viduals and "American exceptionalism."

The closing chapters of this book offer a Freirian hope for a useful understanding of our past, one that is based on historical reality. San Juan analyzes “popular anti-colonialism” premises based on “historical memory and symbols of belonging and solidarity” and the rejection of “post colonial anti foundationalism” while calling attention to the “invention of native traditions” as survival tools. Thus, he concludes with the significance of the struggles in Chiapas.

It is a fascinating book in that it is most understandable despite San Juan’s predilection to word inventions and use of the very jargon he critiques. However, for those trying to theoretically and historically make sense of the creation and consequence of US power relationship over such areas as Puerto Rico, Cuba, Dominican Republic, etc., this book sounds bell after bell of clarity.

Professor San Juan has written an important book; one that can help to untangle the influence of race, ethnicity, and class in power relations and their consequences in America’s subaltern societies.

Linda Delgado
Northeastern University


The author has written an excellent summary of the little known events in Filipino history in the Philippines and the history of the Filipino community in the U.S., a history of over four hundred years that covers the colonial oppression, and resistance first to Spain and then the United States. He attributes the fractured Filipino identity, one that is “fissured by ambivalence, opportunism, and schizoid loyalties,” to the colonial experiences under these two western European powers. In his brilliant analysis of the literature he uses a historical materialist theoretical framework (22).

He has conducted a thorough review of the literature writ-
ten by Filipino and Filipino-American writers from various times periods, the literature written by European American authors on Filipino immigration to the U.S., and the Filipino community in the U.S. San Juan, Jr. has left little written about Filipinos in the United States uncriticized, from Carol Bulosan’s *America in My Heart* (1946) to Yen Le Espiritu’s “Colonial Oppression, Labour Importation and Group Formation: Filipinos in the United States” in the journal *Ethnic and Racial Studies* (1996).

One comes away feeling ambivalent about this book. On the one hand San Juan, Jr.’s heavy usage of linguistic jargon and other obscure verbiage and his *high literary theory on ethnic writing* makes this book difficult to read and understand. Unless one is an anthropological linguist, this book presents a formidable challenge to read without a dictionary close by. On the other hand, however, this does not detract from the fact that he has done an impressive analysis of the literature on the Filipino experience in the United States. His imagery is stimulating and his metaphors thought-provoking, but it is obvious that his book was not written for the average reader.

The literature San Juan, Jr. reviewed touches on some very complex issues that hinder the establishment of a monolithic Filipino identity. For example, his analysis of the literature alludes to the high degree of exogamy among Filipinos in the U.S. and the hybrid offspring from Filipino-European American unions. He speaks of the development of a Filipino identity, but one has to wonder how such an identity can develop in the United States when there is such a high degree of exogamy among Filipinos of both sexes? Correspondingly, how can the offspring of mixed Filipino/Euro-American marriages be included in a new Filipino identity? Like the character he mentions from Hagedorn’s book, *The Gangster of Love*, Keiko: “One day she’s Japanese and black, the next day she’s Dutch and Hawaiian… (173)...She was reinventing herself moment to moment, day to day” (174). This appears to be the situation of most, to use San Juan, Jr.’s word, *miscegenated* types, since the mixture of Filipino/Euro-American genes produces children that are not easily identifiable. He provides an *antidote to the mystification of hybridity and in-betweenness* (187). That is, *we need to historicize, to come down to the ground of economic and political reality* (ibid). The problem is, as is the case
with most of his book, it is not altogether clear what he means by this.

M.L. (Tony) Miranda
University of Nevada, Las Vegas


In their introduction to this stimulating collection of Asian American voices, editors Lavina Dhingra Shankar and Rajini Srikanth describe “A Part Yet Apart: South Asians in Asian America,” as an “exploration” of the ways in which South Asian Americans from India, Pakistan, Nepal, Bhutan, Bangladesh, Sri Lanka, and the Maldives, do or do not “fit” into the popular, academic, and activist consciousness associated with the Asian American Identity which has traditionally embraced immigrants from countries hugging the Pacific rim - China, Taiwan, the Koreas, Japan, Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia and Philippines. The essays in the book debate what constitutes the gap, who perceives the gap, and how the gap can be closed.

The gap is seen, as Rajiv Shankar puts it in his forward to the book, in the relative dominance of the East and South East Asians in the Asian American platform, in the non-Asian-American consciousness where Asian American is associated, primarily and often exclusively, with East and South East Asia, in the racialization of the Asian American identity as “oriental”—all of which marginalizes South Asians and makes them “feel as if they are merely a crypto group”.

The strength of the book primarily lies in what it considers to be legitimate, realistic, progressive, and proven strategies for bridging this gap. In moving away from advocating alliances based on ambiguous and ephemeral notions of self, identity, nationality, and race, many of the essays in the book provide sophisticated and dynamic options based on class and political activism. The most forceful and effective essays are