

## Communications to the Editor

### On Review of *Artist and Patron in Postwar Japan*

Lee E. Scanlon didn't much like what I had to say or how I said it in *Artist and Patron in Postwar Japan* (reviewed in *JAS* 42, [August 1983]:958–59). My thesis, which the review did not state, is this: Before the late 1960s, the government of Japan gave low priority to aiding the arts. Corporate and foundation patronage have been hamstrung by hostile tax laws and a weak tradition of philanthropy. No true public exists for theater, dance, music, or the visual arts. Instead leaders of the arts have cultivated private audiences, patterned after family groups, to support each genre.

The reviewer's quarrels with the substance of what I said are hollow. He complained that no source predated 1966; actually the notes list dozens of such sources. Somehow he did not discern the elites, including professionals, who dominate each genre. In fact they are all there: their numbers, schooling, incomes, and the arts organizations through which they work. The reviewer objected to reading statistics that support my conclusions, but no one can write responsibly about arts patronage without facts. (For the social history of the arts everywhere, but especially in Japan, the real problem is a dearth of reliable figures.) The reviewer chides me for minimizing the human element, but actually the book treats nearly every important patron of the arts since 1955 and draws heavily on interviews with more than a hundred artists, patrons, critics, and administrators. What I wrote was a work about social groups—artists, fan clubs, season subscribers, middle-class pupils. Everyone agrees that these have been the key patrons since the 1950s. Readers will quickly be able to tell whether it is the book or the review that concentrates, in Scanlon's words, "only superficially" on its topic.

TOM HAVENS  
*Connecticut College*

### On the Symposium, *Peasant Strategies in Asian Societies*

I was deeply disturbed by the symposium on peasant behavior, inspired by the controversy between James Scott and Sam Popkin, which appeared in the August 1983 *JAS* (42, no. 4:753–868). Several papers seriously misrepresented James Scott's writings, attributing to Scott ideas that he has never held, and then "refuting" the supposed errors. In particular, Charles Keyes, as editor of the symposium, attributed some remarkably simple-minded ideas to Scott.

Keyes (p. 763) attributes to Scott a claim that "the mass support that has brought revolutionary regimes to power in the postcolonial Third World has been secured by the reassertion of premodern redistributionary ideologies, of untransformed communitarian norms." One would suppose that this came from *The Moral Economy of the*