Chan Heng Chee (in terms of Malay–Chinese groups and their impact upon Singapore–Malaysia relations), and Wanandi and Zakaria Haji Ahmad (with reference to generational change in the foreign policy administrations in Indonesia and Malaysia).

Important inputs into the foreign policy-making process, which this book considers, can revolve around a regime’s search for legitimacy through its foreign policy; especially with regard to the idea of performance criteria. Foreign policy which stems from an effort to legitimize a regime often drives states to pay attention to, keep close ties with, and seek support from like-minded countries. The converse of this is that close ties with states with differing outlooks or structures could prove costly. Richter’s essay on Pakistan examines the impact of Islamic ideology on its relations with other Islamic countries and with communist states.

Many of the essays in this book deal with the necessity of effective administrative performance in order to maintain internal stability, particularly with regard to authoritarian regimes. This theme is examined in the realm of foreign policy by Hiroshi Kimura’s essay concerning Soviet policy in Asia, in which he notes that the need for successful economic and political reforms is regarded as an independent variable in Gorbachev’s foreign policy. The attempt to establish cordial relations with Japan and China and the downgrading of ideological and power political motives in Soviet Asian policy are partly explained by the need to gain support for the administration’s reforms.

Whilst there are problems arising from different individual attitudes towards linkage theory, this collection of essays succeeds in impressing the reader through some thought-provoking ideas and contributions. The efforts made by the Institute of East Asian Studies to create some new understanding with regard to the relationship between domestic politics and foreign policy in these societies have not been in vain.

Timo Kivimaki
University of Helsinki


The May 1987 coup in Fiji was the first in the South Pacific. It caused particular alarm in the Western nations of Australia and New Zealand.
where it was viewed as a radically destabilizing event in a hitherto quiet international backwater, and where it offended prevailing ideas about democracy and racial equality. In this book, South Pacific historian Deryck Scarr aims to redress this chauvinism. Perhaps it was a feeling of isolation in this role which makes him more of an advocate than a judge in performing it.

The Labour part of the coalition government which won power in Fiji in April 1987 is represented as a front for the execution of long frustrated ethnic Indian aspirations for power. Likewise, its Prime Minister, the late Dr Timoci Bavadra, is portrayed as naively under the ideological influence of Marxists at the University of the South Pacific, though Scarr acknowledges that the coalition’s election platform was only “mildly leftist” in character. This improbable concert of opportunistic ethnic Indian lawyers and radical intellectuals is partly explained. Scarr suggests, by the social frustrations of acculturated urban Fijians and marginalized part-Europeans, one of whom was to become the head of the prime minister’s department after the election. Public service supporters of the coalition are excoriated for their greed over the excessive wage demands which led to the wage freeze preceding the opposition victory. Thus, Scarr gives little credence to the popular welfare provisions of an election platform borne along in such a sea of unrelieved self-interest.

Ordinary ethnic Indians are represented, sometimes through the medium of recollected conversations with taxi-drivers, as disparaging the Fijians — “Fijians are animals”, he remembers one Indian driver saying as he surveys a crowd at a bus stop in the mostly Indian town of Lautoka. For their part, more educated ethnic Indians are said to depict themselves as “people from a land of culture” with a “patronising affection” for the Fijians. Ethnic Indians are held to resent the political dominance of the native Fijians and the fact that most of the land is tied up in inalienable native titles. In contrast, the Fijian elite is depicted as pragmatic and accommodating in the defence of a native paramountcy they never conceded to Indian designs for political equality. Have we any right to condemn then when, after an election victory in which only a small percentage of Fijian voters supported the coalition, the almost wholly Fijian military decides to redress the outcome in favour of their chiefly leaders in the defeated Alliance government?

A forensic virtue of Scarr’s account is that it accurately reflects a point of view held by many Fijians, albeit anecdotal-slanted; “not many Fijians have survived in the taxi business”, he says in the interest of strengthening the moral justification for a coup that the author sympathizes with. The fact that racial prejudices are sometimes shared by people in both communities, if mostly hidden below the surface, supports
rather than detracts from the thesis basic to Scarr’s account, that Fiji is
a plural rather than a multiracial society and that the opposition ethnic
Indian-based National Federation Party (NFP) was never seen by the
Fijian community as a legitimate alternative government. He accurately
identifies the impolitic stress on legal equality which fostered ethnic
Indian illusions about the entrenchment of their formal rights in Fiji.
But in this account of homogenous racial groups in confrontation, there
is little about the similar problems faced by many rural workers and urban
squatters in both communities, a complication not easily accommodated,
or perhaps not seen as relevant, in such a heavily communal view of
political life.

This simplistic focus on the communal basis for the coups obscures
other factors deserving more attention. These include the extent to which
urbanized Fijians felt frustration over what they perceived as the growing
inertia of the long-term Alliance government, some Fijian resentment over
the continuing dominance of the Eastern Fijian élite in national politics,
and development of urban problems as a consequence of population
growth and the small-scale industrialization. Moreover, the Taukei move-
ment, which was the main civilian base of the coup makers, drew important
support from working class Fijians whose aspirations were not always in
tune with the restoration of traditional chiefly rule. Since the constitu-
tional revisions undertaken following the second coup, some of its leaders have
accused the restored Alliance élite of selling out poor Fijians, and one of
them has transferred his support to the coalition. While the existence
of class factors such as these do not necessarily contradict communal-
based accounts of the coup, they indicate that Fijian motivations were
more complex than a reading of Scarr’s book would suggest.

Within these limitations, Scarr’s narrative of events is still interest-
ing. His depiction of the difficulties confronting the Governor-General
(now President) Ratu Sir Penaja Ganilau as he struggled to reconcile his
constitutional and traditional duties is insightful, as is his account of the
awkward position into which the coups thrust the defeated Prime Minister,
Ratu Sir Kamisese Mara. The coup leader, Colonel Sitiveni Rabuka, though
figuring less prominently in Scarr’s account than he does in others, is
sympathetically portrayed in the context of traditional Fijian political
roles. He also captures the alarm of Fijians who fear being marginalized
in an ethnic Indian-dominated market state.

Scarr’s depiction of the opposition, however, is less revealing. To
bolster his interpretation of the coup, Scarr says that the Labour Party,
which was formed out of the Fiji trade union movement just over a year
prior to the election, was nothing more than a front for a faction of the
ethnic Indian-based National Federation Party. In reality, most of the old
NFP leadership had been eliminated before they were allowed to join ranks with the Labour Party. Indeed, some of its dispossessed mandarins sought shelter in the Indian branch of the Alliance for the restoration of their political fortunes after the coup. The multiracial Labour Party was the dominant partner in the coalition, something which has been confirmed with the selection of Adi Kuini Bavatra to head the opposition, following the death of her husband. Scarr enjoys portraying the ineptitude of some coalition supporters in rising to the defence of the Party after the coup, when exaggerated stories of military atrocities and Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) involvement abounded. Too many petty egos ventilated themselves in the wreckage of the Fijian state, and with hindsight many would agree with him when he opines that the Labour Party should not have gone into coalition with the NFP. He has nothing to say, however, about the failure of the Fijian Alliance Party to reassert constitutionalism after the coups, a role in which Ratu Mara might have been more effective if he had been less withdrawn.

The most serious shortcoming of this book lies in Scarr’s frequent personal disparagement of the deposed government’s members and supporters and, worse, in his projection of the ethnic Indian community as uniformly selfish, racially prejudiced against Fijians, and stupidly assertive in the political sphere. Of what relevance, for example, is the anecdote about the disciple of Ghandi who proudly boasted that he had not lost his records of debtors in a house fire? This tourist’s view of Fijian Indians sits oddly in a book with such a serious intent and makes the reader wonder about the cultural sensitivity of an author so obviously annoyed by the lack of it in others.

Overall, this is a provocative book which has succeeded in its aim of arousing impassioned debate even if it does not finally set the record straight on the coups. With all the cards on the table, what is needed now is an attempt to reconcile differences and ideas about where the communities of Fiji can go from here.

ALAN ROBSON
Australian National University


Most of the vast number of books on the Vietnam War concentrate — inevitably, given market pressures — on the American side of the war. If