fore incorrect to say that at one stage in the historical process Philippine nationalism was a “pseudo-nationalism,” while at another stage, it was real and genuine.

To be sure, the nationalistic movement during the American period was unique in many ways. For one thing, it was carried out in the realm of peace, employing peaceful and lawful methods. The grand strategy of the independence campaign as planned and directed by Speaker Osmeña called for two specific courses of action: (1) the judicious use of the powers granted by the law to the people to prove their capacity to manage their own affairs; and (2) the establishment and maintenance of a policy of cooperation and friendship with the United States.

The nationalistic sentiment for the “sacred cause” was deeply rooted. It pervaded all ranks of Filipino society. Because of its strength and power, Filipino politicians dared not ignore it. Osmeña and Quezon, fully sharing this sentiment with the people, remained steadfast in their loyalty and devotion to the cause of Philippine independence.

Except for those portions of the dissertation which were brought up for critical comment, the work is a notable piece of historical scholarship. It is a study in depth of an institution which has played a major and significant role in the development and implementation of America’s policy in the Philippines. It is a distinct contribution to historical knowledge in the field of Philippine-American relations.

Nicolas Zafra


Apparently based on a doctoral dissertation, this book gives an account of Taft and his activity with regard to United States foreign policy from the time of his appointment to the Second Philippine Commission in 1900 until he was elected President of the United States in 1908. More specifically Professor Minger attempts to show, as it were, Taft’s education in foreign policy through several episodes in which he represented the United States in its foreign relations — colonialist activity in the Philippines, imperialist intervention in Cuba and Panama, and negotiations with major powers, Japan and China. Though in general Minger’s study of Taft pictures him in a favorable light, he does not hesitate to point out how much he mirrored many of the assumptions of his age and political party — seeing American intervention in the affairs of a supposedly independent Cuba, for instance, as fully justified for the good of the Cuban people. Indeed he felt that Cuba was less fit for
self-government than the Philippines, and would have felt no qualms about its annexation by the United States, were it not for the political repercussions at home. In Panama in 1908, he saw a need for the United States to assume some sort of control over the elections, in order to prevent the continuous revolutions which would threaten American interests in the Panama Canal, then under construction.

In accordance with the policy of President Roosevelt in his two visits to Japan, Taft at least tacitly encouraged Japanese ambitions in Asia, yielding them a free hand in "backward" Korea, in order to protect the Philippines, though trying to keep the balance of power in Asia by not overly weakening Russia. Later in China, as he became more aware of the Japanese expansionist danger, he came out strongly for United States maintenance of the Open Door policy, and the development of China in ways favorable to American trade and investments.

These experiences by which Taft gradually evolved his imperialist "Dollar Diplomacy" — the use of American power to promote American business interests in other parts of the world — were all subsequent to his governorship in the Philippines, but one may see a progression from ideas already latent in his approach to the Philippines. What perhaps distinguished Taft's attitude toward the Philippines from that he displayed toward other subjects of American intervention was the genuine affection and admiration, albeit somewhat condescending and paternalistic, that he felt toward the Filipinos. Moreover, in the Philippines, he pursued these policies for what he considered to be the good of the Filipinos rather than merely for the good of United States interests. Many of his policies, which more discerning present-day observers see at the root of contemporary Philippine problems — American encouragement of the entrenchment of a conservative oligarchical elite, establishment of free trade, heavy American investments — Taft did not see in contradiction with his expressed policy of "the Philippines for the Filipinos," and he did intervene against the more exploitative American interests in the Philippines. Basically cautious and conservative himself, and supremely convinced of the superiority of the American system of government and politics and the contemporary American economic ethos, he could not conceive of doing anything better for another country than to encourage its economic development through a conservative elite in close ties with the United States.

The treatment of the Philippines is contained chiefly in chapters 2 and 3. Though fundamentally sound, in the opinion of the reviewer, it adds little or nothing to our knowledge of Taft's Philippine policy. This is not surprising, since the author seems totally ignorant of the studies on the Taft era done in recent years by Bonifacio Salamanca, Oscar Alfonso (both in his book on Roosevelt and other articles specifically on Taft), Sister M. Dorita Clifford on Taft's religious policy, and most recently, though perhaps appearing too late
for consideration by Minger, by John Gates and Peter Stanley. As a result, anyone at all familiar with recent Philippine historiography here and abroad will find these chapters weak and superficial. A token of this superficiality may be offered in noting the fact that Minger used as a major source for Philippine events Leon Wolff's popularization, Little Brown Brother. The accomplishments of Taft are related as he saw them, without investigation into the reality of these "accomplishments," much less evaluation of their long-range effects. This rather than erroneous statements and misunderstandings is the failure of the book with regard to the Philippines. It is true that the subject of Minger's book is Taft, and not the Philippines, but one cannot see Taft's important activity during those years simply through the prisms of his own letters and papers, where, as a benevolent colonial administrator, he naturally saw his efforts in their very best light.

In short, the book offers some new perspectives on Taft and his views, at least by taking a new look at the old facts largely contained in Pringle's biography and other such previous works. Principally it gives an insight into how Taft's ideas on the American role in the non-European world developed. But historians of the Philippines will learn nothing new about Taft's Philippine policy.

John N. Schumacher


"Probably the first of its kind in the Philippines," says Rev. Harry Pak in the foreword. It certainly is a compilation of which Silliman University can rightly be proud of on many counts. Rev. Lydia Niguidula and the other main contributors in this book are members of the Research Center of Silliman University.

This is a "sourcebook," and Ms. Niguidula invites all interested persons to "feel free to duplicate or to modify the original materials presented for use in worship services" (p. ii). I suppose this is the main reason for Rev. Pak's statement in the foreword: I don't know of any other liturgical sourcebook, Protestant or Catholic, printed in the Philippines. And may I add that many original prayers and theological explanations presented here can greatly enhance our own Catholic liturgical services — Catholic liturgists, please take note.

Perhaps more decidedly original, however, is the Silliman committee's attitude toward "cultural adjustments" and its deep respect for "contemporary Filipino experience" (Rev. Pak, pp. ix—x). In my very limited acquaintance with the Protestant churches that have come to us from America, this is the first time I have seen an explicit apologia for really Filipinizing