of society. Thus, Thompson may feel that he is dealing with culture when to us he seems to be discussing rather formal content and literary style. The observations with regard to oral transmission—quoted here from the work of Aarne and Anderson, such as: "(1) forgetting a detail, especially an unimportant one . . . (2) adding a detail not originally present . . . (3) stringing two or more tales together . . . ." etc., are an example. Orlík's "epic laws" are of the same sort. From the sociological point of view, however, the folktale as an element in culture is as closely related to the pulp magazine, the nonsophisticated moving picture, and the popular radio program, on the one hand, as to high literary art, on the other. A comparison of the function of these mediums with that of the folktale and a study of myth and rumor in modern as well as in more primitive societies might well cast more light on orally or otherwise popularly transmitted literature and the basic human traits underlying it than any amount of purely literary commentary.

Thompson quotes Boas to the effect that in order to understand the past we should study the present, in that "we have no reason to believe that the myth-making processes of the last ten thousand years differed materially from modern myth-making processes." But he does not take to heart the moral which the sociologist may draw from this statement. Although Boas' interests in the realm of folk literature and art were neither that of the sociologist nor psychologist, his broad experience with primitive cultures led him far beyond mere formal analysis to a consideration of primitive aesthetics. Thompson directs a bow to Boas' wisdom but does not really profit by it.

Even the final chapter, entitled "The Folk-tale as a Living Art," has no real conceptual basis. It comes closest, however, to giving the feeling of the folktale as an art form. This it does, not so much by discussion of formal structure, as by a few quotations by the Russian folklorist, Azadowsky, whose account of the telling of folktales among Siberian refugees gives a vivid impression of humanity. Russian folklorists, it appears, are distinguished by their interest in the social role of the folktales they gather. Let us hope that this interest may spread to folklorists elsewhere. Thompson states that "when the folklorist has done his best to discover all the facts about the life history of the tale, there may be room for the psychologist and the sociologist and the anthropologist." At the present time the method of analysis of specimens in folklore seems to have been carried to almost its furthest limit. But as long ago as 1910, Van Gennep pointed out in regard to the study of folk literature that "l'étude des themes litteraires seuls est insuffisante." Actually the folktale is a living growth. In order to learn all the facts about it, it must be studied in action. And for such a study all the help which sociology, anthropology, and psychology can give will not be too much.

Margaret Park Redfield

Chicago


This is one of those rare books which sets forth the basic moral values of a national culture in a comprehensive pattern after careful and penetrating analysis of many facts of human relationships. It is the elaboration of a work undertaken for the Office of War Information and other governmental agencies, and, as such, it provides a dependable analysis of Japanese behavior, which may be used as a basis of prediction. In this sense, it can be considered a success and a very valuable contribution to our knowledge, even though there are points at which the analysis may be imperfect.

Dr. Benedict points out that the cultural anthropologist has some unique contributions to make toward an understanding of the Japanese that will make it possible to know what to expect of them. One of these is that his knowledge of other cultures and the operation of institutions in them enables him to point out Japanese motivations and the functions of institutions found in Japan. The study of similarities and dissimilarities even in trivial details of daily life is valuable in this respect. Unfortunately, Dr. Benedict was unable to make a field trip into Japan for firsthand information, because of the war, and the analysis unquestionably suffers from this lack, even though she did meet many Americans of Japanese birth or residence.

Another unique contribution of the anthropologist is his knowledge that all aspects of a culture are systematically related to each other. There are few traits which are not integrated into the total pattern of living which people regard as the basis of their universe, socially
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speaking. The consistency of these relationships enables the cultural anthropologist to predict future and unknown behavior from what has been studied and is known. He must, however, remain objective, generous toward differences with his own culture's traits, tough-minded in recognizing the influence of those differences. Thus Dr. Benedict tries to reconcile the Japanese interest in raising and admiring chrysanthemums and their equally absorbing interest in swords and swordplay.

She points out that orderliness is the principle upon which Japanese society is founded—that whatever is expected is known and not dangerous, even if it is an annihilating air attack, while what cannot be foreseen is unknown and to be feared. The emperor was all things to all men but always thought of as not directly to blame for anything that happened, including the war. Defeat or no defeat, the Japanese people still would revere the emperor: "Only his words can make the Japanese people accept a defeat and be reconciled to live for reconstruction," said the Japanese soldiers who were made prisoners of war. Were they right?

Dr. Benedict tried to check on this by the principles of general behavior implicit in the Japanese culture. Chief of these is their belief in hierarchy—in taking one's proper station. The proper station of Japan was at the head of all nations; therefore other nations must be persuaded to take their rightful places lower down in the structure. Within Japanese society, too, hierarchy based on sex, generation, and primogeniture is part-and-parcel of family life, and hierarchy determines the position of persons in class and caste also. To effect a change it was a major condition that the emperor be put back in his proper place ("restored") in 1868, that progress be resumed by "expelling the barbarians." But, when the barbarians proved the superiority of their techniques by naval bombardments of Satsuma and Choshu, it was clear that an error of calculation had been made and that to "resume progress" it was necessary to learn the barbarian techniques and to embrace them wholeheartedly.

So too with the war. Realistically viewed, the war resulted in a defeat. But the war was merely a means to an end—the putting of all nations in their proper places, with Japan at the apex of the control structure. If war failed and the other nations became powerful enough to secure control, then the techniques used by Japan must be wrong. So they were renounced. American methods and skills must be superior, so these must then be acquired. Hence, when our troops arrived, they found a people prepared to welcome sincerely their late enemies. The superior ways could be learned only from the conquerors, and hence peace and the other techniques which go with it were indicated and accepted by the Japanese. The Japanese had tried to export their formula for safety, but other peoples objected strenuously and successfully. Now she is determined to master the ways which seem to be successful for others. The constant goal of the Japanese is to secure honor, respect, and status; if the means prove ineffective, adopt others which are effective, however different they may be.

How successful this effort will be, Dr. Benedict does not predict, except to say that they will learn the techniques and apply them in a manner and form adaptable to the Japanese culture and that much depends on whether they see the United States or the Soviet Union achieve or lose status through militarism. She discusses the mechanisms which made the Japanese accept the idea of hierarchy; namely, the idea of obligation, or on, and its reciprocals, gimu, or obligation to one's government, one's emperor, or one's parents and ancestors, and gir, or obligations of a contractual nature, such as to one's liege lord, one's affinal family, or non-relatives who had given one work or gifts, or one's duty to keep his name or family reputation clean. The stress laid upon these feelings of obligation (chaps. v-x) makes clear their significance to Japanese behavior, and the explanations given clear up some perplexing problems. However, they seem to be more appropriate to the feudal than to the modern period in many ways, and the infiltration of European culture has undermined them more than Dr. Benedict indicates. This is understandable in view of Dr. Benedict's inability to make a field trip. The informants with whom she conversed were frequently Issei who had been in Japan in youth and left years ago. Changes have occurred since they migrated to the United States, and these apparently were not adequately described to the author by informants who had been there more recently. The Nisei in Hawaii do not acknowledge familiarity with the terms involved, and, although many elements of their behavior seem at first blush to fall in with Dr. Benedict's explanation, Issei parents apparently make little effort to instil these values and concepts in their children.
Self-discipline is described as specific training, and an effort is made to show how this self-discipline is developed in growing children. The theory presented is certainly different from the psychoanalytic theory, although at times the author makes comparisons and points out instances in which the two theories coincide. The book ends with a discussion of what the Japanese have done since V-J Day and with a statement of the successful use of the author's principles by the occupation forces. There is a useful glossary and index.

Dr. Benedict has provided us with a useful book, which has few exact parallels in the literature. It will help and has helped us materially to understand the behavior of the Japanese. But it is not the whole story; to be fully adequate it requires further study, correction, and supplementation.

JOHN A. RADEMAKER
University of Hawaii


To Americans, Hawaii has meant many things. In our national life the attack on Pearl Harbor gave the Islands an entirely new meaning by making explicit a role which to most of us was not even a potential role. For a few it was a "sugar-coated fortress," but for the many it was an insular area which specialized in sugar and recreation.

To the sociologist it has been a group of islands within which an "unorthodox" racial doctrine has emerged within a relatively short time. The fraternity has reported the process of amalgamation in some detail, and, although this author earlier described and analyzed the broader community organization, the Islands have been looked upon chiefly as an area where the mixing of races was to be studied. Our techniques have not so far been adequate for stating the strength of social attitudes associated with amalgamation, and consequently Pearl Harbor created an opportunity for testing the intensity of attitudes which make up the Hawaiian doctrine of race. A report of this testing is the only problem with which Dr. Lind is concerned, and this in itself gives this book a significant place in the literature of race relations.

The book is important, moreover, because of the fact that continental United States, Canada, Mexico, Peru, and Brazil also had what they considered to be important groups of Japanese in their populations. Stereotypes of various sorts, pressure groups, fear of invasions, and rumors from Hawaii all operated to create confused demands for action. Within this larger area of race relations and related problems, an area in which there are important differences but numerous similarities, it has been difficult to establish perspectives and make adequate appraisals. Through the work of Dr. Lind and his associates we expect to learn many more of the facts. In the meantime Hawaii's Japanese is the first objective statement of what went on in Hawaii, and thus it provides a perspective for continental or other developments. The differences in roles of high military and political authorities in the Islands as compared with the Coast, the role of Hawaiian Nisei in establishing military confidence and demonstrating loyalty through military service, the differences between Issei and Nisei, the reactions of different groups in Hawaii, the reactions of continentalists to the Hawaiian race doctrine—all these are placed in a time perspective to show how they developed and what seem to be the major factors which account for their course of development.

This book is divided into nine sections, presenting clearly the pre-Pearl Harbor status of the Japanese, the questions about their loyalty if war did start, the conduct of the Japanese during bombing, the non-Japanese reactions to the presence of the Japanese, the Japanese perspective of the crisis, the issue of military service for Nisei and its resolution, community activities as Hawaii settled down for the war, the "crises of peace," and an over-all appraisal of how this intense and extended emergency affected the "unorthodox" doctrine of race. The general conclusion of the author is that Japanese integration into Hawaiian life has not been retarded. Although strained, the racial doctrine remains intact.

Hawaii's Japanese is well written and has a good index. It has appeared when there is still considerable interest in those problems stirred up by the war. We hope that the Hawaiian sociologists find it possible to publish shortly detailed studies of life in the Islands during the war.

McGill University

FORREST E. LAVIOLETTE