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discern the meaning of Deng Tuo's life of intellectual service to the party that eventually destroyed him.

GLEN PETERSON
University of British Columbia


For several decades, local history and the history of ideas have been among the most exciting specialties in Japanese historiography, and so it is particularly apt that Luke S. Roberts has produced a superbly researched and well-written study situated at the intersection of these approaches. Although Roberts does not exactly accomplish all the claims he makes for his study, he fulfills a sufficient number to make his analysis of the origins of mercantilist thought a landmark study of early modern Japan.

The subject of Roberts's study is the domain of Tosa on the island of Shikoku, the smallest of Japan's major islands. Tosa was among the largest of the over two hundred domains comprising Japan during the Edo or Tokugawa period (1600–1868), and it was Marius Jansen, Roberts's principal mentor, who pioneered studies of Tosa—as well as the modernization thesis that Roberts embraces—in English. Roberts describes how, during the seventeenth century, Japanese society and economy were structured along essentially Confucian notions of service to one's lord in a hierarchy that culminated in the shogun in Edo. Seventeenth-century economic activity throughout Japan centered on the great metropolises of Osaka, Kyoto, and Edo, and Roberts demonstrates how Tosa, a domainal country as akin to that of states of these "domainal countries" as akin to that of states within an international order, but his reasoning could apply just as well to even smaller territorial or societal units than Tosa. Roberts also sees similarities between the domainal protectionism or kokuleki of a large domain like Tosa and the economic nationalism that informed Japan's modernization in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, and he suggests that a genesis for the latter may be found in the former, though he does not pursue this argument in meaningful detail. These quibbles notwithstanding, what is clear is that Roberts has produced a wonderfully stimulating piece of research and analysis that will prove of interest and significance to economic, political, social, and intellectual historians of Japan for decades to come.

PETER NOSCO
University of Southern California


More than most mechanical engineers, the American Frederick Winslow Taylor created a stir. His influence on American and European industrial management
and workplace organization has been studied in considerable depth. The impact of Taylorite scientific management on Japan, however, has been less fully considered. It is common to suggest that although Taylor’s ideas were known in Japan, to have implemented them would have required practices contrary to local labor conditions, social behavior, and cultural values. As a consequence, according to this point of view, from early in this century Japanese managers ignored scientific management or altered it in distinctive ways to bring Taylorite prescriptions in line with domestic cultural needs. This new book by William M. Tsutsui, the first full-length treatment of scientific management in Japan, argues the reverse. From 1911, the author claims, Taylorite scientific management had been “a potent ideological template in Japan” (p. 11).

The book’s six chapters can be divided neatly into two parts. The first includes three chapters that trace chronologically the evolution of scientific management in Japan between 1911 and 1945. They show that, from their introduction in 1911, Taylor’s ideas about rationalizing the industrial workplace were widely embraced by business writers and practicing managers. Tsutsui suggests that this enthusiasm has been obscured by the pervasive rhetoric extolling what were identified as the virtues of traditionalist paternalism in the workplace. Rather than being mutually exclusive, however, he argues that there was substantial “complementarity” between Taylorism and Japanese industrial paternalism since the latter prescribed no model of production management and the former largely ignored welfare and cultural issues. Japanese businessmen, therefore, were revising scientific management to include the “human element” in management practice. This revision, far from being a unique Japanese concern or approach, paralleled Western business attempts at humanizing scientific management. From the late 1920s through World War II, revised Taylorism persisted, and, more significantly, many business writers and managers began to conceive of this revision as a distinctive form of “Japanese-style management.” Indeed, during the wartime years from 1937 to 1945, according to Tsutsui, nativist rhetoric and fascist economic models effectively cloaked the American origins of production controls and scientific shopfloor organization.

The book’s second part includes three chapters that examine key themes of scientific management being played out during the period 1945 to 1973. Chapter four argues that prewar “revised” Taylorism continued to provide the ideological grounding for the push toward productivity growth following wartime devastation. Even prototypical Japanese management innovations, most prominently Toyota’s system of “lean production,” began as attempts to adapt Taylorite ideas to postwar structural and financial conditions. Finally, Tsutsui shows how Japan’s approach to quality control (QC) and the emergence of QC circles were themselves efforts to “humanize” the shopfloor and were a continuing legacy of the longstanding attempt to “re-vise” the harshness of Taylorite prescriptions. That is, he says, QC circles “could promote Scientific Management while denying the premises of Taylorism . . . and could be portrayed as unique outgrowths of Japanese tradition” (p. 235) rather than reflections of American management thought.

Tsutsui is not the first to try to historicize Japan’s ostensible humanistic industrial ideology. Others have also examined the ironies of the vaunted QC circles. None, however, have done more to situate Japanese industrial ideology and practice within the contemporary global discussion on management behavior and practice. Numerous scholars have analyzed the international dimensions of scientific management and thought, but Tsutui is the first to locate Japan’s place in that community of activity. His efforts to link Japan to widely discussed ideas about scientific management were made somewhat easier, however, by the use of a rather imprecise, open-ended definition of scientific management. In “Japan as in the West,” he says, “Scientific Management was perceived by its advocates in terms of broad methodological imperatives and distinctive ideological proclivities” (p. 76). In practice, he seems to imply that just about any effort at rationalized production and systematized shopfloor behavior constituted a species of scientific management. Although the sequence of events and ideas Tsutsui delineates suggest Taylorite influence, identifying all post-1911 forms of industrial rationalization as one variety or another of “revised Taylorism” is not wholly convincing. Nevertheless, the suggestiveness of this new book demands attention. It is an important study that should be of wide interest.

W. Dean Kinzley
University of South Carolina


The tension between transregional bonds and regional diversities has informed much of the history of South, Central, and West Asia. During the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, Muslim elites in the Mughal, Uzbek, and Safavid empires clashed, mixed, and collaborated within a largely shared high culture that was quite distinct from the cultures of many of the people they ruled. In a work of careful scholarship, Richard Foltz describes the ways that Uzbek and Mughal court cultures comprised “one world” (p. xxiv). His fine book further reveals how the disintegration of the Soviet Union has opened up new possibilities both for reconceptualizing transnational cultural regions and for bringing together scholarship from across what were Cold War boundaries.

Foltz’s meticulous research focuses on the immigration patterns of Central Asians to the Mughal imperial court and also on the high Persio-Islamic cultural influences that paralleled these movements. He leaves to other scholars analysis of the more well-docu-