

Reviews

Furuya Tetsuo 古屋哲夫 and Yamamuro Shin'ichi 山室信一, eds. *Kindai Nihon ni okeru higashi Ajia mondai* 近代日本における東アジア問題 (Issues concerning East Asia in modern Japan) (Tokyo: Yoshikawa kōbunkan, 2001). 307 pp. 8000 yen.

This new volume examines a number of topics in Edo, Meiji, and early twentieth-century Japanese history concerned with East Asia. The essays emerged from a research group on the theme of "Structural Relations in the World of Modern East Asia" at Kyoto University's Research Institute in the Humanities held over the course of four years from 1992-96. An interesting, albeit somewhat vague, theme nonetheless has in the five years of its gestation and production led to a marvelous collection of essays. Readers in search of underlying connective tissue that ties the essays together into a neat whole will want to read Professor Furuya's brief introduction several times and the essay by Professor Yamamuro that follows it, and then they may still have to do some serious imagining. Those looking for articles on particular topics will be pleasantly surprised.

The contents of the volume are as follows:

Furuya Tetsuya, Introduction

Yamamuro Shin'ichi, "Nihon to higashi Ajia no renkan o meguru shin shikaku o motomete" 日本と東アジアの連関おめぐる新視角を求めて (In search of a new perspective on the relationship between Japan and East Asia)

Ronald Toby, "Tō no kanata: Tenjikujin Nanbanjin to chū-kinsei ikōki no hen'yō" 唐の彼方：天竺人・南蛮人と中・近世移行期の変容 (From the distant land of Tang: Indians and barbarians and their transformation in the transition from medieval to early modern times)

Asukai Masamichi 飛鳥井雅道, "Sei-Kanron no zentei" 政韓論の前提 (Premises to the debate on attacking Korea)

Sasaki Suguru 佐々木克, "Jōi to kokuze no isō" 攘夷と国是の位相 (The phases of anti-foreignism and a national plan)

Ochiai Hiroki 落合弘樹, "Meiji shoki no gaiseiron to higashi Ajia" 明治初期の外征論と東アジア (East Asia and the debate in the early Meiji period about attacking foreign lands)

Yamamuro Shin'ichi, "Kokumin kokka keisei no toriāde to higashi Ajia sekai" 国民国家形成のトリアーデと東アジア世界 (The triad in the formation of the nation-state and the world of East Asia)

Saitō Mareshi 齋藤希史, "Bungaku shi no kindai: Wa-Kan kara Tō-A e" 文学史の近代：和漢から東亜へ (Modern in the history of literature, from Japan-China to East Asia)

Furuya Tetsuya, "Tai-Chūgoku seisaku no kōzō o megutte" 対中国政策の構造をめぐって (On the structure of a China policy)

Mizuno Naoki 水野直樹, "Kokuseki o meguru higashi Ajia kankei: shokuminchi ki Chōsenjin kokuseki mondai no isō" 国籍をめぐる東アジア関係：植民地期朝鮮人国籍問題の位相 (East Asian relations concerning nationality, phases in the nationality issue for Koreans during the colonial period)

Kagotani Naoto 籠谷直人, "Senkanki Nihon to Ajia tsūshōmō: Nihon no menpu torihiki o jirei ni shite" 戦間期日本とアジア通商網：日本の綿布取引を事例にして (Wartime Japan and the web of Asian commerce, the case of transactions in Japanese cotton cloth)

Yasutomi Ayumu 安富歩, "Manshū ni okeru sho tsūka no sōgo renkan to sono hensen" 満洲における諸通貨の相互連関とその変遷 (Mutual relations and changes among the various currencies in Manchuria)

Yamamoto Yūzō 山本有造, "Nihon shokuminchi teikoku to higashi Ajia" 日本植民地帝国と東アジア (The Japanese colonial empire and East Asia)

The lion's share of these essays concern political and economic history. Saitō Mareshi's piece is really the only one that deals with a cultural issue. It examines a number of fascinating issues surrounding the emergence of the modern in the literary field. As he demonstrates, the designation of *bungaku* 文學 as a translation for "literature" was a Meiji phenomenon and a consequence of the emergence of the modern nation-state. That, however, does not mean that "literature"/*bungaku* began in the Meiji period. Indeed, the modern nation-state has to have a "literary history" (*bungaku shi* 文學史), and this required the invention of a tradition. That task was handled by Mikami Sanji 三上参次 and Takatsu Kuwasaburō 高津鍬三郎 in their co-authored *Nihon bungaku shi* 日本文學史 (History of Japanese literature; Kinkōdō, 1890). After an examination of this foundational work, Saitō traces the dismemberment of the older Wa-Kan 和漢 (Japan-China) unity and the advent of a new field of knowledge, *kokubungaku* 國文學 (national literature) and by extension *Shina bungaku* 支那文學 (Chinese literature).

This was the one essay that I found particular interesting. Other readers may find other essays more to their tastes. At 8000 yen, this is on an absolute scale an extremely expensive book, though not exceptionally overpriced for Japan. In any event, libraries should be encouraged to purchase it.

Joshua A. Fogel

Barbara J. Brooks, *Japan's Imperial Diplomacy: Consuls, Treaty Ports, and War in China, 1895-1937* (Honolulu: University of Hawai'i Press, 2000). xi, 294 pp. \$27.95.

With this brief but insightful work, based on her Princeton University doctoral dissertation, Barbara Brooks has produced a valuable new addition to the study of Japanese imperialism in China. She argues that Japan's gradual encroachment on Chinese sovereignty and the ultimate escalation into full-scale war were just as much a result of the Foreign Ministry's failure to stem the tide of military expansion as they were the product of an increasingly aggressive Imperial Army on the continent. In explaining that failure, however, she also sheds light on much more than just the expansion of Japan's East Asian empire. The Gaimushō's failure, Brooks claims, was ultimately a reflection of systemic weaknesses in the administrative structure of the Meiji state. Therefore, *Japan's Imperial Diplomacy* helps us better understand both early 20th century Sino-Japanese relations and the institutional history of modern Japan.

The first three chapters establish the environment in which the failures of the late 1930s took place. Chapter One, entitled “The Rise of Kasumigaseki Diplomacy: The Struggle for Autonomy,” provides the background narrative of the Foreign Ministry’s establishment and early evolution into a strong, independent bureaucratic institution. However, Brooks also points out that there were efforts by other branches of government to limit its authority, and she cites evidence of internal factionalism even from the ministry’s earliest days. Chapter Two, “The Development of the Career Diplomat: Nurturing China Expertise,” is based primarily on Brook’s contribution to the 1989 volume, *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895-1937*.¹ Here she explores the emergence of a cadre of China hands within the Foreign Ministry, many of whom were graduates of the Tō-A Dōbun Shoin 東亞同文書院 in Shanghai. These low- to middle-ranking bureaucrats sympathized with Chinese nationalism, many advocating the recognition of Chiang Kai-shek’s 蔣介石 regime in the 1920s, and most of them developed a strong sense of anti-expansionism during the decades leading up to the invasion of Manchuria in 1931. Unfortunately, according to Brooks, their voices went unheard. An article Brooks published in 1997 in the pages of *Sino-Japanese Studies* provides the foundation for Chapter Three, entitled “The Japanese Consul in China”² The purpose of this section is to illustrate the position of the Japanese consul as an unwilling agent in the facilitation of Japan’s informal empire in Northeast Asia. Again, the author’s aim here is to portray the Foreign Ministry as a force of resistance to the growing trend toward the militarization of control over Japan’s overseas interests.

The final two chapters are of a different tone. Here Brooks turns to a more orthodox narrative of diplomatic history, which describes the specific events that led to the dismantling of the Gaimushō. This collapse represents the final failure of the ministry to stop Japan’s drift to war with China. In Chapter Four, “The Gaimushō’s Loss in the Manchurian Incident,” Brooks largely uses the case of Fengtian Consul Hayashi Kyūjirō 林久治郎 to depict the breakdown of Gaimushō authority in Manchuria from 1928-1932, due to jurisdictional conflict with institutions such as the South Manchurian Railway Company (Mantetsu), the Guandong Government-General, and the Guandong Army. The discussion finishes with a fifth chapter, entitled “The Path to War: The Gaimushō’s Continuing Loss of Control in China Affairs,” which brings the story back to Tokyo. On the domestic front, the increasing influence of the military, harsh public criticism, and endemic institutional factionalism completed the destruction of the Foreign Ministry as an effective voice in policy formation. The diaries of Ishii Itarō 石射猪太郎 are the main primary sources consulted for the discussion here.

Overall, the book is forcefully argued and well documented. Brooks has effectively categorized the Foreign Ministry’s many failures under three important relationships: the Gaimushō and China, the Gaimushō versus Japan’s other administrative institutions, and the Gaimushō against itself. We must consider the complicated dynamics of each of these relationships to fully appreciate the role of the Foreign Ministry in the evolution of Japan’s continental empire. Brooks also does an excellent job, especially in Chapter Three, of exploring critical issues in the social history of the

¹ “China Experts in the Gaimushō, 1895-1937,” in Peter Duus, Ramon Myers and Mark Peattie, Eds., *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895-1937* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 1989): 369-394.

² “The Japanese Consul in China, 1895-1937” *Sino-Japanese Studies* 10.1 (October 1997): 8-32.

Japanese colonial presence in China. Her insightful discussions of the resident Japanese, Taiwanese, and Korean civilian communities that thrived under the umbrella of consular protection is a welcome addition to the similar works of scholars such as Mark Peattie, Peter Duus, and Joshua Fogel.

However, there are three points I would like to make concerning Brooks' evaluation of the Gaimushō's consular police forces. First, sources on the consular police mentioned but not explored by Brooks indicate that the average consular patrolman, *junsa* 巡查, often executed his daily duties with the help of two or three Chinese or Korean assistants, *junho* 巡補.³ The implications of this are twofold. When one includes the *junho* in the total count of consular police forces in Manchuria and China proper, they quickly appear as a more formidable presence in the region than Brooks has suggested. In addition, the participation of Chinese civilians in Japan's consular police force raises important questions about the evaluation made by both Brooks and Peattie that the consular police were singled out by resident Chinese as a particularly onerous and uniformly despised element of Japan's imperial presence in Northeast Asia.⁴ In other words, if the consular police were indeed so deeply loathed, how did they manage to recruit thousands of Chinese residents into their ranks?

The second point concerns the impact that the Gaimushō's consular police had on Japan's relations with other imperial powers in North China and Manchuria. The Foreign Ministry's armed fist was not only a thorn in the side of Sino-Japanese political relations because consular police often had less than pleasant encounters with Western foreign residents. For example, in mid-March 1919, a series of riots broke out in the French concession of Tianjin between U. S. Army soldiers stationed in the city and several dozen Japanese civilian residents. In quelling the disturbance, officers of the local Japanese consular police force arrested, detained, and physically abused a number of American soldiers, which caused quite a stir among diplomatic representatives of both countries. In fact, an ultimately satisfactory resolution of this "Tianjin Incident"⁵ was not achieved until over a year and a half after the riots took place. As Mark Peattie has pointed out, Japan's consular police often exercised arbitrary legal jurisdiction over Americans and Europeans, not just Chinese, Koreans, and their own Japanese civilians. Therefore, the overall position of the Gaimushō in China can perhaps also be examined in terms of its relationship with other foreign diplomatic institutions and civilian residents.

³ Compiled by the Foreign Ministry itself in the late 1930s, the *Gaimushō keisatsu shi* 外務省警察史 (History of the Foreign Ministry Police) is an enormous collection of documents detailing the activities and administration of consular police forces from every imaginable corner of the Northeast Asian empire. My dissertation research is based on these materials.

⁴ Brooks makes this point on page 96 where she claims "the consular police were singled out by the Chinese for the greatest condemnation." For Mark Peattie's views on the consular police, see his article "Japanese Treaty Port Settlements in China, 1895-1937" in Duus, Myers, and Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895-1937*. Peattie claims that the consular police represented, "to the Chinese, the most outrageously provocative of all the foreign gendarmeries" (p. 201). Peattie does mention the vast numbers of Chinese patrolmen who worked alongside the consular police, but only in passing. It seems to me an issue worthy of much deeper investigation.

⁵ For a more detailed description of this incident, see Erik W. Esselstrom, "Of Such Local Significance: Culture, Diplomacy, and the Tientsin Incident of 1919," unpublished master's thesis, Asian Studies Program, University of Oregon, 1996.

Finally, Brooks seems to argue that the Foreign Ministry as represented by the China service diplomats was a consistent source of resistance to the expansionism of the Imperial Army. This resistance was inspired in large part by a deeper understanding of and sympathy for the nationalist movement in China at the time. I wonder, however, if the Gaimushō's resistance to the growing power of the Guangdong Army might not also have been motivated by institutional jealousy, rather than any sincere commitment to the cause of Chinese nationalism. Perhaps the activities of the consular police, which often closely resembled those of the Imperial Army, may be better understood in this light.

These are only a few additional points that may merit closer examination. They certainly do not detract from the larger value of Brooks's fine book. It is a well-crafted example of how the historian of Japan's imperial presence in China can and should weave together the threads of political, institutional, and social history to create the most complete and accurate picture possible.

Erik W. Esselstrom
University of California, Santa Barbara

Liu Jianhui 劉建輝. *Mato Shanghai: Nihon chishikijin "kindai" taiken* 魔都上海：日本知識人「近代」体験 (Demon capital Shanghai: The "modern" experience of Japanese intellectuals) (Tokyo: Kōdansha, 2000). 253 pp. 1600 yen.

Don't be put off by the main title of this book, but go directly to the subtitle. "Mato" was the title of a popular work about Shanghai written by the novelist and travel writer Muramatsu Shōfū 村松梢風 in 1923 and used ironically by Liu. Liu's book begins in earnest in the nineteenth century with the establishment of the foreign concessions in the city of Shanghai—before the Japanese arrived in the *bakumatsu* period. He distinguishes what Shanghai meant to the Japanese in the *bakumatsu* era from that of the Meiji period. In the former, Shanghai symbolized a semi-colony, the front line in the advancing Western juggernaut. Although much information about the West filtered through the concessions to the Japanese in these years, the Shanghai concessions came to be seen as a convenient entry to the West. It also provided a counterexample in which the Western-run concessions dominated the rest of Chinese Shanghai. In the early Meiji era, though, Shanghai came to be seen as an impediment to the emergence of a strong nation-state. Shanghai lost its lure, as the view spread that the only modernity there was contained in the concessions. With this general framework for the early part of his work, Liu goes through a detailed analysis of the many Japanese missions to China and via China to Europe in the *bakumatsu* era.

He then moves on to (for this reader) the most exciting portion of his work. He describes what he terms an informational network that begins with the Western missionaries in China. These men who knew Chinese exceedingly well took it upon themselves to sell the great strengths of Western science and political institutions to the Chinese through a number of Chinese-language journals published in the 1850s and 1860s. While their proselytizing activities had minimal results, their intellectual and cultural impact was, Liu argues, much broader and much deeper. These journals, all produced in Shanghai, were then picked up by the early Japanese visitors who brought them back to Japan where they were widely read and often reprinted. Serials such as

Zhongwai zazhi 中外雜誌 and *Liuhe congtan* 六合叢談 carried instructive stories introducing Western science, the modern Western nation-state, modern finance and diplomacy, the American presidential election, and the like. Some of these stories seem innocuous enough, such as a report on the spherical nature of planet Earth, but Liu points out that for Chinese (and later Japanese) intellectuals who read such pieces, such an apparently simple article might serve to decenter China—the surface of a sphere has no center—and ultimately dislodge a conception of a Sinocentric universe.

When he gets further into the Meiji period and then into the Taishō years, Liu confronts a number of other images that Shanghai came to represent: the teahouse, the brothel, and the opium den. These symbols of decadence lie at the core of Shanghai as a “demons’ capital.” He brings the story down into the 1920s when such celebrated writers as Tanizaki Jun’ichirō 谷崎潤一郎 and Akutagawa Ryūnosuke 芥川龍之介, Inoue Kōbai 井上紅梅 and Muramatsu Shōfū, among others, visited the city and wrote about it. He concludes with a brief chapter on the Shōwa years.

All in all, this extremely reasonably priced and easily readable book is well worth the effort of anyone remotely interested in the topic. Liu is a younger scholar, trained initially at Liaoning University and later receiving his doctorate in comparative literature at Kōbe University. He taught at Peking University briefly before being invited to join the staff of the Nichibunken in 1999. Keep an eye out for future work from Liu Jianhui—he’s a comer.

Joshua A. Fogel