

Japanese rice production, which had grown rapidly, to return to a static level, thus leading back to the state of equilibrium of which Professor Schultz speaks. Government price policy has now shifted its main emphasis to the function of maintaining equilibriums in consumption and incomes, and its productive functions are withering away.

Japanese agriculture, based on small-area landownership, has exhibited a form of development which is of a different nature from that of other countries in Southeast Asia. However, the possibilities of the system of labour-intensive agricultural practices employing large applications of fertilizers are now exhausted. It would seem that a state of equilibrium has again appeared on the production side. I believe that the way for breaking through these conditions lies in comprehensive government policies which will promote the enlargement of the holdings of the rice-producing farmers and will provide for investment in them. (*Shirō Tōbata*)

GEORGE E. TAYLOR, *The Philippines and the United States: Problems of Partnership*, New York, Frederick A. Praeger, 1964, 325 pp.

Close relations of co-operation have existed between the Philippines and the United States since the Second World War, as before it, and the Philippines is both a basic member of America's regional security organization in Southeast Asia and an important base-point in her Asia strategy. From the economic point of view also, the Philippines continues to preserve its importance as a market in which America can purchase raw materials and sell its commercial goods, and as a field for American capital investment. At the present day, when the conflict between East and West has become much aggravated, the importance of the Philippines for America has increased to an absolute degree. Such an appreciation of the situation is becoming ever stronger on the American side. Thus the basic task which is set before this book is that of determining what policies America should adopt with a view to maintaining this close co-operation with the Philippines in the future, and of fixing the keynote for such policies.

According to the author, the potential sources of political and social dynamism in the Philippines, that is to say, the most important factor for the formation of modern society, is nationalism. Hitherto, manifestations of Filipino nationalism have assumed a comparatively lukewarm form, but of late they have exhibited fairly clearly apparent movements. As examples we may cite the comparatively recent moves for the revision of the agreement on military bases between America and the Philippines, the undertaking and dissemination of a revised history of the Philippines produced by historians of the University of the Philippines (a reappraisal of the War of Independence at the end of the nineteenth century), and the fact that of late the Philippines has been making its way towards a somewhat more independent and racialist

line in its diplomatic relations with Asia. It goes without saying that, in spite of these unprecedented manifestations of Filipino nationalism, the Philippines remains friendly to America as far as outward appearances are concerned, and the Philippines is one of the comparatively few countries in Asia which has consistently refused to adopt neutralism. However, may it not be that important differences in the subjective appreciation of the situation lie concealed beneath such outward appearances, and may not these differences manifest themselves in future in forms which are altogether unpredictable? At present the Americans cannot escape being tormented by this feeling of being burned from within (Cf. Introduction). Unfortunately, the Americans do not possess sufficient knowledge of the Filipinos to enable them to dispel these doubts. "Despite fifty years of colonial administration, it is amazing how little we know of the Filipino" (p. 14). The author then goes on to express his opinion that, as a prerequisite for the devising of effective policies in the future, it is at present necessary before all else to arrive at a full appreciation and understanding of the basic nature of Filipino nationalism and the content of its ideology.

Hereupon the author postulates Filipino nationalism as one pole, and as the opposite pole the bodies which are capable of managing it—the middle classes, the army, and the Communists. The main interest of the Americans is connected with the prospects for the all-important question—which of these bodies will prove capable of undertaking the management of Filipino nationalism in the future? Behind this interest lies the correct insight into the situation which the author expresses in the words, "He who captures Filipino nationalism captures the Philippines." What America fears most of all in this situation is that the peasantry should ally themselves with nationalism and the form which such an alliance would take, and for this reason the post-war Hukbalahap movement and the problems of land reform are frequently mentioned in this book. The Communists may be expected to attempt to gain hold of nationalism through their criticism of American imperialism, and so get the trade unions and peasant unions on their side. The bodies of which America has expectations as being capable of offering resistance to this are, it needs hardly be said, the middle classes and the army, especially the former. The author regards the middle classes—these are not clearly defined but cover a wide stratum of society including politicians, entrepreneurs, professional men, government officials, educators, managers and intellectuals—as being the principal representatives of the spirit of nationalism, the leading stratum in social change, and the natural allies of America. Further, the author regards this class as being a pillar for the maintenance of democracy in a developing industrial society through the transformation of the traditional society ruled by the landlord class, and, consequently, as being the greatest force capable of offering resistance to Communism. In this situation, it is thought that the Philippines army, which has close links with the United States, will prove to be a powerful allied force for the middle class.

America's greatest worry at present is the fact that a submerged propensity to revolution is still deeply rooted in the Philippines. If men were to arise who could equate the concepts of nationalism with the desires of the peasantry and could lead them forward, there is the possibility that they would sweep away the whole of the Philippines. However, the middle classes, of which America has the greatest expectations, are not very powerful in the Philippines. The most desirable direction for policy to take in the future will be to support the middle classes and to cause them to co-operate with the peasantry and the working class. For this purpose it will be necessary to interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines, somewhat dangerous though this may be. Further, this co-operation is attended by the strong possibility that a Philippines socialist party will come into being. If such a thing were to come to pass, America would have to make the greatest efforts to nurture a democratic form of socialism. However, it would be prudent for America to have to do with a socialist body, provided that it were anti-Communist, rather than to lose the Philippines to Communism or neutralism. We may say that the above are the principal recommendations which the author makes to the American policy authorities.

We may perhaps expect that it is inevitable that the keynote of future American policy in regard to the Philippines will not be unrelated to the above views. We may be permitted to think that the views set out in this book will have considerable objectivity and persuasiveness, since the work is in the nature of a collection of the results of a study group on United States policy and the Philippines set down after careful debates by its members, including top-ranking American political scientists and diplomats. The greatest impressions which one receives on reading through this book are of the degree to which the Americans have been nervous of late, and especially since the establishment of the Chinese Communist régime in 1949, over moves in the direction of Communism and neutralism in the Philippines—albeit that these have been no more than trivial manifestations of such tendencies—and of the depth of their interest and concern regarding the direction to be taken by Philippines nationalism. From this we may deduce the simple fact of America's deep involvement in the politics of Southeast Asia at the present day. In this sense we may say that this work may be read not only as a document relating to American policy in regard to the Philippines, but also as a valuable document relating to America's policies in regard to the underdeveloped countries and to the directions being taken by American foreign policy in the sphere of international relations.

As is said in the Preface, this book is a study of American-Philippines relations *from the point of view of the United States*, and in so far as this is so it is natural to expect that its contents will be subject to certain limitations. Consequently, we must naturally expect that there will be Filipino reactions to the contents of this book, and that these reactions will make clearer the points made in this book and will be profitable for future further development of studies of this kind. At present the reviewer does not propose to

undertake a full-scale examination of the contentions put forward in this book, but wishes rather to raise some doubtful points which may have to be considered even if one accepts the author's main opinions.

The reasons for the American side having the greatest expectations of the middle classes in the Philippines are that the middle classes are the natural allies of America, and that they are thought to be the most powerful force which can truly carry out social reforms and land reform by democratic methods in a traditional society where land rights are firmly established. That is to say, behind these reasons lies the view that in a society such as the Philippines, where vested interests are firmly established and there is a great gap between rich and poor, it is impossible for there to be any basic stability in society, and further, that it is impossible to get the peasantry and the working class to join the democratic camp in resistance to Communism, without social and land reform. We may say that this view is more or less correct, considering it in the light of the examples of other countries in Asia. However, we cannot but feel great doubts as to whether the middle classes in the Philippines, considered as a totality, are in fact truly of a reforming character in relation to the society of firmly established vested interests and are truly characterized by opposition over these interests. The author includes in the middle classes not only the stratum of entrepreneurs or businessmen which is being formed in the Philippines but also a wide range of other groups, but while this stratum of entrepreneurs or businessmen does possess, as can be shown from historical experience, the ability to oppose the landed interest out of the necessities of industrial expansion, the other groups included in the middle classes—for example, the politicians and professional men—are frequently also medium or small landowners, as has been pointed out by many students of the subject (it is of course true that of late a tendency for these groups to cast off their character as landowners has appeared, although *only in a very restricted scale*), and in the case of these groups it is inconceivable that they should assume a position of direct opposition to the landed interest, but on the contrary they must be expected to stand on common ground with the landowners in matters of material interest. Consequently, we must have grave doubts over the author's treatment of the middle classes as one body, as if they possessed a homogeneous character. We are led to the conclusion that, when carrying out concrete analyses as a background for drawing near to political policies, a finer analysis of the existing state of affairs is necessary, and that for this analysis co-operation with specialists in a wide range of subjects other than political science might be effective.

We feel that it would have been better if the author had focussed his analysis a little more on the middle and petty bourgeoisie (on the entrepreneurs as their representative champions) instead of on the middle classes as a whole. Further, this class, while it has been traditionally truly opposed to the landed interest, feels about its material interests in a way different from the big bourgeoisie (who in the Philippines are of the nature of monopoly capitalism, possessing the attributes of landowners to a fair degree), as

far as the question of the ideal form of American-Philippines relations is concerned, because of the necessities of industrial expansion upon which it is grounded. We may suppose that it is for this reason that the Communists in the countries of Asia seek to enrol the members of this class (of course including the intelligentsia in the wide sense) when they set about forming a national democratic front. Thus it is possible for this class to be united in a national democratic front, according to the situation in which it is placed, and we are led to conclude that it is not necessarily correct to believe that the whole of the middle classes, including the entrepreneurs or businessmen, are unconditionally the "natural allies of America." Assuming this to be the case, should not the author have given more attention to the specific group within the middle class constituted by the entrepreneurs or businessmen, or middle and petty bourgeoisie, rather than focussing his analysis on the middle classes as a whole, and should he not have given more consideration to the moves made by this class and their relation to Filipino nationalism?

One more point. The author predicts that the alliance between the middle classes and the working class and the peasantry may produce a socialist party, and he considers the measures to be taken in regard to this possibility. But may it not be appropriate to make a more far-reaching examination of the prospects of such a party being able to remain a democratic socialist party, as the author expects? How would the author evaluate the historical fact that the pre-war Filipino Socialist Party (granting that it was a very primitive form of political party) combined with the Communist Party in Central Luzon to form the nucleus of the later Hukbalahap movement? Socialist parties are inclined to move to the left or the right under the conditions which exist in the underdeveloped countries at present, and we have reason to believe that it is difficult for them to hold to "the middle of the road." This is probably why the author says that America must make the greatest efforts to nurture a democratic form of socialism, but may it not be that in order to carry out this difficult task America will be obliged to interfere in the internal affairs of the Philippines on an ever-increasing scale so that in the end America may find itself completely bogged down in the Philippines? The important question in such a case will be related to the reaction which can be expected from Filipino nationalism in response to such action.

As good post-war studies analysing American-Philippines relations we may mention Garel A. Grunder and William E. Livezey, *The Philippines and the United States* (University of Oklahoma Press, 1951), and Shirley Jenkins, *American Economic Policy Toward the Philippines* (Stanford University Press, 1954). The work under review is a policy study which supplements these, and if they are read in conjunction with it the character and significance of the work will be all the more clearly apparent. (*Tsutomu Takigawa*)