

imprisonment or transportation. While the latter was interrupted by the American Revolution, it had been unsuccessful in its earlier phase, and revival in the 1780s depended upon government financing. Transportation may have eased the way for the extension of other forms of incarceration. Beattie has good sections on the houses of correction, county jails and the notorious hulks. As he says, prisons and their conditions were for long a subject of concern, if only in the fears incited by the pitiful diseased prisoners at trial. By the last quarter of the eighteenth century, when Hanway and Howard "exposed" prison conditions, there was in fact a developed consciousness which those men articulated, a consciousness which was prepared to see healthier prisons as houses of (moral) correction; which was offended by the pillory and the whip and wanted to administer those punishments in private; which was allowing the accused legal counsel and deliberately understating property values to evade capital punishment. This consciousness was a necessary precondition to penal reform, and one very clear theme of Beattie's book is the awkward and prolonged manner in which that attitude developed.

Beattie says that he is "concerned with the character and social meaning of prosecuted offenses" and "the way those accused of committing them were dealt with by the courts" (p. 4). The second task is accomplished in an impressive manner; the first may in fact be too much to ask of the evidence, but it is as well done as it can be here. To bring these two parts together, with the extensive research on which they rest, provides an excellent addition to the social and legal history of the eighteenth century.

Richard S. Tompson
University of Utah

* * *

HERBERT J. BIX — *Peasant Protest in Japan, 1590-1884*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1986. Pp. xxxviii, 296.

WILLIAM W. KELLY, — *Deference and Defiance in Nineteenth-Century Japan*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1985. Pp. xvi, 322.

Western studies of Japan traditionally have followed the consensus model. There are reasons for this. Consensus and harmony on all levels of human activity have throughout the centuries been an ideal Japanese society aspired to. Here as in other societies practice fell short of the ideal. But this did not stop traditional Japanese scholars from writing history in accordance with the ideal, nor Westerners from taking note of the for them extraordinary stress upon harmony in the society they studied.

The spread of Marxism amongst Japanese scholars in the 1920s resulted in a shift to research on social conflict and its victims. The radical suppression of the left in pre-war Japan, however, meant that such research could only come into its own in the post-war period.

Amongst Westerners one scholar stands out amongst those turning to the conflict model in the pre-war period: the Canadian E.H. Norman. Norman, now generally considered to have been the preeminent interpreter of modern Japan in his day, committed suicide in 1957 while serving as diplomat overseas. In the inquisition-charged atmosphere of the 50s, the Marxist-orientated approach of his writings had made him the subject of political persecution. Rather than fight for his reputation and job, Norman, who had been brought up in Japan, chose the traditional Japanese method to resolve the dilemma.

Only during the last few years has the consensus approach come under attack. Conflict is being rediscovered as a much neglected aspect of Japanese history, resulting in a re-evaluation of Norman's works and a number of publications dealing with conflict topics.

The two books under review cover perhaps the most important manifestation of conflict in pre-industrial Japan: peasant protest.

While both books deal with the same topic and in part with the same time frame, the treatment of the material and the conclusions reached by the two authors differ radically.

Herbert P. Bix in his *Peasant Protest in Japan, 1590-1884* casts the material into the traditional mould of Marxist class struggle. William W. Kelly in his *Deference and Defiance in Nineteenth-Century Japan* comes to the conclusion that the protesters "grounded their actions in the contingencies of their daily lives and judged their reach by the exigencies of their everyday interactions". (p. 291). Bix singles out for attention the high points of Japanese peasant violence over several centuries, while Kelly limits himself to four disturbances taking place within as many decades in one single domain. Both authors treat their topics with careful attention to detail. But while Bix cites local chronicles at length to paint a colourful revolutionary picture — down to the miraculous happenings preceding an insurrection (pp. 74, 75), and "the pealing of temple warning bells and the blaring of bamboo horns" (p. 122) — Kelly adopts a more matter-of-fact tone to describe the great variety of people that shaped events.

Bix divides his book into four parts. Part one, entitled "Defeat: The Onset of Feudal Decline" centres around the Sanchu Rising of 1726-1727 in Western Japan. In part two, "Forward Again: Readjusting the Social Contract", the scene shifts to peasant unrest in central Japan, cumulating in the years 1751-1761. Part three, "Reaction: Social Developments of the Late Eighteenth Century" deals with the shift in government direction known as the Kansei reform and the effect upon the peasantry of the government's groping efforts to adjust the two-century-old Tokugawa order to radically changed conditions. Finally, part four, "Transition to a New Order: Class Conflicts up to the Late Nineteenth Century" covers some of the social unrest prior to the Meiji Restoration of 1868 and the escalating disturbances afterwards, when government reforms lead to increasing hardship in the countryside. Singled out for longer treatment are the 1837 Osaka revolt led by the government official Oshio Heihachiro at the time of some of Japan's worst recorded famines; a rising in western Japan at the eve of the restoration when civil war had weakened government authority and given rise to high levels of inflation; and finally violent peasant actions in central Japan in 1869-1870 as protest against the destruction of home markets by the unlimited influx of foreign goods permitted by the Unequal Treaties imposed by the West.

The material is spaced unevenly over the time-frame of the title: 1590-1884. Apart from some mention in the introduction, the first one hundred years are accorded less than ten pages, and that only in preparation for the 1726-1727 uprising. Thus anyone purchasing the book for material on seventeenth century peasant protest will be disappointed. The extended time-frame in the title might have been the publisher's decision to increase the salability; it is not a device to be recommended.

Another irritating aspect of this otherwise well researched work is the over-reliance on Marxist inspired vocabulary. "Exploitation" and its derivatives appear with repetitive monotony. When conflict is portrayed in black and white only, when complex human behaviour is reduced to the exploiter and the exploited — history is seldom at its best.

Bix has to oversimplify to make the material fit the theory. For instance, the Shimabara rebellion of 1637 is no longer caused both by the violent suppression of Christianity and economic hardship as generally argued, but by the hardship factor only. (p. 7). After the overthrow of the shogunate in 1868 the new leaders "staked the success of their nation building upon a more effective exploitation of the countryside". (p. 194). Was it really that simple?

The aim of the book is "to be of interest to the general reader and to historians and sociologists of other countries and periods". (p. xv). Yet throughout the book there are passages where those outside the field might easily end up misinformed or confused.

In the introduction (p. xxxv) the reader is told: "Starting in the late seventeenth century and continuing into the early eighteenth century, a money economy intruded deeply into village life. Population growth slowed. There were food shortages and famines on a national scale. Disguised landlord-tenant relations began to change the quality of life in many villages."

If I were unfamiliar with the period, I would take this to mean that the advent of a money economy was responsible for a drastic deterioration of village life. Research has shown, however, that the second half of the seventeenth century was one of unprecedented prosperity for the non-samurai population. Famines did occur towards the end of the century, but these were caused by natural calamities. Further I would gather from the above that population growth began to slow down in the late seventeenth century. On page 26, though, the author tells us that "... the population boom ended early in the first quarter of the eighteenth century."

Ambiguity are also phrases like "... the finance councillors in shogun's capital drafted a series of reforms ..." (p. 26) (If these were the shogunal councillors, why not say so?), and "...Japan's integration into the world market, and the development of commercial capitalism under the stimulus of foreign trade, brought to the surface contradictions, such as the need for currency reform." (p. 195).

Sometimes conclusions are not supported by data. The reader is told of mounting expenses for the domain at the time of the Kyoho reform due to, amongst other factors, the rising cost of the customary compulsory attendance at Edo by the domain lord and his family. The author warns that exact data is lacking. (p. 28). Yet he concludes that attendance expenses were rising at the very time when the government took the unprecedented step of reducing attendance time by half to ease the domains' financial burden.

In Bix's analysis government action is consistently evil. He condemns, for example, the government's 1722 change in policy from assessing tax by annual inspections to one where an average rate was determined at intervals ranging from three to twenty years. He argues "This opened the way to raising the tribute rate after the end of each fixed assessment period." (p. 27). I fail to see the logic of this argument. Surely, annual inspections invite raising the tribute rate annually.

On the other hand, coercion amongst peasants, as equals "needs no apology" (p. 74). Is it really the historian's task to judge the actions of the past and then offer apology when those which theory prescribes to be blameless do not live up to expectations?

History owes a large debt to Karl Marx. But coercing events into his class struggle pattern with the rigour demonstrated by Bix, leads to inaccuracies. Having noticed these in the topics I am familiar with, I am somewhat hesitant to rely on the book for unfamiliar issues.

If Bix is criticized here for over-categorization, Kelly has been accused elsewhere of insufficient interpretation and categorization of facts. (*Journal of Asian Studies*, XLV:3 May 1986, p. 603).

After a discussion of "Historiographic Paradigms of nineteenth Century Japan", Kelly concludes that none of these are applicable to the protest movements under investigation in the domain of Shonai.

"Neither class interest nor community ideology nor citizen rights goes far in explaining these enduring, collective actions that were at once broad in social composition and specific in demands. Participants were strategically shrewd and ideologically impure, capable of fusing disparate motivations into focused action. ... It would be blatantly false to claim that the character of these movements disproves the saliency of class, community, or party in giving voice to aspirations and indignation elsewhere in Japan. But it would be equally mistaken to dismiss the Shonai protests as marginal, inchoate, and immature ..." (pp. 24-25).

Kelly traces the domain's future from the inception of the Tokugawa regime in 1600 and comes to the conclusion that also peasant protest prior to the period under discussion does not lend itself to simple categorization. There was no homogeneous peasantry, merchant class or officialdom. Conflict expressed in both complex horizontal and vertical factional divisions. (pp. 64-65). Nor were the cultivators uniformly oppressed. The tribute base was only just over one-third of the domain's total harvest potential. No land surveys had been conducted for two hundred and fifty years, mainly on account of pressure from merchants with landed interests financing the domain lord's debts. (p. 42).

The country-wide failure of harvests in the 1830s brought economic hardship to the domain, but no major uprisings. Relief measures did not go far enough to remedy the acute food shortage, but managed to confine protest to “a duel of calligraphic brushes” (p. 76).

The first major protest movement took place in the early 1840s. The issue was the central government’s planned transfer of the domain lord to a lesser fief. All levels of society were effected: cultivators feared the lord-designate for his ruthlessness, merchants were called upon to finance the transfer and anticipated losing their customers, while the present lord and his retainers faced a massive reduction in stipend. The issue was made more complex by individuals belonging to several interest groups on one hand, and nation-wide implications on the other. Would other domain lords tolerate the government’s arbitrary transfer of fiefs?

This first movement of the 1840s ended with success for the protesters; the second, of the same decade over another transfer, did not. Again it was a mixture of interest groups: Shogunal officials, brewers and cultivators cooperating here to resist the move of shogunal lands to the jurisdiction of the domain. But this time commercial interests were divided and cooperation between the domain and the central government forthcoming. The result: a defeat for the protesters, but not for uniformly one class.

The third disturbance described took place shortly after the Restoration, focusing on the new government’s attempt to bring the domains under direct control by appointing their own representatives as local administrators. Here, as in the fourth protest movement which was directed against official malpractices, it was “common resentments and suspicions toward political authority” that induced a “structurally diverse rural population” to co-operate (p. 288). Neither can the protesters’ motives be described as uniformly reactionary or progressive. Pragmatic considerations rather than ideology was decisive: a new project for mulberry and tea plantations was opposed, but also the local officials’ reluctance to implement new government directions for the collection of tax in cash rather than kind. The government’s conversion to cash taxes is generally considered as unpopular amongst the peasantry and responsible for much rural hardship. Kelly demonstrates convincingly that this broad interpretation does not hold true for the area under investigation.

“Deference and Defiance” presents the reader with an enormous wealth of information on a great many aspects of nineteenth century rural life in Japan. Although at times I would have liked more elaborate interpretation (i.e. of the fact that Shonai was the first domain in 200 years to effectively resist a direct shogunal order), I am hesitant in following the above-mentioned demand for greater categorization. Perhaps the social sciences have not yet furnished us with adequate tools to classify such complex modes of behaviour.

Nevertheless, I did find the wealth of detail difficult to digest and can imagine that anybody from outside the field would have even greater problems. My greatest difficulties were with the large number of names, often reappearing after several pages without further explanation. For instance on pages 83-84 the reader is introduced to three activists from Saigo village named Honma Tatsunosuke, Kamo-ya Bunji and the priest Bunrin. Seven pages of text and a great number of names later they are mentioned without further introduction: “Support from Bunji, Bunrin or Tatsunosuke was not evident...” (p. 93). Prefacing their names by the word “activists” would have helped me. A glossary of names would have been useful. But perhaps what would have solved the problem most effectively would have been a hard look at which names were absolutely essential and which persons could be described in terms of their functions only.

While I would plead for less detail here, I would have liked more information in other cases. The reader is told that a contribution of 700,000 ryo by the domain to the central government secured the appointment of the domain lord as governor. (p. 135). There is no indication where this considerable sum came from. Speaking about relief measures the author mentions “senior advisors” at the top of the page and “elders” further down. (p. 70). It is not clear whether these were the senior advisors of the domain lord and whether they were identical with the elders.

If scholars working on Japan want to make their work accessible to those in other areas or disciplines, they have to be still more precise. For even the mention of the popular Saigo Takamori without any explanatory note will leave "outsiders" perplexed.

Both books under review suffer from some inaccuracies of indexes. In *Deference and Defiance*, Sargent cited on p. 53 is not listed under "References" and neither the above-mentioned Honma Tatsunosuke nor the priest Bunrin appear in the index. Under Kamo-ya Bunji p. 93 is not listed. In *Peasant and Protest* I was unable to find Oshio Heihachiro, to whom several pages of text are dedicated, in the index.

Apart from the above criticism both books are well researched and well written and fill an important gap in Western works on Japan. The great difference of approach to related topics makes the comparison of these two volumes not only a stimulating exercise in exploring popular protest in Tokugawa and early Meiji Japan, but also a worthwhile topic for any course on historical methodology.

Beatrice M. Bodart-Bailey
University of Ottawa

* * *

JEREMY BLACK — *The British and the Grand Tour*. London: Croom Helm, 1985, Pp. 273.

This book, using for the first time a wide variety of unpublished sources, seeks to explore the eighteenth century British experience of "the joys of foreign travel". Although originally intending to limit its discussion to the Grand Tour *per se*, the climax in the education of the man of fashion, Black decided to include all British tourists, whether students, diplomatists or merchants, to his study. Ranging from chapters on transport to the arts to details about love, sex, gambling and drinking, this study holds out the promise of both pleasure and enlightenment.

Though the topic is fascinating and the scholarship daunting in detail, the volume is disappointing. There are several problems both minor and major with it. The most unimportant, although still enormously irritating, is the lack of editing and consequent sloppy word usage. Thus, on p. 28, in the space of five sentences, two sets of travellers and one journey are described as "impressive". Surely another equally suitable word could have been discovered to convey the sense intended. A similar fault, though less common, is the repetition of stories throughout the text. A good editor's hand, and eye, should have eliminated these annoying flaws.

A map would also have been very useful. Much of the book is given over the recollections and descriptions of journeys made from one spot to another, and a visual representation of the distances and difficulties involved, i.e. rivers, mountains etc, would have allowed the reader to follow the adventures of these hardy travellers with more confidence and sympathy. Perhaps North American parochialism is at fault, but is it unreasonable to ask where Chalon, Lunéville, Helvoetsluis or Laon are?

There are more serious problems however of historical setting, motive, and temporal change. For we are neither introduced to the travellers as a group or as individuals, never told if we are hearing their own voices recounting travels and travails, or those of others writing home for or about them. And they are a wildly disparate bunch. Some were diplomats posted abroad, others young men looking for adventure, still others were on art buying expeditions, while others again travelled for medical or financial reasons. Some were on their own, some with their tutors, others with their spouses or others' spouses. Some were on their first glorious venture abroad, revelling in new sights and sounds, in new experiences and pleasures. Others were jaded travellers, whose discrimination was greater and whose enthusiasm correspondingly less. In a word, they shared no common background or purpose and thus it is perhaps naive and certainly negligent, to expect what they said about their