fashion which is in stark contrast with Pomeroy's one-sided treatment.

The lack of attention to the Philippine dimension of the story is perhaps due in part to the author's lack of knowledge of Philippine history, shown in such glaring errors of fact as making W. Cameron Forbes the successor of Henry C. Ide as Governor-General, totally omitting the lengthy term of James F. Smith. Other employment of facts on the Philippines out of context is less understandable, such as the implication that the destruction of 90% of carabaos was due to the war, rather than to the rinderpest epidemic, or that Mindanao's remaining under military rule until 1913 was due to the survival of the Revolution there. His allusion to the Philippine Revolution as a peasant agrarian revolt can scarcely be taken seriously.

Pomeroy amply documents the fact that racists, commercial exploiters, and other selfish interests which would today be termed imperialist, were to be found not only among those frankly in favor of an American expansionist policy, but likewise among the so-called anti-imperialists. What he neglects to mention, however, or attempts to conceal, by attributing the attitudes of one or some members of a group to the whole, is that those who opposed immediate independence, or encouraged American investment in the Philippines, were often motivated by very diverse reasons, from the basest to the most altruistic, even if their correctness is subject for debate. To class, e.g., Taft, who believed large-scale American investment necessary to supply the capital required for Philippine economic development, in the same group as the paid lobbyists of the American cordage, tobacco, and sugar trusts in the U.S. Congress, is certainly to distort the facts of history.

In brief, the book will be useful as a handy reference for historians who are already familiar with the facts and hence are aware of what has been omitted or included out of context in Pomeroy's account. This is not to say that the author's thesis is totally false, but the relation between turn of the century American imperialism and the economic imperialism or neo-colonialism of today is not likely to be elucidated by historians working within the straitjacket of Marxist-Leninist dogma. Most practicing historians will find reality somewhat more complex than such a framework allows. The book is further marred by an extraordinarily large number of misspellings of proper names and other misprints, as well as rather unreliable data in many entries of the bibliography.

John N. Schumacher

NON-WHITE IMMIGRATION AND THE 'WHITE AUSTRALIA' POLICY.


Mr. London has done extensive research into Australia's immigration policies and out of it has produced a balanced critique of them. Down to the end of World War II 'White Australia' was a policy and a fact. Since
World War II the policy has come under closer scrutiny and strong attack. University student groups have been the most active, and perhaps the most effective, opponents of the policy. Evidently the 12,000 foreign students, most of them from Asia, have had a salutary effect on their hosts. The Christian churches, the Methodist and the Presbyterian more vigorously than the Catholic, have criticized and opposed accepted policy. Most of the nation’s political parties support the ‘White Australia’ policy of the past, but recently they have dropped the racist expression from their platforms and pronouncements. The change is largely verbal, but if one recalls that hypocrisy is sometimes the first step toward sanctity, this could be interpreted as progress of a sort.

Assessing the views of the people on such a sensitive issue is difficult. What data Mr. London has gathered on this point indicate that their attitude is more generous than it was a generation ago. Most of the major newspapers favor a policy that would not restrict immigration to white people. But whatever changes may have taken place, they have not been strong enough to move the leading politicians. And in a democracy these gentlemen are perhaps the best diviners of public opinion.

The reasons for admitting more people of races other than white are cogent. Australia needs population to develop its enormous natural resources. Since the birthrate among native Australians is very low, immigration will have to supply that population. In recent years Australians have discovered that they live in Asia, and they are anxious to improve their relations with their neighbors, none of whom is white. And Australia does not want to join the Republic of South Africa and Rhodesia as an exponent of white arrogance.

Perhaps the most valuable parts of Mr. London’s book are his pen pictures of individuals and small groups affected by Australia’s policy. His chapter on Nancy Prasad, a six-year-old girl from the Fiji Islands who was deported from Australia, demonstrates the government’s attitude toward people who are not white. Every jot and title of the law was on the government’s side, but had Nancy been white she would probably still be in Australia. His pages on how successfully the Chinese have been assimilated into Australian society should be read in every southeast Asian country where the local Chinese are victims of injustice. And the equitable treatment the non-white residents of that country have received in recent years proves that the people of Australia do have a conscience, perhaps a more sensitive one than some of their critics.

The book has some minor flaws. One wonders by what norm Burma, Malaysia, and Cambodia can be considered overpopulated. And one wonders too why the author uses the expression “value-loaded phrases” pejoratively. His book abounds in them and a rose by any other name. . . .

Bartholomew P. Lahiff