

Perhaps that is so, but it is the kind of guess one might have made without carrying out research. This is all too common. On other questions, we do not get even guesses. Certain forms of inheritance strategies common in Tipperary were not practised in Canada. We wonder why, but we are given no guidance. More significantly, we discover little about family size, marriage patterns and other details one might expect in a study which stresses the importance of family. As an aside, the index does not help in understanding family relationships. The entry for "Family, extended" advises us to "See Kin". The entry for "Kin", in turn, is empty except for the advice to "See Assistance; for Kin; Inheritance; Migration, chain". Again, the echoes begin in one's head.

The book is very light on some of the topics one routinely expects to see discussed in modern social history. Social class receives little definition and no systematic treatment. The chapter on economic strategies is in fact devoted to patterns of inheritance rather than to a full-blown discussion of economic life. Nor, surprisingly, are mentalities well-treated. Elliott contends, early in the book, that migration is primarily to be explained as "a strategy of heirship" (6), that is, as primarily concerned with providing security for children. This is the central contention about Protestant Irish ideology, yet, it is a contention which does not rest on a base of evidence. When migrants are quoted about their reasons for leaving Tipperary, the most common reason given is to escape the disturbances troubling their homeland, not their "strategy of heirship". The ideological core of this book is a hollow one.

There are other central assumptions which remain on the level of conjecture. Following Donald Akenson, Dr. Elliott contends that the Irish were primarily a rural people in Canada. He deals, of course, only with Protestants about whom there has not been much dispute. Even so, he does not provide comparative data which would permit us to assess the tendencies towards rural and urban destinations among these migrants as compared to other groups in Canada. We can only piece together bits of data, since he does not give an overall figure for the number of families who ended in urban areas. The result is hazy, but the figures do not look much different than those for other ethnic-religious groups. We finish not much wiser on this question which Akenson and Elliott make so central in their theories about the Irish.

If the subtitle is accurate, then, the main title is not. This is not a book about "Irish Migrants in the Canadas", it is a book about the migration of some Irish Protestants to Canada and the inheritance patterns they adapted in Canada. The study is revealing and valuable on the two topics of migration and inheritance, but it falls far short of providing a picture of the Canadian lives of the migrants. Nevertheless, if one is not misled by the title into expecting more than Dr. Elliott really intends to deliver, this is a book which should be read with care by all students of pre-Confederation Canada and by anyone interested in new approaches to immigration history.

Michael S. Cross
Dalhousie University

* * *

Joshua A. Fogel, ed., transl. — *Life Along the South Manchurian Railway: The Memoirs of Itō Takeo*. New York: M.E. Sharpe, Inc., 1988. Pp. xxxi, 241.

In the competition among the foreign powers at the turn of this century for concessions in China, Japan had made clear its interest in China's northeastern provinces called Manchuria. From 1905, when it defeated Russia, until its outright invasion of Manchuria twenty-six years later, Japan used the South Manchurian Railway (SMR) as the most obvious symbol of its imperial penetration.

Under the rules of the imperial game, foreign powers were allowed to finance, build, police and administer China's railways and the immediate zones through which they passed. It was no coincidence, then, that the incident which provoked the Japanese occupation of Manchuria was the detonation of a bomb on the tracks of the SMR on 18 September 1931. This close link between the

SMR and the activities of the Japanese military has led to an assumption that the SMR was a willing partner in the invasion of China. The memoirs of Itō Takeo, translated and edited by Joshua A. Fogel as *Life Along the South Manchurian Railway*, make it clear that this assumption has been reached too hastily.

Itō Takeo was associated with the SMR research arm from 1920 to 1945. His background, and that of many of his colleagues, was far from militaristic and imperialistic. Indeed, Itō, because of his left wing views, was unable to remain in Japan and sought an opportunity in China. He found employment in the research services of the SMR, a section that had been established by the founding director of the SMR, Gotō Shimpei. Gotō, whose previous experience had been in Taiwan (occupied by Japan since 1895), was convinced that good colonial rule depended upon thorough research into the local conditions. As a result, the SMR compiled a number of detailed and major research studies on China, and marshalled significant resource materials in a number of research centres throughout China. Ironically, most of the researchers were left wing, some outright marxists and *sub rosa* communists, whose approaches to research and to China did not coincide with those of the leaders of the Japanese army stationed in Kwantung at the southern tip of the Liaoting peninsula.

The divergence of views between the Japanese military and the SMR researchers is well illustrated by an incident related by Fogel in his excellent introduction to these memoirs. In 1941, with Japan heavily engaged in its invasion of mainland China, the SMR researchers completed a major study that concluded that, given the overall conditions and the relative strengths of the Kuomintang and the Chinese communists, a political solution was the only one possible. They presented this conclusion to the Kwantung Army and ultimately to the General Staff Headquarters in Tokyo. "When they were finished, there was silence; finally a young staff officer asked: 'So, then, what sites would it be best for us to bomb? I'd like to know the key points'" (xxi).

In fact, the army had already begun the purge of the SMR research department. The exposures of the Sorge spy ring led the Kwantung army to a greater housecleaning: research materials were confiscated and some fifty researchers were arrested, among them, Itō Takeo. As was to be the case with McArthyism in America a decade later, the military did not accept the advice of the "experts" on China, and chose to accuse the researchers of treason.

Itō's memoirs present a fascinating commentary on the Japanese in China during the first half of this century. Itō and his research contemporaries were sinophiles who developed a deep understanding of Chinese society and politics. Their friends and acquaintances were Chinese intellectuals, including those who founded the Communist movement in 1921. Itō's memoirs represent a veritable "who was to be who" of modern China.

Although Itō and his colleagues were to suffer for their views, they were unable to escape the fact that they were an important part of the brutal Japanese assault on China by the Japanese military. In the postwar period, Itō (and others) attempted to expiate the guilt he felt by becoming active in establishing bridges of understanding between Japan and the new communist China. Originally published in 1964, Itō's memoirs end with a call for deeper understanding of China and of its revolution.

This attempt at atonement, however, only made Itō and his colleagues suspect in the eyes of the public, just as their earlier research had made them suspect in the eyes of the military. In each case, their approach was viewed as uncritical and naively biased in favour of communism.

Before his death in 1984, Itō was to witness the remarkable growth in Japanese-Chinese relations following the regularization of contact in 1972. Yet, Itō died convinced that only by ridding itself of the contempt for other peoples could Japan develop fully relations of mutual trust with its Asian neighbours.

Fogel should be congratulated for bringing Itō's memoirs to the English reading public. Just as Itō sought to deepen the understanding by Japanese of their relations with China, his memoirs will enable others to deepen their understanding of the complex history of Chinese-Japanese relations.

Fogel also does much to rehabilitate the vast amount of research published by the SMR. Although the research was carried out at the behest of the Japanese army, it was carried out by persons whose outlook was, for the most part, marxist and not naturally sympathetic to the military. The research is not without bias, but it is not the one that appeared to be obvious.

Brian L. Evans
University of Alberta

* * *

Clifford Geertz — *Works and Lives: The Anthropologist as Author*. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1988. Pp. vi, 157.

Clifford Geertz begins this charming, witty and profoundly perplexing little book by posing the question of why some anthropologists are listened to, and others not. Anthropologists themselves like to think their monographs are heeded because of the sheer power of their factual substantiality, but so much of this consists of incorrigible assertion that this can hardly be *the* reason. Geertz, therefore, suggests an alternative explanation: "some ethnographers are more effective than others in conveying in their prose the impression that they have had close-in contact with far-out lives" (6). The implication of this suggestion is that it is not so much how one does fieldwork as how one does things with words — and, in particular, the success with which one creates the *impression* of "being there" — that separates the read from the unread. Needless to say, this suggestion will not sit well with the many anthropologists who regard the problems of ethnography as essentially epistemological rather than literary. Their mistake, according to Geertz, is that in focussing all their attention on how to attain a meaningful understanding of "the Other", they neglect that what they also do is write, and the former matters not a jot if the latter fails to convince.

After discussing some examples of how ethnographers get themselves into their texts, Geertz goes on to distinguish between authors who seek to "communicate facts and ideas", and authors who seek to "create a bewitching verbal structure" or "theater of language" (20). The former author books, the latter traditions. It is with authors of the latter type, individuals who "mark off the intellectual landscape, differentiate the discourse field" (20) that the rest of the book is concerned, beginning with Claude Lévi-Strauss, and then turning to consider the works of E.E. Evans-Pritchard, Bronislaw Malinowski and Ruth Benedict.

In the chapter on Lévi-Strauss, "The World in a Text", Geertz begins by dismissing the two most usual approaches to Lévi-Strauss' *œuvre*. The first of these is to see that *œuvre* as progressing linearly from the study of behaviour in *Elementary Structures of Kinship* to that of thought gamboling freely in *Mythologiques*; the other is to see it as a rotating searchlight bringing the same view to bear on each of the domains it successively illuminates. The problem is that neither of these approaches can explain where Lévi-Strauss is coming from in *Tristes Tropiques*, whereas, by taking a "cosmic egg view" of the latter, Geertz argues (32) all of Lévi-Strauss' other works can be understood.

Geertz proceeds to show how *Tristes Tropiques* is not one text, but many: a travel book, an ethnographic report, a philosophical discourse vindicating Rousseau, a reformist tract and a *symboliste* literary text. Moreover, the meaning of the work is not to be found in its parts, but (in good structuralist style) in the relations between them. Understood this way, what *Tristes Tropiques* is really about is its own syntax, not the facts and ideas it recounts. As such, it is an analogue of Lévi-Strauss' own "formalist metaphysics of being", the most basic tenet of which is "that 'savages' are best known not by an attempt to get somehow personally so close to them that one can share in their life, but by stitching their cultural expressions into abstract patterns of relationships" (47) — just as *Tristes Tropiques* is stitched together.

Geertz's treatment of *Tristes Tropiques* certainly seems to illustrate his claim that "the way of saying is the what of saying" (68), and the same must be said of his analysis of Evans-Pritchard's