating to gender (urban/rural, refined/coarse, male/female); Bernard Arps's inquiry into the aesthetics of aural apprehension of 'audio *wayang*' (radio and cassettes); and Mrázek's reflections on watching *wayang* on television vs. 'being there'/'going there' to watch live. To this already sizable collection of essays, Mrázek adds a short thought piece by Haryono Haryoguritno ('Why watch *wayang*?') and, finally, a seven-page bibliographic essay for further reading.

Space limitations here prevent me from exploring critically the numerous issues raised in this volume. Each essay offers at least new descriptive data, and many engage insightfully with ongoing issues in aesthetics, performance theory and *wayang*'s own legacy of scholarly literature. Suffice it to say that anyone seeking to know about the *wayang* world in Indonesia today could find no source remotely as valuable as this – a major contribution to *wayang* scholarship.

R. ANDERSON SUTTON

*University of Wisconsin-Madison*

### Malaysia

*Rites of belonging. Memory, modernity, and identity in a Malaysian Chinese community.*

By JEAN DEBERNARDI.

Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2004. Pp. xvi, 318. Maps, Illustrations, Appendix, Notes, Bibliography, Glossary, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405240183

The subject of rituals as channels through which marginal groups express and manoeuvre the contradictions of social relations in the restoration of social order has been a central concern in anthropological studies. In this book, anthropologist Jean DeBernardi seeks to show how religious rituals are powerful sites through which Chinese identity is constructed, maintained and displayed in both the colonial and postcolonial eras in Malaysia. Conceptualizing Chinese religious culture as a localized and historically situated ritual practice that is shaped by an irreducible present yet deeply etched by millennia-long religious cosmology and social memory of conflict in China and Southeast Asia, the book first explores the institutions of shared worship of universal saviour gods and sworn brotherhoods during the colonial era and then moves on to the popular cults of the Tiangong (Lord of Heaven), the Hungry Ghosts, the Tua Peh Kong and Nine Emperor Gods during the post-Independence era.

Arguments about the links between religious practices, Chinese identity and the colonial social order are made in Part I of the book, covering Chapters 1–4. Here the author argues that community temples such as the Kong Hock Keong (better known amongst Penangites today as the Kuan Im Teng – the Goddess of Mercy Pavilion) and Kek Lok Si, which offered a place of shared worship; and the institution of sworn brotherhoods (or the Heaven and Earth Society or Chinese Triad), which drew on idioms of sacrality to seal membership and accord protection to early immigrants, created a sense of unity and collective identity amongst the early Penang Chinese community which quickly became used by community leaders as a means for self-governance as they competed with British rulers for control over the urban settlement. DeBernardi's contribution here is her depiction of the marked difference between British and Chinese notions of authority, religion and the sacred, as well as the resilience of Chinese religious culture in transforming itself in the face of British efforts to circumscribe the power of local religious activities. For instance, she shows how sworn brotherhoods – a localized offshoot of the Heaven and Earth Society which originated as a popular rebellion against alien Manchu rule in China – could not be eliminated even though outlawed by the British, as these societies reformed themselves into the various temple organizations and 'registered' clan societies found in Penang today.

The entwinement between Chinese religion and postcolonial nationalist politics is explored in Part II, Chapters 5–8. Focussing on the revival of popular cults such as the Lord of Heaven, Hungry Ghost Festivities, Tua Peh Kong, and the Nine Emperor Gods in Penang since the 1970s, the author explores how religious rituals around these cults expressed an on-going dialogue of interpretations of the past and the present. Here DeBernardi shows how imaginaries around these popular religious cults, and the performance and display of divine powers and ritual symbolisms, not only reproduced past collective memory of struggle and power but also served to instil a sense of shared identification and pride over cultural tradition among the Chinese community as they found themselves under increasing pressure to assimilate into a Malay(sian) nation that prioritized Malay language and cultural identifications.

The volume's contribution lies in its use of both history and anthropology to meticulously examine the rich and complex world of Chinese history, mythology and identity, thus elucidating the heterogeneous beliefs, myths and values transmitted and made anew by religious symbols and rituals amongst the Penang Chinese population from the 1800s to the present. While the book succeeds in showing how religious culture is both a product and a producer of the social relations of history, power and identity, at the same time perhaps more could be done to better elucidate the types of human agencies and social groups and conditions behind the resurgence of religious cultures in both the colonial and postcolonial eras. This point is perhaps even more pertinent in the postcolonial era where complex internal social stratification as well as trans-ethnic identity politics have occurred, with impacts on patterns of religious beliefs and ethnic identifications within the Chinese community in Malaysia. While the author does acknowledge differing religious perceptions within the Chinese community, such as those who still regard religious rituals as meaningful versus politicians who support them in order to garner public support and those who frown upon them as wasteful and superstitious acts, it is however never quite clear who these groups are and/or what are the particular motivations for their differing beliefs. This point notwithstanding, this is a rich study of Penang Chinese religious culture. The glossary of Chinese (Mandarin and

Hokkien) terms is useful and this volume will be a complementary addition to the subject of Penang Chinese religion.

GOH BENG LAN

*National University of Singapore*

### Philippines

*The Philippine economy: Development, policies, and challenges.*

Edited by ARSENIO M. BALISACAN and HAL HILL

Oxford: Oxford University Press. 2003. Pp. xxv, 466. Figures, Tables, Glossary, References, Authors Index, Subject Index. doi:10.1017/S002246340525018X

This book is an in-depth study of the Philippine economy focusing particularly on the two decades from 1980 to 2000. It is divided into four parts. Part I contains two chapters that set the scene and provide an overview of the entire volume. Part II deals with macro-economic policies and international dimensions. Part III contains three chapters on agriculture, industry and the services. Part IV deals with social dimensions – population growth, poverty and inequality as well as regional development, the environment and natural resources.

The book sets out to explore a puzzle. What have been the reasons for the poor performance of the Philippine economy? Through a better understanding of the failures one can identify the actions needed to achieve a more favourable outcome in the future. As the outline above suggests, it explores the economy from several dimensions. Past trends are presented in each chapter, and comparisons – often unfavourable – are made with other Asian economies.

The book details many of the old ills which are well-known and stem in a significant measure from an oligarchy based on landed interests that have ruled since colonial days in their own short-run self-interest. These include emphasis on import-substituting capital-intensive industries, the failure to extend land reform beyond the rice and corn areas, the subsidization of an agriculture that has failed to capture major export markets and a lack of investment in physical infrastructure – roads, irrigation, etc. To all this must be added the growing disparity between the rich and the poor, too-rapid population growth and rapid environmental degradation. To top it off, there have been a series of political upheavals and natural disasters that have set back economic development, the worst of these occurring in the early 1980s at the end of the Marcos regime.

I recall in particular the enthusiasm with which we academics greeted the Cory Aquino administration. There was much talk of a comprehensive agrarian reform. At the urging of colleagues, I sent a note to then Vice-President of Taiwan Lee Teng-hui asking if he would be interested in consulting with the Philippine government on land reform. He replied positively and subsequently a luncheon was arranged in Makati to discuss this issue with members of the Aquino family and the Chinese community. There was much interest in bringing Lee to the Philippines, but not for the reason we academics had in mind, namely to discuss land reform. In the end, the one-China policy prevailed. Subsequently, we were to learn that land reform would not extend even as far as the Aquino-Cojuangco Hacienda Luicita. Land reform was dead.

I point out the above because as Arsenio Balisacan and Hal Hill note (p. 42), ‘in the early 21st, looking backward as well as forward, it would be tempting to conclude that the Philippines is at a cross-roads were it not for the fact that such a characterization has a sense of *déjà vu*’. What justifies the present thought of ‘a crossroads’? The book points out the considerable progress that has been made in reforming the economy in the past two decades, in particular during the Fidel Ramos administration. The reforms include more liberalized trade (excepting agriculture), a stronger financial sector and export-oriented manufacturing. The Philippines also remains one of the most active and open civil societies. Whether these reforms coupled with a coherent economic strategy will translate into a decade of solid economic development under the Gloria Macapagal-Arroyo presidency remains to be seen (p. 43).

For students of the Philippine economy, this volume is essential reading. The busy reader will gain much from the first chapter, the overview by Balisacan and Hill. However, my favourite chapter is the last, by Ian Coxhead and Sisira Jayasuriya. Here the two authors use modelling to show very clearly how the various policies affecting the agricultural and industrial sectors, as well as demographics, have impacted favourably – or, most often, unfavourably – on the environment and natural resources. In particular, they note how the exploitation of the uplands by a land-hungry peasantry and by an oligarchy seeking quick profits from logging has led to a rapid decline in forest cover.

Finally, the editors are to be congratulated in assembling an outstanding group of scholars who have produced 12 chapters of unusually high and even quality.

RANDOLPH BARKER  
*Cornell University*

*American workers, colonial power: Philippine Seattle and the Transpacific West, 1919–1941.*

By DOROTHY B. FUJITA-RONY.

Berkeley: University of California Press, 2003. Pp. xviii, 302. Maps, Photographs, Notes, Bibliography, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405260186

Positioned in the related areas of American Studies, Asian-American Studies, American social history, immigration studies and the New Western history, Dorothy B. Fujita-Rony’s study of Filipina/o migration and community formation in the Pacific Northwest during the 1920s and 1930s will be of particular interest to those investigating race, ethnicity, gender, labour, colonialism and migration. Fujita-Rony’s work makes noteworthy contributions, particularly in the fields of Philippine Studies and Filipina/o American Studies.

Fujita-Rony extends traditional Filipina/o American historiography in various ways. Going beyond the typical celebratory confines of reclamatory projects that seek to uncover ‘forgotten’ stories and expose Filipina/o ‘invisibility’ and assimilationist frameworks that depend on a linear and unidirectional historicization, the book highlights the centrality of political economic conditions in early twentieth-century Filipina/o Transpacific migration. Fujita-Rony situates the formation of Philippine Seattle within the development of the American West and US colonial expansion and capitalist penetration

in Asia and the Pacific. She emphasizes the dual legacies of US colonialism in the Philippines and in the US: 'my project seeks to understand how the Filipina/o American community in Seattle was in itself formed by the colonial relationship, not just how American colonials from the Philippines created a space for themselves in the colonial metropole of Seattle, but also how Seattle, in turn, was changed by its Filipina/o American residents' (p. 19).

Linking individual life stories to broader historical, social, cultural, political and economic processes, Fujita-Rony illustrates how Filipina/o engagement with American colonialism and racial formation and racial subordination in the US shaped the trajectories and dynamics of community formation in Philippine Seattle, particularly in the articulation of political struggles around race, ethnicity, class and gender. For example, in Chapter 2 she explores the intersections of US colonialism, Filipina/o migration, labour and education. Education was a central part of American colonial policy in the Philippines and was integral in conditioning Filipina/o migration (in pursuit of perceived educational opportunities and the unfilled promise of socio-economic mobility). In Philippine Seattle, education was also key in the development of community leadership, the creation of a Filipina/o intelligentsia, class mobility and the emergence of Philippine and Filipina/o American class consciousness. In Chapter 5, Fujita-Rony examines 'how migration and labor shaped Filipina/o Seattle, as the community not only was formed as a result of its strategic location for those coming to the United States but also was formed by the regular movement of workers to and through its site' (p. 80). Focusing on the experiences of Filipina/o workers, and their participation in unionizing efforts, the labour movement, and worker resistance, Fujita-Rony reveals the complexity of class formation and consciousness, and the contestedness of the politics of race, ethnicity and gender, as they played out in struggles for power in the city and within Filipina/o Seattle.

Fujita-Rony's work moves beyond the male-centred and male-dominated studies of Filipina/o American history in which the narrative of the single, Filipino agricultural worker is used to symbolize Filipina/o American history. Although she recognizes the demographic preponderance of men in early twentieth-century Filipina/o America (due in large part to the fact that Transpacific labour migration and migratory agricultural work were historically inaccessible to Filipinas), she problematizes the historicization of Filipina/o communities as 'bachelor societies'. She argues that the 'bachelor society' model of Filipina/o American historiography marginalizes women's labour and glosses over the role of women in community formation. Furthermore, this model 'downplays the multiplicity of familial relations that connected members of the Filipina/o American community across space and time, particularly those involving women' (p.138). Writing against the grain of Filipina/o American historiography, Fujita-Rony's work reinscribes Filipinas into Filipina/o American history and into broader Asian-American history while complicating notions of race, class and 'family'.

Although there has been much scholarly attention to late twentieth-century global cultural and economic flows and transnational population movements spurred on by late capitalism and advancements in communication and transportation technologies, Fujita-Rony's work reminds us that similar continuous and circulatory migrations occurred during the first half of the twentieth century, albeit in fewer numbers and with less frequency. In the end, this book helps to insert the Pacific Northwest, and Philippine

Seattle in particular, not only into the landscape of Filipina/o America and Asian America but also into the history of the development of the American West.

RODERICK N. LABRADOR  
*University of Hawai'i at Manoa*

*Global divas: Filipino gay men in the diaspora.*

By MARTIN F. MANALANSAN IV.

Durham: Duke University Press, 2003. Pp. 221. Notes, Glossary, Bibliography, Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405270182

In this book Martin F. Manalansan IV presents 'a critical view of globalised modern gay identity' (p. viii) by investigating how immigrant Filipino gay men in New York City 'negotiate between Filipino and American sexual and gender traditions' (p. viii). Specifically, the author investigates how his informants negotiate the differences between Filipino ideas of *bakla* identity – a Tagalog term that encompasses all the Western notions of homosexuality, hermaphroditism, cross-dressing and effeminacy – and American notions of gay male identity. Manalansan exposes the internal plurality of the male homosexual culture of one of the Western world's originating centres of gay identity. In Western gay historiography New York City has long held a mythic status, with the June 1969 Stonewall riots in Greenwich Village widely being seen as having launched the modern gay political movement. In his ethnography of men who straddle competing homeland and American sexual cultures, Manalansan reveals the multiple modernities that exist *within* the contemporary West and shows that even in the urban heart of globally dominant America there is no unilinear path to a singular form of gay identity.

This book also demonstrates the strengths and weaknesses of the rapidly expanding field of Asian-American studies. From the perspective of studies of modern homosexualities in the West, this book's strength lies in its convincing account of the ways that a community of immigrant men do not passively assimilate themselves to American gay culture but contest and rearticulate Western notions of gayness in building new lives and new forms of same-sex relationships in their adopted home. The weakness of this study derives from its reproduction of a not uncommon tendency in the American academy to conflate the diasporic Asian-American experience with the contemporary forms of culture and society in Asia. In a critique of the ethnocentrism of some varieties of Western queer studies historiography, I have called this the American tendency 'to reduce China to Chinatown' (Peter A. Jackson, 'Review article: Opportunities and dangers in American postmodernist historiography', *Intersections: Gender, History & Culture in the Asian Context*, 3 [January 2000], Internet journal at <http://www.she.murdoch.edu.au/intersections/>). In reviews for other journals readers who are much better acquainted with the situation of gay Asian-Americans than myself will no doubt be able to highlight the positive contribution that this book makes to resisting hegemonic White American understandings of sexuality and identity. Here I offer a focused review of the book's problematic assumptions from the perspective of Southeast Asian studies.

While Manalansan helps us understand the diasporic Filipino homosexual experience in America, he tells us very little about how this diaspora relates to the gay culture of the Philippines, whether past or present. Southeast Asianists will be disappointed by the

absence of a comparative survey of how alternative Filipino *bakla* and Western-styled gay male homosexual identities are negotiated 'back home' in Metro Manila. Manalansan refers to the circuits of travel that his informants regularly make between old homes in the Philippines and new homes in New York, but he gives no picture of how these men negotiate their American-influenced identities when they return home on periodic visits. The culture of origin of the men interviewed in this study remains an assumed backdrop that is not brought into concrete analytical dialogue with the book's solidly American focus.

While highlighting the internal ethnicised differences within American gay identities, Manalansan fails to apply a similar critical analysis to the Filipino notion of *bakla*. He does not ask whether *bakla* in Manila and in New York are in fact the same. For example, Chapter 2 on Filipino queer language does not distinguish between the Filipino gay argots of Manila and New York City. In assuming a transnational identity between men who claim the label *bakla* in the Philippines and in the United States, Manalansan presents an essentialist view of this identity that contrasts with his decidedly constructionist view of Western gay identity.

The book's pattern of citations and its publication by Duke University Press (rapidly becoming a major publisher on Asian cultural studies) locate the study within the problematics of American rather than Filipino scholarship. The significant literature on male homosexuality published in the Philippines is surveyed. However, Manalansan criticises Filipino scholars, notably Neil Garcia, for 'revert[ing] to using what they see as indigenous concepts' (p. 40) and failing to critically examine notions such as 'coming out' and 'the closet'. Manalansan does not consider the possibility that while these issues are important in gay American culture and hence for expatriate Filipinos living in America, they may not be as salient for homosexual men who have never left the Philippines. His critique of homosexual studies in the Philippines draws primarily on the interviews with diasporic Filipinos in America and the work of Western anthropologists such as Fenella Cannell and Mark Johnson.

Analytically, Manalansan's critique of the Filipino scholarship is based on the mistaken assumption that there is an identity between the Filipino homosexual culture in Manila described by Garcia and others and the culture of expatriate Filipinos in New York City. He first conflates Asia-America with Asia, and then proceeds to criticise scholars of Asian homosexualities for not enlightening him about the conditions of expatriate Asian homosexual men in America. This critique is not only unfair, it also unjustifiably positions Manalansan's New York-based study as a superior account of male homosexual cultures in the Philippines! In this, the book exemplifies some of the worst features of Asian-American studies, where a claim for minority status within the United States is at times used to legitimate claims to speak on behalf of other minorities beyond America's borders.

Asian-American studies is a legitimate field of inquiry when it deploys the politics of ethnicised voice in local battles within the American polity. However, it loses its legitimacy, and assumes the globally hegemonic mantle of the dominant America of which it is an integral part, when it claims to speak on behalf of people outside the United States. If the politics of voice are deployed consistently then Asian-Americans – as Americans – cannot claim to speak on behalf or to know the 'truth' of the peoples of Asia better than Asians themselves.

On my first visit to New York City in 1995, the streets were decked with flags proclaiming 'New York City, Capital to the World'. One may debate the pros and cons of the hubristic claim behind this tourist hype. However, even if we grant the Big Apple a degree of world capital status, there is no way that New Yorkers, of whatever ethnic background, can claim to be or to represent the world beyond Manhattan. Perhaps Manalansan has begun to believe the hype of his adopted homeland, for like much American intellectual culture he uses the model of United States as a template for understanding and critiquing the rest of the world.

PETER A. JACKSON

*Australian National University*

*Un imperio en la vitrina. El colonialismo Español en el Pacífico y la Exposición de Filipinas de 1887.*

By LUIS ANGEL SÁNCHEZ GÓMEZ.

Madrid: Consejo Superior de Investigaciones Científicas, 2003.

doi:10.1017/S0022463405280189

Luis Sánchez Gómez's 'An empire in the showcase. Spanish colonialism in the Pacific and the Exposition of the Philippines of 1887' should open a Pandora's box to revisit an event as important as the Exposition of Madrid, celebrated in 1887 for its political and cultural relevance. Spain showed the maturity of the construction of its democratic state; and by celebrating an Exposition, it was displaying its new imperialistic policy. The Philippine Exposition of Madrid became a milestone to define the new contours of Spanish colonialism *vis-à-vis* other colonial systems, despite deep-rooted arguments about the 'medievalism' or 'immobilism' of the Spanish system. The architect of the Exposition, Victor Balaguer, the Minister of '*Ultramar*' (colonies), showcased the Philippines as the Pearl of the Pacific. The Exposition had two intertwined objectives: on the one hand, the reaffirmation of Spanish-ness in the Philippines; on the other, the re-colonization of the archipelago (including Mindanao) by designing a real policy of colonization in the modern sense. Unfortunately, these two main dimensions are neglected in the book. Instead, the author gives a prominent role to the religious orders as an indispensable element to rule and preserve the Islands.

Luis Angel Sánchez Gómez sheds light on the Exhibition of 1887; this is, no doubt, a worthy enterprise, since the Exposition has gone unnoticed by Spanish scholars. This neglect is nothing new, as Spanish histories of the Philippines are still tinged with a strong sense of Spanish-ness, whose dominant features are the history of the conquest, the galleons and the religious orders. Nineteenth-century colonialism is something of a blank page for Spanish scholars, and one cannot but be pleased with the publication of a new book on a new topic. Lamentably, as this review will illustrate, Sánchez Gómez gives us a history full of stereotyped images of the Spanish colonial system at the turn of the nineteenth century. The cliché he offers – a quite inaccurate one – paves the way for the idea that the Spanish system was anachronistic until its very end. This thesis will please those American scholars of the Philippines who can read Spanish, since it tacitly accords with their traditionally held assumptions about Spanish colonialism.

Sánchez Gómez explains in the introduction that the objective of his study is the analysis and interpretation of the Philippine Exposition. One immediately perceives in his analysis and interpretation the American imprint in the categorization of the Filipinos, the terminology applied to it, the American bibliography (largely irrelevant to the topic) and an analogy between the Exposition of Madrid and that of Saint Louis in 1904, though they are in fact hardly comparable. It is important to analyse the Madrid Exposition through the chapter structure of *Un imperio en la vitrina*. The book includes 13 chapters plus the bibliography. The first chapter, 'A Catalan politician for a Philippine Exposition', is devoted to the architect of the exposition, Victor Balaguer. From the beginning, Sánchez Gómez misrepresents the colonial policy designed by Balaguer. He does not perceive the transformation of the colonial structure through conspicuous reforms, which started timidly in 1868 and culminated in the 1880s. The author mentions the reformist activity of Spanish Liberal and even Conservative governments, but he does not emphasize or deepen this important issue.

This first chapter is the catalyst of the book since the author builds up his central argument – a defeatist history of Spanish colonialism – by minimizing the new colonial policy. By overlooking the restructuring of colonial objectives, he introduces a prevalent idea in Spanish academe – that of 'generous, paternalist and utopian policy'. The generous policy – for the author – lies in the implementation of many reforms that became a dead letter. The utopia is implicit in his general argument that 'there was no *de facto* political structure'. This lack of political structure gives shape to the traditional assumption that the religious orders were the real rulers with a transcendental role in the Islands – to civilize the 'indigenous'. As for 'paternalism', it is longer implicit in the book. This defeatist approach underlies the book's argument that the Exposition of the Philippines was a complete failure.

Chapters 2–4 describe the organization of the Exposition. Chapter 4 contains beautiful lithographs but does not contribute much that is new, since it is known that this kind of event had a specific role in the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. The Philippine Exposition was no exception. However, Sánchez Gómez does not miss the opportunity to discredit the Philippine Exposition as a specifically Spanish blunder. More significant is the next chapter on 'The collections. Racial criticism of the Peninsular. The exhibiting'. Here the author provides valuable information but, lamentably, he does not analyse his sources. His treatment is based on the press' reception of the event. At that time there were in Spain more than 200 newspapers linked to different political positions, and even the colonies had their own newspapers which often criticized government policies. Sánchez Gómez considers newspapers from the two main political ideologies, Liberal and Conservative, though he charges both with a racist attitude towards Filipinos. In fact, the press criticism of Filipinos was more dismissive than racist and came largely from the Conservative newspapers, which attacked Liberal reformism as too permissive with Filipino *ilustrados* (elite). In other words, criticism was part of the dynamic of Spanish policy, and thus more ideologically than racially based. The author also stigmatizes the shortage of private enterprises in the exhibition, thus minimizing – in line with American historiography – the emergence of the plutocrats in the Philippines from 1868 onwards, who looked at the archipelago as the new *El Dorado*. Chapters 5, 6, and 7 reiterate this argument.

In Chapter 8, 'Images and discourses on Filipino alterity', Sánchez Gómez overlaps several different interpretations, with confusing results. At the beginning, he establishes a

parallel between Spanish and American colonial discourses. By hierarchically categorizing Filipinos (*ilustrados* versus ‘savage’ races, i.e., Igorrotes and Moros), he points to collaboration with colonial powers as an endemic behaviour. The influence of American historiography on this thesis of ‘collaborationism’ is highlighted by the studies in the bibliography. The author believes that paternalistic colonialism informed nineteenth-century scholarship about the Philippines, yet his book reiterates stereotypical images of the Philippines and Filipinos. This cliché of ‘paternalist colonialism’ is the result of his (mis)use of the sources. This point is evident in the next chapter, ‘A confessional-political anthropology of the Philippines’, which reiterates the idea that the Philippines were more an evangelical mission than an overseas colony. Eduardo Navarro’s *Filipinas; estudios de algunos asuntos de actualidad* published in 1897 (Madrid: Imperimeria de la Viuda de M. Minuesa de los Rios) explicitly contradicts the author’s thesis, as Navarro complained about the systematic loss of the friars’ preeminence.

The next two chapters further develop the book’s main arguments: the failure of the Philippine Exposition in Madrid, the anachronism of the Spanish colonial system and its paternalism. Sánchez Gómez praises the St Louis Exposition of 1904 to the detriment of Madrid’s. Following Paul Kramer’s article, ‘Making concessions: Race and empire revisited at the Philippine Exposition, St. Louis, 1901–1905’ (*Radical History Review*, 73 [1999]: 74–114), the author presents the Madrid Exhibition as an imperfect project, since the Philippines was not a *de facto* colony. Kramer argues that the St Louis exposition implicitly delivered imperial messages of benevolence, peace and social progress under American control. Kramer is right since the US government needed to justify the conquest of the Philippines to the domestic audience, and for this purpose it had to show Filipinos as unfit for self-government. Sánchez Gómez tries to build up a similar argument for Spanish rule, but he neglects a crucial difference: the Spanish government did not need to justify its empire.

Admittedly, Sánchez Gómez considers Kramer’s assumptions biased since the latter supports his argument – the failure of the Saint Louis Exposition – by insisting on the confrontation between the American administration and the Filipino elite. Sánchez Gómez thinks there was no confrontation; instead, the elite displayed ‘intense and cynical colonial collaborationism’ (p. 346). I quote this sentence since it is the gist of the American construction of Philippine history. This position accounts for the reliance on a bibliography listing works by Alfred McCoy, Glenn May, John Larkin, Ruby Paredes, Norman Owen and Benedict Anderson. While not really relevant to this topic, this scholarship is useful to systematically discredit the Spanish colonial system at the turn of the nineteenth century. Most of these scholars argue that the Americans inherited Spanish problems by creating a dysfunctional system difficult to eradicate. Sánchez Gómez concludes that the religious orders, the army and an obsolete, despotic and racist administration controlled the colonial structure until the end in spite of the assimilationist discourse of the Spanish administration. He also illustrates the importance of Balaguer’s reformist policy. This recognition is, however, hardly surprising as it fits the Spanish historiographic tradition on the Philippines.

Despite Sánchez Gómez’s assessment that the Exposition was a failure, it was in fact a success. Balaguer was praised by the Filipinos, and if the author had used *La Solidaridad*, he would have realized this. (Published first in Barcelona in 1889 and then in Madrid between 1890 and 1894, this journal was a forum for political propaganda by Filipino *ilustrados* living and studying in Spain. Its first editor, Graciano Lopez Jaena,

decided to stay in Barcelona and became involved in politics; he was replaced in 1890 by Marcelo Hilario del Pilar. Issues 34 and 35 of the journal dedicated articles to Balaguer.) Balaguer shaped the restructuring of the colonial system for other Overseas Ministers. Perhaps the Spaniards awoke too late, but the Americans made good use of many of the late Spanish reforms in ruling the archipelago after 1898. The reorganization of the colonial system is denied systematically by American historiography; Sánchez Gómez has missed the chance to present an alternative perspective.

GLORIA CANO

*National University of Singapore*

## Singapore

*The making of Singapore sociology: Society and the state.*

Edited by TONG CHEE KIONG and LIAN KWEN FEE.

Singapore: Times Academic Press in association with Brill Academic Publishers, 2003. Pp. iv, 467. Index. doi:10.1017/S0022463405290185

This very useful collection is an unusual contribution to what is sometimes called the 'sociology of sociology'. Internationally, few surveys exist of national sociologies and their origins, growth and characteristics, and – with the possible exception of India – even fewer of Asian sociologies. Singapore sociology, however, is an accessible field because of its relatively recent history and compact size yet substantial output; most of the latter is in English, making it available to a much wider reading audience than, say, Thai or Japanese sociologies. The collection in question consists of an editorial introduction charting briefly the founding and development of Singapore sociology, mostly as embodied in the work of the Department of Sociology at the University of Singapore and its successor, the National University of Singapore, and introducing the content matter of the individual chapters, most of them by colleagues of the editors in the aforementioned department. In fact, the book is really a history of that department and its in many ways remarkable output, as little systematic attention is given to work that came out of the old Nanyang University or other institutions in Singapore including the polytechnics, the Institute of Southeast Asian Studies or even the local theological colleges, or from the pens of unaffiliated individuals such as local architects.

The editors have chosen, in what I find to be both an outdated and intellectually unnecessary way, to divide the book into two sections headed respectively 'Modernization' and 'Modernity'. While it is true that a great deal of earlier sociology in Singapore was concerned with and utilized the now very dated paradigm of modernity (and its associated notion in Singapore of 'nation building'), it is very unclear why for example the section on medical sociology amongst others is assigned to the 'modernization' category while religion, crime and the permanently central issue of ethnicity are classified under 'modernity'. In fact, all these themes have always characterized Singapore sociology (and medical sociology as such is amongst the later comers and did not exist as a sub-discipline in the country until quite recently). Regrettably, the notion of modernity itself is given a very simplistic definition and nowhere (especially in the introduction) is there any wrestling with the complex nature of debates on modernity, or the question of how the

modernity of Singapore precisely highlights both the society's lack of postmodernity and how this is and has been reflected in the national sociology.

This said, the individual chapters that deal variously with the sociology of development, urban sociology, the sociologies of education, the family, medicine, work, class, religion, language, crime, ethnicity in general and the specific issues of the three major ethnic groups (Chinese, Malays and Indians) provide excellent and well documented surveys, supported by useful although necessarily selective bibliographies of each of these fields. These substantive essays document both the expansion of empirical work and the theoretical developments and limitations of the local sociology, working within a globalized discipline yet deeply caught up in a political environment that constantly imposed (and no doubt still does) expectations and restrictions on what could or can be actively researched or written about. The very derivative nature of development sociology, for example, illustrates these constraints and the national agendas that have since the 1960s provided both the opportunities and the limitations on the directions of sociological work. Nevertheless the book shows a vibrant and productive national sociology at work, much of the output of which has been of global standards even when focused heavily on very local themes.

Indeed, in some ways the book is too modest and is caught perhaps unwittingly in the very modernist paradigm around which it is structured. Singapore throws up many larger comparative questions: of urban sub-cultures in a highly modernized but clearly Asian city state, the key question of class and how it might relate to understandings of class both in the theoretical literature and elsewhere in Asia, of the possible status of Singapore as a global city, and above all of social and cultural life under conditions of soft authoritarianism. In this collection, however, these issues are seen as being only of local interest. Singapore sociology, as I know from experience, is very cut off from other regional Southeast Asian sociologies, and while this book admirably documents the huge productivity of Singapore-based sociologists, both native and expatriate, and does much to combat the historical amnesia in Singapore of which it rightly complains, it also illustrates some of the directions in which a creative Singapore sociology might go: towards a greater globality, a firmer grasp of theoretical debates on the international scale, away from its preoccupation with methodologies, especially those of a very positivist kind, and with more consideration for the alternative voices that fall outside of institutionalized Singapore sociology.

JOHN CLAMMER

*Sophia University, Tokyo*