



CHICAGO JOURNALS



Reviews

Author(s): William A. R. Richardson

Source: *The American Historical Review*, Vol. 113, No. 4 (October 2008), p. 1301

Published by: [The University of Chicago Press](#) on behalf of the [American Historical Association](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.1086/ahr.113.4.1301>

Accessed: 19/10/2011 01:31

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



The University of Chicago Press and American Historical Association are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to The American Historical Review.

<http://www.jstor.org>

rency held abroad, and the valuta that German industrialists piled up outside the Reich by not repatriating export revenue. The total certainly exceeds 15 milliard gold marks from 1914 to 1923. Thus Germany's capital account stood in substantial surplus throughout the postwar years. For details, see my *American "Reparations" to Germany, 1919–33* (1988).

Finally, Tooze gilds the lily by referring (twice) to Wirth's "aggressive" fulfillment of the reparations schedule. Wirth himself frequently referred to the "so-called fulfillment policy," which aimed to demonstrate that the Reich could not comply with its obligations. Wirth's *Nachlass*, suffused with perfervid nationalist sentiments, makes clear that the latter description is more accurate.

STEPHEN A. SCHUKER
University of Virginia

Adam Tooze does not wish to respond.

REVIEWS

TO THE EDITORS:

In his review of my book *Was Australia Charted before 1606? The Jave la Grande Inscriptions* (*AHR*, April 2008, 481–482), Roy Schreiber condemns virtually all its aspects. Reviewers in journals specifically devoted to the history of cartography and discoveries—*The Portolan*, the *BIMCC Newsletter*, *IMCoS Journal*, and *Terrae Incognitae*—recommended it very highly; even the *Imago Mundi* reviewer, a dogged adherent to the *Jave la Grande* = Australia school, found some merit in it, though was still reluctant to accept its inevitable conclusion that *Jave la Grande* is not Australia.

Roy Schreiber states that the book is about the Harleian/Dauphin map and the identification of *Jave la Grande*. It is *not*. It is about that landmass on *all* the maps of the Dieppe School—a very vital distinction. He then accuses me of performing several “mind-boggling feats with the map.”

1. I did *not* split “the Jave la Grande peninsula in half.” The Dieppe cartographers somehow acquired two very early Portuguese sketch charts, believed them genuine, but were unable to identify them from their inscriptions or their coastal outlines, so did not know where to incorporate them on a world map. Belief in the existence of a southern continent suggested that these enigmatic coasts might belong to southern Java and Sumbawa, which on most sixteenth-century Portuguese charts were left blank. This created a *nonexistent landmass* that some cartographers actually joined hypothetically to the north coast of Tierra del Fuego. I merely noted that two unidentified coastlines were depicted where none existed and sought to identify them, by examining *both* their outlines *and* their inscriptions, on *all* the Dieppe maps, since the latter vary in number and spelling from each other.

2. I did *not* turn the east coast of *Jave la Grande* into

Vietnam “after the image on the map is turned upside down and moved ten degrees to the north.” The reviewer cannot have read the caption to Plate 7, which clearly states that “*South is at the top*.” All the other east coast illustrations have north at the top.

3. I did *not* turn “the western half [of *Jave la Grande*] into *eastern Java* by rotating the image from south-north to an east-west orientation.” Chapter 11 explains that “the western half” is intended to represent the coast of *southwestern Java*. Although not looking like it, the inscriptions are confirmation. Chapter 10 explains that a false, duplicate, misaligned version of Java's west coast appeared on all Portuguese and the derivative Dieppe maps throughout the sixteenth century, so the speculative misalignment of part of the southwest coast is hardly surprising.

4. I did *not* state or imply that “language trumps cartography every time.” Because of the number of hypothetical or questionable coastlines on sixteenth-century charts—Mercator's southern continent and *India Meridionalis* on the *Bünting* world map, for example—I merely insist that dubious cartographical outlines should be treated skeptically unless their supposed identity can be reliably confirmed by inscriptions.

5. The reviewer objects to my contention that proof of *Jave la Grande*'s identification as Australia would entail showing that some of the inscriptions indicated *uniquely* Australia features, or words in an Aboriginal language. Such inscriptions as *Coste dangereuse*, often cited as indicating the Great Barrier Reef, are unacceptable; there are hundreds of dangerous coastlines in the world. Needed are *specific, unambiguous* inscriptions.

6. Though acknowledging that “the case for the linguistic origins of various place-names is convincing,” the reviewer *avoids any comment whatsoever* on the book's major theme, the presence of corrupt Javanese inscriptions of the west coast of “Australia,” and corrupt Vietnamese and South China Sea ones on, and off, its east coast!

7. The reviewer's objections to the format and length of the book, and what he calls its “overall haphazard” and “annoying . . . structure,” are strange. The *Portolan* reviewer is specifically complimentary on these features.

8. Since *Jave la Grande* is *not* Australia, the reviewer's comment regarding longitude is irrelevant.

A closer acquaintance with this controversy, and a more careful reading of my text, would doubtless have produced a different assessment.

WILLIAM A. R. RICHARDSON
Flinders University

Roy Schreiber does not wish to respond.

TO THE EDITORS:

The spectacle of scholars and reviewers exchanging broadsides is never dignified, and I do not intend to