

tem for political, not economic, reasons. As Eisenman writes, “Decollectivization, like collectivization itself, was initiated by China’s leaders and was cast as a popular movement to lend it legitimacy” (210). Put differently, Deng Xiaoping used decollectivization to wrest power away from his political adversaries.

All in all, this is an ambitious, if uneven, study of the Chinese commune and its critical role in creating the preconditions for China’s economic development in the 1980s and 1990s. Eisenman’s characterization of Maoism as a religion, even in the Durkheimian sense, seems overdetermined and more consonant with state goals than the messier aspects of lived realities. The coercive dimensions of Maoism were likely effective in punishing transgressors of commune norms, but one wonders how the cadences of Maoist ideology shifted alongside the changing form and functionality of the commune, particularly after 1970 and the Green Revolution Commune. How did people become the models that the state wanted them to be, and to what extent were such qualities used in the decollectivization process? Regardless, *Red China’s Green Revolution* offers an important corrective about the commune’s value and raises an important question about what purposes the story of the Xiaogang villagers is actually serving.

JIA-CHEN FU  
Emory University

EMILY HONIG and XIAOJIAN ZHAO. *Across the Great Divide: The Sent-Down Youth Movement in Mao’s China, 1968–1980*. (Cambridge Studies in the History of the People’s Republic of China.) New York: Cambridge University Press, 2019. Pp. x, 213. Cloth \$84.99, paper \$25.99, e-book \$21.00.

If China’s socialist project was one of the defining revolutions of the twentieth century, then its Cultural Revolution—era movement of sent-down youth—relocating some seventeen million urban youngsters to the countryside—is surely one of the most significant social experiments that continue to shape our times. In their new book, *Across the Great Divide: The Sent-Down Youth Movement in Mao’s China, 1968–1980*, Emily Honig and Xiaojian Zhao, scholars of modern Chinese history and Asian American history, respectively, trace the sent-down youth movement from its origins in 1968 to its dismantling in 1980. Although the book addresses the movement as a nationwide phenomenon, it takes as a case study the industrial city of Shanghai, which at 1.1 million youth was the largest sender (11). *Across the Great Divide* zooms in further on those Shanghai youth sent to production teams in remote rural areas, like Heilongjiang Province on China’s northern frontier and Yunnan Province in the southwest. As Honig and Zhao suggest with their title, China’s sent-down youth movement provides an opportunity to understand the urban-

rural divide, both as it was experienced by sent-down youth and as a chasm that ultimately persisted.

As a collective biography of a generation, the book’s chapters trace the stages of the sent-down youth movement. Chapter 1 provides the context for the movement—the violence of the Cultural Revolution’s outbreak and the long-standing issue of urban unemployment—while explaining how propaganda mobilized youth to go to the countryside. It reveals that the most effective resistance to the policy was mounted by those at the margins who were most independent of the regime (32–38). Chapter 2 outlines the bureaucracy responsible for the sent-down youth—in particular, the *weiwentuan* teams that Shanghai municipality set up in the countryside (49). The third chapter reveals a “hidden aspect of the economic history of the Cultural Revolution,” showing how local officials in the countryside capitalized on the connections of Shanghai sent-down youth to improve rural conditions, like acquiring material goods from electrical wiring to tractors (85).

The fourth and fifth chapters address examples of discrimination and difference—incidents and phenomenon that demonstrate how the sent-down youth maintained their urban privilege. In chapter 4, Honig and Zhao examine cases of sexual abuse, calling attention to the fact that rural men were “vulnerable to victimization by the state,” an easy scapegoat to distract from systemic problems of rural poverty and issues within the sent-down youth movement itself (115). Chapter 5 is unified by the theme of Shanghai identity, explaining how sent-down youth continued to be marked as outsiders from their clothing to their foodways and how programs to support them—from continuing education to special “sent-down youth stations”—simultaneously shielded them from the harshest realities of the countryside and advantaged them vis-à-vis their rural peers.

The final two chapters of *Across the Great Divide* return to the narrative arc of the sent-down youth story. Chapter 6 is a prehistory to the widespread protests in 1978 that have been considered the beginning of the movement’s demise. Instead, Honig and Zhao argue that it was the culmination of long-term resistance on the part of the sent-down youth, their parents, and officials in both rural and urban centers. A final epilogue chronicles a contemporary “homecoming” as sent-down youth return to the villages in their retirement, supporting investments, forming alumni associations, and engaging in individual and collective tourism. Even in today’s retelling of stories about sent-down youth, Honig and Zhao conclude, the urban-rural divide—further widened by China’s economic “reform and opening up”—is a legacy for our times.

While the history of China’s sent-down youth will be of broad interest to students and scholars of world history, particularly those interested in youth movements and rural development, the pathbreaking nature of Honig and Zhao’s research will set an example for

advanced students and scholars of contemporary China. The book is grounded in decades of research and teaching about China, and it reveals a mastery of sources, especially archival ones. *Across the Great Divide* is trailblazing because it drills down into local archives—from the district-level archives of Shanghai as the sent-down youth's point of origin to the county-level archives of the places that received them. In this way, the book not only shows how to read official documents against the grain but also sheds light on new sources that reveal in fine detail the problems of the movement—from records of accusations to transcripts of telephone calls. It also makes use of local histories known as gazetteers, including ones on trials (31), agriculture (63), and youth (86). Honig and Zhao incorporate many published memoirs, but they rely less on interviews, listing only nine in their bibliography. But the richness of local archives—many of which may no longer be accessible under current political conditions—supply compelling historical detail.

Honig's and Zhao's research bridges a spatial divide between historical studies of China's cities and its countryside, and a temporal divide between the history of the Mao era (1949–76) and its postsocialist era of reform. Throughout, the book challenges periodizations, from the beginning of the sent-down youth as a phenomenon (11) to its internal arc (63–64) to its conclusion. It restores agency to actors across generations—sent-down youth and their parents—and across the urban-rural official bureaucracy, complicating a narrative that has been dominated by one of victimhood. Finally, it enriches interdisciplinary research in China studies that focuses on the urban-rural divide, making the case that we can think of household residence as a form of class, that the power dynamic between urban and rural is not unlike a colonial metropole and periphery (117), and that today's staggering inequalities have their roots in Mao-era policies.

DENISE Y. HO  
Yale University

JOHN J. HARNEY. *Empire of Infields: Baseball in Taiwan and Cultural Identity, 1895–1968*. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 2019. Pp. xxiv, 212. Cloth \$50.00, e-book \$50.00.

This well-presented monograph, *Empire of Infields: Baseball in Taiwan and Cultural Identity, 1895–1968*, adds further complexity to Asian sports history. As John J. Harney points out, baseball, known for much of the twentieth century as America's national pastime, was introduced in Taiwan by Japanese imperial forces planning to use the sport to show cultural power and entertain their troops. The Taiwanese quickly embraced baseball, eventually producing winners in national games against the Japanese. Taiwan's love for baseball continued into the era of Nationalist occupa-

tion despite general Chinese popular indifference to the sport. In the 1960s, Taiwan's teams dominated the Little League World Series. Taiwan's embrace of baseball continues to the present. While only a handful of Taiwanese players have or are playing in the American big leagues, the influence of Taiwanese players on Japanese major league baseball is sizable, with 41 percent of all league players stemming from Taiwan. Sadarahu Oh, the greatest of all Japanese major league baseball players and the world home run leader, holds a ROC passport despite decades of residence in Japan.

Harney carefully credits past scholars of this anomalous cultural history. Most recently, Andrew Morris argued that baseball, as an example of "globalization," shaped a Taiwanese consciousness within a global dynamic. Harney pushes gently against this notion, arguing that the "regional trumps the global" (xxi). In Taiwan, baseball became a symbol through which the small nation could assert its global position. Baseball produced paradoxes affecting our understanding of Japanese imperial power and Chinese anticolonial resistance. After the game developed under Japanese control, post-World War II Nationalist efforts to shift Taiwanese culture into a specifically Chinese narrative floundered and gave way to channeling public enthusiasm for the game into a specifically Taiwanese identity. Although Taiwanese victories against Japanese teams constituted patriotic triumphs, the People's Republic of China's lack of interest in baseball diluted any competition with island teams.

Harney portrays this paradoxical sporting culture in a series of well-crafted and researched chapters. Chapter 1 elucidates American baseball's entry into Japanese sport and its subsequent transfer to Taiwan. Chapter 2 recovers the history of barnstorming professional players and, more importantly, touring college teams, especially from Waseda University, that excited Taiwanese teams. Waseda teams had also visited the United States three times between 1915 and 1926. Waseda toured Taiwan as well. When a team composed of Taipei railroad workers played evenly against the visiting Waseda squad in 1931, the island's baseball community felt capable of competing against Japan's finest talent. Harney points out that Waseda's team claimed peerage in the United States while proclaiming superiority in a colony. American sports fans, accustomed to the study of professional teams, will find enlightening Harney's emphasis in this era on college amateur teams. While such examples of Western liberal culture initially predominated, as Harney shows in chapter 3, Noko, a team composed of indigenous Taiwan teenagers, demonstrated baseball's local development. Harney's research into long-neglected tours firmly undergirds his arguments. Harney points out that the introduction of Taiwanese players into Japanese professional teams, the topics of chapters 4 and 5, occurred when American baseball was resolutely Jim Crow.