



10-1-1990

Conrad Schirokauer, *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilizations*.

Laurence Grambow Wolf

Roger Mark Selya

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr>

Recommended Citation

Wolf, Laurence Grambow and Selya, Roger Mark (1990) "Conrad Schirokauer, *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilizations*," *Comparative Civilizations Review*. Vol. 23 : No. 23 , Article 11.

Available at: <https://scholarsarchive.byu.edu/ccr/vol23/iss23/11>

This Book Review is brought to you for free and open access by the Journals at BYU ScholarsArchive. It has been accepted for inclusion in *Comparative Civilizations Review* by an authorized editor of BYU ScholarsArchive. For more information, please contact scholarsarchive@byu.edu, ellen_amatangelo@byu.edu.

catechism of dates and dynasties. Overall, the book is more interesting than most of its type and would be as likely to hold a student's attention as any on the market.

Whether this book should be used as a course text is a question of the nature of the course. For the usual introductory survey "World Civilization I" or somesuch it would be a very good source for this region, albeit preferably with some supplement on literature and philosophy. As a text for a survey course on Asia in particular, its usefulness would depend on the teacher's intent for the course. The course might for example be arranged to give more or less equal coverage to all subregions and subjects, to a group of students who have achieved a level of scholastic competence that one would hope for from high school. In that situation a group of individual studies would probably be better, such as Eberhard's *History of China*, Richardson's *History of Tibet*, J. T. Hall's *Japan*, Daniel Hall's *History of Southeast Asia*, and the Penguin *History of India*, volume I by Romila Thapar, vol. II by Percival Spear, all of them available in paperback. (One would have to settle for readings on Korea.) On the other hand, the students involved may not have achieved a desirable post-high-school level of competence, or the course may be designed only partially for general coverage, to be followed by more detailed study of one particular subject all around the area. In either of those situations this book would be a good text, supplemented by Thapar's *History of India* vol. I because of failings in that area and by those old standbys, *Sources of Indian [Chinese, Japanese] Tradition* for philosophy and literature. In any case this book is recommended for a quick refresher for scholars who would like to have at least a vague acquaintance with the area.

Overall, the book is recommended for the high school and university library and as an introductory text with the above-listed caveats.

John K. Hord

A TEXT ON CHINA AND JAPAN: CRITIQUE AND DESIDERATA

Conrad Schirokauer. *A Brief History of Chinese and Japanese Civilization*. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich, 1978.

Schirokauer has provided a clearly written text. He has attempted a survey of the politics, art, poetry, literature, religion and philosophy of China and Japan along with some very brief references to Korea and Vietnam. The material on China and on Japan is usually handled in separate chapters, positioned chronologically; a decided advantage if one wishes to focus on but one of the two.

However, several essentials necessary in an introductory survey text are lacking. Any attempt to compress several millenia of history into c.600 pages is a daunting challenge. To provide the reader with a coherent and stimulating presentation requires not only a careful

evaluation of the available factual data, but also the judicious use of general concepts from the social sciences. There should be at least enough discussion of scholarly controversies to provide readers with some grasp of the major questions which have engaged the passions and analytical abilities of the experts. There should be some discussion of the centrifugal and centripetal forces within the civilization, the dynamic processes which governed its period of change and stagnation, and its interrelations with the human and natural environment in which these operated. In sum, we feel that the text is deficient in all the above. It could have been more than a well-written text had it gone beyond a mere weaving of facts in a sort of bland discourse and added a sense of intellectual controversy and a conceptual framework.

As a guide to the reader as to what could have been in the text, we wish to document our critique by referring to two broad categories of topics, treatment of which would have considerably improved the text. We refer to these as Missed Opportunities (but with hints of the issues involved) and Gross Omissions.

A. Missed Opportunities:

1. The use of the term "feudal" is the subject of considerable controversy. One is therefore led to ask how Chinese compares with European feudalism. Also, is it more reasonable to consider all pre-capitalist Chinese history as "feudal" as many marxists do, or to stress the role of the civil service examination as a unique and quite successful technique enabling Dynastic China to escape some of the problems which plagued the European feudal polity? The author really does not get into this.

2. The dynastic cycle is skimpily treated. Insight into its general character has to be picked out of widely scattered parts of the text. One is left wondering whether there is an unmentioned potential for generalizations about bureaucracies and elites in civilizations generally.

3. Much reliance must, of necessity, be placed on official sources. The reader, especially in an introductory text, needs explicit warning that victors interpret history to put themselves in the best possible light. This often means that they see themselves as the legitimate inheritors of time-honored traditions, as if there had been no alternative to their victory.

4. In discussing the "Fall of Han," would it not have been useful to compare and contrast this with the "Fall of Rome" and other great empires? Also, how significant to China were the contacts with the Roman Empire?

5. Anthropology and linguistics can assist one to understand historical developments. The origin of the Japanese people and their language are topics which cry out for such interdisciplinary treatment, from which Schirokauer tends to shy away.

6. Although the text begins with a very brief discussion of geography, thereafter it is ignored except for occasional references to natural catastrophes so potent that they must unavoidably be mentioned to explain the downfall of a dynasty or some other major crisis. The

introduction of new crops, so important as a part of the material basis of Chinese life, is obviously not considered to be of great importance, judging from the scant treatment it receives in comparison to poetry and its other cultural matters, although without food supply and its augmentation, the cultural developments (and all else) could hardly have existed, much less flourished. The question of the importance of this in China as compared with its role in the West is not treated.

B. Gross Omissions:

1. A discussion of the Yang-shao era should lead one to such questions as a) the origin of civilization anywhere, b) the origin of Chinese civilization in particular, and c) whether there were any significant stimuli from civilizations in the Middle East. All of these are rather intriguing questions, and would heighten one's motivation to be concerned with such facts as are known of that era, but they are absent from the text.

2. The Communist Party has portrayed Wang Mang as the first real revolutionary. This claim ought to be evaluated or at least discussed, but it is not.

3. Chinese revolutionary movements ought to be compared to those of Japan and Europe in terms of origins, goals, means, and accomplishments, but the Yellow Turbans, for instance, seem to pass before our eyes without that sort of analysis.

4. Mahayana Buddhism is explained in terms of developments in India, but there is no discussion of the effects of Chinese culture on the form that Buddhism took in China.

5. The Barbarian invasions occur without any adequate explanation of the acculturation of the nomads and whether their invasions were (always? sometimes?) due to conditions internal to China or to social or natural conditions on the steppes. Were these invasions merely due to opportunism, ambition, or general orneriness?

6. "Democracy" takes many forms. It is anything but a simple concept. What kind of democracy does post-World-War-II Japan have? And what do the Chinese mean by the term? We are left in the dark.

7. The treatment of Japan's current standard of living is not balanced. Against the positives one needs also to treat the negatives: environmental pollution, lack of recreational space, hectic commuting, high housing costs, etc.

8. The Great Cultural Revolution is in need of interpretation, and the analysis of the Great Leap Forward is indeed minimal.

9. The Chinese Empire was able, on rare occasions, to extend its power 1,000s of miles far into central Asia, yet until recent decades it was not able to back up this conquest with actual settlement or with the kind of rapid communication and transportation that such a distant conquest required were it to be made permanent, and so these conquests were lost. Yet Korea, only a few hundred miles from the great North China Plain, with an inviting, humid climate instead of the central Asian aridity so hostile to traditional Chinese agriculture, was also conquered, but rarely,

and always slipped out of control. Was its mountainousness and peninsularity so potent that Koreans could escape assimilation? Schirokauer does not address this.

10. The Chinese, in their great long-term southward expansion, conquered (northern) Vietnam at a relatively early date, held it for c. 1,000 years, and then lost it forever. Why? So many other peoples were assimilated completely, or still survive as scattered fragments in the hilly and mountainous south of China, yet the Vietnamese escaped. Sheer distance hardly seems an adequate answer. Indeed, in all the expanse from the Yang-tze southward, how is it that no countervailing force ever developed to halt or seriously challenge the Chinese "Drang nach Süden"? Schirokauer does not address these matters. Apparently a civilization is not a dynamic societal structure, which changes spatially and structurally, but is merely the cultural products of that structure.

11. To what extent does China owe its unique historical development to its geographic isolation? Until the successful attacks by the West, China evolved behind a most formidable set of natural barriers. In the arena which extends from India in the east to Ethiopia and Meroë to the south, Morocco to the west, and Scandinavia to the north, civilizations have had to struggle against rival civilizations. In stark contrast, the only severe external threat to China (until the 1800s) was that of the nomads, who could hardly rival it in technology (other than military) or high culture. The reader is not led to see China in this context.

12. What was the role of the geomorphic or topological floorplan of China in the development of its polity and economy? Surely this has more significance than the occasional reference to Szechuan as a rice bowl, or the fact that the Yellow River's course changes were great catastrophies. Also, were changes in the loci of China's capital merely matters of dynastic whim, or defense needs, or of symbolic significance, or did they provide special advantages or disadvantages for the central administration of so huge an empire? The author does not introduce his readers to such problems.

13. No mention is made of the fact that, despite China's long history of trade, the sophistication of its technology centuries before that of the West, or of the maturity of its financial instruments, it did not, on its own, develop a capitalist or industrial society, or whether, perhaps, it was on route to such a development when the West intruded, yet this is a controversial topic which has engaged a number of scholars.

Despite Schirokauer's attempts to be comprehensive, his treatment of the history of civilization in China and Japan is for the most part a survey of its "high culture." There is only slight mention of the geographic and economic bases upon which these achievements were built.

One may argue that we are taking the author to task for not writing a quite different text than the one he did write. There is a more fundamental question involved here than that, however. It is the question of how history is to be conceived. Historians have long since moved from stories of kings, wars and high politics to a much broader and realistic conception. To accomplish this history must be conceived as the experience of human beings in particular environments, extracting a

livelihood from those environments, and then also producing cultural artefacts of lasting value. To accomplish this for East Asia within a manageable number of pages would mean greater selectivity with regard to poems, pictures and literature, perhaps, but to do so would provide such material with greater meaning, interest, and significance.

One should not leave consideration of this work without commenting upon the high quality of the numerous maps (18) so well designed by Jean Paul Tremblay. They are an improvement over the extremely rudimentary cartography that historians often deem sufficient. We are reminded that maps as a means of efficiently conveying historical events and processes are still much neglected.

Laurence Grambow Wolf
Roger Mark Selya

THE PSYCHOPATHOLOGY OF INTERCIVILIZATIONAL ENCOUNTER

Alan Roland. *In Search of Self in India and Japan: Toward a Cross-Cultural Psychology*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1988. Pp. xxxii, 386.

This is a very special kind of book in the history of comparative Asian studies, derived from what may well be a unique intellectual orientation and written by an unconventional practitioner of the art and science of mental therapy who decided—for the sake of professional integrity, truth, and his patients' health—to undertake, in his own words, a "psychoanalytic odyssey to India" (p. x). For the benefit of his Indian and Japanese patients, Alan Roland, a psychoanalyst in New York City, systematically studied Asian culture and history, took a journey to the patients' countries of origin and intelligently used his newly-acquired knowledge to formulate an innovative, culturally-sensitive therapy. I know of no other practicing head-shrinker who, after publicly admitting to the Westerncentric limitations of his professional training and its therapeutic value, enrolled as a student at the Southern Asian Institute, Columbia University, then went off to Asia as a research scholar and returned with a fresh perspective on the undeveloped field of cross-cultural psychology.

It is not that Indian studies lacked a body of psychological literature which asked probing questions. Carstairs's work on *The Twice-born, A Study of High-Caste Hindus* (1957), Spratt's on *Hindu Culture and Personality: A Psychoanalytic Study* (1966), Erickson's *Gandhi's Truth* (1969), and Kakar's *The Inner World: A Psychoanalytic Study of Childhood and Society in India* (1978) were among the best of many studies of Hindus in search of themselves in unstable modern Indian society and culture. Roland acknowledges his debt to these valuable studies but his concern is with the Indian who takes up residence abroad in a city like New York. The individual inevitably suffers a large degree of radioactive exposure to Americanization through love, marriage, and career. It is not simply a