

wicklung werden Bestandteil dieses Szenarios sein.“ Zwar hätten Ereignisse wie das Ende des Ost-West-Konfliktes oder die Befriedung diverser Sezessionsbewegungen die Rahmenbedingungen für politischen Wandel verbessert. „Doch auch dort, wo genuine Öffnungsprozesse einsetzen oder die Demokratie sich konsolidiert, wird kein Ebenbild von Westminster reproduziert.“

Rülands Untersuchung bietet dem an Südostasien Interessierten eine exzellente und äußerst faktenreiche Aufarbeitung grundlegender Systemstrukturen und aktueller Entwicklungen innerhalb der politischen Systeme der Region. Dabei räumt der Verfasser mit monokausalen Deutungsmustern auf, die viel zu oft in einer Debatte unreflektierter Schlagwörter zur Erklärung der Zusammenhänge zwischen wirtschaftlichen und politischen Entwicklungen im asiatisch-pazifischen Raum herangezogen werden. Wer sich zudem mit den Konsequenzen der ökonomischen Turbulenzen im Fernen Osten für den inneren Zustand der regionalen Akteure beschäftigt, wird bei Rüland eine Fülle von Anregungen finden.

Martin Wagener

MICHAEL HILL / LIAN KWEN FEE, *The Politics of Nation Building and Citizenship in Singapore*. (Politics in Asia Series). London/New York: Routledge, 1995. X, 285 pages, £ 14.99 (Pb), ISBN 0-415-12025-X. £ 45.00 (Hb); ISBN 0-415-10052-6

Without any doubt this is a highly interesting and important book. It is based on a wide corpus of literature including many theoretical publications. However, it is not a book on citizenship but rather one on the politics of nation building and social integration within a developmental state. If citizenship – at least in a European tradition – means discussing the legal status of citizens in the framework of basic rights, then this issue is largely missing in this volume. This book is based more on sociological and political argumentation. Within this scope the authors have written a book which traces the development of the city-state since independence. Divided into nine chapters, each one focussing on the issue of nation building, the book presents an analysis of the most important sectors of Singaporean society. The first chapter recapitulates different theoretical approaches to citizenship and its relationship with state and nation. It is made clear that an inclusive concept of membership in an ethnically and socially non-homogeneous society presupposes the de-politicising of ethnical and social fractions. It is also shown that in Singapore citizenship is viewed rather as a communitarian concept than as one based on individual rights. Otherwise the cohesion of Singapore society might become questioned. Therefore the state has to become meaningful for its citizens.

These considerations are followed by discussions on the multiethnic origins of Singaporean society, on language and education policies and on ethnic relations. In the Singaporean case it seems plausible that the basis of the corporative state can be understood as a business transaction: Absolute loyalty of the citizens exchanged for competent management of the state as moral guardian (107). In this process group-interests are channelled by the state.

The following chapter deals with housing policy which is very important in the city-state, especially in terms of nation building. It can be seen that house-owner-

ship in conjunction with socio-political control and surveillance in the Singapore New Towns are one basis for social integration. But the authors do not discuss the fact that this integration seems to be achieved by an equal distribution of the population all over the island, not by social homogenisation. The following discussion on family issues makes clear that the interventionist state is even trying to keep its hold on family life. The authors ask: "... how far social policy in the area of the family should extend before it provokes a negative response from the populace" (142). This statement is important because it shows a special quality of this book: Although the authors present a lot of arguments which are critical of Singaporean policy, the general point of view seems to be acceptance of the top-down nature of the same. Sometimes this approach seems to creep into the argumentation despite the intentions of the authors, when, for instance, they observe that Malay loyalty in Singapore might become doubtful not because they are disadvantaged but because they "underperform" as the government calls it (108 f.). Even the term excludes the question whether this so-called underperformance might be a problem of Singaporean politics instead of Malayan habits. Back to the family issues. The authors tell us that "the proletarianization of the family in Singapore in the 1970s will probably lead to its embourgeoisment in the 1990s if Singapore maintains its present impressive rate of economic growth" (157). There is no doubt that Singaporean society is highly stratified – but embourgeoisment? From my point of view, stratification indicates that besides growing middle classes there remains an increasing group of urban poor in Singapore and this process is not embourgeoisment. The next chapter on parapolitics clarifies some other important structures of Singaporean society. "In the particular context of Singapore, the government's co-opting, construction and adaptation of mediating structures has been a central mechanism for restructuring collective identity and its symbolic components" (159). I agree, but the authors do not discuss the obvious question if this might not be a precise description of the totalitarian organization of power. I do not think that Singapore is a totalitarian state but I believe that this question has to be discussed if the authors make statements like those quoted above. This lack of clarity regarding central analytical issues runs through a lot of arguments. On page 186 the authors make the following statement: "Through responsible participation in various levels of community activity, the members of such organizations learn to take part in the active performance of civic duties." But Hill/Lian do not discuss the very relevant question who decides what is "responsible". The statement describes government politics in Singapore but I think that it has to be further analysed. If participation is defined by the state, then it is questionable if that is genuine participation. In connection with this question the authors discuss the specific turn of the Singaporean state in defining civil society as civic society, which means that every political issue is monopolized by the state while other issues can be discussed within society without involving state institutions. I agree with this statement but I miss further discussion. The authors write that "... the debate over civil or civic society highlights the tension and the dilemma of the PAP government as it strives to formulate responses to demands by an increasingly highly educated citizenry for legitimate areas of social participation" (240). Right, but again: One cannot just discuss dilemmas from a government point of view. For it could well be argued that the problems lie within the core of Singapore society itself and therefore cannot be solved by the government.



In general: The book imparts a wealth of knowledge on Singaporean history, politics and society, which is undoubtedly its strength. Beyond that, this book is equally important because of its shortcomings. Writing a book on Singapore and avoiding such is hardly possible because government policy is so overwhelmingly present in everyday life. The authors present many critical remarks about Singaporean politics, but these remarks seem to be presented mostly as a reason to consider policy upgrading instead of discussing seriously the crucial tensions within the inner core of society caused by overwhelming social change in a short time and its consequences. Seen from this perspective this volume is about controlled nation building from above and not about nation building. These critical remarks will not diminish the merits of the book especially as it stimulates considerations such as I have presented above, which point to the "strategic" tensions inherent in Singapore society between "traditional" structures and comprehensive social change.

*Manfred Kieserling*

STEVEN WEDEMA, *"Ethiek" und Macht. Die niederländisch-indische Kolonialverwaltung und indonesische Emanzipationsbestrebungen 1901-1927.* (Beiträge zur Kolonial- und Überseegeschichte, 71). Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1998. 353 pages, 3 maps, DM 88,-. ISBN 3-515-07264-0

Based upon a dissertation at the University of Zurich, this colonial history of Indonesia during the first three decades of the twentieth century is not a study of interaction between Dutch and Indonesians. It can rather be considered to be a history of Dutch administrative culture and how it went from a pro-emancipatory ethical principle to the practice of repression of Indonesian nationalism. It makes extensive use of Dutch-language primary and secondary source materials, thereby introducing to the German-reading public a historiography still dominated by Dutch historians.

Starting with an excellent survey of the many meanings "ethical" policy embodied, the ramifications are hardly discussed, since the author concentrates on internal administrative discussions rather than practical outcomes. Pursuing a strict chronological approach, it is shown how benevolent ideas supported by a limited group of politicians and high-ranking colonial officials were gradually undermined, not only by the conservatism of many colonial civil servants but also by the Indonesian emancipatory movement, that step by step became more radical. The final turnaround came with the rebellions in West Java and West Sumatra in 1926-27, after which ethical principles as a guideline for colonial policy were definitively dead.

The names and events that appear in the book are quite well known to any specialist in Indonesian modern history, but for a wider public it offers a useful introduction to the period and, on top of that, the unique flavour of Dutch preoccupations, as they emerge from unpublished archival records. Also, there are some initial steps to engage in debate with major authors such as Locher-Scholten, Takashi Shiraishi and Ruth McVey, but these concern formal matters of detail like certain typologies or periodisations. Due to the focus chosen the book has the same asymmetry as is present in much contemporary Dutch colonial histories: on the Dutch side many details and persons, providing a composite picture, but on the Indonesian side nearly only collectivities and a stress on particular instances of resistance. The