

philippine studies

Ateneo de Manila University • Loyola Heights, Quezon City • 1108 Philippines

American Doctoral Dissertations on Asia

Review Author: Josefa M. Sanieel

Philippine Studies vol. 18, no. 1 (1970): 217–218

Copyright © Ateneo de Manila University

Philippine Studies is published by the Ateneo de Manila University. Contents may not be copied or sent via email or other means to multiple sites and posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's written permission. Users may download and print articles for individual, noncommercial use only. However, unless prior permission has been obtained, you may not download an entire issue of a journal, or download multiple copies of articles.

Please contact the publisher for any further use of this work at philstudies@admu.edu.ph.

<http://www.philippinestudies.net>
Fri June 30 13:30:20 2008

already taken place. If this is so, deeper study is needed before one can conclude, as the author does, that

The inability of the mendicant orders to discipline themselves was a consequence of their decentralized organization. Provincial superiors and definitors...were reluctant or unable to take effective punitive measures against misconduct, since they themselves would soon return to the status of subjects.

Because of the highly centralized...character of the Jesuit organization, Rome could intervene in any province before the abuses got out of hand. With the mendicant orders, Rome could step in only after the abuses had been publicly exposed, and by then the intervention was often ineffective. Finally, the Jesuits avoided the major cause of factionalism that plagued the other orders in the New World by restricting the membership of creoles to a controllable minority (p. 266).

One may quibble over the instances when the author seems to telescope history (for example, pp. 21-22; 40-41, among others). The present certainty grew out of the past, but my complaint is that these sections suffer from their brevity.

These individual remarks do not fundamentally affect the argument of the book. One perhaps would indicate that Phelan has a tendency to be verbose and diffuse. I must admit, a few pages of this study demanded extra concentration, otherwise I would have lost the forest for the trees. This is probably the danger of detailed monographs like this one.

All in all, this is a book worth giving time to. Philippine historiography is sadly lacking, and much of what we know of our past is by analogy with the Latin American experience. Dr. Phelan is not unknown to students of Philippine history. Aside from *The Kingdom of Quito*, he has already presented us with the needed publication on *The Hispanization of the Philippines* (1959).

JOSE S. ARCILLA

STUDIES ON ASIA

AMERICAN DOCTORAL DISSERTATIONS ON ASIA 1933—JUNE 1966, Including Appendix of Master's Theses at Cornell University 1933-June 1968, by Curtis W. Stucki. New York: The Southeast Asia Program, 1968. 304 pp.

Along with the expansion of American involvement in Asia since Pearl Harbor, has been the increased interest in American universities

in most parts of this area of the world and the Pacific Islands, as focus of curricular programs and researches. One can easily observe this development by reading through the entries in this volume listing American doctoral dissertations on Asia, including those on the Pacific Islands, (1933-June 1966), as well as the appended Master's theses covering Asia at Cornell University (1933-June 1968). An up-dated listing by C. W. Stucki of his earlier bibliographic work—Data Paper No. 5: *American Doctoral Dissertations on Asia, 1933-1962, Including Appendix of Master's Theses at Cornell University*, published in 1963—the 1968 edition is identified as Data Paper No. 71, also published by the Southeast Asia Program, Department of Asian Studies of Cornell University. Though the latter could have been more serviceable to its users had it contained annotations, it is in any case an important guide to studies on Asia which have to be consulted by students of the region.

The entries, classified under each country and subject and listed in chronological order, seem to concentrate under China, Japan and India, countries whose history and culture were of much earlier interest to American universities than the other parts of Asia. Likewise, it is understandable to find more dissertations and theses written on the Philippines than on other countries of Southeast Asia. While there is a wide distribution of the subject of the dissertations and theses, there appears to be a larger number written in the fields of Economics, Education, History and Political Science.

Some of the entries covering more than one country could have been classified under each of the countries involved. For example, "S5-86. Hue, Nguyen Thi. Training for Community Development: A Comparative Study of National Programs in Ghana, India and the Philippines, 1962, Political Science, Michigan", p. 184, is placed only under India. Could it not have been mentioned under the Philippines also like other cross references provided for similar entries by Stucki?

Besides indicating whether or not an entry is available on micro-film from University Microfilms, this volume includes an author index and a list of publications of Cornell University Southeast Asia Program. It indeed supplements earlier listings like the *University of Chicago Doctoral Dissertations and Masters' Theses on Asia, 1894-1962* (Chicago, 1962) and *An Annotated Bibliography of the Theses and Dissertations on Asia Accepted at Syracuse University, 1907-1963*, compiled under the Direction of D. V. Hart (Syracuse, N.Y. 1964), both of which cover a broader span of time.

JOSEFA M. SANIEL