

is well illustrated by Dean Forbes and Le Hong Ke. The inability of successive Metropolitan Manila administrators to solve persistent problems of poverty are exposed. But the essays on Kuala Lumpur, Jakarta, Singapore, and Yangon are less critical and probing.

As a group, the essays have three limitations. First, there is insufficient discussion of the overall spatial context in these cities. Recent publications have documented the spatial spread of these city cores into surrounding areas, creating mega-urban regions (see T. G. McGee and Ira Robinson, *The Mega-Urban Regions of Southeast Asia* [Vancouver: University of British Columbia Press, 1996]). The effect of this outward expansion on the city cores is considerable (as it has been in developed countries) and needs to be considered. Secondly, the political economy of these cities is not really engaged—the fact that these cities and their administrations are embedded in national administrations, which makes the task of administrators very different. In an age of continuing nation-building and global competition, these capitals become symbols of a nation's success. They are sites of ongoing regional and global meetings of “power elites” and thus while they may be inefficiently managed, they cannot appear to be inefficiently managed. This difficulty is further exacerbated by the fact that these cities generate a sizable proportion of their nation's wealth. Thus, Bangkok produced 50 per cent of Thailand's GNP in 1992 and Manila one-third. The growing wealth of these cities cannot be neglected because of their contribution to national revenues. At the same time, the political and economic elites are benefiting from this urban economic growth through land and real estate speculation and development. It is thus in their interests to keep local tax revenue at low levels. This is well documented in the cases of Bangkok, Manila and Jakarta. This conflict of interests is a major contradiction in developing more efficient cities in the region.

Finally, there is only limited attention in the book to the significant economic restructuring that is occurring as a result of the increase in manufacturing (particularly in the ASEAN cities) and the growth of the service sector, in particular tourism. In effect, the processes of globalization are greatly influencing the cities of this region and those processes are not really discussed.

I do not raise these omissions because they make the volume any less valuable but because a discussion of these issues would have greatly enhanced the arguments of the volume. This said, this is an immensely valuable collection of commentaries on the administration and management of Southeast Asian cities which is needed to reinforce the wider discussions about urban policy which are outlined in the book.

TERRY MCGEE
University of British Columbia

The Philippine Temptation: Dialectics of Philippines–U.S. Literary Relations. By E. SAN JUAN, JR. Philadelphia: Temple University Press, 1996. x, 305 pp. \$54.95 (cloth); \$19.95 (paper).

For a good many years E. San Juan has energetically and passionately written about Filipino—U.S. literary, economic, political, and social relations. *The Philippine Temptation*, his most recent effort on the subject, delves into the history of Filipino resistance literature; outlines its struggle to contend with the tactics and stratagems of a hegemonic ideology from the United States; and also, and with much enthusiasm, “endeavors to express a Third World perspective on the impact of Eurocentric power

(specifically the United States) on a hitherto unexplored indigenous tradition of protest and resistance” (p. 21).

San Juan begins by examining the Filipino-American War (1899–1903), explaining how American hegemony throttled the Philippines—the people, its culture—by first demanding that English be taught in all schools, and second, that it be declared the official language for business and government. The reason for this calculated U.S. ploy, San Juan contends, was to cultivate and mold a Filipino intelligentsia that would eventually become alienated from its “roots,” the farmers and common laborers, and thus stand ready to promote “Anglo-Saxon supremacy” (p. 218). Later on, San Juan extends the essence of this argument to reprimand Filipino writers who have used English, saying that the Eurocentricity that is linked to the English language encourages and glorifies an individualism that has undermined—continues to undermine—the notion of national Filipino sovereignty.

San Juan goes on to chronicle the Filipino writer through the 1930s, at which time an attempt was made to break free of this American hegemony. The Great Depression helped to ignite a spark of social and economic consciousness in Filipino workers and writers, thanks to Carlos Bulosan (*America is in the Heart*, 1946. [Reprint, Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1973]), who dedicated his life to writing about the plight of the Filipino workers in America, and who San Juan celebrates as a model of what a Filipino writer should be, because by “repudiating liberal individualism and the hubris of the intellect, [Bulosan] was compelled to realize that without the organized resistance of the working masses and the discipline of cooperative labor, the individual is condemned to recapitulate the ignominy of the past: the painful vicissitude of colonial servility and self-contempt” (p. 137) when dealing with something as corrupt and arrogant as America. Indeed, the “Violence of Exile, Politics of Desire: Prologue to Carlos Bulosan” chapter is not only the core of the book, but it also affords San Juan the opportunity to complain, once again, about how Filipino writers writing in English (now, as well as then) lack a social consciousness and, for the most part, are insensitive to the plight of the common Filipino worker. San Juan sees this self-centeredness, this selfishness, as a major deficiency with many Filipino writers.

As always, E. San Juan’s writing is certainly thought-provoking and well researched. However, the book does possess a number of stylistic irritants. First, at times the book seems disjointed, as if some of the chapters and pieces of chapters were a collection of different papers pressed into book form. The chapter on the writer Jose Garcia Villa, “Articulating a Third World Modernism: The Case of Jose Garcia Villa,” is especially tortuous and elusive in terms of the book’s overall theme. This kind of unevenness also seems responsible for a certain degree of repetition as well as unrelated information. Lastly, every now and again Professor San Juan has the tendency to slip into an intellectual jargon that is more overwhelming and confusing than clarifying. For example, in telling the reader what he plans to emphasize in chapter 6, San Juan writes that he will “discuss Villa more fully as an instructive example of how the artist from the ‘boondocks’ resorts to syncretic artifice, to cannibalizing of Western texts, and to bricolage, so as to invent an ersatz, syncretic modernism” (p. 35).

Overall, however, San Juan’s zeal and passion for his subject matter serve to minimize such stylistic irritants. *The Philippine Temptation* offers much valuable information and intelligent insights into what some of the forces, tensions and energies were—are—that have influenced the intelligentsia of the Philippines, especially the Filipino writer of English.

CRAIG LOOMIS

Miyazaki International College