

ponais. En effet, il n'existe aucune étude aussi exhaustive de la famille japonaise de cette époque. Fruit de rencontres qui ont duré quatre ans, regroupant des chercheurs de disciplines diverses (histoire, anthropologie, sociologie, droit, science politique, littérature, démographie, analyse iconographique) de l'INALCO, de Paris Diderot, du CNRS, de Lyon 3, de Toulouse-le Mirail, de Bordeaux 3, de Genève et de Dôshisha, ce livre chambarde nos conceptions de la famille japonaise, en éliminant plusieurs clichés et idées reçues. L'analyse, qui porte davantage sur les discours et débats, comme le sous-titre l'indique, que sur les rapports sociaux, est particulièrement bien développée au sujet du code civil de 1898, dans lequel des visions différentes de la famille sont présentées, bien que domine l'idéologie du *ie*, forme de famille patriarcale, fondée sur une certaine conception de l'organisation familiale des guerriers de la période Edo.

Mais le livre touche à bien d'autres sujets, comme les rôles de père et mère, l'amour, les relations de couples, l'importance grandissante de l'idéologie du *katei*, faisant référence à une forme familiale inspirée de l'Occident, et à plusieurs types de discours ou de représentations, allant des photographies et des romans à des essais sociologique et féministe ou à des pamphlets. En excluant l'avant-propos, qui contient une mise en contexte par les directeurs de l'ouvrage et un texte de Carol Gluck, historienne américaine de grande réputation, et en excluant aussi la conclusion, le livre contient huit sections (De la famille japonaise moderne ; Conceptions de la famille ; Quelques familles particulières ; La famille et la question sociale ; Couples et relations amoureuses ; Femmes, épouses et mères ; Hommes, maris et pères ; Enfants et enfances) et 35 chapitres. Le premier de ces chapitres contient un excellent "Panorama général des discours sur la famille dans le Japon des ères Meiji et Taishô (1868–1926)", un condensé des différents sujets et articles traités dans l'ouvrage qui présente les complexités des discours sur la famille à cette époque.

Comme Carol Gluck l'indique (20–22), les articles du livre démolissent le mythe du *ie* qui devient dans l'analyse, selon la terminologie de Gluck, "un *imaginaire institutionnel*, exprimé en termes juridiques comme une entité administrative", mais qui fut aussi objet de débat au moment de la rédaction du code civil, de telle sorte que la version finale évite d'en donner une définition claire (21). Cette forme de maisonnée est imposée comme seule forme familiale reconnue, mais est aussi présente dans l'énoncé du code une conception de la famille comme couple, empruntée des discours idéalisés de la famille occidentale, conception qui était à l'époque disséminée dans plusieurs revues et qui a affaibli socialement l'influence de la famille élargie patriarcale qu'est le *ie*. Le code civil donne donc une définition floue et quelque peu contradictoire de la famille.

L'insistance sur le couple, ainsi que sur les droits des femmes et des enfants, bien que non généralisée, va faire en sorte que d'autres idéaux et discours vont se développer, dont certains, comme ceux de Yokoyama Gennosuke, un journaliste, vont se fonder sur des enquêtes de type sociologique dans des quartiers défavorisés de Tokyo.

Dans ces milieux, on est loin de l'idéal officiel de la maisonnée telle que présentée dans le code civil et les discours conservateurs. Face aux discours dominants, qui de plus en plus lient toutes les familles à l'empereur, conçu comme père de la nation, des auteurs comme Fukuzawa Yukichi vont défendre les relations familiales égalitaires et harmonieuses. D'autres chapitres du livre étudient les positions de Shimazaki Tôson, de Higuchi Ichiyô, de Natsume Sôseki, de Hiratsuka Raichô et d'autres, qui divergent plus ou moins des positions officielles.

La force du livre réside dans la mise à jour de la complexité des discours et positions sur la famille dans les années de Meiji et Taishô, une complexité qui se révèle autant dans la littérature romanesque que dans les discours d'intellectuels ou de juristes et qui se manifeste dans des positions divergentes, des contradictions et des débats. Mais la grande diversité des sujets est aussi à la source de la seule faiblesse du livre. En effet, l'ouvrage touche à des sujets quelquefois disparates entre lesquels les liens ne sont pas toujours évidents. Le panorama présenté au premier chapitre, qui fait ressortir les lignes directrices des débats et positions, corrige quelque peu ce défaut, mais il n'y arrive pas complètement. Mais c'est là une faiblesse qui n'enlève rien à la contribution unique et extraordinaire de ce livre à la compréhension du Japon moderne.

Bernard Bernier

Glassman, Jonathon: War of Words, War of Stones. Racial Thoughts and Violence in Colonial Zanzibar. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2011. 398 pp. ISBN 978-0-253-22280-0. Price: \$ 26.43

Jonathon Glassman's "War of Words, War of Stones" represents an attempt to have historical scholarship speak to contemporary concerns. Well over a decade in the making, this inquiry was undoubtedly motivated by events at the fin de siècle: widespread "ethnic cleansing" during the collapse of the former Yugoslavia; the horrors of the Rwandan genocide of 1994; and the resurgence of communal violence in the South Asian context. Writing African history, we are reminded, is never a parochial affair, but rather a means of thinking more seriously about Africa's place in the world – grasping the continent's significance within a broader set of circulating global forces and forms. Hence the book, while located in an East African coastal milieu, is very much informed by broader theoretical aims: to analyze processes of racialization, ultimately grasping the diverse modes by which dehumanizing discourses of race, ethnicity, and nation can serve to legitimate and spark political violence.

In the work, Glassman seeks to expand the study of race beyond the West, challenging the assumption that racial categories in Africa were largely the creation of nineteenth-century European colonialism. He also dissolves sharp analytic distinctions between race, ethnicity, and nation, exploring how these concepts of identity play out across an interconnected discursive terrain. Glassman returns to some of the initial debates of postcolonial African history, stressing the importance of indigenous sources of racial thought and highlighting the critical role

played by African intellectuals (both subaltern and elite). In this manner, he argues that mid-twentieth-century racial discourses in Zanzibar counterposing “Arab” against “African” were rooted in much older Arabocentric coastal forms and practices – intrinsically linked to Omani conquest and overrule, the legacy of slavery, and elite notions of status and civility.

By historicizing “race” in the early chapters – performing a kind of discursive archaeology of shifting ideologies, cultural forms, political debates, and material practices – Glassman amply reveals the inadequacies of primordialist accounts of racial and ethnic conflict. At the same time, instrumentalist views come in for equally incisive critique. At key junctures, however, he fails to take advantage of his own best insights. For instance, while race in an East African context bears certain resemblances with other modes of constructing identity, crucial differences remain. For instance, just because race shares an idiom of descent and the rhetoric of blood with coastal discourses of *ustaarabu* (civilization) and *ushenzi* (savagery), they are not simply the same. Glassman collapses distinctions between them in the interest of downplaying the role played by European colonialism. But the hardened scientific racism of the later nineteenth century had a distinctive impact throughout the colonial world, spurring more essentialized and fixed notions of race that indelibly shaped the conceptual landscapes engaged by African intellectuals – a difference that Glassman seeks to elide (while similarly downplaying the contributions of the colonial state, which remains almost invisible for a good deal of the text). Glassman’s work is best served when he seeks to account for all the diverse factors involved, staying true to his own observation that racial thought has multiple, overlapping, and divergent sources, avoiding singular attributions or any search for ultimate origins.

The outward events of Glassman’s account are fairly well known, treated in any number of political histories and memoirs of the period. In the years prior to independence in 1963, the political landscape of Zanzibar was punctuated by a series of intensely contested elections that set an “African” racial nationalist party (the ASP) against an ostensibly non-racialist (but “Arab” identified) coalition, the ZNP/ZPPP. Political, economic, and social differences were increasingly seen in racialized terms, as essentialized differences between “African” and “Arab” took over and infused the terrain of everyday life and practice. These electoral conflicts were marked by civil strife and spasms of violence, most notably in the pogrom of June 1961 and the widespread killings in the immediate wake of the revolution in January 1964.

To interpret this framework of events, however, Glassman brings a distinctly critical perspective. Most broadly, he seeks to understand how discursive formations of racial thought can erupt into violence – in other words, under what circumstances does a “war of words” readily translate into a “war of stones”? Ironically, for all the book’s emphasis on indigenous agency, few local political actors emerge unscathed from Glassman’s analysis. And for a work of intellectual history, the work of intellectuals comes off as positively poisonous: the book is filled with an ar-

ray of venal demagogues, ideologues, and propagandists. Glassman never hesitates to take on conventional wisdom, and he is particularly sharp when skewering self-serving memoirs and politically convenient myths. The ZNP/ZPPP coalition routinely presented itself as non-racialist, while in reality, as Glassman shows, much of their rhetoric and policy was premised in coastal exceptionalism, Arabocentric rhetoric, and anti-mainlander bias (including, of course, squatter evictions) that singled out “Africans” as criminals, savages, or aliens. Alternatively, propagandists within the ASP were responsible for some of the most extreme racial demagoguery, cultivating racial nativism and threatening “Arabs” with expulsion or extermination.

Much of the heart of the text is a subtle analysis of racialization in everyday life, linking newspapers and “civil” society to the politics of rumor, memory, allegations of criminality, and racial violence. Here, Glassman makes excellent use of interdisciplinary approaches, combining historical depth with theoretical sophistication, drawing on recent work in the anthropology of violence, cultural studies, and political theory. His discussion of violence as racial discourse – and the reciprocal dynamics of dehumanization, whereby extremist rhetoric about racial others serves to construct the self as potential victim, highlighting a visceral sense of “vulnerability” that can then be used as the pretext for preemptive assaults on the other – is both acute and altogether insightful.

Glassman recognizes the potential risks involved, especially of “implying that things had to turn out as they did” (ix). Discursively and performatively, extremist rhetoric, extravagant rumors, riots, and racialized violence all produce an excess of social meaning – never easily contained within rationalist categories (or political boundaries). As matters spin out of control, countervailing tendencies and alternative discourses tend to fall off the analytic map. Again, as Glassman notes, it becomes all too easy to overlook those who defused the crowds, diverted attention elsewhere, or denied the racial dehumanization of neighbors, acquaintances, or passersby. Indeed, in the later chapters, events leading up to the pogroms take on a seemingly inexorable logic; once unleashed, the dynamics of dehumanization appear almost impossible to arrest.

Glassman describes the book as a “story,” and clearly he has broader hopes for the tale he seeks to tell. Breaking with racial thought, he states, is “a burden we share” (302), and “War of Words, War of Stones” is intended as a contribution to that end. The goal is certainly laudable, but whether the text will move much beyond a Euro-American academic audience is open to question. Leaving Tanzania late this summer, none of the political activists or intellectuals I knew had yet seen the book, nor was it locally available half a year after publication. Beyond questions of access or affordability, it remains to be seen how the writing of academic history can serve to alter political practices on the ground – especially in a popular domain where discourses of race, ethnicity, and nation intersect with everyday life and consciousness. Perhaps this is the real tragedy of the text: its very separation from the historical processes in which it seeks to intervene.

William Bissell