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("Towards Economic Security") needs a little more elaboration. Some discussion of the fiscal policy controversy during the Magsaysay administration would have been a helpful background. The move to attain economic equality with the United States during the period was an important aspect of the controversy. Similarly, there is a need to explain some of the forces operating in the United States that bear on foreign policy in general and relations with the Philippines in particular. While there is a brief allusion to decision-making and special interests in Chapter 1 (p. 4) the reference needs to be spelled out. After all, foreign policy is one of the outputs of the political system. Not unlike other policies or outputs, foreign policy is the outcome of competing demands on the decision-makers. When ultimately promulgated, it assumes authoritativeness, uniformity, and finality, thereby making its much checkered background.

The author's final observations are worth noting: "The United States recognized the value of the Island....The Filipinos, anxious for their security against the Communist menace...wanted to continue United States military protection apart from the economic benefits of the association. There was no prospect of Philippine nationalism assuming a neutralist character in the forseeable future." (p. 148) The observations were as relevant in 1956 as they are today. What then might have been asserted as the realities of the period are now raised, however, as questions within the context of the succeeding years.

The book contains a few misspelled names: Lanuzar (p. 128) for Lanuza; Mabañag (p. 137) for Mabanag; Bancita Warns (p. 38) for Pacita Warns.

MANUEL S. ALDANA

WHAT VISITORS THOUGHT OF AUSTRALIA


A few decades ago, when the Philippines was still an American colony and Australia still a British possession, there was very little contact between the great Australian continent and our far-flung islands. We were located in the same hemisphere, yet the two countries were as far apart as the Antipods. Filipinos went to Melbourne for the Eucharistic Congress, and Australians came to the Philippines to deliver beef and butter; but there was little cultural contact between Filipinos who looked eastward to America, and Australians who looked westward to England.
The Japanese invasion (actual in the Philippines, potential in Australia) brought us together. It was to Australia that President Quezon escaped when the fate of Corregidor was hopeless; and it was from Australia that MacArthur's great offensive was launched that drove the invaders back from our islands to Japan.

In the ensuing two decades since the war, the cultural and commercial relations have gradually become closer, and the all-white immigration policy, which in the past had excluded all Filipinos from Australia, has lately been relaxed to the extent of admitting an increasing number of Filipino immigrants into that vast continent.

In promoting this humane relationship between two neighboring peoples, an important role has been played by two of the persons involved in the book under review: Robert Menzies, then Prime Minister, and Alfred Stirling, Australian Ambassador to the Philippines.

Alfred Stirling did in the Philippines what only one other foreign ambassador (to my knowledge) has done. Many foreign diplomats have visited the principal cities and the better-known tourist spots: but Sir George Clutton of England and Alfred Stirling of Australia travelled, in their separate ways, to the little known places, the hidden corners of our archipelago where tourists did not go. They used every available means of transport by air, land and sea: by jeep, on horseback, on foot. Everywhere they brought the same message: they were envoys not merely from one government to another, but from their respective peoples to ours.

When Mr. Stirling wrote this little volume long ago in collaboration with John Oldham, he was a young man at the start of what has turned out to be a distinguished career. The first edition of this book appeared in 1934; but it has now been reprinted. Robert Menzies, who wrote the Foreword to the original edition, adds this postscript to the new: "I wrote this foreword thirty five year ago. Much has happened since then...Alfred Stirling, who in 1935 was my Private Secretary, rose from that modest beginning to be High Commissioner to Canada and South Africa, and Ambassador to the Netherlands, France, Italy, Greece and the Philippines; while I vividly remember, on one of my journeys to Great Britain, being received in Karachi by John Oldham as High Commissioner to Pakistan." To Mr. Menzies' enumeration, we should add that after leaving the Philippines, Alfred Stirling rounded out his diplomatic career by serving as Ambassador to Rome.

The book under review is an entertaining way of giving a glimpse into the history not of the entire Australian continent, but of one of her states: the one named after Queen Victoria, whose capital city, Melbourne, is named after the Prime Minister of England in the early years of Queen Victoria's reign. In this book, Australia is seen
through the eyes of visitors. Some of their comments are amusing, and not always flattering. After all, they saw Australia in its youth—and youth is notoriously immature.

Lord Sherbrooke in 1842 wrote: “The state of Melbourne was at this time very peculiar... Everything was at a standstill. Everybody wanted to sell and nobody wanted to buy.” Another visitor, a decade later was amused at the rustic state of things: “I think you would have been amused to see the fashion in which we went out to dinner yesterday evening: part of the way in an omnibus, then half a mile to walk....”

Anthony Trollope, who visited Australia in 1871, adopted a patronizing air to the new colony: “They blow a good deal in Queensland, they blow loudly in New South Wales, but the blast of the trumpet heard in Victoria is louder than all the blasts—and the Melbourne blast beats all the other blowing of that proud colony.”

Sarah Bernhardt, visiting in Melbourne in 1891 at the height of a financial boom, was interviewed by a journalist who noted her un-English accent. Asked why she had a different leading man to play opposite her in her love-scenes, contrary to the custom of British actresses who always had the same artist for the lovers’ parts, Bernhardt replied: “Bah-zat ees Anglees monotony all ovare. Why do I haf deefrant costumes? For ze effect, mai boy, for ze effect. Camille’s dresses would not suit Cleopatra....”

Rudyard Kipling, visiting Australia in 1891, pointed to the danger of unlimited immigration from China. Apparently the realization of this danger produced a xenophobic reaction. As General William Booth noted in the 1890’s: “In all Australia, I have not seen above three or four pieces of land that I count properly cultivated, and they belonged to Chinamen. Then comes the cry of ‘Australia for the Australians’. But who are the Australians?”

Kipling on the other hand noted an American atmosphere in Melbourne, which he considered “second-hand”: “There is an American tone on the top of things, but it is not real. Daresay, bye and bye, you will get a tone of your own.” (What would Kipling have said about Manila?)

The visitors who thus spoke patronizingly of Australia in the nineteenth century did not dream of what Australia would become in the twentieth. One man however (Lord Roseberry in 1884) had caught a glimpse of that great future: the Australian states, he said, were not colonies in the ordinary sense; they were “a nation in performance and fact”.
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But perhaps even he did not realize that in the mid-twentieth century, Australia would become one of the most progressive nations on earth.

MIGUEL A. BERNAD

SINO-AMERICAN RELATIONS: 1949-58


Much of the material relating to China Assignment contains official reports, personal observations and suggestions submitted to the US State Department by the author Karl Lott Rankin who had been assigned as American ambassador to China from the middle of 1949 to the beginning of 1958. The author has systematically sketched the development of American relations with China in that particular period.

When the Chinese mainland fell to Chinese Communist hands, the Republic of China moved its seat to Taiwan. During this critical moment, the State Department became quite confused about its foreign policy insofar as China was concerned. Rankin pointed out a way for American policy-makers which has been proved correct by the passage of time. Antagonistic forces against Nationalist China in the U.S. government notwithstanding, the author was able finally to convince the State Department to advocate a policy of action in favor of the Chinese Nationalist government. This policy was based on the strong belief that to support the government in Taiwan is to create an asset for the American side.

Unlike those so-called “China experts”, who misrepresented the Chinese Communists as “agrarian reformers” and who entirely neglected the importance of Taiwan’s phenomenal progress through the Land Reform Program pushed through with the help of American economic aid, Rankin, through clear observation and fair judgement, not only was deeply impressed by Taiwan’s progress, but also made a series of constructive suggestions for the improvement of the Chinese governmental, economic, and military administration.

In chapter IV of his book, he pointed out that the communization of the Chinese mainland was the result of the interference of the Soviet Union which took unfair advantage of Nationalist China’s weakness after eight years of war with Japan by arming the Chinese Communists with weapons seized from the Japanese and thus enabling them to rebel against the Chinese government on the mainland. Rankin tried to take away from the U.S. the responsibility of approving for the Soviets a free hand in Manchuria made during the Yalta conference.