

philippine studies

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

American Neo-Colonialism

Review Author: John N. Schumacher

Philippine Studies vol. 21, no. 1 and 2 (1973): 242–244

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

written in a style worthy of the best of the academicians. It lays a finger on the characteristics and traditional attitudes of the regions, with the corresponding problems that merit close attention and serious study. The author's own views and the variety of themes which he discusses both incidentally and deliberately have a certain attraction for the reader and quite easily suggest many other ideas and views. One could not have asked for more from a good writer.

One seeks, however, a much more balanced analysis of the key problems and issues relating to the integration of personality and the consortium of the regions. The essay would gain no little cohesion and unity if Laín Entralgo could rid himself of some personal bitterness that repeatedly shows itself in his pages and which distracts from such an excellent piece of writing.

A minor correction or omission here and there would certainly help both the author and his work, making it a real introductory accomplishment for the projected history and genealogy of Spain.

Angel Hidalgo, S.J.

AMERICAN NEO-COLONIALISM: Its Emergence in the Philippines and Asia. By William J. Pomeroy. New York: International Publishers, 1970. 255 pages. \$2.85 paper.

From the fact that the author of this book is an American communist who held a high place in the Huk rebellion of the 1950's, and its publisher the well-known Marxist publishing firm of New York, the prospective reader may be inclined to write it off as another diatribe of Marxist propaganda. Undoubtedly Marxist-Leninist ideology forms the framework in which the book is written, but in spite of its tendentiousness and serious defects from the methodological point of view, it is not without value for the historian of the Philippines.

The framework for the study is the apparent discrepancy between Lenin's classical analysis of imperialism and the actual evolution of American imperialism. Since for Lenin the fifth and final step of the imperialist process was the territorial division of the world by the capitalist powers into colonies for exploitation, how "explain the rise of the United States to world imperialist supremacy with only a minimum participation in outright seizure of colonies" (p. 7)? The answer for Pomeroy is to be found in an analysis of the American imperialist venture of the forcible annexation of the Philippines. Contrary to the expectations of the imperialist sector of the American people, the first substantial American colony, far from proving profitable for capitalistic America, in the long run proved to be both an economic and military liability. Profiting from this experience, United States policy evolved from classic colonialism to the type of neo-colonialism early adumbrated in the American policy toward Cuba and

subsequently implemented in the economic colonization of Latin America and of Asia. As Pomeroy sees it, the intense struggles that rocked the American domestic political arena at the turn of the century between "imperialists" and "anti-imperialists" were rather struggles between two different types of capitalist exploitation of the world markets — should it be by the establishment of outright colonies for military and economic purposes or should investment in the domestic market and the nearby economically dependent countries of the Western Hemisphere provide the same capitalistic returns without the financial outlay, military losses, and domestic strife consequent on the forcible subjugation of the Philippine Republic? The anti-imperialists, as the term was then used, were no less keen on the expansion of markets for American products than were the imperialists; it was merely a difference in strategy, and the former were proven correct. Hence, as Pomeroy sums it up, "in simplified terms, the anti-imperialism of that time is the neo-colonialism of today" (p. 10).

The thesis is thought-provoking, and Pomeroy has marshalled a great deal of factual information on the more sordid aspects of late nineteenth and early twentieth century American policy towards the Philippines. His bibliography is extensive, and the historian aware of the studies on American imperialism by responsible American and Filipino historians will perceive that the author has culled wisely and extensively from recognized scholars. The factual information is not new to scholars abreast of the literature, but it has been assembled in cumulative fashion, which is impressive evidence of the author's diligence. Herein lies the value of the book — it is a handy compendium of factual information on the economic, military, religious, racist, and messianic components of American imperialism, particularly for the period up to 1913, buttressed by extensive quotations from American sources.

Unfortunately, however, whatever may be the validity of the book's thesis, it cannot be substantiated from the evidence presented in this book. In the first place, the author almost totally ignores the Filipinos in his discussion, as if American imperialistic policies had operated in a complete vacuum. The success or failure of such policies certainly did not depend solely on American initiatives, but on the social and economic structures existing in the Philippines at the time of American annexation, the acceptability of American policies to the Filipino elite, e.g., with regard to free trade, American investment, etc. It is significant that the important study of Dr. Bonifacio Salamanca, *Filipino Reaction To American Rule, 1901—1913*, which appeared in 1968, does not appear in the lengthy bibliography. Salamanca has shown clearly, for example, that, in spite of ritual opposition in the Assembly, there was widespread desire for free trade among leading Filipinos. An even more serious omission from Pomeroy's bibliography, since it deals precisely with American economic policy, is Pedro Abelarde's *American Tariff Policy towards the Philippines, 1898—1946*, published in 1946. Abelarde carefully documents both the story of the efforts of American cordage, sugar, and tobacco trusts to promote a crudely exploitative policy towards the Philippines, and likewise the efforts of Taft and other members of the Philippine Commission to block such exploitation, in a

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.
By H. I. London. Sydney: Sydney University Press, 1970. 318 pages.

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