



Japan in the World, the World in Japan

**FIFTY YEARS OF JAPANESE STUDIES
AT MICHIGAN**

Edited by the Center for Japanese
Studies, University of Michigan

**UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
CENTER FOR JAPANESE STUDIES**

Japan in the World, the World in Japan

Japan in the World, the World in Japan

Fifty Years of Japanese Studies at Michigan

Edited by the Center for Japanese Studies,
The University of Michigan

The Center for Japanese Studies
The University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, 2001

*Open access edition funded by the National Endowment for the Humanities/
Andrew W. Mellon Foundation Humanities Open Book Program.*

© 2001 The Regents of the University of Michigan

Published by the Center for Japanese Studies, The University of Michigan,
202 S. Thayer St., Ann Arbor, MI 48104-1608

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data

Japan in the world, the world in Japan : fifty years of Japanese studies at
Michigan / edited by the Center for Japanese Studies, the University of
Michigan.

p. cm.

ISBN 0-939512-95-5 (pbk. : alk. paper)

1. Japan—Study and teaching (Higher)—United States. 2. University
of Michigan. Center for Japanese Studies—History. I. University of
Michigan. Center for Japanese Studies.

DS834.95.J318 2001

952.0071'173—dc21

00-064354

Cover design by Seiko Semones

This book was set in Garamond.

This publication meets the ANSI/NISO Standards for Permanence of Paper for
Publications and Documents in Libraries and Archives
(Z39.48-1992).

Published in the United States of America

ISBN 978-0-939512-95-9 (paper)

ISBN 978-0-472-12796-2 (ebook)

ISBN 978-0-472-90192-0 (open access)

The text of this book is licensed under a Creative Commons
Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives 4.0 International
License: <https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>

Contents

Note on Personal Names	viii
Preface	ix
Hitomi Tonomura	
Opening Remarks	1
Philip H. Power	
PIONEERING JAPANESE STUDIES	
Moderator's Comments	7
Roger F. Hackett	
In War and Peace: Japanese Studies and I	9
George Oakley Totten III	
A Personal View of the Impact of the Center for Japanese Studies on Academia and United States Foreign Policy	19
Edwin Neville	
Japan: Twelve Doors to a Life	23
Forrest R. Pitts	
The Bridges of Washtenaw County, or I Remember Yamagiwa	29
Grant K. Goodman	
Fate, Timing, Luck	35
Arthur E. Klauser	
Moderator's Comments	39
John Creighton Campbell	
Reflections on the Origins of the Center for Japanese Studies: A Tribute to Robert Burnett Hall (1896–1975)	41
Robert E. Ward	
Perspectives on Village Japan	49
J. Douglas Eyre	

Personal Reflections, 1950	53
Grace Beardsley	
<i>Tozama</i> among <i>Fudai</i> : A Cornellian in Okayama	57
Robert J. Smith	
Personal Reminiscences	63
Margaret Norbeck	
Remembrances of Michigan	69
Robin Hall for John Whitney Hall	
KEYNOTE SPEECH	
Present at the Creation of the Japanese Constitution	73
Beate Sirota Gordon	
CONNECTING WITH THE PROFESSIONAL WORLD	
Japanese Economic Studies: From Marginal to Mainstream	89
Hugh Patrick	
Japanese Economic Studies: A European Perspective	95
Jennifer Corbett	
Studying the Japanese Economy: Michigan Origins	99
Gary Saxonhouse	
Moderator's Comments	103
Yuzuru Takeshita	
Connecting with the Japanese Economy through Law	107
B. J. George, Jr.	
Connecting with the Professional World	115
Dan Fenno Henderson	
Japan Center as Campus Catalyst	121
Whitmore Gray	
Law and History	125
Mark Ramseyer	
The Frustrations and Promise of a Career Involved with U.S.-Japan Economic Relations	129
Merit E. Janow	
From Household Enterprise to the Professional World of Business: An Anthropological Journey	135
Jill Kleinberg	
Learning from Japan: From Toyota City to the Motor City— Twenty Years of Learning about Each Other	139
John Shook	
Twin Displeasure on Two Sides of the Pacific	147
Kondo Motohiro	

LOOKING AHEAD TO A NEW GLOBAL AGE

Marx vs. Area Studies: Social Science Illusions	155
Irwin Scheiner	
The Politics of Modernism in Japan: Once Again the	159
Problem of Fascism	
Bernard Silberman	
The Paranoid Style in Japanese Foreign Policy	169
Peter Duus	
My Middle University	175
Edward Seidensticker	
War and Ethnicity in the Study of Modern Japan	181
Samuel Hideo Yamashita	
Internationalism in Interwar Japanese Financial Politics	197
Richard J. Smethurst	
Discovering Korea at Michigan: The Making of an	
Interarea Historian	205
Michael Robinson	
Japanese Studies in Korea: Past Developments	
and Future Prospects	209
Jung-Suk Youn	
Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s and Beyond	221
Patricia G. Steinhoff	
Contributors	229
Index	241

Note on Personal Names

It is the style of the Center to put Japanese personal names in Japanese order (surname first, personal name last), and we have tried to follow that style here. In a few articles, however, we have used the Western style in order to avoid, for example, Ono Eijiro next to Yoko Ono. We hope that our decision does not create too much confusion.

Preface

A crisp blue autumn sky greeted us on the morning of November 6, 1997. The night before, guests began arriving in Ann Arbor, and some walked over to Zanzibar on State Street for, along with an evening snack, warm handshakes or hugs with their old buddies and new acquaintances. Almost everyone had experienced a life at Michigan, though at different stages in the life of the Center for Japanese Studies. All had played a notable role in the development of “studies about Japan” into “Japanese studies,” an important academic field and a subject of serious human interest.

The Center for Japanese Studies had been preparing for its 50th celebration for about two years. After deciding on the theme, “Japan in the World, the World in Japan,” one of the earliest tasks involved compiling a list of alumni/ae. This was easier said than done; the data were far from complete. Eventually we streamlined our search into basically three different phases in the history of CJS. The first phase actually belonged to the prehistory of CJS: the time of the Army Intensive Language School, the government-run and supposedly top secret institute that produced superb linguists under strict instruction. The decade following the formal establishment of CJS in 1947, the second phase, included the Okayama “outpost” years of the 1950s when path-breaking, highly interdisciplinary research was accomplished. The more recent past was the third phase that saw Michigan’s program expand in all directions to host a large and influential body of faculty and graduate students. We also looked into resources at the Law School, whose relationship with Japanese legal scholars dates back to the late nineteenth century, and the Business School, with which CJS had worked closely on various programs including the studies related to Japan’s manufacturing sectors.

In identifying and locating possible speakers, we received valuable suggestions from alumni/ae themselves, many of whom, apparently, maintain

their networks of past UM friends and colleagues. Slowly the outline of the event emerged. Musical performances, keynote speeches, and a historical exhibit would be important components of the celebration. The central feature was the symposium organized under three themes: "Pioneering Japanese Studies," "Connecting with the Professional World," and "Looking Ahead to a New Global Age." Soon, the program was set; invitations were sent; venues were reserved; the food and flowers were ordered; staff assignments were clarified. We were ready to go.

The encouraging remarks from Mr. Philip H. Power, a regent of the University of Michigan, had the event rolling bright and early on November 6. The presentations from the "pioneers" proceeded, impressing the audience with the fascinating saga of learning the Japanese language and culture during and shortly after the war. Together with the afternoon session that vividly retold the life in Okayama, the panels of the day stimulated us to contemplate the changing significance of US-Japan relations. While the war with Japan barred Japanese-Americans from enrolling in the University, select Americans, numbering more than a thousand(!), were busy practicing Chinese characters and repeating Japanese phrases under the disciplined training demanded by the indomitable Joseph K. Yamagiwa, a Japanese-American himself. These linguists became truly outstanding by any standard, and a large number of these experts continued to hold clout in the politics of postwar years. The audience, myself included, learned a great deal about the circumstances and personalities that made the establishment of CJS possible. The prior foundation of linguistic strength and the tremendous foresight that characterized the CJS leadership were crucial in instituting an interdisciplinary program that demanded rigorous grounding in and balanced interpretations of multidimensions of Japanese society. This comprehensive approach would soon find its way to the publication of such books as *Twelve Doors to Japan* and *Village Japan*.

The participants of the celebration enjoyed an opportunity to juxtapose the speakers' presentations with footings of visual images. Three documentary films—"Reunion: A Streetcar to Hibiya," "A Japanese Village: Modernization and Its Price," and "An Island Without a Sea: Takashima and Its Half-A-Century"—were shown at breaks. In the midst of one, a misfired fire alarm in our building alerted us to roll out to the front lawn, without coats or even a cup of coffee. This perhaps was a test of our participants' character and endurance. Fortunately, all seemed to survive the mini-ordeal in good humor, and I was most grateful to everyone's magnanimity as well as to the sympathetic autumn weather.

Mrs. Beate Sirota Gordon, the keynote speaker that evening, was as entertaining, gracious, and captivating as her reputation suggests. There is, of course, nothing like her story of helping to write, as a young lady just in her early twenties, the constitution of a country that had only recently lost a war to

hers. The Bentley Library, the site of this reception, exhibited a sampling of photos and documents from the CJS's founding days and Okayama outpost experiences. Reactions to the exhibit were mostly, "Not enough!" Indeed, the exhibit could have filled all of the walls of the library.

Economists, lawyers, and other professionals poured into the Business School on the second day of the celebration. Along with our speakers, we contemplated the history of the postwar Japanese economic recovery and the parallel development of Japan-focused economic studies in the American academia. The keynote speakers—Eisuke Sakakibara, the then Minister of the International Finance Bureau of the Ministry of Finance, and Jeffrey Sachs, the Director of Harvard Institute for International Development—sent an optimistic forecast and a confidence vote on the state of economy in Japan and East Asia to the crowd that filled Hale Auditorium. For the time being, we were not going to worry about the economy and were instead pleased that so many Japanese studies graduates had distinguished themselves in many sectors of the professional world here and in Japan.

Historians were dominant, at least in number, among the speakers on the third day, though a political scientist, a sociologist, and a literature specialist also prevailed. Too bad that two of the speakers could not get farther than the San Francisco airport; thanks to the fax machine, their papers were read authoritatively by "proxies." Presenters delivered cogent and thoughtful reflections on themes of modernization, wartime politics, significance of Japanese and East Asian studies in postwar years, among other concerns. A video showing of "Occupied Japan" broke up the rhythm, and the performance by the alumnae of the now-defunct University of Michigan Japanese Music Study Group astonished us with the members' unmitigated expertise in and love for their instruments—*koto*, *taiko*, etc. The Lion Dance, with Bill Malm as the Lion, was a scary interlude that filled the room with honest laughter.

At the end of the sessions, we were challenged to ponder questions: As the world grows increasingly more global, what will it mean to study one country in the future? How do we reconcile the need for linguistic competence that is based on regionalism, and the demand for global thinking and outlook? Fifty years from now, when many of us are no longer around, how will the Center for Japanese Studies celebrate a centennial? As these reflections faded, all of us strolled over to the Museum of Art for our last meal together. The Museum was exquisitely set up, complete with an Edo-period screen and various other precious artifacts. The dinners on two previous nights were great, too, but since this was the last one, the ambiance seemed particularly lavish and the food quite delectable. The night before, we had indulged ourselves in the eerie beauty of Tsugaru *shamisen* performed by Takahashi Chikuzan II. Draped in shocking red curls, Chikuzan delivered a music that was an expression of sorrow and humanity born out of the rough north, where her blind

master had traveled and sang through the wind and snow. On our last night, the mood was joyful and bright, with Keiko McNamara at the piano, jazzing away her passionate and sensitive tunes to the museum full of happy munchers. The celebration was ending, and I watched guests depart, filled with good food, a renewed sense of nostalgia, and promises for another reunion. Vases filled with red roses contrasted brightly against the whiteness of the tablecloth as plates were removed and chairs were stored away.

The celebration served to revisit a long list of alumni/ae whose lives are a fascinating embodiment of the complex postwar history in which Japan's relationship to the United States was rapidly transformed and continually redefined. The event regenerated our search for the past meanings and the future paths of Japanese studies. We were delighted to become acquainted with those pioneers who had built the foundation for all of us and those scholars who are actively engaged in cultivating new perspectives and approaches to tackle global issues through their knowledge of Japanese society and cultures.

A celebration of this size and repertoire cannot be made possible without the help of many organizations and individuals. Toyota Motor Corporation, Japan Business Society of Detroit, IMRA America, Inc., The Japan Foundation, the UM International Institute, and the many individuals whose names appear in our symposium program all contributed to the success of the event. Okayama Broadcasting Company was also kind to supply us with the documentary videos on Michigan's Okayama outpost. I wish to note the Center's appreciation to Professor Grant Goodman for establishing the Goodman Fund for graduate students, and Mrs. Robin Hall, for founding the John Whitney Hall Book Series in the Center for Japanese Studies Publications Program.

In compiling this volume, CJS staff, especially student assistants, worked hard to transcribe some of the talks from the recordings. Bruce Willoughby, Robert Mory, and Ellen O'Connor of the CJS Publications Program contributed their superb editorial skills and good sense in bringing this volume to fruition.

This volume is dedicated to all who shared this heartfelt occasion either in person or in spirit. Thank you, all authors, for sending in your paper and allowing us to present it as a testimonial to this meaningful and unforgettable event.

Hitomi Tonomura
Director
November 8, 1999

Opening Remarks

Philip H. Power

As a member of the governing body of the university, I want to offer a sincere and warm welcome and best wishes to all of you, present and absent, as you celebrate the fiftieth anniversary of the founding of the Center for Japanese Studies. The history of the Center and of the personalities associated with it correspond almost exactly to many of my own conscious memories of growing up in Ann Arbor. Professor Yamagiwa was a family friend with whom my father and I played water polo, and I went from kindergarten through twelfth grade with the Yamagawas' daughter Roseanna, who was certainly the most intelligent and talented member of our high school class. And I remember, although I did not participate in, the extended cocktail hours at Bob Hall's house in Barton Hills. The fact that my parents got home safely following those hours was possibly because they had only a couple of miles to drive on largely unoccupied roads. As I grew older, I used to play tennis with Dick Beardsley, and while I was dating the Beardsleys' late daughter Betsy, I enjoyed meals with the entire family. It was around their dinner table that I learned yet again what delight can come from the civilized, knowledgeable, and caring family. I was moved to read Grace's personal recollections of their life in Okayama. Otto Laporte, who was a neighbor of my parents while a professor of physics at the University of Michigan, and who later became scientific attaché at the American embassy in Tokyo, introduced me to three vital parts of any civilized life: eau-de-vie, four-handed Schubert piano music, and Japanese art. I bought my first lacquer pieces when my family and I were visiting Otto and Eleanor Laporte on my first trip to Japan in 1955, and I treasure them to this day. And, when a student at the University of Michigan, I would sit enthralled at the feet of Bob Ward while he analyzed some complex matter in Japanese politics, relating it clearly to larger trends in Southeast Asia and relating those analytically to all previous thought. So this event and

the presence of all of you on this anniversary refresh for me some of my happiest memories, and I thank you very much for doing that.

Professor Tonomura suggested that I might want to situate the role of the Center within the framework of this university's broad goals and missions. I shall try, but very briefly. The University of Michigan has a number of distinguishing characteristics that help situate the Center. It's a relatively old university. It is midwestern in location, but worldwide in reach. It has a distinguished tradition of innovative interdisciplinary scholarship. It is a public university and at the same time it is a seriously excellent place. The history of this university is intertwined with personal and institutional relationships with Japan. The first Japanese students came to Ann Arbor as a result of President Angell's time as special envoy to China in the 1870s. Toyama Masakazu, later president of Tokyo Imperial University and eventually Japan's first education minister, received an honorary degree from the University of Michigan in 1886. The first English-language studies of the Japanese economy were conducted in the 1890s by Ono Eijiro, later president of the Industrial Bank of Japan. World War II led to the establishment of the U.S. Army Japanese Language School here in 1942. I believe something like 1,500 soldiers were trained in the rigorous, fast-paced program. Professor Hall's report on area studies for the Social Science Research Council led to the idea of area studies centers to unite the various disciplines explicitly including the humanities. These traditions of academic interest in understanding nations and cultures served as important models here at the University of Michigan and led of course to the creation of this Center.

The University of Michigan is geographically located in the Midwest, and I've always felt that the special qualities of the Midwest—being friendly, secure, solid, free of snobbery on the one hand and of craziness on the other, and outward looking—characterized the unexpected reach of the university to Japan, more than six thousand miles away, and motivated, interestingly, a special relationship built first at the field site in Okayama. The University of Michigan prides itself on innovative interdisciplinary scholarship to this day. I may be entering an academic and policy thicket, but personally I've always felt that the area study centers here are among the most significant interdisciplinary programs in the country. Surely, for example, globalization is not merely a matter of economics or of technical exchange. It requires an integrated understanding of history, institutions, culture, language, and of the entire fabric of a society. And the Center for Japanese Studies illustrates perfectly the continuing power and relevance of precisely such an integrated conception. The Center supports a community today of more than twenty-five faculty members in all fields. It offers more than a hundred courses on Japan, enrolling more than a thousand students at the undergraduate and graduate levels. Since 1947, the Center has involved itself in the bestowal of 500 master's degrees and 200

Ph.D.'s. More than eighty-two universities have adopted Center titles as textbooks. And the Asia Library, with 236,000 volumes, is the second largest collection of Japanese-language books and periodicals in the United States.

And so as I reflect on the nature of my early memories about Japan, of schoolmates, athletics, cocktails, family dinners, and of art and geopolitics, the correspondence between the multifaceted nature and the intellectual core of the Center becomes clear and direct in my mind. This is what Bob Hall recognized when he required everybody, regardless of discipline, to attend the evening cocktail hour and dinner in Okayama. A full understanding of any nation requires one to knit together, in shared argument and discussion, insights over a wide range of fields. The Center, since its founding, has developed into one of the most significant jewels of the University of Michigan. It is my very great pleasure to mark its importance, to commemorate its anniversary, and to wish all of you a warm welcome for your celebration.

Pioneering Japanese Studies

Moderator's Comments

Roger F. Hackett

I can merely add my words of welcome to those of Professor Tonomura and Regent Power, and point out an obvious fact: this celebration is, in large part, a homecoming for all of you. It is an opportunity to reminisce—and we've started that over coffee earlier this morning—to think back, reflect where the work and the mission of the Center for Japanese Studies fits into your careers and your experiences. The theme this morning and this afternoon, as Brett Johnson just pointed out, is "Pioneering Japanese Studies." And for me it is impossible to think of any pioneer without bringing attention to John Whitney Hall, who passed away one week ago. I particularly wanted to recognize the presence of his wife, Robin, with us today. I succeeded Jack Hall here; he left these huge shoes that I couldn't begin to fill. When I reflect on some early experiences with Jack, who was a few years ahead of me at the Canadian Academy in Kobe, Japan, the feature that stands out in my mind was his incredible jumping ability. He had the school record for the standing broad jump. I often associate that to Jack's impact on the field of Japanese studies—his contribution to its leap forward. So, I'm happy to recognize his singular contribution, while saddened to note his death.

This morning we will hear from five members of this panel. In searching for what they have in common (aside from septuagenarianism), I note that there are four professors and a corporate executive among the five. And as has been pointed out, all of the members of today's panel and tomorrow's will be people who have had an early connection with the University of Michigan and with the Center for Japanese Studies. The metaphor that I want to introduce here is derived from the building of a Greek temple. There are many different parts of the building, including the stereobate and stylobate, which are below the base upon which the column, capitol, and entablature rise. What we are really engaged in at this point is really the stylobate, the base behind the

Center, and the early experience of people who went through the Center. So we begin with those whose experience predates the founding of the Center for Japanese Studies.

In War and Peace: Japanese Studies and I

George Oakley Totten III

It was gray and snowing when I arrived in Ann Arbor with my duffel bag and my crumpled GI (government issue) uniform after a several days' train ride from the camp in New York where I had only a week or so earlier been inducted. The room in the main dormitory of the University of Michigan seemed overheated and cramped. It had been originally built as a single student's room, but two double-decker beds had now been squeezed into it for Tiedemann, Totten, Tuckman, and Turkington. Guess how the rooms were assigned! We were to be trained to learn to interrogate Japanese prisoners of war and to read Japanese military documents in order to gain military intelligence from them to enable our troops to defend themselves and to attack and destroy the enemy.

The next day we new GIs were milling around in a large lounge, waiting to meet our teachers, after words from our officers. The door opened and a couple dozen diminutive Japanese men and women, as intense and nervous as we were, stepped into the room. I thought how small they looked. Some of the women could not have been more than five feet tall. The thought crossed my mind: Are they going to teach us the wrong things and thus ingeniously stymie our effectiveness on the battlefield? As I look back now, I wonder how I could have had such a thought. Part of it was that I had had so little contact with Japanese people; they still seemed so mysterious. We had also been fed stereotypes to demonize the enemy, so our commonsense thinking was temporarily knocked off the hook.

As a result, over the first few weeks I sought to regain my balance by reading Japanese history. This I did at the expense of concentrating on the language study, which began as a rat race and in fact remained one for some of us until the end. From my outside reading I secretly became enthralled with the romance of ancient and medieval Japan. But this kept me from getting into

the fastest class, where I thought I should be. I was in the second class and never moved, although promotions and demotions were periodically made, until we graduated a year later and went on to Camp Savage, near Minneapolis, for concentration on *heigo* (military Japanese) before being sent abroad six months later. I kept my position near the top in the school, despite my new interests in Japanese history both ancient and modern and my new concern with the discrimination still being practiced in America, especially during the war, against the *issei* (Japanese Americans who had been sent back to Japan for part or all of their education), *nisei* (the Japanese Americans first born in the U.S. but in Japanese eyes constituting the second generation), and *sansei* (their children).

I had not wanted to go into the army. Not that I disliked the discipline (I was used to that from my prep school) or the study, and not because I did not think the Japanese were aggressors, but because I hated to be a part of a death machine. I had considered becoming a conscientious objector. Wars, it seemed to me, created more problems than they settled. Besides, I had been brought up on the literature stressing the carnage of the First World War, which seemed to be the cause of the Second World War, with the rise of the Nazis who sought revenge against the French, British, and Americans. And the First World War enabled the Bolsheviks to dare to challenge the rest of the world by turning the class system upside down.

Despite the horrors of war and the dangers inherent in the settlements, I felt it necessary to aid in the defeat of the Nazis, fascists, and the Japanese ultranationalists, and to give mankind another chance to make a better world. A new peaceful international system, I felt, could be created by using the lessons gained from the mistakes of the past.

I had come to know the Germans while traveling in Europe as a child, and in my teens I began to be aware of the dangers of Naziism and its scapegoating of the Jewish people, but my political consciousness first became acute in the summer of 1937 when my father took me to Paris for the World's Fair and to study painting at Fontainebleau. The specific event that caused this acute consciousness was the Japanese attack on China on July 7, 1937, just before my fifteenth birthday. Even though it was on the other side of the world, I somehow immediately identified with the Chinese victims—probably part of the long-standing American missionary instinct to “save” China. Soon I became aware of how Hitler dropped his support for Chiang Kai-shek and allied himself with the Japanese, whom he now designated the Asian counterpart of the European Aryans.

When I got to college, for the first time I had a chance to study Chinese. I dreamt of becoming a student of Chinese architecture who would blend European and Chinese styles, and I thought I could create a new genre for the future. When the draft seemed imminent, I tried to get into a Chinese

program but had to settle for Japanese. I rationalized that learning Japanese would help me with my Chinese. Little did I know my future academic impact, to the degree that I had any, would first be in Japanese studies.

As for my wartime experiences, I actually enjoyed them. I felt I was doing something important. I improved my Japanese, working with it on a division level in part of the Dutch East Indies and then in the important landing on the big island of Mindanao in the Philippines. When the war ended, that is where I found myself. I had close friendships with the *issei* and *nisei* who made up my team. Soon after, when I worked on the repatriation of Japanese soldiers and civilians, I saw much suffering not only among them but among the Filipinos. I had never had any hatred for the Japanese people and felt their deaths and maimings were just as tragic as those on our own side. I only hated the Japanese political and military leaders, including the emperor, as the persons responsible for the Japanese aggression. I made friends with some of the Japanese prisoners and those who surrendered after the war. I have kept up with a couple even to the present.

I found myself going to Japan on the last repatriation ship from Mindanao, the *Takasago Maru*, a former luxury liner that served as a hospital ship during and after the war. Japanese naval doctors, still wearing their uniforms and insignia, worked with the sick and made out the death certificates for the corpses that almost every day were incinerated in the small crematorium on the back deck. That oven came into my mind's eye toward the end of the journey when a naval officer offered to give me a shot to kill an excruciating stomach pain I experienced. I took a chance that I would not be the last American killed by these navy men. I survived, but the sickness turned out to be jaundice. The only treatment the American army had for it was intravenous glucose and Babe Ruth candy bars!

In Japan, at the Allied Translators and Information Service (ATIS), I was assigned to reading wartime reports by Japanese "thought" police on people who were suspected of harboring "dangerous thoughts." I was surprised that they were able to accomplish so much while continuously being followed and spied on by the police. In some cases the police even became quite friendly with those who were under house arrest.

I became interested in what these "dangerous" thoughts were. A large number of these individuals were critical of Japan's aggression in China and some even of Japan's colonization of Korea. They criticized Japanese aggression not only because it brought suffering to the victims but because it brought suffering and further dangers to Japan. They did not equate the welfare of Japan with the wishes of the emperor, but it could have been treason to say so openly.

Even before I landed in Tokyo I could smell what came to be called the cold war brewing. Already the division of the Korean peninsula was part

of the last minute scramble for advantage, the U.S. getting a foothold on the peninsula, which would otherwise have been totally occupied by the Russians, in exchange for the Russians getting a toehold in the Allied Council that was supposed to decide on basic policy for the occupation of Japan.

When I returned to Columbia College, I graduated in one semester instead of another whole year by receiving credit for the Japanese language training and by taking exams in various other required courses in general education, which I was able to pass because I had gone to a private school (Choate in Connecticut). For my master's degree at Columbia I wrote an essay on the origin and development of local "self-government" in Japan, using Japanese primary and secondary materials. From that I got my first article published in Japanese in Japan.

However, I found Columbia Graduate School too crowded, and so I shifted to Yale, where the political science department was considered the best in the country. There I studied under Professor Chitoshi Yanaga, the first *nisei* to become a full professor at a top American university. My three fields were comparative government, political philosophy, and Far Eastern international relations.

Soon after transferring to Yale, an unexpected and crucial thing for my career occurred. Yale sent me to spend the summer of 1949 at the Library of Congress. To explain the significance of this, I have to recount something that happened in Tokyo in the first few months of the Occupation. MacArthur ordered the whole libraries of the Foreign Ministry and the Home Ministry to be confiscated, put in mailbags, and sent to the Library of Congress. There, some army historians combed the Foreign Ministry materials in an effort to discover secret Japanese diplomatic moves and materials left over from those used for the War Crimes Trials in Tokyo. But of course as time went by the Japanese did all they could to get back the foreign office archives. The United States agreed to return them but only after filming everything for the Library of Congress.

The other library, that of the Home Ministry, which was quickly abolished, housed all the materials confiscated from those considered left- and right-wing "subversives" in Japanese eyes. They included anarchist, communist, socialist, and democratic materials, including all criticisms of the emperor system, antiwar, profeminist, and pro-*burakumin* writings, and material on Koreans, Jews, and other foreigners in Japan. Since the police system was entirely reorganized under the Occupation and the Home Ministry was not reestablished until much later in reorganized form, the Japanese government did not ask for its materials back. Also Japan was still occupied. The Library of Congress was stuck with these hundreds of mailbags and no qualified personnel available to go over them. A plan was worked out to ask the libraries of the leading universities at that time with Asian collections to send a person to the

Library of Congress to open the bags and make a preliminary classification of the materials. When a duplicate of any book was found it would go the library of the person who found it. When other copies were found they would go to another library or could be traded. In this way the duplicate copies could be dispersed to other American libraries, since there were often two or three.

I was thus able to build up a collection for Yale of proletarian literature and Marxist studies of Japanese history from the pens of various Japanese leftist scholars who were engaged in debates over interpretations. Also available were all materials on opposition parties in the elections after 1925, when universal manhood suffrage was instituted in Japan with certain limitations, since the Home Ministry was in charge of local “self-government” as well as overseeing the police.

That summer’s work in 1949 enabled me to get previously unavailable materials for Yale that I could use in writing my doctoral dissertation. I focused on the opposition parties in the elections up through the end of the war. The Japanese Communist Party was illegal, but it supported some social democratic candidates. Other socialist candidates accused these of being pro-Communist and thus illegal. The various leftist factions fought among themselves as well as against the so-called “bourgeois” parties over domestic social and economic issues, foreign relations, colonialism, and imperialism. The biggest issue was support for or opposition to Japan’s aggression abroad—that is, the peace issue—and the support for peace in the face of the ultranationalists. These activities made up what was the growth and suppression of democracy in prewar Japan. I completed my doctoral degree at Yale in 1954 after a year’s further study with Maruyama Masao and others at Tokyo University and interviewing people in Japan as a Social Science Research Council fellow.

My first job was teaching at Columbia, but I was lured away with a two-year grant from the Ford Foundation to do a book on the postwar social democratic movement. One of my two colleagues on this project was Cecil H. Ueyehara, son of a Japanese diplomat father and an English mother. He had worked on photographing and classifying the foreign office collection. On our project he surveyed all the major libraries in the United States in the mid-1950s and published a bibliography that indicated in which libraries Japanese leftist material could be found. Dr. Alan Cole was the senior member, a full professor at the Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy who had researched middle-sized businesses in Japan. The three of us coauthored *Socialist Parties in Postwar Japan* (Yale, 1966); Ueyehara compiled *Left-wing Social Movements in Japan: An Annotated Bibliography* (Tuttle, 1959); and I authored *The Social Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan* (Yale, 1966), using materials from my dissertation for about one-third of it. In 1987 my book was translated into Chinese and published in Beijing. In 1997 it was published in Seoul, in Korean, arousing interest because South Korea was just embarking on a multiparty political

system and might go as far as to allow socialist parties to exist. A study group, including myself, is being formed to write a counterpart book that covers the left-wing political activities in Korea under the Japanese Occupation.

What I had hoped to do with my book was to open the way for a lot of different studies in America and elsewhere that would be critical of the mainline views of Japanese politics for having more or less left out real discussion of the left wing in prewar Japan. That has now happened. The subjects included the labor movement, the agrarian movement, the more radical political parties (called “proletarian” parties), the anti-party anarchists, the Communists, the *burakumin*, Korean students and residents in Japan, socialist women, the thought police, the antiwar movements (both Christian and Buddhist), the anticolonial movements relating to Taiwan and Korea, campaigns against corruption and against police brutality, and the movement supporting proletarian literature and art. Nowadays we can find articles and books on all these subjects in America, including one group I did not touch on: the Ainu, whom the Japanese in 1997 officially recognized as living in Japan before the “Japanese” came. Thus, Japan is officially no longer to be considered a strictly homogeneous nation. And it has become increasingly more democratic in recent years, even if more unstable, than during the long period of conservative Liberal Democratic Party dominance. Japan has also been entirely at peace since World War II, although it has prospered from fighting by others (including the Korean and Vietnam Wars), had to help pay for the Gulf War, and is now helping to pay for food for North Korea and the building of nuclear facilities there—something entirely unthinkable only a few years ago.

I had my first opportunity to visit mainland China after the death in 1975 of my first wife, Astrid Anderson, whom I met while at Camp Savage and who, like myself, spent time in Sweden as a child, which enabled us to bring up our two daughters to speak Swedish. I had first visited Taiwan and Hong Kong in 1962. In 1976 I married my present wife, Lilia Huiying Li, who had been born in China, had graduated from the famous Yenching University, and had moved to Hong Kong in 1947, where she married a well-known medical doctor who had known Sun Yat-sen. This led to her meeting Mao Zedong in 1956. After the death of her husband, she eventually moved to the United States, where she was a freelance journalist attached to the United Nations when I met her. This enabled me to rekindle my Chinese studies and to publish several translations from Chinese.

I also embarked on studying Korea. Actually my first study was while at Yale. Since Yale had so little on Korea, I taught myself by teaching a year-long course devoted to Korea at the University of Connecticut. It started in the fall after the outbreak of the Korean War, which began on June 25, 1950. In 1977 as the first director of the USC-UCLA Joint-East Asian Language and Area Studies Center, I got funds for the first full-time teacher of Korean language

and culture. I also made the first contract for USC students at Yonsei University in Seoul, following my establishment of USC's Year-in-Japan at Waseda University Program in 1968. In 1973, after editing *The Song of Ariran: A Korean Communist in the Chinese Revolution*, written by Helen Fost Snow (whose pen name was Nym Wales), the wife of Edgar Snow and contributor to his world-famous *Red Star Over China*, I began studying Korean. I helped to establish a chair in Korean studies at the University of Stockholm where I served as the first director of the Center for Pacific Asia Studies between 1985 and 1989, while on leave from USC. While in Sweden I was able to visit North Korea twice. Over the years I have had more Korean graduate students than Chinese and Japanese combined. One of them, Kang Young-hoon, was prime minister from 1988 to 1990. Although not a student of mine but a friend, I have edited an English version of *A New Beginning* (USC, 1996), a memoir by Kim Dae Jung, whom I came to know in 1984.

My Chinese studies have been mostly influenced by my wife, known in China as Li Dajie (Big Sister Li), who has been doing remarkable work in promoting dialogue between Taiwan and mainland China. Since 1978 I have made almost yearly trips to China, taking students from USC and the University of Stockholm to study joint ventures and rapid growth. I have had the opportunity to take part in numerous conferences and meetings where my wife was the main speaker, at which I was the only non-Chinese. Other activities I have undertaken without her, such as organizing and translating a book with others by the famous Chinese philosopher and historian Ch'ien Mu, who was president of the Chinese University of Hong Kong and later retired to Taiwan: *Traditional Government in Imperial China: A Critical Analysis* (St. Martin's, 1882). I have also coedited with Chou Shu-lien *China's Economic Reform: Administering the Introduction of the Market Mechanism* (Westview Press, 1992).

In all the above, what have been my main motivations? The explanation in a nutshell, I will argue, is not just international understanding but the search for world peace. How could such a motivation come into existence? When did it take shape in my consciousness? How did it manifest itself in any practical way? How did it get whittled down to something practical? How has it affected my career? And what did Japanese studies have to do with it?

My interest in peace started during my years at the Choate prep school. This interest from the beginning was multiethnic and transnational, which is the name of the center to which I became attached after becoming professor emeritus in 1992. (Unfortunately it folded in 1998 due to lack of funding.) In my early teens I became interested in the fact that all great religions look forward to the coming of a messiah who will bring peace to the world. Buddhism has the Buddha of the Future. In Christianity it is the Second Coming of Christ. In Judaism, which does not recognize Jesus as the Messiah, people are awaiting the coming of the Messiah. In Islam Mohammed was the prophet of

a new world order. In its offshoot Ba'hai, Bahauulla spoke more explicitly about peace in a united world. As a boy of fourteen, I thought: If the message could come out that the Buddha or Messiah would be coming at a certain date in the future, then all the people in the world could prepare for it. Since I was not waiting for a miracle, I thought technology could be harnessed to set up a broadcasting system that could quiet all the radios in the world at the same time (television was not then an option) and allow just one message for a certain period of time whenever we wished it. The technology would be so advanced that no one could detect where the message in all important languages emanated from. But I imagined it would be somewhere around where Shangri-La was supposed to be. The message would be that the time had come to end wars and live in peace.

To make this idea work, I would have to have an organization that would convert at least some top leaders of all the religions to the idea. We would have to have a secret organization to develop the technology and coordinate our actions. I, myself, would not stand out in front, like a Hitler or Stalin, but would stay behind the scenes to see that all was running well.

However, as I grew up, I could see that this kind of secretive elite organization and technology could lead to fascistic control and not to the liberation of mankind that I was seeking. I came to realize that reform, to be effective, needs mass support. It needs what today we call "transparency." And it needs criticism for legitimacy. But rules are also necessary, rules that protect the minority from the majority, just as we have in sports. So we need courts and umpires. Loyalty to the rules, and to ethics, is more important than loyalty to any individual.

Therefore, I disbanded the organization I had begun to build up in prep school and college. Of course, I believed in friendship and sought people who had ideals similar to mine, but I also came to value friends who had very different ideas but who I thought were decent and upright people of different religions or political parties. I came to realize that people on the right were as important as those on the left, if they had integrity. There are rotten apples on all sides, but the majority is usually decent. And each individual can be bad sometimes but is usually good.

Political leaders tend to have strong ego drives and needs, but they are necessary. In wielding various powers, they can and invariably do both good and bad things; that is, some actions profit a few or those on one side and some actions profit or benefit many and are good for society as a whole. Therefore, we should criticize the specific things leaders do that we judge to be bad and not judge them to be bad as a whole—with a few exceptions.

Given these criteria, I myself have tried to be friends with individuals of many different kinds of persuasions, some left-wing and some right-wing, Christians, nonbelievers, Buddhists, Hindus, etc., etc.

In China and South Korea, I have known conservative prime ministers and outspoken opposition leaders. In China I know Communist leaders, some who are conservative and others who are progressive or liberal, as well as Tiananmen activists. At present there is no godlike figure in China, and in general the people are enjoying peace and freedom to a degree and on a wider scale than ever, even though there still are civil rights critics in jail and the vast majority of people have very low living standards. Even in North Korea where there still is a deified leader, I have known people who are widely different. For instance, I had long talks with Hwang Jong-Yop and advised the State Department to talk with him as things began opening up after former president Jimmy Carter visited there in 1994. I have cultivated these contacts, not only because I am by profession a political scientist, but also because I felt as though I could do at least a little to help avoid war on the Korean Peninsula and find a peaceful solution or rather a more peaceful way for the people of the North and those of the South to live and work together.

Thus, I attempt to use my skills and knowledge to lay out the problems and suggest why I think one solution to a situation may be better than another. At the same time I consider the parameters of politics to be constantly changing, so that "solutions" are only temporary and give rise to further problems in an unending chain.

As for Japan, I have an ongoing interest in Okinawa, because I sympathize with hardships the people there have had to put up with, including the absolute hell of the last days of the Second World War, when the Japanese experienced hand-to-hand warfare on their own territory. Since that was such a small and distant part of their territory, it is hard for Japanese who saw no first-hand combat to understand how Chinese and Koreans and others in Asia even now feel about the Japanese when they hear about how Japanese textbooks treat the war. The Japanese cannot understand why their former enemies do not forget the war, as they themselves do. I try to promote understanding on both sides.

Finally, I feel I must mention one more interest of mine, which is related to transnationalism and multiethnicity and grew out of my study of Japanese—the question of the romanization of all languages. I am interested in romanization not for the purpose of replacing Chinese characters or other alphabets or syllabaries, but for the purpose of adding another tool of communication that can help spread the use and understanding of Japanese, Chinese, and Korean, as well as other languages that do not use romanization but some other system of writing in which their history and culture are recorded.

Many Chinese and Japanese were greatly relieved when computers were developed for writing Chinese characters. Before that, many wondered whether the importance and speed of modern communication might render their painfully acquired knowledge of Chinese characters useless or merely

ornamental. They feared they would have to switch to a phonetic system such as an alphabet. But in actuality most systems of writing Chinese characters by computer require the input to be by their system of romanization called *pinyin*. Thus, users are not escaping from romanization, and they are only getting part of the benefit they could get.

My recommendation is that people who use Chinese characters should, in addition and as a supplement, develop an ability to read their own language fluently in romanization without giving up their mastery of writing in Chinese characters and the syllabaries or alphabet derived from them.

The present-day practice of writing Vietnamese in romanization shows that it can be done successfully for any language, even if it contains many homophones. However, I am not advocating ending the use of Chinese characters, even in Japanese. What I advocate is digraphia: that is, learning and using more than one way of writing a language where it is helpful. This is not new. Not only does Japanese have *katakana* and *hiragana*, it also has simplified (*ryakuji*) and traditional Chinese characters. There is a movement among teachers for writing Japanese in romanization, but it is still small and is plagued by infighting between advocates of the *hyōjun* (or Hepburn) system and proponents of the *kunrei* system.

With literacy so high in Japan, there is at present little need to increase literacy by use of romanization for Japanese. But today there are almost two million foreigners who live and work in Japan. These people acquire varying degrees of competence in speaking Japanese, and some even learn to read and write *kana* and *kanji*. If provision were made for government documents, news, and pleasure reading to be available in romanization for these people, they could achieve a higher proficiency in communicating in Japanese.

It goes without saying that there are millions and millions of illiterates in China who could benefit from having a wealth of materials written in *pinyin* for their use. It would also immensely increase their vocabularies and use of spoken Mandarin to the mutual benefit of the majority and the minorities.

To sum up, from my learning Japanese during the war, in addition to my secondary interest in language reform, I have come to devote my abilities to help humanity get beyond the use of force for “settling” problems. More specifically, my wife and I devote ourselves at this stage in our lives to promoting communication and understanding for peaceful solutions to the tensions that exist in the areas of relations between Taiwan and mainland China, North and South Korea, and even Okinawa and mainland Japan, as well as America’s relations with all of these entities.

A Personal View of the Impact of the Center for Japanese Studies on Academia and United States Foreign Policy

Edwin Neville

This paper is a personal assessment in historical terms of the importance of the Center for Japanese Studies for cutting edge of interdisciplinary studies in the United States. In personal terms, it touches on important features of my life and on those I was close to in this program. Most of them have passed on, but I associate the best years of my life with being in their company.

I was not here at the beginning when the Center for Japanese Studies opened in the fall of 1947. I arrived for the fall semester of 1948 joining the second class in the master's program. Others here in that group and on this panel are Grant Goodman and Forrest (Woody) Pitts.

Most of those in the Center for Japanese Studies Program were trained in Japanese at the Army Japanese Language School here at the University of Michigan during World War II. I, however, went through the Navy Japanese Language School at the University of Colorado in Boulder, Colorado. I had entered Harvard in the summer of 1943, having just turned seventeen, and had taken intensive Japanese for two semesters, when I was interviewed by a former dean of Harvard, Navy Commander Hindmarsh. I then enlisted in the navy as a yeoman second class to go to Boulder for a fourteen-month intensive Japanese language course. I took a commission in the U.S. Marine Corps as a second lieutenant. At the age of eighteen years and five months, I went through a two-month combat intelligence course at Camp Lejeune in North Carolina before heading toward the Pacific. I arrived in Los Angeles on V.J. Day. It was quite a party. I was bound for Kyushu where I spent almost a year with the Second Marines. This has been written up in the *Eighth Symposium Proceedings on the Occupation of Japan* held at the MacArthur memorial in Norfolk, Virginia. Grant Goodman and I presented papers there.

I returned to Harvard for the fall semester 1946, received a year's credit for fourteen months of Japanese at the University of Colorado, and

majoring in oriental language and literature in order to graduate in two years.

Not having planned my future, I toured Europe in the summer of 1948 and then at the last minute applied for graduate work here at the Center for Japanese Studies. Bob Hall, Sr. had to go over to Rackham and talk them into letting me in. I know Bob Ward will be giving a eulogy of Robert Burnett Hall this afternoon, but I have to throw my two cents in now, if I am to live with myself. Bob Hall, Sr. dreamed up this whole project and proceeded to carry it out against all odds, including establishing the field station in Okayama and finding the participants. It was a tremendous tour de force. Still, without Bob Ward it wouldn't have worked. Bob Hall didn't necessarily make everything clear as to what was going on and how it all fit together. Bob Ward did. At certain points in the seminar that we students and the faculty all participated in, Hall would turn the floor over to Bob Ward, and he would make everything crystal clear in simple terms. Years later, when I was chair of the Erie-Ontario Japan Seminar, which covered an area from the University of Toronto in Ontario to the State University of New York at Albany, Bob Ward was invited to speak to us at the dinner hour at Canisius College in Buffalo, New York. He was president of both the Association for Asian Studies and the American Political Science Association that same year and was socked in at the Detroit Metropolitan Airport. He called to cancel, for it would take him another hour to get to Buffalo if the plane left right away, and he would prefer to go home to Ann Arbor and go to bed. There were many topflight Japan specialists at the dinner, and I hung on to him for fifteen minutes trying to talk him into still coming while many of those attending crowded around, saying, "Hang on to him! He's got to come!" And then the plane suddenly was leaving and he came. It was so late when he arrived that I don't remember whether he got anything to eat or not, but his talk was a brilliant analysis of his appearance before the congressional committee responsible for legislation on international affairs and the academic community. It was very informative and something we needed to learn.

I expect that Bob Ward's eulogy of Bob Hall will be the finest paper of this conference. I am looking forward to it this afternoon.

Then there were those students who have since passed on. I used to have coffee regularly with Joe Sutton, Jim Kokoris, and Gaston Sigur in the middle of the morning between classes downstairs in the Michigan Union. Later, Joe Sutton helped train Thai police in Siam under the auspices of Michigan State University. He went on to rise through the ranks of the political science department at the University of Indiana to become president of the university. He was half Native American from Oklahoma. Just when he was revving up to run for the U.S. Senate from Indiana, he died in a car crash. What a loss! He would have shaped up Congress in no time at all.

Joe was best man at Sigur's wedding. The stag party the night before the wedding was a blowout. Gaston ended up in the shower with all his clothes on. Both Jim Kokoris and Gaston Sigur went to work for the Asia Foundation. Bob Hall set them up. As Jim Kokoris tells the story, he and Gaston were at a reception at the American Embassy in Tokyo when word was received that a congressional committee had unearthed the fact that the Asia Foundation was being funded by the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). Gaston was then station chief of the Asia Foundation in Tokyo. He went ashen at the reception because it ended his effectiveness. Yet, on returning to the United States, he received a professorship at George Washington University. I accompanied him to his first public lecture held at Georgetown University, and his talk was excellent. When Nakasone became prime minister of Japan in 1980, he requested Sigur as his contact in Washington, and Gaston went on the Security Council. When George Bush became president, Gaston took over the policy-making position of assistant secretary of state for the Pacific. He kept his position at George Washington University, and a center was funded there with his name on it. He also traveled widely in Asia as a troubleshooter and information gatherer. He entered North Korea twice for discussions with its leadership before he passed away.

I used to go to Washington every three or four years when the Association for Asian Studies (AAS) met at the Washington Hilton, and I looked forward to having lunch with Gaston in the navy mess underneath the Oval Office. I met Bud Klauser, also on this panel, for the first time on one of these trips. He was the top foreign gun in the Mitsui organization, which had offices in the building across the street and catercorner to the White House (a building that, under stress, Nixon had used after he was dumped as president). Bud was kind enough to come to Canisius College and give a series of lectures over two days on Japanese business practices. One was an open lecture to the college at large and the others were in the classroom, including a business management seminar for graduating seniors. Each lecture was different. It was a remarkable experience for me to see a pro in action.

There were others who graduated from the University of Michigan who were Japanese specialists and associated with us but were not part of the Center for Japanese Studies. One was Jim Wickel, who ended up as an interpreter/translator for the State Department in Washington. He told me about a luncheon at the White House where President Johnson was hosting the prime minister of Japan. The prime minister's interpreter, at one point, misinterpreted a word from the prime minister's public remarks that angered President Johnson. Jim Wickel was standing behind the president just to his right. Johnson's arm and fist whacked Jim in the chest, knocking the wind out of him. He asked, "Did I hear him right?" Jim answered, "No, Mr. President," and gave a direct

quote which alleviated his anger. Jim Wickel, without going through the usual channels, became second secretary at the embassy in Tokyo. In the '60s Edwin O. Reischauer as ambassador found most of the official interpreters/translators incompetent and cleaned house. He demanded competent ones, and Jim Wickel was one of them. His wife, Fumi, translated a great deal for authors who were publishing regularly, especially Martin Weinstein of Columbia University.

Everyone who was connected in any way with the Center for Japanese Studies has done well, but none more so than my mentor, John W. Hall. He was sensational. In fact he rewrote my thesis. I would hand in chapter drafts, and he would indicate how they should be changed and then actually write the wording I should use. I had written seminar papers for Jack Hall and nothing had been written on them except the grade. But this was different. When he went to Yale, Hall was compiling a library of theses he had directed at Michigan. He used Gaston Sigur's and my theses as examples of what he expected Yalies to do, and a number of them complimented me on the job done on Okayama-han.

The *pièce de résistance*, however, of my relationship to Jack Hall came from his work on the modernization of Japan. He had chaired the Conference on Modern Japan with two sessions, one in Hakone in 1960 and the other in Bermuda in 1962. A raft of books by various authors on the modernization of Japan appeared in the following years published by the Princeton University Press. The year I came back into teaching, 1966, was the year that Knight Biggerstaff, Chinese historian at Cornell, gave the annual presidential address at the AAS annual convention in New York City. With Jack Hall on the dais, he lauded his work on the modernization of Japan and proceeded to show how the process of modernization, Hall-style, worked well in Chinese history. On top of that, I wrote Edwin O. Reischauer asking for a copy of his paper presented at the Hakone conference. He wrote back that Hall had "cannibalized" his paper on the modernization process in Japan. That conference proved to me that the modernization process was the way to go, and whenever possible I have structured my talks, lectures, or courses on this modernization process, and it works.

Whatever I have done in academia or in lecturing to public audiences, the information, concepts, and the general train of thought using the modernization process has worked wonders, and the Center for Japanese Studies has been the touchstone of my reality.

Japan: Twelve Doors to a Life

Forrest R. Pitts

Thirty-two years ago this Center sponsored a book, *Twelve Doors to Japan*, stage-managed by the sadly missed Jack Hall and Dick Beardsley. As is true of many others gathered here, my life has been immeasurably enriched by my Japan experience. Hence my presentation is titled, "Japan: Twelve Doors to a Life."

The first door was the happy discovery of a gender-free tongue. I had to take first-year German twice, five years apart, and could still see no rhyme or reason to its gender system. In the Navy Language School I spent fifteen months on Japanese, then studied four semesters of advanced Japanese, including *kanbun*, under Professor Joseph K. Yamagiwa in Ann Arbor. Afterward I spent all told three years living in Japan. On this campus I also studied three semesters of Mandarin on a cultural scholarship. In 1953 I had the pleasure of living on Okinawa for nine months, during which time I gathered linguistic minimal pairs as if they were going out of style. Exchange of letters with Samuel E. Martin had showed me how closely the grammar and levels of politeness in Japanese and Korean corresponded, and about 1957 I started studying Korean from language records.

The second door was invaluable contact with many outstanding people. Among my mentors on this campus were my doctoral advisor and sometime Coloradoan, Professor Robert Burnett Hall, who had discovered me at Berkeley and persuaded me to finish my B.A. here. Joseph Yamagiwa, George Kish, John Whitney Hall, Richard K. Beardsley (another Coloradoan), Mischa Titiev, Kenneth Pike, Robert Ward, and Charles Remer influenced me. Several of these played water polo at noon, including Philip Powers's father, and I was invited to join the weekly splashings of The Flounders. Passing through this people door, I formed many rewarding friendships, such as those with Edward Seidensticker (still another Coloradoan), Jim Kokoris, Takie Lebra, Doug Eyre,

Sam Martin, Bob Smith of *Kurusu* fame, Gaston Sigur, George DeVos, James Araki, Wayne Suttles (who is still alive and active in his mid-eighties), and Viscount Amberley (John Russell, son of the famed philosopher).

At 362 Minamigata in Okayama, as “cultural entrant number seven,” I was befriended early on by Ishida Hiroshi, a geographer who has been my firm friend for forty-six years. He accompanied me to Niiike in October of 1996. In Kagawa I was long ago befriended by the Suwa family, and by a *burakumin* family of horse and cattle traders. A high school geography teacher warned me off, which only increased my intention to associate with that family. Since 1983 I have had the Hagiike family as close friends in rural Takamatsu. These three families live within a couple of miles of each other.

The third door was my doctoral work in Japan, started at the field station in Okayama, quaintly called the “outpost” in the first brochures for this symposium. My introductory paragraph for the Social Science Research Council funding application read thus:

On the north shore of the Japanese island of Shikoku lies one of the world's most productive farming areas—the Kagawa plain. Centered in the fertile Inland Sea region, it represents the pinnacle of Asian indigenous agricultural development. Yet this great productivity and the relatively high level of rural prosperity which accompanies it have been achieved only in the face of adverse conditions. The Kagawa farmer lives in “prosperity amidst adversity.”

This paragraph became the first paragraph of my dissertation, which I assembled from a footlocker of materials in eight weeks, writing day and night in freezing midwinter isolation at the House of the Seven Pear Trees, home of George and Vin Kish, west of Barton Hills.

I must pause to tell you of something that quite surprised me. In the 1950s there lived an English professor in Ann Arbor who no longer published, but who read every doctoral dissertation in the social sciences as soon as the bound copy appeared in the library. He showed up in Angell Hall one day, to Professor Hall's great apprehension, and said, “Who is this guy named Pitts?” Professor Hall started to explain that I had been shanghaied from Berkeley, had spent time in the navy, and so forth. The English professor cut him short with this remark: “His is the only literate dissertation I have ever read,” and walked out. Just as Edward Seidensticker has noted some influence of Trollope in his translation of *Genji*, so I must confess that phraseology from Wilbur J. Cash and Edmund Wilson had crept into my manuscript.

The fourth door opened when I was asked to teach the last half of a course in elementary conversational Japanese at the University of Hawaii in fall 1953, after the born-in-Japan *haole* teacher had become too pregnant to continue the course. On the basis of this stint, I later joined the Association of

Teachers of Japanese (ATJ), and subscribed to their newsletter. Eventually I was excluded from membership (retrospectively blackballed) on the basis that I did not have an *advanced* degree in Japanese. (My B.A. was in oriental languages and literatures.) Nonetheless, for a long time I continued to read the *ATJ Newsletter* in the university library.

The fifth door opened when I was asked to go to Okinawa, with anthropologists William P. Lebra and Wayne P. Suttles, to study the “sources of tension between Okinawans and Americans.” There I recorded an entire *mura koseki*, and later got a microfilm update, all prior to such local records becoming off limits to *gaijin*. I wish to note that unlike many of my distinguished audience, I have never resented being called a *gaijin* by Japanese. One experience explains this: In the autumn of 1951 I had gotten the six people of our circum-Inland Sea field survey lost in the mountains of Shikoku. We gradually moved from locales where the children as usual yelled *shinchūgun* (occupation troops) at us, to settlements where they shouted *gaijin* at us. To be called *gaijin* in such a situation was indeed welcome.

Because of my Okinawan experience, I became one of a dozen or so Okinawan nationalists. These included the noted Berkeley geographer, Clarence Glacken, who helped brief Lebra, Suttles and me before we flew to Naha. In my collection of minimal pairs, done mostly for relaxation, I was delighted to find the Old Yamato labiodental *f* alive and well. I taped the Shuri speech of a lady born when Okinawa was still a kingdom, and mailed the tape to Professor Yamagiwa.

The sixth door opened when I was asked by the Fideler Company of Grand Rapids to author a fifth grade social studies text. My *Japan* appeared in 1960, and only recently went out of print. Its fourth edition was published in 1988, and was promptly adopted by the school system of Los Angeles. The second edition had won a prize one year for the best children's book on Japan. Fideler did not tell me this, allowing me to use my favorite Japanese verb, *uketamawarimashita*. Still later I found that the book had been pirated in Taiwan, and I decided not to tell the publisher, thus establishing a karmic balance.

I walked through the seventh door in February 1962, when I traveled around academic Japan with the economist Uyemura Fukushichi, graduate of Swarthmore and the South Manchurian Railway bureaucracy. Dick Uyemura was doing input-output studies on the impact of the proposed Seto Ōhashi. Together we touted the exciting work of regional scientists, and ended by helping to establish the Japan Section of the Regional Science Association.

The eighth door was my invitation to become an adviser to the South Korean government in agricultural economics, to help in the writing of its first three-year economic plan. My doctoral work on Japanese farming had finally come to someone's notice. I had long wanted to go to Korea because what the

Japanese had told me about Koreans sounded precisely, in chapter and verse, like the stories that white Americans were then telling about American blacks. I knew that the latter complaints were hogwash, and had a sneaky desire to learn what it was about the Koreans that so distressed the Japanese.

Attached to the Economic Development Council of the Ministry of Reconstruction during South Korea's democratic year, I toured the rural areas. Soon I came to the conclusion that what was needed was a new thrust in the mechanization of farming, similar to what I had seen at close hand in the reclaimed areas of Kojima Bay, and especially across the waters of Seto in Kagawa. I worked up a plan for a pilot project and submitted it. It was published in both English and Korean. The national legislature in April 1961 funded the project for about \$38,000. On May 9, 1961, a military coup put Park Chung Hee in power, nine hours after my family and I had left Seoul. We learned of the coup over breakfast in the International House of Japan, on our way home to Oregon. Early in 1962 I visited the SIMAR factory in Geneva from which the first rototillers were shipped to Japan in 1927. It was not until the summer of 1966 that I next visited Seoul, where I was told by the minister of agriculture that I was regarded as "the father of the hand tractor in Korea." Thus at the age of thirty-six, I had done my best public work.

The ninth door opened when I became one of the five or six founding members of the Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii. Effective area studies centers have similar structures, and I was able to adapt what was admirable at the Center here in Ann Arbor to the academic culture at Mānoa. I had been asked to compose an organizational rationale for a new center. My three drafts were like the beds in *The Three Bears* story: the first one was too short, the second too long, but the third one was "just right."

I edited the first three years of the Center for Korean Studies's annual journal, *Korean Studies*, starting in 1977, and later did another stint of six years prior to, and even a year or so after, my retirement in 1989.

The tenth door swung open when the National Geographic Society gave me a small grant to restudy two of my six doctoral townships. I spent most of the time in the former Kawaoka-son, now a part of Takamatsu City, and met the Hagiike grandmother who drew me firmly into the folds of her family. They live next to the pond of the same name. Her grandsons visited me in Hawaii, and one came years later with his medical intern friends to San Francisco. They were amazed that fans catching errant baseballs could keep them, rather than being forced to return them, as is done in Japan.

In that nostalgic summer of 1983, Professor Ishida Hiroshi and I visited Naka-son, now part of Sadowara City. He had visited Naka as a high school student in 1940. It was the second visit for him, and the third for me. I got a nice short article out of that summer's visit.

The eleventh door has been standing open for a long time. I refer to all the books that I have read on Japan, starting with *The Honorable Picnic* by Roger Poidatz, a geographer, or at least an aerial photographer. Since my college years I have habitually made a note of the author, title, and year of each book as I finished it. My list of Japan-related books read now totals close to 200. Some I have read more than once. *Genji Days* holds the record for five readings. (I have given the director a copy of this list.)

The twelfth door opened onto a quasi-literary endeavor. I had long been taken by the *senryū* tradition in Japanese verse. In the early 1970s I experimented and found that many American phrases fit the five- or seven-syllable rhythm. After a heart attack in Taegu in 1985, I was ordered to walk two miles each day. While thus exercising, I once again made up verses about what I saw. These latter had the working title of *Walking Verse*. Here is an example:

BEWARE OF THE DOG
This sign protects Old Mary—
The dog is long gone.

I have given the director copies of the verses that mention what *uchi-nānchu* call *yamatugwā*. Finally, I keep on my shelf a copy of Iwanami Shōten's publication of Saikaku's *senryū* and *kyōka*, hoping to translate some of them into an appropriate *Gallopig Verse* when I am finally bedridden.

The Bridges of Washtenaw County, or I Remember Yamagiwa

Grant K. Goodman

Professor Tonomura, dear colleagues and old friends, ladies and gentlemen, I am truly honored to have been invited to this superb celebration. Interestingly, of course, this proves once again one of my current cardinal precepts, namely, survival has its own rewards. In seeking a title for this presentation, I wanted something that would perhaps attract an early morning audience and would also indicate my true feelings about Ann Arbor and the University of Michigan. And therefore, the titles I finally submitted reflect, hopefully, both my romantic and my nostalgic sentiments on this occasion.

There is, however, one more title that I did not use, but that perhaps even more forcefully expresses my emotions today. In the immortal words of Evita, "The truth is, I never left you." I first set foot in Ann Arbor in May 1943, now nearly fifty-five years ago, and moved into Hinsdale House in the West Quadrangle as a newly inducted GI, entering the second class of the Army Intensive Japanese Language School, or Company A, as it was better known. For the next calendar year, I lived, breathed, and studied the Japanese language on this campus. The peculiar combination of my youth, my patriotic commitment, and some apparent aptitude for languages resulted in my beginning Japanese language training here in the first out of sixteen class sections, and completing the year having miraculously remained in section one throughout the entire year. We were given extensive examinations every Saturday morning, and each week's results were reflected in new section assignments every Monday morning. Accordingly, my memories of that period of my life on this campus, despite being in the military, are not only vivid to this day, but recall what was in fact the most exciting and personally rewarding academic experience of my very long career in academe, which continues to the present.

This is not to cast any aspersions on the superb faculty who instructed and supervised me through the M.A. in Far Eastern studies and the Ph.D.

degree in history on this campus. The difference between my Army Intensive Japanese Language School year and my graduate study from 1948 to 1955 was primarily myself. My youthful enthusiasm and my emotional patriotism were unfortunately largely gone by the summer of 1948 when I formally entered the University of Michigan as an M.A. candidate; nevertheless, much of my prior Ann Arbor experience clearly remained. My decision to come here to do graduate study was obviously impelled by my recognition that Michigan had, at that time, the most outstanding Japanese program in the United States. My respect for, and frankly, terror of, Professor Joseph K. Yamagiwa had developed during my Army days here, and I really wanted to study under him. The fact that Professor Charles Boxer was to give a course in the summer of 1948 augmented my interest, since I had relied heavily on his work when I was writing my undergraduate thesis at Princeton University, from which I received my B.A.

Academic 1948–49 was unforgettable for me. I was in a daily language class with Professor Yamagiwa, the most advanced level of Japanese then offered. There were three of us in that class: Don Bailey, George Shea, and myself. We were all from the same Army Intensive Language School class, and both Don and George continued through the Ph.D. under Yamagiwa in Japanese language and literature. Yamagiwa demanded the best from us and I believe that he got it. Under his supervision and direction, I wrote my M.A. thesis, an annotated translation of an eighteenth-century Japanese book, which incidentally, the Center for Japanese Studies subsequently published. By June 1949, I had an M.A. degree in Far Eastern studies and moved into the history department to pursue the Ph.D. under John Whitney Hall, who, I believe, came from Harvard to Ann Arbor after completing his own Ph.D. about the same time I came to the University of Michigan.

I should here briefly reminisce about the Center's continuing seminar, which was required of all graduate students working in any aspect of Japanese studies. In my day, and this is fifty-five years ago, the seminar was run by Professor Mischa Titiev of anthropology, a very humane and stimulating individual. Different faculty took part in the seminar to introduce us to their respective disciplines and to inform us about Japan in that specific context. Professor Charles Remer of economics was one of those, as was Robert B. Hall of geography and the Center director. Bob Ward, whom you see here today, also took part in the seminar. It was in that seminar that one encountered the small coterie of one's fellow graduate students in other disciplines: for example, the late Edward Norbeck in anthropology, a fellow Army Intensive Japanese Language School graduate, or my friend, the geographer Woody Pitts, who was a product, as he said, of the Navy Language School. Later I encountered now-deceased peers Joe Sutton and Gaston Sigur. I want to recall one small memory of Professor Robert Ward. He gave us a simple nostrum, which I never forgot. Said he, "Remember this: In Japan, government is done

to you, not for you.” On many occasions over the last forty-five years of my teaching I have repeated that to my students and have attributed it appropriately to Bob Ward.

Two of my fondest memories of that Center seminar were guest appearances by those pioneer Japanologists Johannes Rahder and Serge Elisséeff. I remember well that when Professor Rahder came from Yale, whatever he was supposed to talk about never actually materialized, since he began by telling us how important bibliography was and then proceeded for the next hour or two to write on the blackboard literally endless references to obscure Hungarian journal articles from volume such and such from perhaps July 1937 or March 1928, and each such reference would then evoke yet another until there was simply no blackboard space left and the class ended. I assure you that we students were utterly in awe of what seemed to us to be total bibliographical recall. In the instance of the visit to Ann Arbor of Elisséeff, whose textbook in Japanese language we had in fact used, the lecture topic, to the complete surprise of the seminar, turned out to be pornography in Japan, which he proceeded to illustrate with appropriate slides. Professor Yamagiwa, who had arranged the invitation to Elisséeff, was nervous beyond belief, given the then sensitive subject matter of his guest’s presentation. I remember distinctly Yamagiwa counting heads to make absolutely sure that there were no ringers in the audience. He also carefully locked the classroom door during Elisséeff’s lecture to be certain no one wandered into the room, even by mistake. Of course, when Elisséeff was finally introduced to us and his topic was revealed, it was very clear why we had not been informed of it in advance.

My record at the M.A. level was evidently sufficiently impressive to secure my admission to the Ph.D. program in history; however to this day I can still recall my revered mentor Professor Yamagiwa in his inevitable basso profundo inquiring of me, “Mr. Goodman, are you sure this is what you want to do?” Although at the time I was greatly depressed by the nature and tone of his query, in retrospect I feel certain that he was suggesting I reexamine my career intentions and ask myself whether an academic career in history was indeed the route I wanted to travel. From fall 1949 to spring 1952, I immersed myself academically in preparation for the “Ph.D. prelims” as they were called in those days. From today’s standpoint, the requirement that a Ph.D. candidate in history had to offer six fields for examination seems quite unbelievable. Apparently, in places like Harvard and elsewhere, they currently have maybe two fields, from 1812 to 1814 or something. But in those bad old days the chronological scope of those fields was all-encompassing. For example, China from the oracle bones to the morning newspaper was a single field. In my case, I took both Japan and China from Professor John Hall, who at that time was the only Asian historian on the faculty. My Russian history was with Prince Andre Lobanov-Rostovsky, who told his class that the history of Russia stopped

in 1917. Everything thereafter, he said, was political science. In his actual lecture courses, he never had a note but would come into the class, lean over to the most attractive young lady in the front row, and say "Vere vas I?" She would look at her notes and say, "Well you were just telling us about Alexander III," and he would say, "Ah yes," and then begin a beautiful story. And that's the way lectures were given; it was a remarkable experience. I should also say that in the Ph.D. prelims themselves I had another field in American history with the then young and brash and brilliant Sidney Fine. To make me feel at ease at the beginning of the examination Professor Fine leaned over and said to me, "Grant, what's wrong with the Indians?" He knew I was from Cleveland, and in 1952 the Indians were not exactly the greatest team in the American League. Lobanov-Rostovsky looked up from his papers and said, "What? What tribe was that?" I also had two political science fields, called "outside fields," with Robert Ward and Russell Field.

I will not bore you here with the details of my study habits or my memories of idiosyncratic instructors; rather I would like to recall a bit of Ann Arboriana: my life as a regular at duplicate bridge night at the League, or as an habitu   of the Old German, or as a committed May Festival-goer, or as a frequent stroller in the Arboretum, or as a grind who spent football Saturdays deep in the bowels of the Law Library, or as a horrified witness of the terrible conflagration of Haven Hall. As an old Jimmy Stewart movie would have it, it was truly a wonderful life.

My ties to the Center, however, attenuated greatly as my relationship to the history department deepened; nevertheless, I faced a personal mini-crisis in academic 1951–52 as my prelims grew nearer. The expectation of course, was that I, like all of my contemporaries in the Center for Japanese Studies, would join the happy band of Michiganders in the still-occupied Japan. In my case certain inhibiting factors arose. As a historian with an already chosen dissertation topic, I was quite convinced that I would be much better off doing library research than marking time in rural Okayama. Further, the structure of the Niiike group was reported to be very rigid and hierarchical, with wives playing a key role in the daily life of the place, and limitations, real or imagined, imposed on the participants. Very fortunately, my fears were dissipated and my dilemma was resolved when I was awarded a Fulbright Scholarship for study in the Netherlands in 1952–53. The result was that I was to become fairly unique in that I am one of the few American Japan specialists of my era who has spent almost as much time in Europe as I have in Japan. But I must admit that back in 1952, when I announced my intention to go to Holland instead of to Niiike, the reaction of Professor Robert B. Hall was not a positive one, and my relationship to the Center for Japanese Studies was, in effect, terminated.

So it is with humility and deep gratitude that here today I resume my

contact with the Center. The Army Intensive Japanese Language School, the Center for Japanese Studies, and the University of Michigan nurtured me and, if I may use a time-worn cliché, made me whatever I subsequently became. I truly loved it all and I apologize to my audience for this exercise in nostalgia. It is, I hope, evident that my memories of Ann Arbor are remarkably vivid even to the extent of being able to recall my Ph.D. orals as though they were yesterday. May I take this opportunity then to say to all those who are no longer here and to those who happily still are, thank you very much.

Fate, Timing, and Luck

Arthur E. Klauser

I feel as excited and enthusiastic as I did fifty years ago, when Joe Yamagiwa and Bob Hall welcomed me and my nine other Army Language School friends to the Center for Japanese Studies (CJS). We were to be the first Ph.D. class in the multidisciplinary program called "Oriental Civilizations." It was the first multidisciplinary studies program on Asia of its kind. The first step was a totally multidisciplinary M.A. program to give us a well-rounded foundation. It was, indeed, a pioneering effort, which became a great success, thanks to the strong convictions and unique innovations of its creators, Professors Hall and Yamagiwa, and the unswerving support of the University of Michigan.

Since that January 1946 CJS-welcoming day, I can't believe that fifty years have transpired: Am I that much older? Yes, I know I must be. How do I know it? Because, as a septuagenarian, albeit a young one, I now know all the answers, but, you know, nobody asks me the questions!

Today, I want to share with you the significant influence that, in the context of "FTL" (*fate, timing, and luck*), CJS has had and continues to have on my life and career. I'll be brief, because today I feel like Henry VIII, and you know what he said to his six wives: "I won't keep you long."

FTL—WHAT IS IT? HOW DID I COME BY IT?

It was thirty years ago, when events and many big changes were rapidly happening in my life. I stopped to take stock of where I'd been and where my family and I should or wanted to go. I reviewed my life and career up to that point, and I discovered a strange pattern emerging. I found that whenever I made an important change in my life, for example, getting married, changing careers or jobs, accepting new responsibility, or moving to a different country, there seemed to be three elements always present. And they were F, T, and

L—*fate*, *timing*, and *luck*. For me, *fate* is an unexpected event, such as World War II, that can cause changes in or can affect my situation in life. *Timing* to me means that at the time of the event I'm given an option to make a change. *Luck* is that in making such decisions based on the event and timing, my life and career are affected positively. Acting on FTL often placed me in a situation or career that was totally different from what I had originally planned. How true is John Lennon's comment that "life is what happens to you while you're busy making other plans."

HOW THE PROCESS OF FTL HAS OPERATED AND CHANGED MY LIFE

For me, World War II *fatefully* changed my plans to stay in school and study history in order eventually to teach it, or to study to become a foreign correspondent. Instead, the *timing* was right for me to join the army, as I did, and *luckily* I was assigned to study Japanese at the University of Michigan under Joe Yamagiwa, who became my mentor, influencing me to join CJS after leaving the service.

CJS—THE CATALYST FOR MY FTL AND THE FOUNDATION FOR MY CAREER

I consider that CJS was the perfect catalyst for my FTL process. CJS provided me with a solid foundation, exposing me to a wide range of Asian area, language, and other related studies. It supported the development of my intellectual and professional life by giving me a lifelong source of invaluable resources, including language mentors, friends, and useful contacts. In addition to initiating me to a life and career focus on Japan, CJS introduced me to a multitude of other interests and career opportunities.

Together, CJS and FTL have enabled me to pursue career opportunities and interests in such diverse fields as academia, government, law, business, foundation work, art, and music.

HOW FTL IN COMBINATION WITH CJS CHANGED MY CAREER TO INTERNATIONAL BUSINESS

FTL is dynamic and it occurs unexpectedly. FTL and my impatience to return to Japan to complete my dissertation research changed the course and direction of my career. Indeed I did get to Japan before my fellow students. With the help of Dr. Yamagiwa and my CJS studies, I was able to obtain a job in Japan with the newly established Central Intelligence Agency (CIA). However, my intention to complete my dissertation research was sidetracked by the Chinese Civil War and the Korean War. My work load and responsibilities were

such that I had no opportunity to do any research other than that which concerned Chinese, North Korean, and Soviet intelligence.

During eight fascinating years with the agency, I became interested in following a career in international business. But now, at age thirty-two, no business firm would have me. So I planned a new strategy. I went to law school for three years, believing that with a J.D. and bar credentials, I could enter an international company through its back door, that is, its legal department. The strategy worked, and thereafter I had no problem in attracting good jobs with leading international companies. I obtained excellent positions with five of these multinational companies, working and living in Canada, Argentina, Europe, the United Kingdom, and Japan. With those firms I obtained a wide variety of experience and responsibilities. I handled marketing, acquisitions, corporate planning, joint venture management, government negotiations, contract negotiations, corporate communications, and public affairs. My last American company, Dow Corning Corp., even sent me, at my request, to business school and the Kennedy School of Government at Harvard.

In all of my positions, I always felt indebted to the foundation that CJS had provided. This was particularly true with respect to the last firm for whom I worked and opened their office in Washington, D.C., before my retirement in 1993, the Japanese trading firm, Mitsui (USA), Inc.

How ironic and amazing are the workings and results of FTL! Suppose fifty-four years ago, in the midst of our war with Japan, that my roommate, Gaston Sigur, and I are studying *kaiwa* and *kanji* in our room at the Army Language School. A stranger enters our room and announces, "Soldiers, thirty-five years from today, both of you will be in our nation's capital. One of you will be the assistant secretary of state for Asia and the Pacific. The other will be the senior vice president and manager of the Washington office of Japan's largest trading company and former *zaibatsu* conglomerate, Mitsui."

Imagine our reaction! We'd have thought the person was crazy, or that we'd lost the war.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, just remember that CJS continues to provide a unique and broad foundation and support that enables its students to have the capabilities and opportunities to pursue a fascinating diversity of careers and activities.

I wish to acknowledge my fellow classmates of that first predoctoral class. Indeed they are examples of the Center's results, as distinguished scholars in their respective fields, representing quality institutions: Drs. Brower, Cornell, Eyre, Kokoris, and Norbeck; distinguished Professor and Assistant Secretary of State D. Sigur; distinguished government official Dr. Wheatly;

distinguished Professor and President of the University of Indiana Dr. Sutton, and Curator of the Freer Gallery Dr. Stern.

Finally, I pay my tribute and appreciation to our CJS founders, Professors Robert Hall and Joseph K. Yamagiwa. As scholars, teachers, and mentors, they affected and enriched the lives and careers of us all.

Moderator's Comments

John Creighton Campbell

I imagine I was picked for this role because I'm a transitional figure. Except for Harold Stevenson in the psychology department, I think I am the oldest professor in Japanese studies at the University of Michigan. This panel is about the Okayama Field Station, which is certainly well before my time. I did visit about five years ago, or at least I tried to. I went with a friend and a map; we looked hither and thither around the outskirts of Okayama City to find where Niiike was and thought we sort of found the place, but there isn't any way to tell anymore. It's a Japan that's passed in a certain sense.

The book that came out of the Okayama project, *Village Japan*, is one of the absolutely best books in Japanese studies. Actually for area studies around the world, it's just a remarkable book and is still well worth reading, including the political science chapter by our first speaker about how a village assembly really works in Japan, which is classic in its own right. One of the reasons the book is so good is because it was the product of a faith that we no longer have. This is impressionistic on my part—I wasn't there at the time—but when the Okayama Field Station was established and during the process of producing the book, it seemed that somehow or other we could grasp the essence of Japan. If we could really understand how a single rural village worked in all of its contemporary simple yet complex human relations, and then understand its history and how it related to the broader history of that region of Japan, and then where it was going and how its economy and its agriculture worked and so forth—if we could grasp that single village then we somehow would have grasped the essence of Japan. These days, essences aren't very popular in academic discourse; being called an essentialist is a bad thing. But even if we still did think of essences—if one tried to define the essence of Japan today—where would you begin? Twenty years ago it seemed plausible that if you could truly understand a Japanese company you'd under-

stand all of Japan, but even that no longer seems to make sense. Today this “thing” called Japan, whatever it is, there is a lot of reality to it. But I don’t think anyone would start a project these days thinking, “Boy, if I could just understand this X, I would really understand the essence of Japan.” That kind of conviction, even if in retrospect it may seem a bit overambitious, is what led to a massive and absolutely scholarly project like the Okayama Field Station and *Village Japan*. All of the people sitting up here, except me, were associated with this project in one way or another, and they will tell you about it.

Reflections on the Origins of the Center for Japanese Studies: A Tribute to Robert Burnett Hall (1896–1975)

Robert E. Ward

I would like to speak to you today about the problems of structural and curricular innovation in American universities, and to use the establishment of the University of Michigan's Center for Japanese Studies and Bob Hall's role therein as an example of how one of the first such innovations in this field was achieved. I should begin, however, with a few words about my qualifications to speak with some authority on this subject.

My appointment to Michigan's Department of Political Science (and coterminously to the Center for Japanese Studies) dates from October 1947. Prior to my departure for Stanford in the summer of 1973, therefore, I spent more than twenty-five years with the Center, four of these as assistant director under Bob Hall and six as director. During these years I probably worked more closely and continuously with Bob than any other member of the Center's faculty. So far as my credentials in the larger field of structural and curricular innovation in American universities are concerned, this has been a central focus of my forty active years in the profession and has involved continuous service as teacher, scholar, administrator, and fund-raiser at two major universities as well as lengthy service on an appalling number of national and international academic, philanthropic, and governmental programs and committees.

Against this background let me now turn to my central theme of how in practice one solves the complex problems of engendering structural and curricular change in universities such as Michigan or Stanford. In particular, I would like to show how Bob Hall, a veritable modern Odysseus in this sphere, managed to surmount many hazards, negotiate the perilous passage between Scylla (the departments) and Charybdis (the deans), and eventually drop anchor safely in Haven Hall.

First, a word about the general circumstances in which Bob was operating. The academic scene was very different in 1946–47 than it is today—far

more traditional and far more conservative. The postwar economy was depressed and universities were struggling valiantly to cope with vastly expanded enrollments on the basis of grossly inadequate budgets. These are circumstances that reinforce the traditional conservatism of all universities. When you add to this innate conservatism the further consideration that any significant structural or curricular innovation is certain to entail additional costs either immediately or prospectively, and that your institution's budget is barely keeping abreast of inflation, it is easy to understand why universities in the '40s were very cautious about accepting new programs such as the Center for Japanese Studies. These are circumstances that heavily favor the status quo and make any significant change very difficult.

Having said this, let me next describe the credentials that Bob Hall brought to his task. First, he was a superb academic politician. It was both an aesthetic pleasure and a valuable learning experience to watch Bob operate at either the university or the national levels.

Second, few, if any, of his peers at Michigan knew the university or how most effectively to manipulate its decision-making processes as well as Bob. His connection with Michigan was almost lifelong. He received his A.B., M.A., and Ph.D. degrees in geography at Michigan from 1919 to 1927. He spent his entire academic career here from 1919 until his retirement in 1966.

Third, Bob's interest in and knowledge of Japan was not a postwar development. Between 1928 and 1936 he made at least five extended visits to Japan. At one time he actually walked the Tokaido and spent a good deal of time in the countryside. Also, in the course of these prewar visits, he developed a number of lasting friendships with prominent Japanese that were very valuable after the war. It was Maeda Tamon, for example, who later made possible the establishment of our Okayama Field Station and our cordial relationships with the local administration.

Bob's interest in integrated foreign area studies was also not a postwar phenomenon. In the '30s he had been director of an interdisciplinary "Program in Oriental Civilizations" at Michigan, which terminated in rather unhappy circumstances before the war.

In addition to his local status and influence in Ann Arbor, Bob was well known on the prewar national academic scene. He was a senior and widely known figure in the field then known as "Far Eastern Studies," and he was active in the small group that in June 1941 had organized the Far Eastern Association, the immediate predecessor of our present Association for Asian Studies. Later, he was responsible for locating its national headquarters at the University of Michigan, where it still remains.

Of greater consequence where Bob's national reputation and influence were concerned was the fact that in 1941 he became a member of the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council (known familiarly as

SSRC), an organization that was to play a major role in the establishment of the Center for Japanese Studies. With time out during the war he continued to serve in this capacity until 1955 and became chairman of its board of directors in 1948.

Let me explain why the SSRC played so critical a role in the establishment of the Center for Japanese Studies. Founded in 1923, the SSRC serves as a sort of general staff for the social sciences collectively. Individually, each of these has its own national organization such as, for example, the American Political Science Association. But there are important issues and occasions on which it is essential also to have a national body competent to represent and work for the shared interests of the social sciences collectively. The SSRC was then and is now that body. With limited assistance from the American Council of Learned Societies, the comparable representative body for the humanities, the SSRC played a leading and essential role in obtaining from the foundations the grants that made possible the establishment of our first world area programs.

There were in 1946 a number of preparatory steps that had to be taken before the innate conservatism of the universities could be overcome and programs such as the Center for Japanese Studies actually established on campus.

First, there was the matter of timing. By 1946 the United States was both the victor in World War II and a recognized superpower. It was apparent to many in the universities, foundations, and government that:

1. We had won the war despite an almost abysmal ignorance of the languages, cultures, interests, and capabilities of both our enemies and our allies;
2. We had paid a very high price for this ignorance; and
3. As a newly minted superpower it behooved us to rectify this as rapidly as possible.

The actual campaign to remedy this national illiteracy was launched early in 1946 when the Social Science Research Council commissioned Bob Hall to make a national survey of existing world area programs at major research universities throughout the United States and, in so doing, to make recommendations with respect to their future. In the fall of 1946 the SSRC took a further step when it created a Committee on World Area Research to evaluate the results of Bob's national survey and make recommendations as to future developments in this field. It was a small committee of four members chaired by Bob. Its first order of business was the Hall Report, and in May 1947 it summarized its findings and recommendations under the title: *Area Studies with Special Reference to Their Implications for Research in the Social Sciences* (SSRC Pamphlet No. 3, 90 pp.).

The Hall Report was based on personal visits by Bob over a six-month period to twenty-four major American research universities to examine first-hand all of their existing foreign area programs. Written in 1946–47, it would be difficult today to improve on Bob's definition of the essential characteristics that an "Integrated World Area Program" should have:

1. The aim of such programs should be "to provide broad and integrated knowledge of the area concerned, adequate training in a particular discipline, and experience in the application of one or more disciplines to the problems of the particular area. . . . The basic objective should be to add competence in an area to competence in a discipline."
2. The area specialist must gain a considerably greater command of the language or languages of his particular area than has heretofore been required of most other scientific workers.
3. Research seminars should be introduced early in a student's training. They should be interdisciplinary in character and, because research is so essential to foreign area training, graduate centers for area training should be encouraged only at major research universities.
4. It is difficult to visualize an area expert who has not had at least one protracted period of study in his or her country of specialization.
5. Each major center should inaugurate a long-run program of collective research designed to yield cumulative results.

Sounds remarkably like our Center for Japanese Studies, wouldn't you say?

The Hall Report of May 1947 was the basic element in the next stage of the evolution of "Integrated World Area Programs" at major American research universities: the all-important quest for financial support. Three organizations were crucial in the fund-raising campaign that ensued: (1) The Social Science Research Council, which served as the forum for discussion and planning on the part of the universities, the interested foundations, and the Hall Committee on World Areas; (2) The Rockefeller Foundation; and (3) The Carnegie Corporation of New York.

In major financing ventures of this sort a great deal of preliminary preparation is essential at both the university and the national levels. Individual universities had first to convince their own faculty and administration that the changes involved were important and would result in a net gain. These intrauniversity struggles were formidable. At the national level the problem was primarily financial: how to obtain from some foundation a firm commitment to support the new program.

These are precisely the circumstances in which intermediate institutions such as the Social Science Research Council are invaluable. They provide a knowledgeable and reasonably neutral means of helping universities to for-

mulate and present their case, to identify the foundations most likely to be interested, and to facilitate agreement between selected universities and these foundations.

In addition to defining the essential characteristics of an "Integrated World Area Program," the Hall Report also identified twenty-four major research universities and seventy-four programs located on these campuses that might potentially qualify for serious consideration as candidates for foundation funding. It also proceeded to classify each of these seventy-four programs in terms of the following criteria:

1. Was it graduate in nature or only undergraduate?
2. Did it have a graduate research program?
3. Were each of the above actually operational or only in the planning stage?

The strategic implications of these criteria are obvious. The foundations were seeking programs that were graduate in nature and also possessed operational research programs at the graduate level. The Hall Report thus provided a simple and convenient way of narrowing the list of seventy-four to a far smaller number of qualified candidates.

Where the University of Michigan was concerned, the Hall Report listed only two conceivably qualified programs: Latin America and Far Eastern studies. But Latin America lacked a graduate research program. Consequently, there was at Michigan only one fully qualified candidate for foundation support: the Far Eastern Studies Program.

It is interesting to examine Bob's list of the fourteen major universities that then had significant Far Eastern studies programs. Only five of the fourteen were able to qualify on two of the above three criteria: Columbia, Harvard, Michigan, Washington, and Yale. But Columbia and Harvard lacked operational graduate research programs, and in the cases of Washington and Yale only the Chinese segment of their East Asian studies programs had operational graduate research programs. The Japanese side had none. The conclusion implied is that only Michigan qualified on all scores.

Knowing Bob well, I must confess to a bit of skepticism on this score. When I joined the Michigan faculty in 1947, I would have found it very difficult to identify the current conversations at the faculty level as constituting an "operational graduate research program." I am tempted, however, to explain this seeming inflation of Michigan's qualifications as a mere serendipitous oversight on Bob's part. But I can readily envisage him calculating that a little extra insurance of this sort might come in handy.

You will also have noted that the Hall Report characterizes the Michigan program as "Far Eastern." This clearly implied that we had operational graduate and undergraduate programs on both the Japanese and Chinese sides.

However, only the Japanese side was to receive foundation support. How did this happen?

The term "Far Eastern" was synonymous with Sino-Japanese and clearly connoted coverage of both. It was also the case that historically Japanese studies were clearly secondary to Chinese studies. How is it then, that when practically every other major American university was ambidextrous on this score and, furthermore, made China their principal focus, Michigan alone not only gave precedence to Japanese studies but also managed to exclude China totally from the terms of the Carnegie grant?

I cannot speak with authority on this score since, where dealings with foundations were concerned, Bob played his cards very close to his vest. Knowing Bob well, however, I think that I can reconstruct the scenario with reasonable accuracy. I would speculate that his thinking ran along the following lines:

1. Only two major foundations—Rockefeller and Carnegie—were known to be seriously interested in financing these new programs. But no one knew how interested, how much they might be prepared to invest, or how many or what programs they might ultimately choose to support. Applicants had, therefore, to proceed with caution.
2. The identity of our more serious competitors in the Far Eastern field was fairly clear: Columbia, Harvard, Yale, and the University of Washington. All had outstanding programs and those at Columbia, Harvard, and Yale were larger, older and better known than Michigan's. It was quite possible that Michigan might lose to one or all of these three.
3. Bob's problem was clear—how to improve the odds in Michigan's favor? In doing so, he had one advantage not shared by any of the competition: He was the sole author of the Hall Report on which the entire campaign for world area programs was based. He had written this on behalf of the foundations as well as the academic community. In this sense the foundations were at least modestly indebted to him personally. I suspect also that he had reason to believe that the foundation staff members most actively involved were personally grateful for his assistance.

I believe that Bob made several crucial decisions at this point: First, he decided to approach the Carnegie Corporation rather than the Rockefeller Foundation, largely, I suspect, because its relevant staff members were very close to the SSRC and he knew them well. Second, he was concerned that if he couched Michigan's proposal in terms of support for both Japanese and Chinese studies it might suffer from Michigan's relative weakness on the Chinese side, whereas on the Japanese side it had a tradition of active involvement dating back to the nineteenth century plus a superior faculty both in actuality

and in prospect. Furthermore, the early location of the Army's Japanese Language School at Michigan under Joe Yamagiwa's direction had added substantially to Michigan's reputation as a notable Center for Japanese Studies. I suspect also that Bob's unhappy experiences with Michigan's Program in Oriental Civilizations during the 1930s may have disposed him to prefer the relative simplicity and better personal relationships of an exclusively Japanese focus to a joint Sino-Japanese one. Finally, in terms of the major foreign policy interests of the United States at this time, Japan was a more active and vibrant concern than China. It was far from certain in 1947 that the Communists were going to win the Civil War, while Japan had been our principal opponent in a long and costly war and was currently subject to a long-term and well-publicized occupation by American forces. It would have been difficult at this time to challenge the concept that understanding Japan should be a matter of major concern to the American government and people.

The Hall strategy succeeded splendidly. When the two foundations announced their decisions in 1947, it emerged that between them they had decided to support nine programs in the Far Eastern field: California (Berkeley), Michigan, Cornell, Washington, Columbia, Stanford, Harvard, Yale, and Johns Hopkins. All save Michigan had a dual Sino-Japanese focus. All but Hopkins and Michigan received their support from the Rockefeller Foundation.

From the Carnegie Corporation Michigan received a grant of \$125,000 for a period of five years (May 5, 1947–May 4, 1952). This was supplemented in December 1949 by a second grant of \$50,000 earmarked for the support of the Okayama Field Station. Today, this would seem an incredibly small amount. But for the time, it was both adequate and impressive. Bob had earlier persuaded most of the relevant departments and deans at Michigan either to maintain or acquire the best available Japan specialists. It was they who paid the salaries involved, not the Center. The \$125,000 was used to finance the Center's office and secretarial costs, some research needs, and occasional social events. I shudder to think what this would cost today.

So let me conclude with a salute to Robert B. Hall, geographer, teacher and fund-raiser extraordinary. Beyond this a number of us who were here in the early days either as faculty or students owe him a substantial personal debt. He gave us very early in our careers the support, encouragement, and academic opportunities essential to the achievement of distinction in the academic profession.

If, in their otherwise splendid arrangements, our hosts today had seen fit to provide an appropriate bottle on the podium, I would at this point raise my glass and invite all of you to join me in saying: "Here's to you, Bob. Sorry you can't be with us to see the differences that fifty years have made in the program you founded. I think that you would find them impressive." I know that I do.

Perspectives on Village Japan

J. Douglas Eyre

One advantage of older age is that it allows an unhurried review of the full sweep of one's lifetime. Such a review invariably identifies a broad plain of the commonplace above which rise peaks of meaningful events and experiences. The year spent with my wife, Olga, at the University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies Okayama Field Station in 1950–51 ranks as one of my personal high points.

The road leading to the Ann Arbor Center for Japanese Studies and its Okayama Field Station wound through the World War II years. Pearl Harbor found me a sophomore here on the University of Michigan campus. When Professor Joseph K. Yamagiwa announced an intensive eight-hour course in the Japanese language for spring semester (1942), I was unable to meet criteria for admission. However, he, Mrs. Yamagiwa, and their young daughter, Roseanna, ate dinner every Sunday in the Women's League cafeteria, where I worked as a busboy and hence was in good position to advance my cause. He eventually granted me admission, convinced of my persistence if nothing else.

The class was an exciting introduction to spoken and written Japanese and Japanese culture. One year later, I enlisted in the army and was assigned back to Ann Arbor in uniform in the first Army Japanese Language School class headquartered in East Quadrangle with classes in the Michigan Union. Completing that program in six months, I was one of some thirty men sent to Camp Savage, Minnesota, to form the first class in the U.S. Military Intelligence Japanese Language School. There, in a former CCC (Civilian Conservation Corps) camp, we went through one year of officer training and specialized military Japanese study.

One year later as a new second lieutenant, I was scheduled to go to the Southwest Pacific theater with a team of ten *nisei* for prisoner of war

interrogation and intelligence gathering. However, with eleven other Camp Savage products, a “temporary” assignment, which meant the rest of the war, took us to an Army Security Agency, Military Intelligence Division facility in Arlington, Virginia. There we became part of a large group effort that succeeded in penetrating the Japanese Army’s shipping code. Decoded messages provided such valuable information as the movement of individual ships and convoys and the personnel and equipment being transported. Once the information was relayed through Pacific headquarters, American planes and submarines could move swiftly and effectively toward their targets. There was time for romance, too: a civilian coworker and I were married in May 1945.

Shortly after Japan’s surrender, I served in Japan with the U.S. Strategic Bombing Survey, Oil and Chemical Division, in northern Kyushu and western Honshu, where I could witness the general wartime devastation as well as the special cases of Nagasaki and Hiroshima. Back in civilian status in summer 1946, I returned to Ann Arbor with my wife to do graduate study under the G.I. Bill while sorting out a career path in business or government. Within one year, I discovered college teaching as a profession, with specialization in economic geography.

The creation of the Center for Japanese Studies in 1947 involved about thirteen graduate students and a faculty that included the director, Robert Hall (geography), Robert Ward (political science), Delmar Brown (history), Michail Titiev and Richard Beardsley (anthropology), Charles Remer (economics), James Plummer (art) and Joseph Yamagiwa (Japanese language and literature). We students were treated to a steady stream of well-known Japanese/Asian specialists from other places who broadened and deepened our knowledge of Japan, and to a visit to Washington, D.C. to inspect the Asian holdings of the Library of Congress.

Within the Department of Geography, I became Professor Hall’s graduate assistant. Although I received one of the first Social Science Research Council (SSRC) World Area Training Fellowships a year later, there was little prospect of study in Japan while the Allied Occupation continued. As a back-up strategy, my wife and I studied in Mexico during the summer of 1949. That fall, I had my first semester of full-time college teaching at what is now Eastern Michigan University in nearby Ypsilanti. Also, my wife and I took on the job of painting the exterior of Professor Yamagiwa’s house. Then, dramatically, in late fall permission to create the Okayama Field Station came from General MacArthur’s headquarters in Tokyo!

Two new Willys Jeeps left Ann Arbor in January 1950, headed for San Francisco, one carrying Olga and me, and the other Dick and Grace Beardsley and their two young daughters, Betsy and Kelcey. One enduring memory of that cross-country trip was a picnic on the rim of the Grand Canyon after a

light snow and without another person or car in sight. In San Francisco, we rendezvoused with Professor Hall, Bob and Connie Ward, and fellow University of Michigan alum, John Cornell. The *SS General Gordon*, an ocean liner that had served as a troopship during the war, carried us to Yokohama.

The year in Japan got off with a bang with a two-hour evening meeting with General MacArthur in his Dai Ichi Building headquarters opposite the Imperial Castle moat. Professors Hall, Ward, and Beardsley and I provided an attentive audience as he reviewed the steps his Allied administration had taken to push Japan into a new national direction. The Jeep trip to Okayama followed the historic, winding, and poorly marked Tōkaidō. A bit later, Ed and Maggie Norbeck joined us in Okayama to round out our first-year field station group.

The Okayama year was continuous magic, and the months sped by as we established our Okayama lodging; selected the hamlet of Niiike as our research target and settled into data collection; indulged in a wide variety of cultural exposures; fitted in travels to other Japanese locations; and interacted with an assortment of Okayama government officials and local scholars. Some memorable visitors were Maeda Tamon, once a member of Japan's League of Nations delegation and minister of education; Dr. Warner Wells of the Atomic Energy Commission's mission studying long-range effects of Hiroshima A-bomb radiation; Mr. Harada of nearby Kurashiki, a member of Japan's powerful Davis Cup tennis teams of the 1920s; and a bright young British doctoral student, Ronald Dore.

The Center group was invited to attend the first postwar opening of the Shōsōin in Nara, and it witnessed the revived *Jidai matsuri* in Kyoto. Three of us—Professors Beardsley and Ward and I—went to northern Shikoku to select books and other materials from the private Kamada Library that were purchased and shipped to Ann Arbor, where they formed the nucleus of today's excellent Asia Library resource. To supplement our main research effort in Niiike, we visited and heard reports of John Cornell's study of a mountain village and Ed Norbeck's coastal fishing village. Olga and I had a well-remembered bike trip visiting a number of the Buddhist shrines in the Shikoku Ninety-Nine Holy Places pilgrimage circuit, and longer train trips through northern Honshu, Hokkaido, and northern Kyushu.

During the first half of the year, I focused upon Niiike land ownership, seasonal cropping patterns, and irrigation systems, as well as more general topics. The construction of a base map of the hamlet and the patchwork of surrounding fields on which data could be plotted was a major undertaking. At midyear, Professor Hall decided that my Niiike findings were best left as part of the broader multidisciplinary village study, and he redirected my dissertation efforts to a survey of the sea salt industry around the borders of the Inland

Sea, where traditional, labor-intensive techniques were used to overcome a key resource deficiency.

The Okayama year finished, it was across the Pacific aboard the *SS President Cleveland*, a successful interview for a starting faculty position at the University of Washington, and to Ann Arbor to finish the dissertation. The Beardsleys provided a place for me to live while my wife went home to South Carolina to await my degree completion, which came in June 1951.

Hidden among these narrow personal details, some big lessons were learned. It was edifying to watch one person, Professor Hall, translate his dream of a Japanese Center into the reality that so many of us have shared through his personal charm, vision, persuasiveness, and determination. The Niiike experience revealed the intellectual, educational, and social rewards of group research and has prompted my interaction with colleagues in other specialties throughout my academic career. Among the humbling truths learned is that social findings are quickly dated. The thick volume, *Village Japan*, that the Okayama efforts of our and later groups produced, described a rural Japan that was already being modified by powerful urban, economic, and social forces. The Niiike of today is part of Okayama City, where urban lifestyles and values prevail with only a token maintenance of agricultural activity.

My one regret at this moment of joyous remembrance is that so few student members of the first University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies class and only one of its faculty, Dr. Ward, survive to share in this celebration. Their contribution to my Ann Arbor and Okayama experience will remain forever fresh.

Personal Reflections, 1950

Grace Beardsley

I speak to you as the oldest living fossil from among the group who pioneered in establishment of the Center's first field station in Okayama City, Okayama Prefecture, in 1950. Our leader was Bob Hall, a geographer who had pre-World War II research experience in Japan and the wit to organize those young University of Michigan graduate students and faculty members who had training in Japanese language and research interests in Japan into a coherent whole, the Center for Japanese Studies.

World War II was but recently over, and citizens in the United States were acutely aware of the need to obtain greater knowledge and understanding of their counterparts in Japan. Okayama was chosen for initial inquiry because it was thought to be less Westernized than some other parts of Japan and might provide insights into an older Japan that had contributed significantly to the contemporary culture. So off we went—an aspiring little group who, with the exception of Bob Hall, had never set foot on the islands of inquiry.

Upon arrival in Japan we had a few days of orientation in Tokyo and, for the men in our party, an interview with General Douglas MacArthur, who earlier had given permission for our party to enter, the first nonmilitary American group in occupied Japan. Subsequently, we set forth for Okayama-shi driving our jeep station wagons brought with us from the United States. It was winter. It was fascinating. And with postwar fuel shortages, both day and night it was cold.

In addition to Bob Hall, there was Bob Ward, a political scientist, and his wife, Connie, who had agreed to play housekeeper for the field station, a formidable task and one admirably dispatched. Additionally, she surprised us with Erica, the Wards' first daughter and the first Center child born in Japan.

There was Doug Eyre, a geographer interested in Japanese salt production, and his wife Olga, a young woman of many talents including being a tennis player. With Bob, Doug, and Olga we were ably represented in social games with our Japanese friends, held on our field station's tennis court. There was also Dick Beardsley, an anthropologist with long-standing interests in Asia. He was a man domestically encumbered by two young daughters and me, a wife who spoke not a word of Japanese and whose early interests had been in pre-Columbian textiles of the Andes, not very useful in Japan. Actually, my chief function was to keep our children, Betsy (age six) and Kelcey (age two), not heard and preferably not seen. Lastly but importantly, our group was guided and morally supported by a Japanese colleague of Bob Hall's, Ogasawara Yoshikatsu, a geographer and repeatedly a godsend. I remembered his name by thinking "a glass of water," Ogasawara.

Settling in Okayama, one of our first problems was with language. No one was fluent. Some had studied Japanese systematically and stood in need principally of practice. Others knew scarcely a word. But each of us learned according to individual needs. For me, supervising a two-year-old barely out of diapers, my first vocabulary was small indeed but, while traveling, in constant use. Who needs *kore wa hon desu* when what you want to know is *o-tearai wa doko desu ka?* I also learned *ōkii ne*, frequently spoken of me behind my back by groups of women confident that I couldn't understand. Well, I learned. And also common was *kawaii*, applied to our blonde, blue-eyed daughters.

Our daughters, too, learned to speak, and with less of an accent than the adults. By summer, some seven months after arrival, I was walking one day in a public park with my daughter Kelcey, by that time two and a half years old. An elderly woman approached us and after friendly exchange of greetings made an inquiry that baffled me. Kelcey looked up and said, "She wants to know my name." So I obliged. But the questioning continued. Again, knee-high looked up and said, "She wants to know how old I am." I was humiliated, pleased with my daughter's performance perhaps, but chagrined with mine.

However, adults had their language accomplishments too. For example, later in the first year, we were joined by John Cornell and Ed Norbeck, both anthropologists, and by Ed's bride Maggie, who had studied archaeology. John promptly set off to a remote mountain village to do an ethnographic study and, while there, thoroughly absorbed the local ambiance. Later, upon his return to the field station, the provincial village speech issuing from his American lips greatly amused our Japanese friends. Ed Norbeck, for his part, studied a fishing village on the Seto Naikai and emerged with a splendidly sturdy if impolite vocabulary. Mine was sometimes sturdy too. One day in the country watching some men clear out a fish pond, I heard a man shout "oi" to

catch the attention of others on the opposite side of the pond. Later, as some of our party drove off leaving my interpreter, Miyakawa Seiko, and me behind, I shouted a lusty “oi” to call them back. Seiko was mortified.

In the study of another culture people are all-important. Words are only tools that help understanding. In our little microcosm, Bob Hall’s idea of having scholars of different academic disciplines live together in a common dwelling, eat, sleep, and explore together was a good one. He further clinched the interchange of impressions and emerging ideas by holding an extended cocktail hour at the end of each day, attendance required. In a leisurely atmosphere the day’s experiences were exchanged, ideas provoked, developed, probed, modified, rejected, or extended. It was a way of banishing arbitrary academic divisions and giving place to the whole.

In our larger setting there was much interaction between local citizenry and Center people. An astonishing number of Japanese in all walks of life generously invited us as a group or as individuals to participate in a wide variety of activities. We visited shrines and temples, ate *obento* lunches in bamboo groves, witnessed school children’s daily classes as well as special festivities, coached English-speaking Japanese, swam in the sea, attended geisha parties, toured craft colonies, partook in archaeological digs, and were guests at weddings. All this was in addition to our individual field observations pertaining to academic goals.

Soon the time came for us to reciprocate. We decided on a party for some of our gracious hosts. Food was easy. Through clerical error, we had brought with us from the U.S. ten times as much canned fruit cocktail as we could possibly consume. Therefore, fruit cocktail was ever prominently on the menu. But what about house slippers for some thirty to forty guests? After an arduous search the nod went to some attractive, strawlike, old rose-colored, lovely, lacy-toed slippers. Our guests tactfully put them on without a blink and walked about in them with great composure for the entire evening. It was only later that we realized we had blundered with *benjo* slippers.

At that time, Japanese wives did not customarily attend parties with their husbands. Nevertheless, we invited wives along with husbands. Some came. But in the daunting unaccustomed situation it was interesting that they clung not to their husbands but to each other. For their part, Japanese hosts, acting on the idea that American husbands and wives should be treated equally, invited us wives even to such traditional events as geisha parties. It was an interesting experience for geisha and wives alike.

Formation of cultural imagery is a complex matter. For example, I was one day interviewing a farm wife about behavior among young boys and girls. Earlier I had seen a lot of unsupervised interaction among children as after school they climbed the hill in back of the village of Niiike where I was digging an Iron Age tomb, to observe the dig and play with our children and

each other. All this was more or less obscured from village view. Often boys teased girls, and girls retaliated by chasing boys and vigorously pounding them on the back. During an interview I asked the farm wife if children ever teased each other. "Oh, no," she responded, then added that perhaps a boy might tease a girl, but a girl would never tease a boy. At that moment, from where I sat I could see on the village road that her own son, a sturdy lad of eight or nine years, was being teased by two girls. They had snatched his school cap from his head and were tossing it back and forth across an irrigation ditch. As the boy rushed toward one to retrieve his cap, she would throw it across the water to the other who kept it just long enough for the victim to run across a little stone bridge spanning the water and toward the second girl. Upon his approach, she tossed the cap back to the first girl. This ploy continued until the boy was close to tears. But the other children seemed not to notice, nor did the few adults who happened about. Meanwhile the mother, apparently unconscious of the little drama, was telling me in apparent sincerity that such an incident would never occur. It made me wonder how many aspects of American society I might be misconstruing, how much of my own social outlook was formed by conventional belief and how much by experience. Setting aside preconceptions sometimes helps reveal hitherto unrecognized patterns of behavior.

Recently I saw a cartoon in which a small boy asks, "Grandma, were you alive when tennis balls were white?" Yes, I was. I also rode in a rickshaw when not only geisha but ordinary citizens might use them. When I rode overnight in trains, in the morning passengers all debouched onto the station platform, washed their faces and brushed their teeth in long rows of public wash basins, then bought *obento* breakfasts and some tea in a little ceramic jar—the Japanese throw-away Dixie cup but far superior—then climbed back aboard. As the train continued, we passed bright green fields framed in yellow flowering rape, and elegant white egrets rising skyward.

At the field station we all rode bicycles for individual excursions into the Okayama countryside. What pleasure to ride paths among the fields and watch the seasons pass. In spring, how joyful the mountainside azaleas beckoning with fuchsia blossoms, how fragrant the diminutive wild orchid. On a moonlight night, what magic the sound of a *shakubachi* drifting across still fields. And how ghostly the sight of villagers silently reaping rice in the moonlight ahead of a storm. I never heard the cry of the deer nor wet my sleeve with tears, but I heard the skylark after ascending vertically almost out of sight burst into exultant song, then plummet to the earth, only to rise again in repeat of the joyous performance. With these many fond memories I join Wordsworth when I'm in a vacant or pensive mood, for then "they flash upon that inward eye which is the bliss of solitude."

Tozama among *Fudai*: A Cornellian in Okayama

Robert J. Smith

In the course of preparing for this fiftieth anniversary celebration, I decided to take a break one day and turned to one of my favorite writers, William Maxwell. In one of his essays, I came across the following observation that seems made for the occasion:

The view from seventy is breathtaking. What is lacking is someone, anyone of the older generation to whom you can turn when you want to satisfy your curiosity about some detail of the landscape of the past. There is no longer any older generation. You have become it, while your mind was mostly on other matters.

Just so. One of the consequences of being at something for a long time—as many of you will have discovered for yourselves—is that somewhere along the line you begin to notice that odd and vaguely disturbing characterizations of the past are being made by younger colleagues. It is your past they are talking about, which is bad enough, but to make matters worse, we have the great misfortune to live in ungenerous times.

As an example, a quote:

After the war, the field of Japanology was quickly dominated by a number of former American military officers who learned the Japanese language in military schools before or while participating in the American Occupation of Japan. Arguably, this new breed of Japanologists studied aspects of Japanese society, history, and politics that did not conflict either with their politically conservative beliefs, nurtured by the emerging cold war, or with the Occupation's attempt at politically engineering a democratic Japan remolded in America's image of itself.

I will confess that it is difficult for me to recognize in these characterizations either my colleagues of those times or their politics, which is not to claim greater accuracy for my recollections, but to suggest very strongly that some brushes simply are too broad to be much use in painting complex subjects.

Let me say, first of all, that I was not a military officer, although I was in the U.S. Army. Second, and not surprisingly, it is clear to me that among those of us who one way or another became involved in the establishment of the anthropological study of Japan fifty years ago, some held conservative political views, some appeared to have no coherent views whatsoever, some were (dread word) liberals, and a few were ideologically very far on the left.

The details of how I got to the Center for Japanese Studies Okayama Field Station make for a story too long to tell, so here is the short form. I was discharged from the army late in 1946, took my B.A. at Minnesota in 1949, and, after considering several options, entered the doctoral program in anthropology at Cornell University, where not only was there no Center for Japanese Studies, there was no instruction in the Japanese language and not a single course on Japan itself. I mention this to make the point, possibly unwelcome in this context, that many of us in the field of Japan studies were trained in purely disciplinary departments rather than area programs.

When the time came to think about field research, I lucked out. Professor Lauriston Sharp of my department raised my problem with Robert B. Hall, Sr., and together they contrived to help me secure funding. Bob Hall offered me the chance to join the group planning to go out to Okayama in the summer of 1951. I received a research grant that was to cover a year's field research and round-trip transportation—the princely sum of \$3,500. We sailed from San Francisco on the *President Cleveland* in June and made our way to Okayama, then the only authorized research site in Japan prior to the signing of the peace treaty.

Those early days were not easy ones. Looking back, I find it difficult to believe how very little we had to work with in our struggles with the language and how thin our preparation for research really was. Our language texts were either the Naganuma series (known universally in my cohort as *kore wa hon desu*) or in my case mimeographed materials produced by our teachers at Minnesota or Yale. (In this retrospective context, it is worth mentioning perhaps that our mimeographed Yale textbook was written by someone we never laid eyes on named Bernard Bloch and his graduate assistant Eleanor Jorden.) Although we had been shown some Japanese films in the Army area and language program, we had none of the audiovisual aids that have been in use for many years now. In her engaging account of the very early days, Grace Beardsley has just reminded us that it was a time when tennis balls were still white. My first encounter with the beginnings of the new technology—you will not believe this—was the Webcor wire recorder. These

infernal devices were ill suited to Minnesota's climate, for if you carried them in from the cold out-of-doors and failed to let them warm up to room temperature, the wire either ran at random speeds or spun out in great tangles of unrecoverable silvery blossoms.

It is hard to think back to a time when there was so little published material on which we could base our research. Sir George Sansom's one-volume history was available, of course, as were a few other sturdy prewar titles, but the only anthropological community study we had was John Embree's *Suye Mura*. The other anthropological work, which I had purchased off the new books shelf at the Minnesota bookstore in 1946, was Ruth Benedict's *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*. As for Japanese-language publications, our Japanese colleagues in anthropology had worked mostly in Tohoku in the northeast, and the folklorists' publications frequently proved to be less relevant to our projects than their titles suggested. What local historians had produced often was more useful, but the coverage was far from uniform.

Under the circumstances, it is hardly surprising that so much of our research effort and published work were normative in character. There was so little information about so much of the quotidian that we took as our assignment the recording and analysis of what was happening to the institutions of Japanese society and to its traditions, which had recently been so universally reviled. That is why most of the earliest postwar publications by anthropologists are fairly straightforward accounts of the structure of rural communities, religious institutions and beliefs, family and household, and local politics. They are about how things worked.

When we arrived in Okayama, the long-term study of the village of Niiike was in full swing and all were expected to participate in it. But I soon discovered that the Norbecks, who had returned to Ann Arbor already, had worked in Takeshima, a fishing village, and John Cornell was just winding up his study of Matsunagi. I soon began to wonder just how I would manage to carve out a dissertation topic while jostling for position in Niiike. It was Woody Pitts who showed me the way across the Inland Sea to Kagawa Prefecture where, for comparative purposes, I found a research site.

It is perhaps a measure of how much has changed that when I went to the prefectural office to check in with the Foreigners' Liaison Section—remember that the peace treaty had not yet been signed, and that I had just turned twenty-four—I was at once escorted to the office of the governor. I have not met a prefectural governor since, which may be why one interchange at that meeting is indelibly impressed in my memory. When he finally understood that I was interested in finding a rural community where I might be able to find a place to live while conducting research on village life, he said, "You want to live in a village?" "Yes," I said. "Why on earth would you want to do such a thing?" he asked. Almost a year later and thirty pounds lighter, I had to admit

that the governor of Kagawa Prefecture had a point. Nonetheless, it was an experience I would not trade for any other, for the people of Kurusu were both patient and supportive, and I have revisited the place every three or four years since.

I had been working there for some time when Robert B. and Pauline Hall handed over the directorship of the Okayama center to Jack and Robin Hall. It was Jack who designated me *tozama*—they were the outer lords of the Tokugawa period who for the most part, far from the central government, enjoyed a degree of autonomy denied the inner lords, the *fudai*. Even the *tozama* made the journey to the shogun's capital in alternate years, however, and I lived up to my role by making periodic visits to Okayama. Among other attractions, there was a seemingly inexhaustible supply of canned fruit cocktail available from the center's stores.

As a consequence, I have only episodic impressions of how the field station functioned. The center that I knew was a large compound in which the entire research contingent lived. In order to lessen the very real possibility of isolation, every effort was made to establish and maintain close contact with an impressive number of local people and institutions. It was clear, for example, that both political and academic relations were very good indeed. In my time, Jack Hall's contribution to the latter was crucial, I think, for he was to all intents and purposes bilingual. He worked assiduously to build relations with local scholars, as Dick Beardsley had done prior to my arrival. Politically, the way was smoothed for the entire operation by the enviable long-standing connections that Robert B. Hall, Sr. had with the people who mattered in Tokyo. Visitors were frequent—I remember particularly Sakanishi Shio, writer, essayist, and translator, then a force to be reckoned with but now, I suspect, all but forgotten.

The view of the past from the vantage point of seventy is breathtaking, as Maxwell observed, but the view of the future is positively dizzying. I do not believe for a minute that it is possible to predict the future, having been wrong about it so often in the past. Who, fifty years ago, would have come even close to imagining what the anthropological study of Japan would be like today? However, since bad guesses entail no severe penalties, I will make one prediction. The value of the normative materials on the Japan that my generation first encountered is now primarily archival in nature. Much of what we saw and wrote about Japan forty and fifty years ago represented how things were then in light of how things had been earlier. Because that is precisely what ethnography has taken as its charge, and because of the character of the transformations of the institutions of Japanese society, there will always be a need for constant checking of the present against the past. For all the current hubbub in our discipline, there can be no doubt that theoretically informed updating of how things work remains our major responsibility.

Let me close by acknowledging two debts. One is to my wife of forty-two years, Kazuko. It is matter of immense pride to me that her recently published book, *Makiko's Diary*, won the Arisawa Prize just ten years after the appearance of my book, *Japanese Society*, which won no prize at all. The second debt is to the founders of the Center for Japanese Studies. I find it hard to imagine how things might have developed had it not been for the help and understanding that Robert B. Hall, Sr., Dick Beardsley, John Eyre, and above all Jack and Robin Hall, extended to an outsider at a crucial turning point in his career.

Personal Reminiscences

Margaret Norbeck

I recall being on the Inland Sea in an oddly-shaped rowboat (more like a caracole) with my suitcase perched precariously in the middle, looking as though it would go into the water at any minute, and thinking to myself, “How did I get here?” “What am I doing here?” I have the same feeling right now: “What am I doing here?” Incidentally, the village children, upon seeing our boat, taught me one of my first Japanese words: *abunai*.

Most of the people at the Okayama Field Station had been expecting to go to Japan for quite some time before they actually did—the men had been in Japanese language schools in either the army or navy, and their wives had known that a stay in Japan was in their future. I had not even suspected a trip to Japan until the middle of the previous November. When we arrived in the spring of 1950, I suffered more from culture shock than anyone else. In fact, the so-called “culture shock” started in the train from Tokyo to Okayama. I was amazed at the men who took off their outer garments and sat, lotus-fashion, on the seats in what appeared to be their underwear. I was also amazed at the *mikan* peels thrown into the aisles and the little holes in the aisles where the debris could be swept down. I was also just a little surprised at the people who wanted to feel my clothes and my hair. Ed was talking to them in Japanese, so I am sure they must have asked permission. Now, Japan has the cleanest and fastest trains anywhere in the world, and I must say that I would like to import the ladies rooms in the Osaka airport. I was also impressed, looking out the window, at the way in which the Japanese utilized every bit of space—the squash vines were trained to climb up the haystacks, not to wander around and take up space.

Food was scarce at that time, and yet our porter insisted on running after us with the remains of our lunch—mostly a loaf of bread and some fruit.

I began to get a glimmer of the basic honesty of the Japanese as regards thievery; at that time only a special caste of club members were thieves.

Takashima was one of the beauty spots of the world, arising as it did from the Inland Sea, and right in the center of one's view was a magnificent old pine tree, almost looking like a stage prop placed by a scenic director who had decided its shape. Now gone, alas! Along a white sandy beach, nets were spread and mended. The houses were old and rather large by Japanese standards. I think that the things that bothered me the most during our stay in Japan were the lack of central heating and the lack of chairs. I never truly became adjusted to sitting back on one's legs or on one's knees. In the mountains, however, there were pits under the table which not only kept one's feet warm but did permit one to stretch out one's legs.

Things have certainly changed as the video from the Okayama Broadcasting Company demonstrated. Instead of a picturesque boat ride across a beautiful sea, one can drive to Takashima, and the beautiful beach has given way to small garages over small cars. They make life easier for the inhabitants, but the beach has lost some of its beauty. When I saw the small cars owned by almost everyone, I remembered the time that Edward gave a few friends a ride in the Center's station wagon—a first ride ever for these particular individuals—and a couple of them became seasick.

Much of Japan reminded me of pictures of medieval England, and, indeed, in some ways we had stepped back a couple of hundred years in time. Again, I am not being strictly accurate, as they had also lived through the war, but the habits and way of life in the village certainly harked back to an earlier time. No, I do not mean the way of life was as truly ancient as medieval, but it harked back to a time now completely gone. A favorite walk of mine, through a lane at the back entrance of the center, led past half-timbered houses and houses with thatched roofs.

Edward and I were very fortunate in having the opportunity to know Kaji-san of the Okayama Broadcasting Company. He was instrumental in helping us to collect folk music and attend festivals throughout the area. I would work the tape recorder and Edward would take movies. Through his kindness, we were able to see many of the festivals that still had their ancient trappings. Particularly impressive was the one at Suimon, which included elaborate boats on the water and music playing, all under a full moon. One of the trips we made with Kaji-san and the radio crew was to an island overnight. Ed and I took a boat out a very little way to an islet, thinking to be alone for a minute or two. When we rounded the islet—too small to be called an island—children poured out of a cave; the islet was really a spit, and could be walked to at low tide. One of the problems for most of us was that we were never really alone. When looking at the Inland Sea with its many small islands, I asked if they were all inhabited. My companion replied, "No," and I thought how wonderful

it would be to have an island all to oneself. My friend was horrified at the idea of having time completely alone, of not being more or less around people. This, of course, may have changed in the past few decades, but the Japanese seem far more adjusted to living and working in groups. The individualism we prize so much seemed to be much less important to them.

Among my pleasant times was digging in an Iron Age passage tomb (with Grace Beardsley) by candlelight, with the sound of many cicadas when we stepped outside. Also, with my husband, there was the expedition with the Antiquarian Society to a mountain site in the rain. We did see some ancient rock paintings and ate *udon* at a temple, which warmed our chilled bones.

I was much interested in the different attitude from ours that the Japanese had toward the sacred. Once, when we were about to picnic, it started to rain, and the local priest invited us to sit in the sanctuary to have our meal. This would never happen in a Christian church. In fact, before we left to return stateside, Edward wanted to show to the villagers the movies we had taken. We tried the schoolhouse on the mainland, but the projector blew the fuses. After sundry other mishaps the local Buddhist priest invited us to use the temple, which we did. The villagers were delighted and enjoyed seeing themselves, but I found myself being slightly uncomfortable about using a sanctuary in such a profane way.

Also impressive was the friendliness and overall helpfulness of the villagers. After all, they had just been through a terrible war with us as the enemy, and the widow with whom we stayed when we slept away from the Center had lost her husband when his ship went down during the war. She became a close personal friend and within the past couple of weeks, I received a long letter from her son, who was a boy in the house then. Throughout our stay, there seemed to be very little bitterness as a result of the war. Perhaps the fact that Japanese culture is a polite culture helped this.

Do you all remember how one of the first questions any Japanese would ask was, "How old are you?" whereas our first question is likely to be, "Where are you from?" The emphasis on age, of course, was probably because one's age determined the social society one joined when about to be one of the fortunate youths celebrating the village *matsuri* festival in an enclosed litter and collecting money for saké.

An important concept that my husband told me I never properly understood was *shibui*, which I interpreted as ascetic aesthetics. Even if this is completely erroneous, one could not help but notice how important bringing a small touch of beauty was, bringing it into a rather dingy and drab postwar world. Small shopping stalls would have a vase with a single flower, and ticket sellers on trains would have flowers on the counter.

The department store in war-bombed Okayama (the Ten Maya) was a fascinating place, with a shrine on the roof and a children's playground, also

on the roof. It was especially fine for me because it was the first time that I had ever been tall enough to see over people's heads; I did enjoy that. It was extremely interesting to be exposed to so many different foods with all of the postwar shortages, including different varieties of watermelon—seedless, golden, silver, etc.—and many varieties of citrus fruits, including *bassaku*. I also remember with great delight our visit to the Okayama Field Station, at which time we were fed pears and the most wonderful peaches I have ever eaten. Many of the foods served to us at local private homes were strange to us and some were truly delicious. The prefecture officials often arranged interesting outings for us, among them a mushroom-picking picnic. On that occasion occurred one of the very few unpleasant happenings of our stay in Okayama, although it in no way troubled us—going through a Korean village, some of the children threw rocks at the official prefecture car. So, although things appeared to be smooth on the surface, there were tensions underneath, with which we did not deal.

I remember cherry blossoms and the picnic under them, little lighted boats sailing on the river at *obon* (some of which washed up on the beach at Takeshima the next day), fireworks on hot evenings all summer long, the delight of a hot *ofuro* on a winter's night before slipping into bed, the natural beauty of the countryside, the complexity of gift exchange, the *oshibori*, which I imported for dinner parties in the U.S.

The village represented an interesting combination of the old and new. Villagers easily grasped all sorts of philosophical complexities, but at the same time, a shaman was called in for a curing ceremony for a desperately ill man. There were some people who were still respectful of the god of the *benjo* and who knocked before burning barnacles off the hulls of the fishing boats for the benefit of the god therein.

There were some concepts very strange to me. I was astounded that after the pledging with the three little bowls at a wedding, with the go-between playing a major part, no one got up and said anything similar to, "By the power invested in me by the Province of Okayama, I now pronounce you man and wife." That a marriage could be legal without the state's interference was strange. Of course, it would be registered, although I understand that this wasn't always done either.

Every day brought new experiences, like the time I went with John Cornell to help in finding him a mountain village and discovered that I was the first white woman some of them had ever seen. They had, of course, seen white men.

There are so many memories, each one tumbling after another, that it was hard to pick out a few of my personal reminiscences—and please remember that this short talk was not a scientific or an in-depth one, just a few things that were important to me. I feel especially fortunate in having been able to

see a side of Japan that is gone forever. For example, in homes that had cooked with a grill over a fire pit, there are now modern stoves and electric dish dryers. It was an utterly fascinating life now gone for good.

Again, I want to close by saying how much we appreciated the kindness of the villagers. There is really too much to remember.

Remembrances of Michigan

Robin Hall for John Whitney Hall

We looked forward with great anticipation to the Center's fiftieth anniversary celebration, as we had for the twenty-fifth. Many of Jack's early students were presenting papers, and our closest friends would be on hand. But it was not to be. Jack succumbed to the ravages of Parkinson's disease in October 1997, and I was left with the mission of representing him on this special occasion.

Returning to Michigan always felt like a homecoming, for we had spent many happy years in Ann Arbor. In the late 1940s Jack was one of those young scholars, fresh out of graduate school, recruited by Bob Hall to join the Michigan staff Bob had already assembled for his new Center. It was a challenge for young scholars, immediately faced with creating new courses, developing the Central Integrated Course and other interdepartmental ventures, and even serving as director of the Okayama Center (our turn came in 1952) and later as director for the Japanese Center itself on the Michigan campus. There were open opportunities to initiate and edit such research publications as the Occasional Papers—and all this under the enthusiastic patronage of Bob Hall, whose dream was rapidly becoming a reality during those early years. Even the accompanying young families felt a part of the larger Center family, happily participating in the picnics, parties, and special Center events, of which there were many. What an incredibly special way to begin an academic career!

In tune with the easy flow of the times I remember that Jack's recruitment by Michigan seemed a natural happening, coming as it did out of the blue and unsolicited. In 1946 Jack had returned to Harvard to attend graduate school after his war service as a communications officer in the United States Naval Reserve. Harvard, flooded with returning graduate students, had placed our little family, along with many others, in somewhat primitive accommodations: a series of workers' housing units left over from the war. Cooking for our family of four was done on a portable two-burner stove. There was no central

heating, just a solitary kerosene stove in one room, and during heavy snows the flat roof generously dripped snowmelt into the interior. But it was far easier than the hour's commute out to Harvarddevons in Ayer, Massachusetts, which Jack had undertaken during the first year of graduate study. These temporary units with the pleasant name of Andover Court had been built on the tennis courts of the Harvard Divinity School and bordered Divinity Avenue faculty homes where the Reischauers lived. Ed Reischauer, just seven years Jack's senior, was his advisor. The Reischauer children used to romp through our area during the day, and occasionally Ed and his wife strolled by in the evening, sometimes stopping in for a chat. One night in the spring of 1948 they came with a special message. With his course work completed but with a year still remaining on his grant to finish the dissertation, Jack was unprepared for Ed's words. "Jack," Ed said, "the University of Michigan is looking for a teacher of Japanese history for the upcoming summer session, and probably an extension to a full-time position, and I think you should go for it." We were stunned, but that is exactly how it worked out. Before we even reached Michigan for the summer session the offer came for a full-time faculty position. The salary was \$3,000, with the promise of an increase of \$500 on the completion of the doctorate. And that is how we happened to come to Michigan. Life seemed a good deal simpler in those days.

We left Ann Arbor in the early 1960s to answer Yale's call, but we eagerly returned for the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Center for Japanese Studies, a memorable occasion held off campus at Inglis House. I particularly remember two things: the strutting peacocks in the garden, and the stunned looks on the faces of the younger faculty when Dick Beardsley, Bob Ward, and Jack Hall, by then middle-aged, well-established, and looking decidedly contented, were introduced as "the young Turks of the early years."

Glancing through Jack's fiftieth reunion book from Amherst the other day, I was reminded of how very much his students meant to him, beginning with those special "first" students at the University of Michigan. He was extremely proud of his students, and he followed their successes with interest. I like to think of Jack as a kind of Johnny Appleseed, programmed perhaps by his missionary background to spread the seeds of information about Japan wherever he went. I suspect he was well aware that by encouraging bright students who moved out across the country and the world to teach and write, spreading the word about Japan themselves, those seeds would have a far broader distribution. On the occasion of the fiftieth anniversary of the Center for Japanese Studies I know that he would wish to celebrate the Center's students first of all.

Keynote Speech

Present at the Creation of the Japanese Constitution

Beate Sirota Gordon

Before I begin, I want to say how honored I am to be here this afternoon. To me, the University of Michigan means a great deal in that I know that Japanese studies were revolutionized by this university, with all the new techniques they used in the early days. The lab, the use of films, all that originated here. And of course, Professor Yamagiwa was really an idol to all of us, even though I only met him once. My husband was here in the military intelligence school, and I see there are many here today who studied in those first classes at Michigan. So it gives me many nostalgic feelings to come here and praise you for this wonderful, wonderful program. To start out I thought that some of you would remember this, and the rest might be interested in hearing it. Here is one of the sentences that people had to learn in the military language school here. I will read it in Japanese first, because I know so many of you know Japanese; then I will give you the English translation. In Japanese: *Hikōki ga ochisōdattaga umaku chūgaerishite minami no hō e tonde ikimashita*. In English: "The airplane looked as though it was about to fall but it looped neatly and flew off in a southerly direction." So you can see that they learned Japanese very well if they were able to translate this kind of sentence.

In any case, I do want to tell you before I start on the serious part how much I respect this university that I went, let's see, 25,000 miles to get to today. If you doubt it, I will tell you exactly what happened. I had arranged to speak on a tour of Japan, all over Japan, to start on November 7. Then I got a call from the University of Michigan asking if I would speak here; I thought this would be perfect because I'd speak here on the sixth and go on the seventh to Japan. Actually, the lectures in Japan were not to begin until the eighth, so I thought it would be very easy. About two weeks later I got a call from Japan from, strangely enough, Avon. Avon Japan International called, saying that I was going to be awarded the biggest prize for women in Japan. They award it

in Tokyo. They said that I should come because in addition to it being a very great honor, they would give me a sum of money that I could give to any feminist organization I wanted. And then when I asked, "What is the date?" they said October 31. I told them, "You know I can't, I'm speaking at the University of Michigan on November 6 and then on the seventh I'm leaving for Japan." "No," they said, "If you don't come you don't get the award." So I almost refused, but then someone from Japan called me and another person faxed me, saying, "You've got to come, this is a very important event, you've got to come." So what happened? I went to Japan last Friday. I was there on Saturday to receive the award, and I went back to New York on Sunday. I am here now, and tomorrow I'm going to Japan. Altogether that is about 28,000 miles; so you see my devotion.

Well, I think there are many people here whom I know personally, but there are also many who don't know me. So before I begin to tell you about my work on the drafting of the Japanese constitution, I thought I should give you some background, because most people are shocked at the idea that a twenty-two-year-old could even dare attempt to write the draft of a constitution. I would like to tell you about the situation at the time when I did it, because at the age of twenty-two I was a little bit more advanced, shall we say, both educationally and in terms of knowing something about the world than you might think. I had lived in Japan from the age of five and a half. My father, who was a pianist, had been to Japan on a concert tour in 1928. He went back again in 1929 and took my mother and me along. We went from Vienna, where I had been born, and traveled on the Trans-Siberian Railway, which at that time took thirteen days. Then from Vladivostok we went by ship. It was a long trip. When I first arrived in Japan, I had never before seen an Asian. Apparently there were no Asians in Vienna in 1928, 1929. So when I saw the Japanese and everybody had black hair and black eyes, I said to my mother, "Are they all brothers and sisters?" My mother said, "No," and I think it shocked her into making me really participate in Japanese society, because I guess she didn't want an ignoramus like that around her.

So I was integrated into Japanese society, different from many other children at the time in Japan, because there was an English club, an American club, a German club—all these different organizations where most of the Europeans and Americans went and where their children went. But I didn't. I played with neighbors' children and with the children of my father's students so that I learned a great deal by osmosis. My learning, in general, is not very much out of books. It comes, rather, of having been there, lived there—having met the people. I couldn't help but learn from living in Japan, even as a child, and I lived there until I was fifteen years old. I had all my secondary education in Japan. I first went to the German School in Ōmori and then I went to the American School in Tokyo. My mother tongue is German because I was born

in Vienna, but my father tells me I spoke Japanese after three months. Now, I don't think that's amazing at all because what does a five-year-old talk about? I mean, the vocabulary is not very large, so I was able to learn it very quickly, and, then, since I had Japanese friends, I went on learning.

I also learned about the situation of women in the home. I saw my friends preparing themselves for marriage by playing the *koto*, doing *ikebana* (flower arrangement), doing *chanoyu* (tea ceremony). I knew that they were going to marry men whom they might have never met and that it was arranged by the parents. I saw my friends' mothers walking behind their husbands on the street. I saw them preparing dinner in the house for the guests, serving it, not participating in the conversation nor in dining with the guests, but then going to the kitchen and eating by themselves. I saw all that. I also knew that the woman had power within the family, at home, in that she controlled the money. The husband would come home and give her the envelope with the money in it, and then she would dole it out to the husband and to all the children who were of the age to use money. She also had a lot to say about the education of the children. I knew many who played piano and would sit with their children while they were practicing the piano, which I'm sure all of you know is a terribly boring thing to do to—sit there for hours with a child practicing the piano. The Japanese woman would sit there patiently; *gaman suru koto ga dekin* is really something you could say about the Japanese woman. She knows how to be patient. A lot of these things made a great impression on me.

My mother met with many of the Japanese women who went to Europe. At that time America was not that popular. People went to Europe, to France, to Germany, or to Austria to study and to learn about European culture. A lot of the women who were "high society" came back from Europe with ideas about women's rights, and they would talk to my mother. And at that time, children like me, although I had a governess, did participate quite often in adult life; we could listen to what the grown-ups were saying at dinner parties and afterwards. So I heard women talking about how terrible it was that—I don't think I really knew what a geisha was—but I did hear that there were men in Japan who had a wife and a geisha living in the same house. I don't know how much I knew about what that meant, but I know that when my mother, my father, and I were walking near Nogizaka, by Nogi Shrine, we met up with Yamada Kosaku, the composer who had brought my father to Japan originally. He came with a lady to whom my mother introduced me by saying, "This is Mrs. Yamada." Two weeks later we were walking around there and met Mr. Yamada again; he lived near us. And this time he was with a different lady. When my mother introduced me she said, "This is Mrs. Yamada." Thank goodness I didn't blurt it out, but as we were walking away I said to my mother, "Mrs. Yamada looks very different from the Mrs.

Yamada last time." I don't know what I understood, but I can tell you, this really happened.

I learned about what it was to live in a militaristic state. First of all, when the 22/26 Incident took place there were soldiers with bayonets in front of our house. The secret police used to visit us every day to sit in the kitchen and drink tea with our cooks and maids and ask for information about us. One of the most striking examples of life in a militaristic state is this story. My mother used to ask me to write the place cards for the dinner parties she gave; she entertained a great deal. She was, after all, a musician's wife and there were a lot of diplomats in Tokyo at the time and many musicians from Europe who had to be invited. People don't know how great the musical life in Japan was before the war. Rubinstein came and Heifetz came and anyone you might name, they all came to Japan. So we entertained these musicians, whom my parents knew from Europe. One day I said to my mother, "You know, many of the people come over and over again. Why don't we keep the place cards of the people who come often and then I'll only have to write the new ones for the new people?" And my mother said, "Yes, that's a good idea. Why don't you ask the cook where these cards are? I never see them after it's over." My mother sent me to the kitchen because she didn't speak very good Japanese. I was the interpreter. My mother's Japanese was like this. When she wanted the plates taken away from the dinner table she would say, "*sara, sayonara*," which for those who do not speak Japanese means, "plates, good-bye." And, of course, the cook immediately understood, and she liked that phrase (our cook, Mio-san, had a great sense of humor), so instead of teaching my mother correctly she'd come to the dinner table and say, "*sara, sayonara?*" and my mother would say, "*hai*," and that was the extent of her Japanese. So I was sent in as interpreter and I asked, "Mio-san, what happens to the cards? I never can find them afterwards." "Oh," she said, "I gather them and I give them to the secret police. Because," she said, "they always bother me. They're always asking who is coming to the house, but I don't know the names. I don't know the foreign languages, so it's very convenient at dinner parties because all the names are there. Then when I give the cards to the police I tell them which people come on Tuesday for lessons or to have tea with madam on Wednesdays and things like that." So you see you do learn something when you live in such a society!

My mother always warned me never to say anything political in a public place. My parents often went to the Imperial Hotel, the old Imperial Hotel, to play bridge. I would go along, because they had a very nice library there and I would go there and read. But my mother would warn me, "In Japan, you must not ever say anything political outside the house, because there are always people listening and we are guests here. It's a situation that you have to be careful about." So I did learn that. Then, of course, going to the

German School I learned something about the Nazis, because the German government sent Nazi teachers to the German schools. The last semester that I spent at the German School I had to say “Heil Hitler” before and after every class, sing the Horst Wessel Lied, etc. They had a “Hitler Jugend” and a “Bund Deutscher Mädchen.” They had the whole thing. I left the school as soon as I could, but as you probably know, with a European school you have to end the semester and the school year in order to get a proper report card. After that, I went to the American School in Tokyo.

So I went to the American School and I graduated in 1939. As an aside, it turns out that the driver of the cab who brought me here today also went to the American School in Tokyo, which was quite a coincidence. As I said before, I knew quite a bit by that time about the Japanese arts and also something about Western music. I had played the piano since I was six. I had taken ballet and modern dance for many years in Tokyo from an American teacher who had been in Anna Pavlova’s company. I knew several languages because there were so few foreigners in Japan at that time—I think only about two thousand—so that you were exposed to many languages. My governess spoke English and German. I had a tutor for French and Russian. I took some Japanese courses at the American School, not very much, maybe only a year or two of reading and writing, but I spoke very well. And so before I left Japan, I knew five languages. I only mention this again to tell you that at twenty-two I was not quite as ignorant as some scholars and newspapermen in Japan tried to make me out to be during the Occupation when they wanted to amend the constitution, which of course they want to do again now.

Anyway, I came to Mills College. Why Mills College? First of all, it was the closest college to Japan. It is located in Oakland, California. Second, it was a women’s college, and my parents thought I would be safe there. The choice brought me into an atmosphere where I met many women who were career-oriented; Mills College was quite advanced at that time. We had a woman president, Aurelia Henry Reinhart, who talked to us a great deal about women not going to college just to find husbands. At that time, some considered it fashionable to go to college because you could catch men. But she said it would also be good to study for a career because you could certainly have both. So the atmosphere was feminist, and liberal in that sense. When the war began I was still in college and my parents were in Japan; I had absolutely no communication with them.

Because I was one of only sixty, if you can believe it, Caucasians in the U.S. who spoke Japanese at that time, I was very much in demand for government work. I was still in college, either seventeen or eighteen, when I took a summer job as a monitor for Tokyo radio. That is, I monitored Tokyo radio for the Federal Communications Commission’s (FCC) Foreign Broadcast Information Service, which had a listening post in San Francisco. It meant

listening to Tokyo Radio, not only in Japanese, but in the other languages that I knew and translating them as the reporter spoke. Now, you must try that sometime. Sit in front of the typewriter and listen to an English broadcast from any of the news stations, and try to type a summary of it as the newscaster speaks. Then imagine what it is like to translate, especially with Japanese, where the verb comes at the end, and you can understand that I became a very fast, but inaccurate, typist in summarizing these items. The editor would come and look at the summary I had prepared and pick out whatever was an important item. Many of these items were repeated just as they are here, over and over again, in the various languages, so he would just pick out the most important new items.

You are all professors—there are very few students here. What I always tell students is not to give up when the Japanese language becomes very difficult. What I want to tell you is that though I had lived in Japan for ten years and had really great fluency in everyday conversation, the first time I listened to a shortwave broadcast in Japanese I did not understand a single word. This is really true. I didn't know *bungotai* and I didn't know any war terms. Naturally, at the age of fifteen, I never spoke with my friends about battleships or submarines or anything of the kind. That vocabulary was completely new to me. And so I didn't understand a single word and was terribly embarrassed, thinking how can you live in a country for ten years and then hear a broadcast and not understand anything? But this is how it is. You've got to know that kind of language, radio language. So I sat down with the *San Francisco Chronicle* and made myself a list of all the war terms and then tried to get a dictionary. Well, the army and navy had bought up every single Japanese dictionary in San Francisco; there were none available. I was going out at that time with a navy officer who was studying at the Navy School. He had a dictionary, but it was only a character dictionary. It had a Russian cover—it was English/Japanese but it had a Russian cover. It was a character dictionary so it didn't do me any good. But I had a friend who had been a student of my father, a pianist, in San Francisco, who was from Harbin and had a Russian/Chinese/Japanese dictionary. So we would sit down together and take the English terms, translate them into Russian, and then look them up in this dictionary. And this is how I made these lists of Japanese and English war terms.

I studied day and night. The man who was the head of the listening post at that time was a very interesting man whom some of you may have heard about, Christopher Rand. He used to write "Letters from Hong Kong," for *The New Yorker*. He was a wonderful man who kept saying to me "Oh, Beate, it's just that you're not used to the static on shortwave radio." I kept wanting to say to him (but I didn't), "No, it's not shortwave. No, it's not static. It's I don't know the words." But I did learn them gradually. For two weeks I tried every day to go and practice at the listening post, and then the miracle

happened. I was practicing and I heard that a Japanese submarine was approaching San Francisco. Christopher Rand came over, looked at my summary, and said, "Are you sure that is correct?" Having learned *sensuikan* the day before, I knew it was correct. It was a submarine. I said, "Yes, I'm absolutely sure." And he said, "Would you check it," because we had a dictaphone on which the whole broadcast was recorded, so we could find the item on the dictaphone roll and then translate verbatim, which I did. The other listening post in Portland, Oregon, which was manned by *nisei* who had had to leave California, had missed this item. It was just one of those strange things, that this post, the backup for the listening post in San Francisco, had missed the item. Because this was the only reference to a submarine approaching San Francisco, I was hired on the spot.

It took me another two or three months until I really became proficient. After that I was quite good, especially because I did the translating in so many different languages with the same items appearing over and over again. At one point when the Portuguese interpreter was ill, I was even asked to do Portuguese. I said, "I don't know Portuguese. I couldn't possibly do that." And they said, "Well, you know Spanish, so you can do the Portuguese." I protested, "Well, I have never even heard Portuguese." But they said, "Look, it's very important tonight. It's a broadcast that is beamed to Brazil—whatever, you've got to do it." So I put on my earphones and I listened to the Portuguese and I could understand it very well. I did a very, very good summary, and when it was all over, the editor said, "But you said you didn't know Portuguese." I said, "I don't know Portuguese." The editor told me, "But you did better than the usual, real Portuguese translator." And do you know what it was? The Japanese announcer who spoke Portuguese had such a strong Japanese accent that to me it sounded like Spanish, but the real Portuguese translator couldn't understand it. When I finally left the FCC's FBIS (Foreign Broadcast Information Service) to go to the Office of War Information (OWI)—at that time you had to get permission, you couldn't just leave a war job without getting permission—the editor said, "But, oh, what a loss, you know Portuguese."

So I left and I worked for the Office of War Information where I first translated English news broadcasts into Japanese. We only had Koreans who did the broadcasting because the *nisei* were gone, and the Koreans refused to read *romaji*. I did my translations into *romaji*, and they refused to read them. I really didn't know many *kanji*, maybe five, six hundred, but now I had to learn *kanji* every night in order to be able to translate these broadcasts for the Koreans to read. I was given a show of my own, which was to be a counterpart to Tokyo Rose's. I did not voice it because my superiors were afraid my parents would be harmed if the Japanese recognized my voice. So I wrote the show and it was voiced from Portland, Oregon by the *nisei*. This was a nostalgia show; it was not quite like Tokyo Rose's. I mean, hers were broadcast to

the battlefields to make American soldiers surrender. Well, we didn't think that there were many Japanese soldiers who had shortwave radios, so ours was more for the mainland. It was a nostalgia show to make the Japanese regret all the things they were missing by waging war: Western culture, music, dance, the theater they used to have. Before the war, the Japanese were very much on the cutting edge of culture; they wanted to hear the latest music by Stravinsky. There were more classical music records sold in Japan by Columbia Records than anywhere else in the world. This is prewar. And so I kept on writing such shows, and I added music to them; it went on for, I don't know, eight months, or something like that. I don't know if anyone ever heard these broadcasts (I think a lot of these things were from government to government), but it was very interesting for me to do. The experience prepared me for my future, when I became a producer for both the Japan Society and Asia Society, trying to introduce music, dance, and theater from Asia into the United States.

Anyway, having done this stint, I wanted very much to come to New York City, where I had relatives. I went and I got a job with *Time* magazine as a so-called "Japan expert" in the foreign news section, at that time headed by Whitaker Chambers. That was an experience—I could tell you about that sometime, but not tonight. After I had worked there for about six months, the war ended, and I wanted desperately to go back to Japan to see my parents. I really didn't want a job. I just wanted to go. But I was told that I couldn't go as a civilian because of the Army of Occupation—there were no civilians permitted. I was advised to get a job, so I went to Washington and spoke to the Foreign Economic Administration. Because I knew Japanese, and because I was an editorial researcher at the time, and had done work at the Office of War Information and the FCC, they hired me on the spot. I applied for my American passport; I had just become a citizen shortly before that. Under "occupation" I wrote what I was supposed to write, "research expert," because that's the title I was to have in Japan. The State Department made a mistake, however, and when I received my passport, under "occupation" it just said "expert."

So I went to Japan as the first civilian woman in the Occupation. I was twenty-two years old and arrived in Tokyo in December 1945. There was no billet for me because I was a civilian. There were only billets for civilian men and, of course, for the army. They put me in with the Women's Army Corps (WACS). The WACS were living in a billet with six beds in a room. They were all the secretaries of the important generals in the Occupation. They were very friendly and asked, "Is there anything you want?" And I said, "What do you mean 'want'?" "Well, do you want perfume? Do you want champagne? Do you want a radio?" And I said, "I don't know what you're talking about." They said, "Well, you know our generals have planes that go to Shanghai every weekend, and since Shanghai is an open port, there's nothing you can't get there. If you

want nylon stockings, or whatever you want, tell us and we'll get it for you." And that was my introduction into the Occupation of Japan.

I immediately went to find my parents. I didn't know whether they were still in Karuizawa or whether they had come back to Tokyo. I went to look for my house in Nogizaka and I found nothing. Even the surroundings had changed. Nogizaka had been a hill of a certain shape, but because of the bombing it was different. The Japanese driver of my Jeep kept on going around and around and finally we found a place that looked as if it had been the compound where my house had stood. We finally found it by asking some people. There was our house, a European-style house, and all that was left was one stone pillar. The rest was rubble. There were no neighbors either, so I asked the driver to go further on to Mrs. Netke's house. I asked her and she said, "I don't know, but they probably went to Karuizawa." So I went back to my billet, and, of course, there was nothing there, not even a phone because this was a WACS billet. So I went to the Dai Ichi Building where the officers were staying. There were two officers in the lobby to whom I spoke: "I'm looking for my parents." When I mentioned my father's name, the woman who was at the reception desk asked, "Did you say Leo Sirota?" I said, "Yes." She came up to me and said, "I heard him yesterday on the radio." So I said, "Really? You heard my father?" She told me it was on JOAK. I immediately called the radio station, and they said, "Yes, your father played here yesterday." I asked them, "Do you know where he is now?" They said, "Yes, he lives in Karuizawa, and he left this morning." So I immediately sent a telegram to Karuizawa. When they received the *denpo* at the house, the maid rushed over to the train station. My father, who had just come from Tokyo on the train, saw the telegram and left on the next train back to Tokyo to see me. Well, it was a very traumatic experience because my father had changed so much. He had suffered from malnutrition, he was thin, and he had rills in his face. My mother couldn't come because she, too, was suffering from malnutrition in another way—her body had blown up, and she was in bed. My father said, "You've got to come to Karuizawa."

And so I went to Karuizawa with him. I had never been in Karuizawa in the winter. No one went to Karuizawa in the winter. When I was a child, we went there in the summer to enjoy the cool weather and to play tennis and go swimming. I had wonderful memories of Karuizawa. But winter in Karuizawa was impossible. The houses were not winterized. There was one potbellied stove downstairs in the living room and my parents hadn't been able to get coal. My mother put many futon on me when I went to bed the night I arrived, but I wore my slacks, my sweaters, and my coat, and still I was cold. In the morning, when I woke up, my mother said: "You know, during the winter if I left an egg on the kitchen table, the next morning it was ice, and you could

throw it on the floor and it wouldn't break. And when the water pipes broke in the kitchen, the next day you could skate on the floor; it was all ice." So I got an inkling of what it was like to live there during the war, without much food—on Japanese rations. It was very difficult.

I went back to Tokyo because I had to start work. I had been assigned to the Government Section in General Headquarters (GHQ), in the Dai Ichi Building. I was assigned to the Political Affairs Division with two others: Colonel Roest, my boss, and Professor Wildes, who had at one time taught at Keio. They were very much impressed because I spoke Japanese so well. The first assignment they gave me was to do research on women in politics and minor political parties. There were many minor political parties at that time. Five people would get together and form a political party. And since the Occupation had to know what was going on, I had to do research on all of them. There were literally hundreds of such parties, and so I worked day and night.

After I had worked in the Government Section for only a month, on February 4, General Whitney, MacArthur's closest advisor, called us to a meeting. He was at the head of the Government Section. It was 10 A.M. I remember it well. The conference room was not big enough for all of us to have seats. Some had to stand. He said to us, "You are now a constitutional assembly, and by order of General MacArthur you will write a draft of the new Japanese constitution. General MacArthur is not satisfied with the many drafts Minister Matsumoto has presented in the name of the Japanese government, and he wants a democratic constitution to be written. He does not think that after all the drafts he has received from the Japanese government that there is any hope of getting an acceptable one from them directly, and so you shall write it and you shall write it in one week." Well, you can imagine, we were pretty stunned, but when you're in the army and you get an order, you do it no matter what. We left the conference room, and Colonel Kades, the deputy chief of staff, came up to my section and said, "You three will write the civil rights chapter." The three of us sat down and looked at each other, and Colonel Roest said to me, "Well, you're a woman. Why don't you write the women's rights?" I said "Oh, yes, wonderful, but I would also like to write about academic freedom." And he said, "All right. You go ahead. You do that and we'll do the rest."

Having been quite well trained by *Time* magazine in research, I thought, "How am I going to write a draft without any samples? I'm not a lawyer. I went to college and I know a little bit about the American constitution, but that's not enough." So I got myself a Jeep and a driver, a Japanese driver, and I said, "Take me to whatever libraries are still standing in Tokyo." I wanted to go to the various libraries and get some constitutions as samples. But I didn't want to go to only one because this work was top secret. I was sworn to secrecy. If

I went to one library and asked for ten constitutions, they would wonder what is this person from GHQ doing here asking for all these constitutions? So, I went to the three or four libraries still in existence, and I got ten or twelve constitutions, which I brought back to the Government Section. I became very popular after that, because everyone else working on the other parts of the constitution wanted to borrow them.

As I studied these constitutions very, very thoroughly, I found that in the European constitutions there was a great deal written about women's rights, not only basic rights and equality with men but also social welfare rights. Thinking back to my own experience in Japan, seeing the Japanese woman who really did not have a single right and was a chattel of her husband and her family, I thought, "I've got to cram as many rights as possible into my draft. Get everything in there so the bureaucrats who later on will write the civil code, the *minpo*, will have to give them ample rights. Not just the basic rights, but also social welfare rights." In my opinion—I had had some experience with Japanese bureaucrats—those men would not interpret the constitution in a liberal way. Therefore, I wanted to include a detailed list of fundamental rights so that no mistakes would be made. And so, in the first draft I wrote, I not only said that men and women should have equal rights, but that women should have property rights, inheritance rights, rights of domicile; all these basic rights. I specified equal rights for women and men in terms of marriage and divorce. I emphasized this with the phrases "not under male domination," "not under coercion from parents." Unfortunately, these words were taken out afterwards, but I had them in the original draft, and the reason was to emphasize fundamental equality.

I also included many social welfare rights. For example, adoption was to be decided upon by both husband and wife. Often at that time, as you know, a husband would adopt the son of one of his concubines and then make that boy the heir if the family had only daughters. This male child would then inherit everything, and the daughters had nothing. I had all these details in my draft. And interestingly enough, because you have to remember this is a long time ago when American men were not that liberal either, my boss, Colonel Roest, and my colleague Dr. Wildes absolutely approved of what I had written. Colonel Roest approved, I think, because he had traveled widely and was married to a WAC (which was unusual at that time) who was also working in the Occupation in the Civil Information and Education Department.

Our committee was asked to met with the Steering Committee—all men, all lawyers, all over forty. Colonel Kades, Colonel Rowell, and Commander Hussey walked in, and we started talking about women's rights. They said, "Fundamentally we are in agreement, and certainly the basic rights we have no quarrel with. But the social welfare rights don't belong in a constitu-

tion. They belong in the civil code." I gave my little speech about the bureaucrats who were going to write the civil code. I felt these rights had to be in the constitution, that it certainly was appropriate in a constitution because many of the European constitutions had them. Then they said, "The American constitution doesn't." And I said, "The American constitution doesn't even mention the word 'women.' Of course they don't have anything about that in there." I argued and argued, and finally I was so emotionally involved that to my great embarrassment I burst into tears. Colonel Kades claimed that I cried on his shoulder. I don't remember that. I remember crying, but not on his shoulder. He kept on assuring me and assuring me not to worry, that these rights would eventually be in the civil code, that the Occupation forces would be there for a long time and would see to it that the social welfare rights would be included in the civil code. Let me just tell you, when I go back to Japan these days—and I've gone back for the last three years for lecture tours—every woman I meet says, "I wish your rights were in the constitution because we haven't gotten the social welfare rights. All these years and we're still fighting. For ten years we've been trying to get a clause about the rights of illegitimate children into the civil code; it is just now coming into the courts." It took them *ten* years for the issue to come to the courts. They say that if it had been in the constitution fifty years ago, it would have been much easier. Of course the other social welfare rights are far from becoming law as yet.

In any case, this is what happened. I had written something like ten or twelve different articles and of those actually only one remained. It did stipulate equality of the sexes, the same rights to men and women, property rights, inheritance rights, rights to divorce, and rights to a marriage of your own choosing. I had to be satisfied with that. When the Steering Committee prepared the draft for General MacArthur, I thought our work was finished. We had worked for a whole week, day and night, and it was finished. But then a month later, Colonel Kades called me on March 4 around nine o'clock in the morning. He said, "I want you to come to the meeting with the Japanese government. This is the last meeting we will have in which we will decide what goes into the new constitution, but we have to have the Japanese government agree to what we have written. And we want you there, not as a drafter of the women's rights but as an interpreter. You are a very fast interpreter, and although we have very good interpreters under Lieutenant Joseph Gordon, you are to help out." I said "Fine." Colonel Kades added, "Of course this is top secret."

We started at ten o'clock and we all thought it wouldn't take very much time, because, after all, the constitution had been discussed already in general by the Japanese government and the Steering Committee. Well, just the clause on the emperor took hours. Every word was weighed. The Japanese

wanted this word for sovereign, and we wanted another word; they were trying to strengthen the emperor's power, we were trying to weaken it. And we noticed that the draft they were working from was not a translation of the draft we had written. They had, at the last minute, brought another draft they had written in Japanese, and there was no English translation of that, so the team of interpreters and I had to translate the Japanese draft into English for Colonel Kades and the rest of the Americans there. You can imagine being under this kind of pressure, the going back and forth. Colonel Kades said, "Well, this is impossible," because they had again brought in a draft that was undemocratic. I noticed that Shirasu Jiro, who was a Central Liaison Office official, took something out of his pocket and put it on the table right next to me and near Lieutenant Gordon. I didn't know what it was and didn't really look at it, I was too busy. But a few minutes later Lieutenant Gordon noticed it—here was an exact translation into Japanese of our draft. Having discovered that, he immediately showed it to Colonel Kades, and Colonel Kades said, "Let's work from this draft, not from the draft you brought today." This, of course, made the job of the interpreters much easier. However, the arguments went on. I was a very fast interpreter at that time, so I interpreted for both sides, not just for the American side but also for the Japanese, who had their own interpreters, but they were not as fast as I. In spite of all of this it went on and on and on.

We had started at ten o'clock in the morning. We could not leave the room and we were sworn to secrecy. We ate in the room, and we got C rations and K rations—you all know what that is, not very delicious—and a lot of coffee of course, and everybody was smoking. At 2 A.M. the next day we came to women's rights, and it was as violent as when we were arguing about the emperor. The Japanese were so against women's rights. Colonel Kades, who was psychologically very attuned to people—I've never seen anyone who could handle people the way he did—had noticed that the Japanese had very good feelings towards me because I was helping with the interpreting. They didn't know that I had drafted this particular part. Colonel Kades didn't want a lot of argument for another two or three hours, so he said, "Miss Sirota has her heart set on the women's rights. Why don't we pass them?" I don't know why—either they were so stunned that he had said this, or whatever, but they passed them. Now, one could say that this is the way history is made, but, of course, in the end, since this was an occupation, they would have had to pass them, though maybe in a more watered-down version. This way they were passed more or less intact, which, of course, made me very happy. Colonel Kades says he remembers saying more about me at that meeting. I only remember that one sentence. He apparently told them that I had lived in Japan for a long time, that I had written that particular draft, that surely I would only

want the best for Japanese women, and that they should agree to it. I don't remember that. I think I was much too excited and too tired at 2 A.M. after having interpreted from 10 A.M. the previous day.

Well, we went on to the next chapter, which again took a long time, and we were finished at ten o'clock the next morning. For twenty-four hours I had interpreted; Lieutenant Gordon and his team stayed on until, I think, six the next evening. They could not leave because little—not little, important but small—word changes had to be made, and that took many, many more hours. I always say many things were born through this new constitution; one thing that was born from this was that Joe Gordon and I got married a little while later!

So, this was March 4, and then, curiously, Prime Minister Yoshida sent a gift to all of us who had worked on the constitution. It was a silver saké cup with the golden chrysanthemum emblem of the emperor on it. On the other side it said "Commemoration of the Japanese Constitution." I thought that it was very curious that the imperial emblem should be on this gift commemorating the new democratic constitution. A few weeks later, I received a bolt of silk, white silk, *babutai*, the best silk in Japan. This particular one was from the Imperial Household Agency. I thought, "What am I going to do with this?" And I again thought, "Why is it the imperial part of the Japanese government that is sending these gifts out?" I wondered, "Well, what do I do with the silk? I will do something with it so that it will disappear quickly." And so I had blouses made of the silk. But this silk was so good that it lasted for years, and every time I wore these blouses I was reminded that this was imperial silk, not from the Diet.

Anyway, this ended my work on the Japanese constitution. I went back to work on political parties and the political purge and on the economic purge. I stayed in Japan until 1947, when I returned to the United States. Then I got married, and very curiously I went into a completely different career; I became the director of performing arts for the Japan Society and later for the Asia Society. For forty years I worked as a producer of Asian performing arts, trying to introduce the performing arts of Asia to Americans for better understanding of Asia through the arts. When I retired it was just before the commemoration of the fiftieth year since the end of the war and of the promulgation of the constitution. And, suddenly, I was back fifty years and starting again to be invited to Japan, not for my forty years of work on cultural exchange, but for one week when I worked on the Japanese constitution.

Connecting with the Professional World

Japanese Economic Studies: From Marginal to Mainstream

Hugh Patrick

First of all, I want to say how glad I am to be here and to participate in the celebration of the fiftieth anniversary of the Center for Japanese Studies. This has unleashed tremendous nostalgia, reinforced by the opportunity to see so many friends from over the years. I recall vividly our 1954 entering class in the Center, which included Jim Crowley, Miles McElrath, Harumi Befu, George Steitz, and Morse Saito among others. We were eager to learn, and eager to challenge and catch out possible errors in the accepted wisdom of our teachers, led by the three sharp young assistant professors Dick Beardsley, Jack Hall, and Bob Ward. For me, this gathering has a special resonance since Jack Hall passed away so recently. He was my mentor at Michigan and at Yale for many years, and friend always.

But not only nostalgia brings me back to Michigan; it is also my profession as an economist. Before being invited to this symposium, as it happened I had accepted the invitation from E. Han Kim and David Weinstein to participate in their Symposium on Global Financial Markets being held at the Michigan business school this afternoon. And I must confess that my forward-looking professional interests will dominate my nostalgia these next two days.

The title of this presentation catches the essence of what I have to say. I want to touch upon five interrelated themes:

1. The development of Japanese economic studies as a field in American academe
2. The development of key scholars and key projects building the field
3. The increasing and more complex interaction among U.S.-based and Japan-based economists
4. The increasing importance and complexity of the field, which have attracted a number of outstanding American economists who are not specialists on the Japanese economy

5. A very brief noting of the evolving research agenda and themes over the past fifty years

But first, a personal note. Once I decided to get a master's degree in Japanese studies, I looked for a university with an excellent Japan program and a faculty advisor dealing with the Japanese economy. When I looked, I found *no* specialists on the Japanese economy teaching in any major university program. Michigan had Charles Remer—my *sensei* in the very best sense—a China economy specialist who taught a course on East Asian economies, one-half on Japan and one-half on China.

At Michigan, I got turned onto economics, especially by Gardner Ackley, Richard Musgrave, and Wolfgang Stolper, all major players in the economics department and the economics profession. So I decided to do a Ph.D. in economics and went to Japan—Hitotsubashi University and the Bank of Japan—to do my dissertation research.

Being in Japan was a huge intellectual shock; the Japanese economy seemed to be the exact opposite of the textbook economics I had been learning: a balanced government budget, money supply growing 15 to 20 percent per year but little inflation, large firms guaranteeing lifetime employment, and so on. I soon recognized that the Japanese were just as rational, competitive, and interested in trying to maximize their self-interests as Americans, so culture—whatever that means—did not seem like a very good explanation.

Then how does one account for the many economic institutions created in the 1950s and 1960s, such as the industrial relations system, the main bank system, and the various forms of *keiretsu*? Over time, and related to many of my research activities, I came to realize those institutions were rational responses to the requirements and the opportunities of the times. Most of the differences between the American economy and the Japanese economy have reflected institutional and policy developments that were conditional upon Japan's evolution from a follower, or developing country, to a major economic power, and the rapidity of that growth process.

In the 1950s, there were very few of us specializing on the Japanese economy. William Lockwood's book, *The Economic Development of Japan*, was seminal. In his own, rather reserved way, Bill played the major leadership role in the early years. He organized panels at the Association for Asian Studies (AAS), and in 1963 brought together for the first time the economists in America working on Japan, in a conference leading to the economics volume in the *Modernization of Japan* series. We economists had an advantage. Simon Kuznets had defined for us that economic modernization means the application of science and technology to the production system, epitomized by the modern factory. The paper writers from the U.S. were Bill Lockwood, Martin

Bronfenbrenner, Solomon Levine, Jim Nakamura, Harry Oshima, Henry Rosovsky, and myself; Jerry Cohen and Leon Hollerman were discussants.

The development of the field in many respects is reflected in our group as well as in individual behavior. In 1966, Henry Rosovsky at Harvard, Jim Nakamura at Columbia, and I—then at Yale—established the Japan Economic Seminar, an East Coast interuniversity group that meets regularly on a Saturday afternoon to discuss draft papers on the Japanese economy circulated in advance, followed by drinks and dinners in an informal process of bonding and information exchange. Some thirty-one years later the Japan Economic Seminar continues to be very active, and virtually every specialist on the Japanese economy ever on the East Coast has participated, including my fellow economist panel members here.

Perhaps the most important activities furthering the development of the field have been a series of projects and conferences on a wide range of aspects of the Japanese economy. These include, among others, the multiauthored Brookings study, titled *Asia's New Giant: How the Japanese Economy Works*, published in 1976; the series of studies led by economists under the sponsorship of the Joint Committee of Japanese Studies administered by the Social Science Research Council (SSRC); studies sponsored by the Committee on Japanese Economic Studies, chaired by Gary Saxonhouse, a group that has also provided matching funds prior to field research for Ph.D. students specializing on the Japanese economy; and a very ambitious and comprehensive collaboration by American and Japanese social science scholars of Japan under the auspices of the Japan Political Economy Research Committee (JPERC), which resulted in the thirty-six chapters published in the three-volume series, *The Political Economy of Japan*.

Over time, a relatively small number of American specialists on the Japanese economy have been trained and have entered academe. Others joined governmental or private research institutions such as the World Bank, the Federal Reserve System, the International Monetary Fund (IMF), the Brookings Institution, RAND, and the Japan Economic Institute. A number of Japanese have earned economics Ph.D.s in the U.S.; almost all returned to Japan with two early major exceptions: Kazuo Sato, now at Rutgers, and Koji Taira at the University of Illinois. In the last decade we have had two remarkable cases of senior Japanese scholars at major Japanese universities who resigned in order to accept major posts to teach about the Japanese economy in the U.S.: the theorists Koichi Hamada of Todai, now at Yale, and Masahiko Aoki of Kyoto, now at Stanford.

American specialists on the Japanese economy owe an immense debt to our counterparts in Japan. They accepted us in their universities when we did dissertation research, and we have benefited from their scholarly empirical

research on the Japanese economy, which has grown exponentially. The interaction between American and Japanese economists—theorists, area specialists, and field specialists—is deep and rich, far more so than in any other social science discipline. This has been reinforced by the number of major mainstream American economists, not Japan specialists, who have addressed a range of intellectual and policy issues involving the Japanese case. This has been in part because the Japanese economy itself was too large and important to be left to the still small band of specialists on the Japanese economy in the U.S.

Japan has become an important database and testing ground for a range of comparative analytical and theoretical approaches examining such concepts as repeat business, transaction costs, and the benefits (and now costs) of less-than-arm's-length contracts; the human capital training benefits of permanent employment; how to monitor corporate performance and behavior in interactions of very imperfect information; and so on.

Over time, the research agenda has evolved. Early postwar research concentrated on Japan as a historical case study in economic development, then as the first case of a rapidly growing postwar follower economy. Inevitably these interests led to analysis of government economic policies, such as macroeconomic management, trade and foreign investment policy, and industrial policy. As Japan in the early 1970s became what both economists and policy makers define as a big economy, in that its actions have a significant impact on other economies, and as a series of trade and other economic frictions developed and persisted, research interest focused increasingly on the nature, causes, and implications of Japan's global and bilateral balance of payments, trade structure, import barriers, the yen-dollar exchange rate, and, from the mid-1980s, Japan's dramatically increasing global creditor position and the foreign direct investment of its companies. One major policy issue has been whether Japan is an outlier, necessitating a special set of trade policies. In case you don't know, the answer is no.

Many other issues are being addressed, far more than I can even mention in this brief presentation. Let me simply note a few key issues in addition to those I have already mentioned: saving behavior; competition policy; the evolving nature and role of the large Japanese corporation, its production system, its corporate strategy, and its financing; the nature and operation of labor markets; and, now, the effects and implications of profound demographic change.

The study of the Japanese economy is now fully in the mainstream of the U.S. economics profession. It well integrates American-based specialists, American-based non-Japanese economists, and economists in Japan who interact extensively and effectively with their American counterparts. One sign of this integration lies in Japan. The major Japanese economics professional journal

Riron keizai gakkai a few years ago renamed itself the *Japan Economic Review* and is published entirely in English.

NOTE

This is a substantially abridged version of my paper "The Development of Studies of the Japanese Economy in the United States: A Personal Odyssey," published in *Finance, Governance and Competitiveness in Japan*, edited by Masahiko Aoki and Gary Saxonhouse (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000).

Japanese Economic Studies: A European Perspective

Jennifer Corbett

I want to talk today about what is happening in European Japanese studies and to introduce to you the fairly remarkable development that has been going on, which may not be well known to some in the United States. As you might expect, the field has been generally lagging behind the United States, but my guess is that there is a lot going on that is not known outside Europe. Many old universities in Europe, including Oxford, have in fact been teaching Japanese language since well before the Second World War.

Beginning with the United Kingdom, in the 1980s there were four centers teaching Japanese studies at the undergraduate level in Britain. A 1993 study carried out by the U.K. Japan 2000 group showed that by that date there were already twenty-seven institutions offering credits in Japanese toward degree courses. By 1996 a new review of Japanese studies in the U.K. by the Japan Foundation and the Daiwa Anglo Japanese Foundation showed that there were forty-two institutions offering such credits, that is, 74 percent growth. Of these, seven institutions were offering dedicated Japanese studies degrees, in British terminology "single honors degrees." In 1996 nearly two hundred students graduated with Japanese as their main course of study or as a major in a combined degree program. Approximately 2,700 students are currently involved in courses that have Japanese as a component in the U.K.

At the graduate level in 1996, 127 students completed degree courses other than Ph.D. programs, up 140 percent from 1993. Four Ph.D.s were completed from Japanese studies centers, while seventy-eight are currently being supervised. Of those seventy-eight, 46 percent are at Oxford University.

We don't have subject breakdowns within these figures so I can't tell you very much about economic studies, but from the Japan Foundation 1996–97 survey it appears that nine universities offer combined Japanese and economics degrees. Another twelve offer Japanese language as an option with all

degree courses, thereby allowing students to combine Japanese with economics. A further eleven institutions offer Japanese and business studies degrees.

The Japan Foundation is just completing a Europe-wide survey of Japanese studies programs and of Japanese studies researchers and university faculty. At the moment we don't know how many institutions in total are offering Japanese studies in Europe, nor what the economics breakdown would be, although we hope to have that information quite soon. However, a 1992 study of economics and Japanese studies in France provided a remarkable profile. That survey showed that sixty researchers within France were working regularly on the Japanese economy. Roughly half of them had Japanese language ability. Between 1981 and 1991, five hundred articles were published in French economic journals with some reference to the Japanese economy. About one hundred had Japan as the main theme, although 50 percent of these are translations of other works, including work published by the Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD). Between 1988 and 1991, fifty-eight doctoral thesis topics were registered in French universities with Japanese economics and business in the title. This suggests that there is a very large body of work, both teaching and research, being carried out in non-English-speaking European countries. My guess is that a very large part of this work is unknown to most researchers and teachers in the English-speaking countries.

Finally I'd like to introduce the work of the European Network on the Japanese Economy. This is a network that I helped to set up in conjunction with the Centre for Economic Policy Research in London in 1992. This year we are holding the fifth annual conference of that network, and the mailing list for the initial call for papers numbered one hundred economists. The members of the European Network are Europe-based economists who publish predominantly on Japan or who do significant comparative work that includes Japan; they now cover the majority of continental European countries. The purpose of the European Network was partly to bring together European researchers who have in the past not had opportunities to meet other researchers on Japan since in each country the numbers are small, but it was also to help to develop a European view of research on the Japanese economy.

Let me set out what I think a European view consists of and the way in which it differs from an American view. First, there is a view that there are several models of capitalist economic development, not just the Anglo-U.S. model. This view is borne out of observing the range of models that exist in Europe and does allow a broader and more nuanced view of what is different about Japan. It is true that the process of European integration has not yet solved the question of how to move economies with different systems closer together, but it is to be hoped that viewing Japan from a different perspective will make the apparent contrast between Japan and the United States less

threatening and tension producing. Second, the role of government within European economies varies considerably, and the European experience leads to the view that Japan does not look so extremely different. There are, in addition, several other respects in which Japan also looks much less extreme when compared with Europe. These cover areas such as financial patterns, bank relations, *keiretsu*-style corporate groupings, the importance of the political or old-school-tie networks, and labor markets. In the area of labor markets it would not be true to say that Europe and Japan are similar, but again the existence of a wide variety of systems of industrial relations and different degrees of flexibility of labor markets themselves does provide a richer range of comparison between Japan and Europe than is available when limiting the comparisons to Japan and the U.S.

I hope this brief tour of the development of Japanese studies generally and, in particular, of the development of Japanese economic studies in Europe provides you with a taste of what is going on, gives you the sense that the field is active and rapidly growing, and perhaps inclines you to some curiosity about improving academic contacts and finding out more about the research that is coming out of Europe.

Studying the Japanese Economy: Michigan Origins

Gary Saxonhouse

As I'm sure is true with all the other panelists, it's really a special pleasure to be here this morning and to see many old, old friends and mentors. I am particularly happy to share the platform this morning with three of the University of Michigan's most prominent alumni whose research focuses on the Japanese economy. It's a particular pleasure for me since one of the three is my teacher and the other two are my students. I'm the odd one out here, the only one without a University of Michigan degree. Given my colleagues on the panel here this morning and on the basis of other information I'm going to provide you, I'd like to claim for the University of Michigan the strongest and longest-lasting commitment to the study of the Japanese economy of any university outside of Japan. The modern era begins with University of Michigan alumnus Ambassador Philip Trezise (B.A., 1936, M.A., 1939), who had a very distinguished career in government and was a voice of reason in Washington on U.S.-Japanese economic relations for many years. Larry Krause, professor emeritus at the University of California at San Diego, and known to many here as a long-time Asia specialist, is also a graduate of the University of Michigan (B.A., 1951, M.A., 1952). We move on from Phil and Larry to the group assembled here on the platform. And today we still have many graduate students in the pipeline getting their Ph.D.s who are studying Japanese and making the study of the Japanese economy their primary intellectual commitment.

I do want to emphasize this morning that the study of the Japanese economy at the University of Michigan actually goes back much further than Phil Trezise. Indeed, I hope Tomi won't be offended when I say such study at Michigan goes back far before the founding of the Center for Japanese Studies. I want to remind you that today we're holding this wonderful symposium just a few short steps from the Clements Library. The Clements Library is really one of the architectural and cultural jewels of the University of Michigan, and it

contains the papers of Lewis Cass, who as a territorial governor was one of the founders of the University of Michigan. While founding the University of Michigan probably would have been enough to give Cass undying fame, at least in Ann Arbor, Cass had many other accomplishments in his long career as a public servant. After serving as Michigan's first governor, he went on to be a U.S. senator, secretary of war, and finally, as the capstone to a very distinguished career, as secretary of state. While secretary of state, it fell to Lewis Cass to provide the original instructions to Townsend Harris, the first American consul in Japan, who negotiated the treaty opening Japan to international trade for the first time in over 250 years. Records of these negotiations, parts of which are actually in the Clements Library, make fascinating reading. In many important respects, the negotiations that took place then could have taken place last month and not in the last century. Then as now, the American negotiators preached the virtues of free trade to the Japanese. Then as now, the Japanese in turn accepted the American arguments in principle, but feared that too rapid a change in traditional Japanese practices would result in social turmoil.

Without commenting on the merits of these arguments in the context of present U.S.- Japan trade disputes, in the mid-nineteenth century both the American negotiators and the Japanese negotiators were right. Opening up Japan to foreign trade brought great benefits, probably greater than the American negotiators had predicted. But it also brought just the turmoil that the Japanese negotiators had predicted. So much turmoil, in fact, that the Tokugawa regime, which had ruled Japan for centuries, was overthrown, and Japan's Meiji government, whose successors are still in power, was ushered in. I'm reminded of this episode by one of our recent graduate students in economics who bears the celebrated name of Iehiro Tokugawa. He is a direct descendant of the last shogun. His father is the head of the main branch of the Tokugawa family, and by his account, had it not been for the founder of the University of Michigan, Lewis Cass, and his Japan policy, instead of hoping for a career in an international agency on the strength of his master's degree in economics from the University of Michigan, he could expect to be the ruler of all Japan!

Within weeks of the overthrow of the old Tokugawa regime, young Japanese were eagerly going abroad to study in the hopes of helping to bring Japan into the modern world. One of these Japanese was a young samurai by the name of Masakazu Toyama, who had participated in one of the many battles that had resulted in the overthrow of the Tokugawa regime. As luck would have it, he found his way to Ann Arbor over 125 years ago. Toyama spent a decade in Ann Arbor, enrolling first in the old Ann Arbor High School, then located in what is now the Frieze Building, just across the street from today's Center for Japanese Studies. Upon leaving Ann Arbor High School, he entered the University of Michigan, where he was an outstanding student.

On returning to Japan, this first Japanese graduate of the University of Michigan became a founding member of the University of Tokyo, today Japan's premier university. He later served as president of the University of Tokyo, and in the 1890s served as minister of education. Toyama was more than an educational administrator, he was a man of letters. He translated Tennyson into Japanese and is still well known for his translation of *The Charge of the Light Brigade*. Perhaps still more important for us, upon returning to Tokyo from Ann Arbor he wrote an article in a popular Japanese journal describing a football game that he witnessed in Ann Arbor. Fittingly, what was probably the first article in Japanese on American football was written by an alumnus of the University of Michigan.

With his very successful experience at the University of Michigan in mind, Toyama encouraged many young Japanese to enroll here in the late nineteenth century. Among this group was another young samurai, Eijiro Ono. Unlike Toyama, who was fond of English literature, Ono had the wisdom and foresight to study economics. Indeed, after receiving his undergraduate degree, he continued to study, enrolling in graduate courses in economics here at Michigan, and finally receiving his Ph.D. in economics in 1889. Not only did Ono receive one of the first Ph.D.s ever granted by the University of Michigan's Department of Economics, his Ph.D. was the first Ph.D. ever received by any Japanese in any subject anywhere in the world.

Though it was one hundred years ago, young Ph.D.s acted then much as they do now, and Eijiro Ono rushed to publish his dissertation. Then as now, the best place for an economist to publish was the *American Economic Review*, and he had the main part of his dissertation, which was on the Japanese economy, published there. This was the first piece ever to appear in a scholarly journal in the West on the Japanese economy. I should point out that our keynote speaker this afternoon, Vice-Minister of Finance Eisuke Sakakibara, is also a Ph.D. graduate of the University of Michigan, and, like Eijiro Ono, he also published the main part of his dissertation in the *American Economic Review*.

With such a wonderful launching at the University of Michigan, it is small wonder that Eijiro Ono had a successful career. After a stint as a professor helping to found Doshisha University in Kyoto, he joined the Bank of Japan, Japan's central bank, and rose high in its ranks. Ono ended his career as president of the Industrial Bank of Japan, then as now one of the principal financial institutions in Japan. During his presidency at the Industrial Bank of Japan, Eijiro Ono emphasized the importance of banks developing long-term relationships with their customers. Students of the history of Japan's financial system date the first development of Japan's main bank system to the 1920s and to the practices of the Industrial Bank of Japan. Eijiro Ono studied money and banking at the University of Michigan, so perhaps with a bit of celebratory

stretching we can claim for the University of Michigan the role of intellectual forebear of this important Japanese financial institution.

Eijiro Ono died in the 1920s, but his descendants remain prominent throughout the world. Let me name just two. One is Hiroyuki Kase, a prominent conservative social critic in Japan. Some of you may be familiar with his proposals for restoring the mystery and aura that once surrounded Japan's imperial family. Kase would turn the clock back to 1868 and have the imperial family move back to Kyoto. (That would allow Iehiro Tokugawa and his family to reoccupy their old quarters in the center of Tokyo. Perhaps there really is a Michigan *batsu* in Japan after all.) The other descendant that I would like to mention is a social critic of a different sort who lives in New York. You may be interested to know that Yoko Ono, artist and widow of John Lennon, is a granddaughter of a University of Michigan Ph.D. in economics.

What a good point for me to be told my time is up. I will leave for another occasion a discussion of the preeminent role the University of Michigan has played in the development of Japanese economic studies in the United States in the 1970s, 1980s, and 1990s. Just seeing the group we have on stage here this morning may be enough evidence for the moment. Thank you.

Moderator's Comments

Yuzuru Takeshita

I am honored to be invited to participate in the fiftieth anniversary celebration of the founding of the Center for Japanese Studies. I would like to congratulate all those present and absent, old and young, who have contributed to the program's success over the half century of its illustrious existence and thank those who have organized this event, the current faculty and staff of the Center.

Yesterday we listened to many of our early predecessors, our *dai-senpai*, tell us how they came upon the study of Japanese and entered the Japanese studies program at Michigan in the late 1940s and early 1950s and what the program has meant for them in their professional lives since. As Arthur Klauser reminisced, fate, timing, and luck had much to do with how it all started. And, of course, the war in the Pacific was the fateful event that engulfed each one's life just as he or she came of age; and it wrought a great change in the direction each one's life took. Well, it was no exception for me, although from a different route.

Let me take a few minutes to talk about how I ended up at Michigan and my involvement with the Center for Japanese Studies, and comment briefly on how it affected the life of one Japanese American, a *kibei* at that, who spent the war years in an internment camp.

The immediate impetus went something like this. In 1950 I was applying to graduate schools to pursue my interest in sociology, an interest that had its origin in the camps, as I wanted to understand what it was about us Japanese Americans and the American society at large that caused such an injustice to be perpetrated. My first choice was the University of Washington in Seattle, as I wanted to study under George Lundberg, a leading research methodologist of the time. But every letter I received from them was addressed to Miss Yuzuru Takeshita. Even after I had corrected them several times, my admission

letter was so addressed. This was the early '50s and I was not liberated from the gender biases of the period. Just as I was feeling annoyed by this gender mix-up, I got a letter from my army buddy, George Kakiuchi, who was here studying geography. He urged me to come here because there was a Japanese studies program and an opportunity to go to Okayama to do field study. I immediately applied and was admitted to both the M.A. program in Japanese studies and sociology. I chose to stay in sociology but enrolled in the interdisciplinary seminar where I met some of the former language school graduates who returned to pursue graduate studies. I also worked for Mr. Okuno in the Japanese library and discovered the vast social science literature dealing with Japan. I also took advanced Japanese courses from Professors Shohara and Brower and was tested for my Ph.D. language in Japanese by Professor Yamagiwa.

In short, I did not come to the Center by way of the wartime language program. In fact, I was literally kicked out of the Military Language School in Monterey in 1946 in spite of the fact that I was told I had scored the highest on the entrance exam in the history of the school up to that time. What happened was that Colonel Thorpe, the commandant, learned that I was at Tule Lake, had answered "No, No" to the loyalty oath, and had also renounced my citizenship out of anger for the treatment we received. So back to the infantry I went.

What has the Center program meant for me professionally and personally? As a *kibei* who celebrated the Fall of Nanking in a village in Kyushu, not knowing what was happening in China at the hands of soldiers, many of whom I knew as nice people, and as one who later lost his closest childhood friend to a *kamikaze* pilot's death, I was a confused teenager, to put it mildly, when the war ended. The Japanese studies program, though I was involved in it only marginally, provided me the opportunity to look at Japan more objectively as a topic of scholarly pursuit. The scholarly posture of Professors Ward, Hall, and Beardsley impressed me immensely. I needed to understand Japan as a way to understand myself as a person of Japanese descent, caught between my ancestral heritage and early education, and between my place of birth and country of citizenship, and caught up in a bloody war between the two.

I was awarded a Fulbright Fellowship in 1955 and was able to undertake my dissertation research in the Osaka area. The topic I chose for my study was the fertility and family planning status of an urban population, an idea I got from reading a book titled *The Scientific Study of Japan's Population* by Okazaki Ayanori, the director then of the Institute of Population Problems. I found the book in the Japanese library while working there. From that research, I was called on to help establish a population studies program in Taiwan and also help the Korean public health officials and scholars set up

experimental studies on how to promote family planning. At their request, I conducted my day-to-day work in Japanese. Subsequently, I helped the Malaysian government evaluate its population program and more recently worked in Nanjing and Shanghai to do studies on improving the quality of services to minimize their citizens' resorting to abortion.

The significance of my involvement in projects in these countries is that they were all places Japan had invaded or occupied during the first half of this century. Through my professional work, I was able to learn the history of Japanese militarism from the perspective of those who suffered under it.

Even though my work spread to places away from Japan, there was always a reference to Japan. Malaysia adopted a "Look East Policy" and wanted to learn how Japan developed the way it did. In my field of population planning, they wanted to know how the Japanese were able so quickly to bring down their fertility rate to below replacement level, and how they were able to improve their mortality rates. In China and Korea too, the same questions were asked. It gave me the impetus to continue studying the historical conditions of Japan that led to its rapid development especially after the war.

Now, I am back full circle to where I started. Recently, with financial assistance from the Center for Japanese Studies, a group of colleagues and I conducted a study of styles of coping with stress in a multicultural setting. We are currently completing a study of the Japanese who were interned during the war, focusing on how they have over the years coped with that traumatic event in their lives half a century ago.

I am grateful for the fate, timing, and luck that characterized my life through my affiliation with the Center for Japanese Studies since 1951. It's been a thoroughly satisfying journey for me.

Connecting with the Japanese Economy through Law

B. J. George, Jr.¹

INTRODUCTION

Although the title of this presentation was worked out during the planning stage for the conference, in a sense it amounts to an exercise of eisegesis and not one of exegesis.² During the 1980s and 1990s, focus on Japan's modern legal system has been, of course, motivated by concerns with international commercial and financial transactions and treaties. But to project such concerns backward in time to the 1950s is eisegesis, not exegesis.

In the mid-1950s, Japan's economy was still on the ropes. Although with the peace treaty of 1950 the United States had come to view Japan as an offshore depot area to serve the Korean conflict, Japan's time of economic wonder lay nearly two decades in the future. Accordingly, the primary focus of attention at the time was not law relating to the economy, including transnational financial and commercial transactions.

Instead, the fundamental issue in the 1950s was whether the new constitutional system of government, impelled by the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) in the principal form of the adoption of the Showa Constitution in 1946, in effect from 1947, could take root.³ Thus, the primary concerns were whether the Japanese judiciary could become a truly independent third branch of government as envisioned in the Constitution of Japan,⁴ whether the legal system would become an effective guarantor of the human and social rights set forth in the new constitution,⁵ and whether an independent legal profession would emerge capable of asserting violations of individual rights. It was evident at that stage that intensive education of legal educators and key members of the judiciary and procuracy was the key to achieving the intended constitutional goals, for they were the ones responsible for training the next generation of jurists. "Train the trainers," although prob-

ably not a catchphrase at that time, was the functional objective of public and private efforts beginning in the 1950s.

THE JAPANESE AMERICAN PROGRAM FOR COOPERATION IN LEGAL STUDIES

By 1955, a handful of American law schools had already begun to address the need to provide educational opportunities for Japanese academicians and government lawyers to study the American legal system. For example, Fujishima Akira, a young procurator, studied at the University of Michigan Law School on funds donated by American naval personnel who had befriended him in Japan.⁶ But the most significant development was the creation of the Japanese American Program for Cooperation in Legal Studies, funded by the Ford Foundation. Leadership in developing the program was provided by then-Associate Dean David F. Cavers of Harvard Law School.⁷ Dean Cavers obtained substantial funding commitments from the Ford Foundation and the United States Educational Foundation in Japan (the Fulbright Commission) for a five-year legal exchange program.

The participating Japanese entities were the Supreme Court of Japan and its Legal Training and Research Institute, the Ministry of Justice of Japan through its Consolidated Research and Training Institute, and the law faculties of Chuo, Keio, Waseda, Kyoto, Tohoku and Tokyo Universities.⁸ The three participating American institutions were Harvard Law School, Stanford Law School, and the University of Michigan Law School. Without doubt, the University of Michigan Law School was selected because of its status as a major center for comparative law under the direction of Professor Hessel Yntema,⁹ as well as of international law under Professor William W. Bishop.

There were three subprograms within the umbrella program.¹⁰ Under the first, six assistant professors¹¹ and two judges¹² studied at Harvard for a year. At the end of that time, four members of the group came to Ann Arbor¹³ and three went to Stanford.¹⁴ Under the second, one faculty member from each of the participating American law schools spent the 1956–57 academic year in Japan.¹⁵ Some of the envisioned visits were postponed for personal reasons, but eventually each of the three participating American law schools provided at least one visiting professor at Japanese legal institutions. The third subprogram envisioned a three-year program of study in the United States for newly appointed Japanese assistant professors¹⁶ and an opportunity for one graduate student from each of the participating American law schools to study and conduct research in Japan.¹⁷

UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN LAW SCHOOL INVOLVEMENT IN JAPANESE STUDIES

As a member of the law faculty during the period 1952–68, I benefited from and participated in the original program. After the program ended, as envi-

sioned from the start, the Ford Foundation made a continuation grant to the University of Michigan Law School to enable more Japanese scholars, judges, and procurators to study and conduct research in Ann Arbor. At the same time, using funds from the William W. Cook Endowment, arrangements were made with the Ministry of Justice to enable a young public prosecutor to study in Ann Arbor for from one to two academic years. The latter program continues to this time, so that Michigan-trained public procurators form an identifiable cadre within the Ministry of Justice.¹⁸ I was also able to study the Japanese language during summers in Japan, and in 1962–63 spent a sabbatical year at Tokyo University and Chuo University faculties of law and the Legal Training and Research Institute. During a year in which several Japanese public procurators were concurrently in residence, the group completed a translation of the Preparatory Draft Penal Code of Japan.¹⁹ I was able to work on various translation projects as well.²⁰

As the new Center for Japanese Studies continued to establish its presence on the university campus, Professors John Whitney Hall and Richard K. Beardsley invited me to participate in the projected *Twelve Doors to Japan*,²¹ and thereafter in the survey seminars offered through the Center. Occasional seminars were developed at the law school by myself and visiting Japanese colleagues;²² invitations were extended to persons participating in Center programs to attend as auditors.

CONCLUSION

In hindsight, it is evident that the selection process by which Japanese participants were chosen for the Japanese American Program for Cooperation in Legal Studies ensured that only persons of great ability came to the United States. That is attested by the fact that, almost without exception, program participants including those who studied in Ann Arbor rose to positions of eminence in the academy,²³ procuracy,²⁴ and judiciary.²⁵ The ripple effect of their careers went far beyond that, however. The field of Anglo-American legal studies became quickly and firmly established as an important part of the curriculum at leading Japanese law faculties,²⁶ and since 1962 in a steady stream young scholars have come to the United States to experience firsthand American law and judicial administration. As a result, within each major Japanese law faculty there are highly qualified specialists in Anglo-American law, of equal stature with their colleagues who have studied French and German law in Europe.

The modern school of Anglo-American legal scholars has produced a very substantial body of publications in the field; many of them are notable for their pragmatic and sociological analyses of Japanese law and practice cognate to contemporary American jurisprudential developments. In contrast, the body

of specialists in Japanese law in the United States is much smaller than its counterpart body in Japan. Nevertheless, a substantial number of American academics have generated an ever-growing body of publications in English on Japanese legal topics, and offer each academic year comparative seminars to a small body of interested students. As a consequence, persons not conversant with the Japanese language can pursue competent research into a wide array of legal topics, using only English-language materials.

Returning to the original theme of eisegesis versus exegesis, the objective of *Nichibei hikaku kenkyū* in the 1950s was to provide a core body of experts in American constitutional and public law who could educate a new generation of Japanese jurists²⁷ about a constitution-based rule of law. That objective has been realized. For the most part, Japanese jurists view law as a pragmatic science. Judicial precedents constitute an important source of law in Japan, indeed, a controlling source in matters of constitutional interpretation. This constitutes a major change from pre-Pacific War Japan, in which judicial decisions were given relatively little weight, at least as a philosophical matter.

Moreover, in fifty years the system of government, including judicial administration, established through the Showa Constitution, has become the Japanese system as far as a strong majority of Japanese are concerned; it is well to keep in mind that many more than half of all living Japanese have been born since 1945. The constitutional rule of law, thus established, is firmly in place and will not be eliminated or significantly altered other than through the exceedingly unlikely event of insurrection or invasion. That, in turn, has made possible the eisegetical circumstance of connecting with the Japanese economy through law. That, however, is a creature of the 1970s and after, not of the 1950s.

NOTES

1. B. J. George is professor of law emeritus, New York Law School, and a retired elder in the United Methodist Church. He served on the University of Michigan law faculty from 1952 through 1968.
2. Simply put, exegesis is the process of drawing meaning, as far as possible, from the original text. See Douglas Stuart, "Exegesis," *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 2:682–88. Eisegesis, in contrast, is the process of reading one's own predilections into an inherited text. As an illustration, the New Testament book of Revelation, exegetically examined, is a pastoral letter to Christian communities in Asia Minor written late in the first century C.E. to benefit Christians undergoing or about to undergo religio-political persecution. Written in apocalyptic form (a "drawing back of the curtain" to reveal expected future happenings), it was designed to strengthen and encourage its recipients in the face of community repression. Eisegesis is manifested by those who peruse the book against the background of contemporary happenings, particularly in the Middle East, to determine the imminence of the *parousia*, the final judgmental arrival of God-in-Christ. See generally M. Eugene Boring, *Revelation* (Louisville, Ky.: John Knox, 1989), 1–30.

3. That it could, and did, is documented in the *Law and Contemporary Problems* symposium, *The Constitution of Japan—The Fifth Decade*, vol. 53, nos. 1 & 2 (Durham, N.C.: School of Law, Duke University, 1990), passim.
4. Japan Constitution, chapter VI, articles 76–82.
5. In particular, Japan Constitution, Articles 11 (fundamental human rights), 13 (right of individuals to life, liberty, and pursuit of happiness, to the extent it does not interfere with the public welfare), 14(1) (equality under the law, with no discrimination in political, economic, or social relations because of race, creed, sex, social status, or family origin), 16 (right of peaceful petition), 17 (right to sue for redress from the state or a public entity based on illegal conduct by a public official, under provisions of law), 18 (freedom from bondage or involuntary servitude except as punishment for crime), 19 (freedom of thought and conscience), 20 (freedom of religion), 21 (freedom of assembly and association; prohibition of censorship; inviolability of any means of communication), 22 (freedom to choose and change residence, and choice of occupation to the extent the latter does not interfere with the public welfare; freedom to move to another country and divest oneself of Japanese nationality), 23 (academic freedom), 24 (marriage to be based only on mutual consent with equal rights of spouses; property rights, etc., to be established through laws reflecting individual dignity and essential equality of sexes), 25 (right to maintain minimum standards of wholesome and cultured living; the state is to promote and extend social welfare, security, and public health), 26 (right to receive equal education; compulsory education to be free; those responsible for children must see the latter are educated), 27 (right and obligation to work; standards for wages, hours, rest, and working conditions to be fixed by law; children not to be exploited), 28 (right of workers to organize and to bargain and act collectively), 29 (right to own or hold property; property rights to be defined by law in conformity with public welfare; private property may be taken for public use upon payment of just compensation), 31 (“no person shall be deprived of life or liberty, nor any other criminal penalty be imposed, except according to procedures established by law”), 32 (no denial of right of access to the courts), 33 (arrest only pursuant to proper judicial order), 34 (arrested or detained persons to be informed immediately of the charges and given immediate privilege of counsel; to be detained only on adequate cause that, on demand, must be shown immediately in court in presence of detainee and counsel), 35 (protection against unlawful search and seizure), 36 (prohibition of torture and cruel punishments), 37 (right to speedy and public trial by impartial tribunal; full opportunity to examine witnesses; right of compulsory process to obtain defense witnesses at public expense; accused persons to enjoy right to counsel, at public expense if accused is financially unable), 38 (protection against compelled testimony; confessions made under compulsion, torture, or threat or after prolonged arrest or detention inadmissible in evidence; no conviction or punishment to be based solely on a confession), 39 (prohibition of criminality for an act lawful when done, or following an acquittal, or constituting a repeated prosecution for the same matter), 40 (right to sue the state seeking redress for unlawful arrest or detention, if later acquitted).
6. Fujishima rose in time to be the vice-minister of justice and then served several years as a justice of the Supreme Court of Japan. He is now retired and in private practice in Tokyo.
7. Dean Cavers was Fessenden Professor of Law at Harvard until his retirement.
8. The first three are eminent private universities; the others are leading national universities.
9. Professor Yntema was the founder and first editor-in-chief of *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, which was housed in Ann Arbor until 1978. The author and Professor Alfred Conard were the editors-in-chief following Professor Yntema's death and until the move of the *Journal* to the University of California at Berkeley.
10. A detailed historical account of the program may be found in David F. Cavers, “The Japanese American Program for Cooperation in Legal Studies,” in Arthur von Mehren, ed., *Law In Japan: The Legal Order In A Changing Society* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1963), xv–xxxviii.
11. Four were from Tokyo University (Hirano Ryuichi, Ishikawa Kichiemon, Ito Masami, Yazawa Makoto), one from Kyoto University (Michida Shinichiro), and one from Chuo University (Hashimoto Kiminobu).

12. Hattori Takaaki and Tanaka Kohji. A public procurator already studying at Harvard Law School under private sponsorship, Abe Haruo, was allowed to continue for a second year to provide Ministry of Justice participation.
13. Professors Hashimoto, Michida, and Yazawa and Judge Hattori. I served as adviser to foreign law students during their time at Michigan. Professor Michida later served as dean of the Kyoto law faculty and Japan's representative to UNCITRAL, and was a visiting professor at the law school. Judge Hattori eventually became chief justice of Japan. Professors Michida and Yazawa died far younger than one would have expected; one wonders if wartime deprivations shortened their eminent careers.
14. Professors Hirano and Ito and Judge Tanabe. Professor Hirano later was a visiting professor at the University of Michigan Law School, and was president of Tokyo University at the time of his retirement. Professor Ishikawa remained at Harvard for an additional year studying in the economics department and Graduate School of Business Administration. Procurator Haruo Abe returned to Japan, having completed his two years of study during the first year of the program.
15. Professor Arthur T. von Mehren of Harvard spent the year at Tokyo University, and I was at Kyoto University working with Professor Michida in a practitioners' seminar on criminal procedure and evidence and a graduate seminar covering many of the same areas. In June 1955, Dean E. Blythe Stason delegated to me the responsibility for an initial administrative visit to Japan to meet with officials of the participating Japanese entities. Within traditional Japanese values, undoubtedly it would have been better had a senior academic figure like Dean Stason himself represented the law school, but it proved an invaluable opportunity for me, making it my first visit to Japan. (My military experience during World War II was in the European Theater.)
16. Professors Nagahama Yoichi of Waseda University and Taira Ryo of Keio University spent two years in Ann Arbor and a third year at Stanford. Professors Kawamata Yoshiya of Kyoto University and Obuki Yoshito of Tohoku spent two years at Harvard and a final year in Ann Arbor. Professor Kobori Kensuke of Chuo University spent two years at Stanford and a third year at Michigan. Judge Tokikuni Yasuo studied at Harvard for two years and at Michigan for a final year.
17. Carl J. Bradshaw, an honors graduate of the University of Minnesota Law School, took an LL.M. degree at Michigan and went abroad under Michigan sponsorship to study law at Keio and serve as a legal intern at an American law office in Tokyo.
18. Indeed, within the Ministry they have been known as the "Michigan Mafia."
19. Published as *A Preparatory Draft of the Revised Penal Code of Japan, 1961*, vol. 8 of *The American Series of Foreign Penal Codes* (with Y. Suzuki) (London: Sweet & Maxwell; South Hackensack, N.J.: Fred B. Rothman Co., 1964).
20. See Shigemitsu Dando, *Japanese Law of Criminal Procedure*, trans. B. J. George (London: Sweet & Maxwell; South Hackensack, N.J.: Fred B. Rothman Co., 1965); Shigemitsu Dando, *The Criminal Law Of Japan: The General Part*, trans. B. J. George, (Littleton, Colo.: Fred B. Rothman Co., 1997); Shigemitsu Dando, *Basic Concepts in and Territorial Limits on the Applicability of the Penal Law of Japan*, trans. B. J. George, 9 N.Y.L. SCH. INT'L & COMP. L.J. 237-63 (1989); Hideo Fujiki, "Property and Criminal Law," trans. B. J. George, in *Law In Japan: An Annual*, vol. 2 (Tokyo: Japanese American Society for Legal Studies, 1968); Atsushi Nagashima, "Partial Revision of the Penal Code in Regard to Kidnapping for Ransom," trans. B. J. George, in *Law In Japan: An Annual*, vol. 1 (Tokyo: Japanese American Society for Legal Studies, 1967).
21. B. J. George, "Law in Modern Japan," in John Whitney Hall and Richard K. Beardsley, eds., *Twelve Doors To Japan* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., 1965), 485-536.
22. The visitors included Professors Dando Shigemitsu and Hirano Ryuichi of Tokyo University and public procurators Nagashima Atsushi and Suzuki Yoshio. Mr. Nagashima's accomplishments are noted in note 25 below. Mr. Suzuki retired after an eminent career in the Ministry of Justice, including service as chief public prosecutor in Kyoto; he currently serves on the faculty of Asia University.

23. All the young professors became outstanding scholars in their respective fields, several were elected by their colleagues to two-year deanships (the Japanese practice), and one became president of Tokyo University.
24. The group that later studied in Ann Arbor produced a vice-minister of justice, two procurator-generals, several superintending public procurators, heads of the Corrections Bureau and directors of the United Nations, Asia, and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFEI). Nagashima Atsushi, who was at Stanford during the life of the third subprogram and later served as a visitor at the University of Michigan Law School, was director of UNAFEI, and superintending prosecutor of the Nagoya High Public Procurator's Office; he later served as a justice of the Supreme Court of Japan.
25. At least four of the participants in the original program later became justices of the Supreme Court of Japan.
26. From the 1880s onward, there has always been at least one eminent faculty member on the Tokyo University faculty of law specializing in Anglo-American law. An illustrious figure in Anglo-American law studies during the 1930s, Professor Suyenobu Sanji of Todai, chaired the Japanese committee administering the Japanese-American Program.
27. A term derived from continental European law that includes practicing attorneys (*bengoshi*), judges, and lawyers within government and academics. A postwar phenomenon was the promotion of the principle of the integration or unification of all subcategories of the juristic world (*bōsōichigenron*). Because all who become judges, public procurators, and *bengoshi* have undergone the same program of professional training under the auspices of the Legal Research and Training Institute of the Supreme Court, the principle is probably much better established in Japan than its counterpart has been in the United States, where the responsibility for admission to law practice rests on individual states, resulting in little uniformity of experience at the formative level.

Connecting with the Professional World

Dan Fenno Henderson

It was Thorstein Veblen I think who said: "A law school has no more place in the university than a dancing school!" That is a rather jarring sentiment for us lawyers, but it does call attention to the very real problem professional schools often have in conversing with the rest of the university. Ironically, "area studies" too have had a considerable problem of "fit" in the university setting. So Japanese law may be seen to have a little of the awkwardness of both Japan and law in the American academy. I have found that to be true.

Before reflecting a bit on those weighty concerns, though, let me say what a delight it has been to be here again and hear the testimonials to Michigan's leadership in Japanese studies by its distinguished alums. Many of these "old soldiers" are my best friends, of course. So let me add my words of gratitude as well for the boost I got along my career path from Michigan. The total immersion and forced feeding methods of the Army Intensive Japanese Language School for the entire year of 1944 were as effective as they were sometimes rigorous and burdened by army routines.

We learned a lot of Japanese, and it stuck with me, and changed the direction of my life. Also, as an unexpected bonus from Michigan, I got a B.A. degree in oriental civilization in 1945 by mail. I well remember at the end of 1944 enclosing my prior Whitman College transcript of credits with my degree application to Michigan, as I was packing my G.I. duffel bags for the Military Intelligence Service Language School at Fort Snelling, Minnesota. I did the same for Whitman, enclosing my Michigan credits with a Whitman degree application. Several months later I received B.A. degrees from both by mail while I was on a Minnesota army bivouac. It was a big day I will not soon forget. At war's end, I was able to go directly to law school, rather than first going back to graduate from college. Somehow we all felt that we had fallen

behind in life when the war ended. So saving a year by my mail-order degree meant a lot then.

It was several years after Michigan before I found my way to Japanese law. That story has a personal side and a broader institutional side. I will tell those two stories separately.

On the personal side, I had long planned to be a lawyer and moved in that direction right after my army discharge (1947). Japan had been destroyed, and no one foresaw then that it might rise from the ashes to support specialists in U.S.-Japanese law. Not only conditions in Japan but conditions in law schools and in law firms were simply uncongenial to comparative law, especially to anything as exotic as Japanese law, until much later.

My first two years after the Japanese surrender (1945–47) were spent in Japan with the army, censoring press, radio, and movies for the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) (the unit: G-2, CIS, CCD, PPB). Because I could read the Japanese language, I was held over beyond my regular discharge date (September 1, 1946), and sent to head up Pictorial Press and Broadcast (PPB) censorship first in Tokyo (fall 1945), then in Sapporo (to fall 1946), and finally in Kumamoto (until February 1947). Then I came home and entered Harvard Law School, graduating June 1949.

It was not until I had passed the Washington bar exam (1949) and became associated with a Seattle law firm that Japanese law even crossed my mind as a possible specialty in practice. That happened when Japanese businessmen began to find their way to my office about 1950. NYK Shipping Line applied to send the first Japanese cargo ship to our West Coast, and my role in that and several other Japanese clients' affairs awakened my interest in Japanese law and Japanese legal practice. It was at that time that I made the career decision of my life. I resigned my position in Seattle and decided to study for a Japan law specialty. The rest of my legal career with Japan really unwound naturally from there, with of course a bit of serendipity now and then.

Japan and Japanese law as a career were at first risky because there was no scholarship funding for graduate students in 1950, except in the sciences, and my G.I. Bill had run out. Besides, just how U.S.-Japanese business relations would evolve from 1950 onward was anybody's guess, but I do recall that Professor Morgenthau of the University of Chicago and various allied spokesmen clearly envisioned an agrarian future for the vanquished. In short, I was "building on spec," and it was a rather lonely venture.

Deciding to quit my job and try to become competent in Japanese law was tough, but implementing my study plan was at first even tougher. I soon discovered that there was no way to study Japanese law in American law schools. Rather, with the encouragement of Bob Scalapino, Delmar Brown, and Hans Kelsen, I decided to study Japanese law within the framework of a Ph.D. in political science at Berkeley, partly because they would support me

with a job teaching American government and comparative government. Thus working full-time, it took me five years to finish my thesis: *Conciliation and Japanese Law: Tokugawa and Modern* (2 vols., University of Tokyo Press). In the interim I had also been admitted to the Japanese bar in Tokyo as a foreign member (*jun-kaiin*) in the spring of 1954.

My career after the Berkeley Ph.D. (1955) grew along with the Japanese Gross National Product (GNP), and happily at about the same annual rate, not that it was a “miracle,” but it did benefit from the so-called “Japan miracle.” In the early 1960s, when asked by the journal *Jurisuto* to write an essay about my experience with Japanese law, I remember calling it “Made in Japan,” for that reason. Also from Berkeley onward my work tended to straddle practice and academics, sometimes teaching, sometimes practicing, sometimes both. I left Berkeley in 1955 and joined a law firm, Graham and James, full-time in San Francisco and Tokyo (1955–62). From 1962 to 1991, I switched back to academics and served full-time as director of the Asian Law Program at the University of Washington, but I was able to maintain my practice in Tokyo through a firm I founded with two former Japanese students of mine and James Adachi. We called it Adachi Henderson Miyatake and Fujita (1973–91). Upon retiring from Washington (1991), I withdrew from the Tokyo practice and joined the firm of Graham and James/Riddell William, and also joined the faculty of the Hastings College of Law, University of California in San Francisco. Such was my lengthy experience connecting my Michigan language training with the legal profession.

But the central part of the story connecting Japan to the professions has several themes on a broader canvas that need to be sketched out. The improvement of our understanding of Japan as a nation through area studies was the start. Also important was the interdisciplinary expansion of the law curriculum to place law in its essential context; the expansion of comparative law to recognize non-European systems; and the integration of the world economy and society to produce a whole new body of “international economic law” that has transformed the law practiced in our cities and in turn moved comparative law into the law firms and law practice as well as into the mainstream of legal education. Immense changes in all of these areas have transformed both legal education and law practice as they relate to comparative law in general and Japanese law in particular.

I can comment on only a few highlights. First, the American law school, being both graduate and professional, is designed to turn out lawyers who can pass the bar exam administered outside the academy. This professional mission is often uncongenial with concerns that the social sciences and humanities have with law. But new courses have grown up to redress that problem in part and introduce interdisciplinary approaches. “Law and Society,” “Law and Literature,” and especially “Law and Economics” are gestures in that direction.

But the three-year graduate law school in this country is not only a global peculiarity (only Canada has anything similar), but it will remain somewhat alien to the legal interests of the rest of the university.

Second, comparative law has come a long way. It has become both more interdisciplinary and more useful in the professional practice of law. Not all law schools even offered comparative law in 1949 when I graduated. Those that did offered only a single course comparing the civil and common law systems; in other words, they were essentially broad systemic surveys of institutions. Now it is common to have several comparative (or foreign) law courses in the larger law schools, and it is generally recognized that the social context and institutional framework must be a part of the course. Nearly all schools offer transactions courses with comparative solutions to professional problems. This is a far cry from the old regime, which treated comparative law as a mere perspective course—that is, the lawyer having fun looking out the window! Also recognizing the many dimensions and demands of comparative law (two laws, two languages, and the rigors of comparative method itself), post-J.D. offerings are beginning to become a professional way to domesticate comparative law practice in depth, like U.S.-Japanese transactions.

To close I will say a word about the strategy used to introduce the first Japanese courses taught in an American law school in 1962 at the University of Washington. In a rather small law school such as Washington, my judgment as director was that the emphasis had to be on professional law, meaning transactional; the new courses had to deal with problems encountered in the practice by lawyers. For a while the risk was that there was not enough such practice then, and perhaps never would be, even to support one law school's Asian law program. Second, it was to be comparative; it had to compare U.S. and Japanese legal solutions to problems encountered by clients in the real world. Third, we soon came to the conclusion that it had to be a professional graduate degree in comparative law: an LL.M. in U.S.-Japanese legal transactions requiring at least a year devoted half-time to individual creative research on a thesis, and half-time to course work. But a feature of the course work was the six custom-made courses for the LL.M. program. We did not simply depend on the everyday, garden-variety J.D. courses, as was universal practice in master's degree programs elsewhere in American law schools at the time. The new courses were: U.S.-Japanese Litigation, U.S.-Japanese Contracts, U.S.-Japanese Corporate Relations, U.S.-Japanese Tax, U.S.-Japanese Administrative Law, and U.S.-Japanese Anti-trust Law.

Not all of the special courses were required of each candidate, but it was usual for a student to take at least four of them. The cases and materials were matched sets of U.S. and Japanese legal authorities (cases, statutes, code or treatises) concerning the same practical legal issues of everyday business. The Japanese materials were translated into English so we could teach in

English. But the admissions requirement was that students already be lawyers and already be bilingual. In later years, the classes had about twenty-five students annually, and, as it turned out, they were about one-third American, one-third Japanese, and one-third third-country students, mainly from Taiwan, Korea, People's Republic of China, or Indonesia, with an occasional student from Europe.

The LL.M. program was started in 1967 and has flourished with Japan's growth ever since. It had some risks at first, and some surprises, which is another story. The program has survived as a one-of-a-kind, professional, graduate program in practical comparative law in this country.

Japan Center as Campus Catalyst

Whitmore Gray

I come in a kind of special role, because I'm not a Japan specialist. Japan has been one of the countries I have focused on in a career that is more in line with Jim George's description of foreign law—the study of the law of various countries. Probably, unfortunately, I came to Japan later than I came to some other countries, and so for me the Center for Japanese Studies on the University of Michigan campus provided a very special resource. It was not where my principal intellectual support was. It was not an adjunct to my career as a graduate student. It was not part of the network of faculty dealing with my major field. Instead, by serving as a multidisciplinary resource on Japan, it was what really enabled me to add Japan in some way to a teaching career that was already busy doing other things.

Let me just go back with a personal note, as each of us on these panels has been talking about how we got interested in Japan and got our training about Japan. I first came to the University of Michigan from a small undergraduate school, Principia College, where I had made very good Japanese friends. My English teacher in my first year was a Japanese who had spent the war years in the United States and who was a wonderful English scholar. He eventually became editor of the Japanese edition of *Newsweek*. One of my best friends was Imai Ryukichi, who eventually went back and became Japanese ambassador to Mexico. There was also a whole group of people from the Matsukada family at Principia College. The wife of the dean of men was a Matsukada, another Matsukada became Mrs. Reischauer, another ran the Nishimachi School in Tokyo. We benefited from a Japanese presence without really thinking about it as Japanese; we thought of them as wonderful individuals. None of those people was able to tip me off to the fact that I should have been studying the Japanese language. So at the time I had won-

derful people I could have benefited from, but that really wasn't my focus. I was interested in European languages.

When I came to law school at Michigan, I sat at the feet of Jim George as a first-year student learning criminal law; neither Jim nor I was thinking very much about Japan at the time. In fact, my only exposure to Japanese studies and thinking about Japan came during my third year. Each year I tried to take some class outside the law school just to keep my brain going. In my third year, I took a first-year Chinese class with a wonderful Chinese woman, Shun Yao, and I had through her a view of Joe Yamagiwa, the chairman of the Asian Languages Department at the time. Departmental politics looked about as confrontational as the relations between Japan and China had been twenty years earlier. I saw that Joe was a formidable adversary—he kept moving Shun Yao from one small office to another, according to her. (When I came back, I just have to add, I got to know Joe and Mrs. Yamagiwa because they were our neighbors.) So I had that little bit of Chinese background, but again, I was just circling around Japan.

After I had some legal experience and had studied in Europe, I came back to teach. At that time I was very interested in the Far East, but mainly in China because I was teaching Soviet law and was a specialist who did translations in the Soviet law area. So I went to Hong Kong, studied Chinese, interviewed refugees, and, on my way back from Hong Kong, stopped in Japan and finally discovered Japan. For me, this was the great moment, and a kind of real turning point, because I found that I was unlike some of the other Americans, as Jim was describing, who had taken the European approach. I had studied both French and German law and I was teaching those areas. Yet my principal concern in the legal field was American commercial and contract law—topics that the Japanese were very interested in but preferred to learn about from somebody who appreciated the French and German civil law background that they had all studied. So they started asking me to come to do short courses in American commercial law. I found that Japan was a place of wonderful intellectual ferment for me, of interaction between Japanese systems and the American system.

Finally I decided I would make the commitment to add on top of my European and Chinese law teaching something about Japan. Fortunately for me, there was the Center for Japanese Studies. It was really a marvelous way for me to learn, in the most efficient way, both by listening to bag lunches from all kinds of people doing different things and by working with the CJS graduate students. One of our professors of Japanese very kindly gave me a little Japanese-language instruction, but I never had enough time to really work hard at it. My studies led to my going to Japan, first twice as a visiting professor at Kyodai and then several times, four times I think, at Todai. But all of that was sporadic; that is, after two or three years of being away from Japan,

I would go back. My sole continuity and link to Japan during that time was the Center for Japanese Studies. So for me it was a very important resource.

I had succeeded Jim George in taking care of the foreign graduate students at the University of Michigan, so I was also able to watch the role of the Japan Center as catalyst for those people—not because they needed an entrée into the Japan part of the Center, but because they often found a very hospitable reception among Americans who were interested in Japan. A few of them, unfortunately only a few of them I think, took full advantage of that, but that's because all Japanese students coming to the United States, even from the most distinguished universities, suddenly find they really have to work hard. They have had four wonderful years, let's say, studying at a university in Japan and enjoying themselves. Then they come to study in our law schools and find that they are up until 3 or 4 A.M. every day. So, I had to push pretty hard to get some of those people to go over to the Center to mix, but those who did benefited from it.

I also had my own American students who were interested in Japan, some of whom came out of the Japanese studies environment here. I see a distinguished practitioner, Bonnie Dixon, sitting out in the audience here; you'll get a chance to hear her perform later in the program, not in law, but in music. Watching Bonnie come into the law school and seeing that her roots still happily stayed within the Japanese studies program at the University of Michigan, which shaped her whole career as a practitioner in that field, was a real pleasure. I'm sitting here between two giants in the substantive Japanese law field from two different generations: Dan Henderson, who has just talked to us, and Mark Ramseyer. Both men started from the Japanese culture end and continued to their distinguished positions in the substantive Japanese law field. We also have Merit, who will talk about Japanese trade laws. It was wonderful for me to be on the fringes watching, and I hope I have been somewhat of a bridge between those serving on the executive committees for the Japan and China Centers at various times.

I want to go back, taking a cue from Gary Saxonhouse on the previous panel, to give you a little bit more perspective on the law school and Japan. As Gary pointed out, the involvement goes back well before the Center for Japanese Studies was founded. Dan's experience started before the Japan Center. The law school has one of the longest and most intimate relationships with Japan, I think, of any part of the University of Michigan. I think many people may not be aware of that. It's nice that as part of this celebration we are celebrating a very long relationship between the law school and Japan. Our first graduates go back to 1878, when we had two LL.B. students, our basic law degree, from Japan. I brought their pictures along so that you can see them later if you want. They are distinguished pictures. We didn't teach much in international law. I hope a historian will one day write a book about how

these people in the Meiji period found their way to Ann Arbor to study at this remote, but I hope very hospitable, place. It was more hospitable than the West Coast was, and I think that was one of the reasons that people kept coming. Maybe they ran out of money when they got to Ann Arbor and didn't get all the way to the East Coast. I'm not sure. Anyway, it was a clear pattern, because when the law school conferred its first LL.M. degrees in 1890 on six people, two of them were from Japan. Through 1900, we had only seven LL.M.'s, the Master of Law degree in the Law School, and five of those people were Japanese. It gets better. From 1900 to 1920, there were only two LL.M. degrees granted by the law school, both to Japanese.

So we have a very long and happy relationship with Japan, I have to say. When Jim George revived the relationship in the 1950s with a program to bring prosecutors from Japan, those people followed in the footsteps of many other Japanese who had been here. Through 1900 there were seventy-two foreigners who got law degrees from the University of Michigan, and twenty-seven of those were from Japan. It is really a remarkable history of cooperation. I know many people at this university talk about our relations with China, which were of course developed by Angell's becoming ambassador to China during his term as president of the University of Michigan in the 1880s. So, the China relationship was explained in part by that kind of personal link, but I hope someone will tell us about the law school side.

It is a real pleasure for me to come back and to have a chance to see many of my friends. I still commute back and forth, but I now have one foot in New York, both in practice and teaching. I still see how far-reaching the Michigan group is, however, because almost every week I come into contact with Michigan people in New York. And of course when I'm in Japan, I get a glad reception from the many University of Michigan Law School people who are there—people who still have contact with the Center for Japanese Studies.

Law and History

Mark Ramseyer

Well, “Law and History” is not a terribly sexy topic, I admit. At first I thought I was probably supposed to tell stories about intrigue and the like when I was here, which would be the late 1970s, as a graduate student. I’m sure there were all sorts of exciting, interesting, behind-the-scenes maneuverings. This is a university after all, so I’m sure there was a lot of intrigue; whether it was interesting is another question. But the problem is that as a graduate student I really didn’t have a clue what was going on, notwithstanding the fact that I was and am a gossip junkie. Mostly I was simply horrified. I came from a small Midwestern college, which turned out to be very good training, but at the time I didn’t know if it was or not. I had no clue then and I showed up scared stiff. Frankly, going to law school after the Center for Japanese Studies was really easy. This may just have to do with the fact that professional graduate education itself is stressful and once you make it through one program the rest are relatively easy. Anyhow, I have no gossip; I was mostly just trying to make sure I didn’t flunk out when I was here. After doing an M.A. program here I planned to go on and get a Ph.D. in history, but this was the late 1970s, so given the job market I bagged it and went to law school.

Merit will tell you about the legal market, I guess—what it’s like to practice as a lawyer. So I will defer on those issues to her and talk a little bit about doing legal history or doing history that involves law, which sounds obscure. I think in fact it’s not quite as obscure as you may suppose. The reason it’s not is that institutions matter on a basic level. Institutions determine the way in which a society develops, the way in which it changes. And one of the most basic institutions is of course law and the legal system. Now, to put this all another way: I think a lot of things that strike people who go to Japan as curious and bizarre and strange don’t really have much to do with the way

in which the Japanese people think, or the way in which they imagine the world around them. They have to do with the laws that are in place.

Let me give you some examples. If you try to rent an apartment in Japan you'll find that rental apartments are tiny and you have to pay huge up-front deposits. Is there some sort of odd explanation for this? Well, it is frankly a function of the fact that the Japanese courts at the turn of the century decided that notwithstanding what you put in a lease contract, if you didn't want to leave the land, the owner couldn't force you. It didn't matter if you had a five-year lease or two-year lease. If you wanted to stay, you had a right to stay. And so essentially when you rent an apartment you are buying a lifetime right to stay there. Given that you're not simply renting something on a month to month basis, landlords act proactively. They charge you up front. And not only that. Because landlords really want turnover in their apartments, they will not rent you an apartment that you would want to stay in after you had two kids. This is why condominiums in Japan are so much larger than apartments. If you want to buy an apartment, that's fine; they'll sell you a big apartment. But if you want to rent one, the big apartments aren't there. Or take dispute settlements. Suppose you're in a traffic accident in Japan. It's very unlikely this will go into court; instead, it will get settled outside of court. Does this have to do with harmony and consensus and the fact that Japanese are nonlitigious and the like? I think the answer is no. It's the fact that courts, at least with respect to traffic accidents, are very straightforward. Since both sides know what the judge would say, there's no point in asking him. Instead, they just settle out of court in line with what would happen if they did take it to court. So you don't need fancy explanations about harmony and consensus and the like.

Or take doctors: you go to see the internist and you'll see one for three minutes. Those three minutes include his reading the chart, diagnosing you, talking to you, and filling out the chart for the next time for your medical history. Now, you say, "Is this because doctors have internalized Confucian norms of hierarchy and they therefore see patients as vermin, and because patients have incredible respect for doctors and therefore take what they get?" I think the answer is no. It's because the government runs the medical system and reimbursement rates are so low that this is basically like trying to rent an apartment in Manhattan. When you get prices low you will get exactly what you pay for. Or suppose you want to get a better doctor; you want to get a university doctor. Well, as you all know you have to go the day before—if this is for surgery, for example—and hand the doctor an envelope that's stuffed with cash. Okay, does this have to do with gift giving in Japanese society and cementing social bonds? Of course the answer is no. It's the fact that the doctor is worth a lot more than the regulated price. Since he's worth more than the regulated price, if you want to have him treat you, you have to bribe him.

Or yet another example: suppose that a client wants to hire a law professor. Well, what they do in the United States is call you up and talk to you. They describe their problem, and, if you're interested, you don't hang up and sort of keep them talking for a while. Then they ask you if you want to do it, and you have to figure out if they're willing to pay you an appropriate fee. The issue is price. As I understand it, in Japan, if you want to retain a national university professor, you never talk price. You sort of discuss the problems and then the professor says he'll do it. Then after the professor does the work, a few days or weeks later, money arrives. Is this because Japan still has this Confucian aversion to merchants and money and things of that sort? No, of course not. It's because it's illegal for a national university professor to do it. You can't talk price over the telephone. There are simple legal explanations for much that strikes people as complicated and bizarre in Japan, and they're pretty straightforward.

There are some places, though, where legal training actually helps. These previous examples of the law are things that it takes no legal training to figure out, with the exception perhaps of turn-of-the-century cases involving landlords and tenants. But there are cases where, I think, people have tried to deal with legal questions in Japanese history and simply gotten it wrong. It is sort of reassuring because we law professors tend to be very cynical about whether we are teaching students anything that amounts to much. We take smart students in and send out smart graduates, and we worry that there may not be much value added on our part. But now take the issue of primogeniture. If you read histories of prewar Japan, particularly in the English press, you will get an account of how the Meiji civil code, being a oppressive implant, forced primogeniture on all Japanese. The code mandated it. And you'll also get stories about how the law gave no protection to wives, so that essentially husbands had a trial marriage. They could try out a woman for three or four months and then could send her home, and there was no legal recourse. This was the standard account; you will see it in a lot of histories of prewar Japan. What's interesting is that it is completely false. If you ask why, well, rules of inheritance in Japan, as everywhere, are incredibly complicated. There are only a couple dozen code sections dealing with it, but even if you're a trained lawyer, it will take you a few hours to try to figure these things out; they're a lot like the internal revenue code. Yet if you have legal training, you at least know what to look for; you know how to piece these things together, and once you figure them out they're fairly straightforward. The rules having to do with sending wives home turn out to be case law, and if you don't know how to do research, it is actually quite hard to sort them out. It turns out, however, that all across the country, up and down the social hierarchy, women who were sent away from their husbands sued and won. They got a real "pound of flesh" in cash for doing this.

Now, what I think is the more interesting story is how these myths came to be. Because they are myths. The accounts that we have of prewar Japanese law having to do with primogeniture and sending wives home are flatly false. And I think they come from Japan. Actually, if you read the Japanese family law textbooks written before 1945, they get it right. Obviously law professors can read the civil code, they can read cases, they know what is going on, and in these earlier accounts they've got it right. But then around 1950, law professors in major universities started to write differently about the prewar period. And it's curious because they have examined the same prewar civil codes and read these cases—so you wonder what is going on. They start talking about primogeniture and sending wives home. It's true there are footnotes; they've got the caveats buried. I think what's happening is that they see Japan as coming into a brave new world. The conservatives haven't consolidated their power yet, there is a strong Marxist contingent in Japan, the unions are going strong, the landlords are losing their land, the Marxists have taken over the universities, and it looks like they may in fact be able to remake Japan in their own image. Yet in order to usher in the millennium, one of the things they needed was a bleak and oppressive past. So they made it up.

This is the sort of thing that if you don't have legal training you're not going to be able to figure out. Although law school is not a lot of fun from the student's standpoint—as a faculty member it's fine, but as a student it's not fun—there are advantages to having a law degree. And there are advantages to doing history with a law degree.

The Frustrations and Promise of a Career Involved with US.-Japan Economic Relations

Merit E. Janow

I have spent much of my career thinking about problems in international economic law and policy and in particular working on issues resulting from economic ties between the United States and Japan. Here, I shall venture no more than a few very personal observations and reflections. But first, since anniversaries are designed to allow moments of personal as well as professional reflection, please let me indulge in a moment of nostalgia.

Unlike most of the distinguished panelists and attendees at these happy celebrations, my first exposure to the University of Michigan came as an undergraduate, not as a graduate student. I came to Ann Arbor from the American School in Japan (ASIJ). My parents had been civilians in the Supreme Commander for the Allied Powers (SCAP) Occupation of Japan. My father served in the government section as an economist and worked on exchange-rate reform issues; my mother worked on agricultural reform as a botanist. In 1947 they started an engineering consulting firm in Tokyo. Except for my father's brief stint in the Kennedy Administration, my parents stayed on in Japan until they returned to the United States and retired. I therefore came to the University of Michigan from Tokyo, relatively unfamiliar with life in the United States.

The Japan that I remember from my youth is, of course, not to be found today. Tokyo was filled with streetcars. *Kamishibai* (story tellers) regularly visited our neighborhood, and so did old men banging *hyoshigi* (wooden clappers) to warn of fires. I attended a Japanese *yochien* as the only foreigner; I recall the Japanese children were unwelcoming. While in high school, I thought I had some vague sense of wanting to major in matters related to Japan, law, and economics. The University of Michigan had the good sense to send a recruiter out to Tokyo and without much additional knowledge about the school (except that it was large and excellent in many departments) I came

to Ann Arbor. I'm not even sure I really knew where Michigan was located when I landed in Detroit. Kids today are much better organized and informed!

Michigan, even as an undergraduate, offered a marvelous selection of classes related to Japan and Asia. I found the Center for Japanese Studies to be a second home. As a student in Professor Roger Hackett's seminar on foreign influences in Japan during the Meiji period, I recall taking an oral final that focused on the contributions of Lafcadio Hearn. I am also indebted to Professor John Campbell, who taught me what little I know about the structure of the Japanese political system. It goes without saying that his work on Japanese budget politics remains a classic. Indeed, some of his observations from the 1970s provided guidance for me in the 1990s when I was working on sectoral problems as a trade negotiator. I also studied Japanese language intensively at Michigan and learned with horror what I had been saying for so many years with my informal adolescent Japanese. I also remember auditing a course from Professor Seidensticker. One day, all of the students appeared in class wearing T-shirts stamped with the words "Murasaki Shikibu"—who was, of course, the author of *The Tale of Genji*. This was a practical joke that my mother had suggested to me. Professor Seidensticker did not appear to notice, or perhaps he thought our jest was in such poor taste that it didn't warrant comment! Well, enough nostalgia, suffice it to say that I remain grateful to the remarkable faculty associated with the Center for Japanese Studies.

With a B.A. in Asian studies, I then went to Washington, D.C. in search of a job as a policy analyst interested in Japan and Asia. Knowledge of and interest in Japan was uneven in Washington. I was offered a job translating articles from the Japanese press, but other than that I received no offers. I remember one Hill staffer telling me that my background made for an interesting hobby but that I needed to go learn something useful.

So instead, I went to Tokyo and found a job as a member of the professional staff of a U.S.-based research institute. I spent the next year in Tokyo; thereafter, having returned to New York headquarters, for the next five years I spent several months a year in Japan and other parts of Asia. In the 1980–85 period, I undertook several research projects that focused on Japanese industrial development policies.

One study undertaken in 1981 for the U.S. Department of State, U.S. Department of Commerce, and the U.S. Trade Representative's Office (USTR) outlined the range of government supports that were being offered by the Japanese government to domestic industry and argued that direct and indirect Japanese government supports to industry, although important, had diminished greatly over time. Moreover, we argued that the effectiveness of most of the specific instruments of industrial policy had declined as the economy itself matured; there was a the relative increase in the power of market-based devel-

opments and a relative decline in Ministry of International Trade and Industry (MITI) influence. We suggested that MITI's influence had been particularly significant in the early stages of some industries development—notably the high tech industries of computers and semiconductors—but by the 1980s, a combination of domestic and foreign market- and government-based pressures were producing a more pluralistic domestic economy and a somewhat more open market.

At the time (early 1980s) there were many analysts and advocates in Washington who were arguing that Japanese industrial policies were the key to Japan's economic prowess, and that they should be emulated by the United States. Remember, this was still a period when Japan's computer and semiconductor industries were benefiting from specialized loan repayment programs, government procurement programs, joint public-private research projects, and other indirect support. Moreover, the financial sector was highly regulated, and the *gaitameho* (foreign exchange control laws) still exerted meaningful controls over capital inflows and outflows.

At the time, there was a vigorous debate under way in U.S. academic and policy circles about the role and importance of the Japanese government in fostering Japan's highly competitive manufacturing firms. U.S. scholars and policy makers were deeply divided on the questions of whether the tools employed by the Japanese government were effective, "fair," and appropriate for emulation by the U.S. government, or otherwise responsible for Japan's relatively low levels of imported goods and services. The so-called revisionist scholarship on Japan was beginning to surface at this time.

Our studies on different features of the Japanese economy and U.S.-Japan trade and economic relations were expanded and published in a book that came out in 1985. This book challenged the scholarship that credited the Japanese government with Japan's industrial prowess, since we argued that the tools available to the Japanese government to foster industrial development were declining for domestic and international market-based reasons. Perhaps more importantly, despite Japan's apparent economic ascendancy, my coauthors and I argued against proposals to emulate the Japanese government model in the U.S. domestic context. We thought that partial planning of the sort practiced by Japan could look very successful for a time, but that this approach reached its limit as an economy matures.

During those years, I also spent some time advising non-Japanese companies conducting business in Japan and Asia. I remember my first major consulting job was for an Australian minerals company trying to sell both ore and fabricated metals into Japan. Our analysis (in 1980) showed that energy price differentials between Japan and Australia (a country that possessed both ores and cheap energy) were likely to mean increased Japanese imports of

both ore and fabricated metals—both of which the client wanted to sell. The client then asked us to try to design a selling strategy for Japan and Asia—a strategy that failed miserably for a time and then proved quite successful.

Let me explain. At the outset, despite strong evidence of price differentials between the domestic product and our client's product, Japanese trading firms were not purchasing lower-priced imports. Why not? Perhaps executives were more naive at that time, but I recall a number of Japanese trading company executives explaining that it simply wasn't worth their while to risk antagonizing their major domestic clients in order to import relatively small amounts of foreign product. I also remember my shock to hear that a price differential of some 80 percent was argued to be necessary before imported product would be procured in volume. We discovered small trading entities that had been established outside of Tokyo to handle competitive imports so that the big trading houses wouldn't run afoul of their major domestic clients.

Well, within a few years, energy price differentials made this "Buy Japanese" preference unsustainable. Price differentials in these commodities became overwhelming. Long before the 80 percent price differential one saw Japanese aluminum producers downsizing dramatically and imports of fabricated metal pouring into the country.

In hindsight, I believe that our analysis of the early to mid-1980s proved accurate in three areas: first, with respect to the role of Japanese government industrial policies; second, with respect to the unsustainability of traditional purchasing practices in sectors of the economy subject to global markets; and, third, with respect to the nonapplicability of the Japanese governmental policy model to the United States. However, the passage of time has also educated me that we were very over optimistic on timing. In many sectors, adjustments took much longer than we imagined and are still only slowly underway. If a perceived trade-off exists among increased efficiency, higher imports, and increased unemployment, on the one hand, and inefficiency, lower imports, and fuller employment, on the other, evidence suggests that there can be overwhelming pressure to choose the latter.

Having deferred going to law school for several years, after the publication of our book I knew that it was time to go back to school and make the switch from being an analyst of international business and policy to an attorney, working on facilitating transactions. So, I obtained a J.D. from Columbia Law School and thereafter joined a major Wall Street law firm specializing in corporate mergers and acquisitions. This was the go-go mergers and acquisitions period of the 1980s, a period somewhat akin to the current climate. I had the privilege of witnessing and working on a number of fascinating (big) domestic as well as cross-border transactions. Europeans were, of course, the most active foreign acquirers in the United States, but Japanese firms were for the first time acquiring major American assets, and doing so with great enthu-

siasm. (As it turned out, they also demonstrated a good dose of naiveté.) “Synergy” was a greatly overused word in those days that masked a lot of issues.

Foreign investment into Japan was also growing modestly, and I worked intensively over a several-year period on a number of potentially significant foreign acquisitions of Japanese assets. Although a number of joint-ventures that I worked on came into being, regrettably all of the foreign acquisitions ultimately came apart. The reasons were many, but included: difficulties in protecting intellectual property, insurmountable anxieties by local labor, subtle Japanese government resistance that chilled the proposed transaction, and headquarters’ impatience with the slowness of the transactions, among other factors.

As an aside, I think the bubble years of the late 1980s were also a turning point in foreign personnel in Tokyo. Before that time, it was the relatively rare U.S. corporation that put senior managers in Tokyo who were destined to assume leadership positions in corporate headquarters. In the late 1980s that finally began to change. Although anecdotal, it was my observation that a number of foreign firms substantially increased their commitment to Japan and Asia. Conversely, in the United States we saw not only substantial increases in Japanese inward investment in the United States but also a deepening of such investment and much heightened interest on the part of Japanese corporate leaders in being perceived as good corporate citizens. Of course, in some sectors voluntary restraint agreements or other trade measures provided powerful inducements for investment.

In 1990, I was honored when Ambassador Carla A. Hills asked me to join her staff as the deputy assistant U.S. trade representative for Japan and China. My next three and a half years were spent deeply immersed in sectoral negotiations between the United States and Japan on a host of issues—satellites, semiconductors, telecommunication, legal services, glass, and paper. This was also a period of engagement on structural economic issues between the two governments, talks that occurred under the rubric of the Structural Impediments Initiative (SII).

I think, overall, the 1989–93 years marked a tense but productive period in U.S.-Japan economic and trade relations. Some sectoral trade accords appeared to hold real promise, and most valuable—for a time—were the SII negotiations. In SII, briefly, the United States government was engaged in intensive subcabinet-level discussions on an interagency basis with their Japanese counterparts. The process was extremely time-intensive and grueling, but for a while both governments were able to get out of the traditional dynamic of trade negotiations, that is: blame followed by denial, escalation of tension, and then eventual accommodation with disquiet on both sides as we walked down the narrow *hanamichi*. There appeared to be considerable Japa-

nese public support for many of the reforms sought by the U.S. negotiators, which then placed constructive pressure on the bureaucrats and politicians to deliver.

The sectoral disputes were knotty. Those negotiations were often lengthy, contentious, and difficult to resolve since at least part of the perceived market access problem stemmed from allegedly discriminatory Japanese business or government-condoned exclusionary private practices, which were not covered by established international trade disciplines.

By the way, and contrary to conventional opinion, I never once had a Japanese official suggest that if we would just tell him the market share we were seeking we could strike a deal! And parenthetically, during the period I served at USTR, the administration never sought new market share targets, although we certainly sought improved performance.

These experiences suggested to me that a central challenge for the future was to develop new approaches to address tensions resulting from differences in national regulatory structures and business practices. Successive rounds of multilateral and bilateral trade negotiations had proven successful in reducing or eliminating many governmental border barriers to trade and investment; the next policy frontier was regulatory reform and competition policy. These are among the areas that are my central academic and advisory focus at this time.

Some policy areas, such as competition policy, are matters of national enforcement. But nonenforcement or discriminatory enforcement can have transnational economic consequences for both domestic consumers and foreign firms. Indeed, many areas of economic regulation are now subject to international scrutiny—be it competition policies, investment rules, financial systems, or regulatory frameworks generally. It is now a truism that the international economy has outpaced the ability of our national or international systems to manage the process, or our publics perhaps to even accept the extent of the implied economic and governance changes that we are experiencing. The impact of globalization is, in my view, obliging countries to consider more fully both the limits and the practical necessity of improved economic cooperation and comity arrangements between nations.

Many U.S.-Japan economic tensions are now representative of global challenges that need to be considered not only between the United States and Japan but more profoundly at the international level. Or, put differently, solutions to global problems to be successful must be informed by the challenges of integrating systems at least as diverse as those of the United States and Japan. The University of Michigan's Center for Japanese Studies has long recognized and risen to that challenge.

Thank you for inviting me to muse on the past and future.

From Household Enterprise to the Professional World of Business: An Anthropological Journey

Jill Kleinberg

Natsukashii is the word that best captures my feelings for my years in Ann Arbor, and the people and activities that constituted the Center for Japanese Studies occupy much of the landscape that these memories revisit with such nostalgia. They were turbulent times. Cynicism about government prevailed, as did cynicism about business, which many students and faculty saw as hand in glove with U.S. policies of international aggression. Many of us engaged in social protest; many engaged in other kinds of social experimentation. The Center for Japanese Studies endured throughout, somehow allowing voices that reflected various shadings of the political spectrum to be heard, somehow channeling the minds of hyperactive youths into avenues of learning that prepared them to negotiate a world that would challenge conventional expectations.

Finding the desired academic positions to be elusive, many of us tarried at makeshift way stations and arrived at improbable destinations. My story undoubtedly is less dramatic than are the stories of some of my contemporaries. At this point in my life I find myself safely harbored in an academic institution, the University of Kansas, doing the sorts of things one might anticipate doing with a master's degree in Japanese studies and a doctoral degree in cultural anthropology (also from the University of Michigan). The journey to this place, however, was roundabout and fraught with uncertainty. My present home, in the School of Business, was not easily constructed.

Reviewing the journey, I realize how strongly a perspective that was fundamental to the Center of Japanese Studies persists as a dominant influence in my life. What was the worldview fostered by the Center? I interpret it as a holistic perspective that recognizes the complexity and interconnectedness of social phenomena. Officially, this was captured in the term "interdisciplinary." It was Japan we endeavored to comprehend. The road to comprehension took

us back in history with byways through social, political, religious, and economic thought. Along the way we were introduced to the mysteries of Japanese cultural knowledge and cultural practice. Language, literature, and music were at once objectives and vehicles of learning.

Like many people who passed through the Center, I chose to continue learning about Japan through further graduate study. The choice of cultural anthropology seemed natural, given my holistic training. Ethnographic fieldwork is the rite of passage for anthropologists of the cultural ilk. I engaged in this rite throughout a year of living in a remote Japanese mountain village where the inhabitants for centuries had depended on pottery production for cash income.

This experimental learning gave me a feeling for traditional Japanese cultural practice far different from that gained from textbook learning. In particular, I experienced firsthand the meaning of the Japanese term *ie*, which can be translated as “enterprise household,” an ongoing entity of both production and reproduction. The Japanese folk craft movement, or *mingei boomu*, which gained momentum after the Second World War, offered the household-based pottery workshops a new market for their product, now known as Tanba-Tachikui pottery. I discovered that it was by calling on traditional patterns of kinship that the impoverished village potters were able to revitalize a nearly defunct local industry.

Furthermore, in the course of doing fieldwork in this village, I came to see that, as Clifford Geertz illustrates in his study of the bazaar economy in a Moroccan town, business may be viewed as a “cultural form.”¹ I was able to infer from the “doings and sayings” of the villagers the commonly shared understandings by which they accomplished pottery work. Most anthropologists consider such shared understandings—that is, the explicit and tacit “cognitive sketch maps” that help guide thought and behavior—to be the essence of a group’s culture.² Local cultural knowledge, for example, encompassed an understanding of different categories of pottery worker, largely determined by one’s relationship to the head of the household-based enterprise. Similarly, Tanba-Tachikui pottery making reflected cultural assumptions about work processes, as well as cultural assumptions about social relationships among members of the potting community and between potters and buyers of the vases, tea ceremony ware, tableware, and flower pots produced in the workshops. Clearly, the business of pottery making had meaning beyond the goal of profit.³

One way station I stopped at after doing doctoral fieldwork further piqued my interest in the social organization of work. At the same time, it pointed me toward a new research focus: the interaction in the workplace of persons representing different nations and cultures. We were a small group of scholars working on the first edition of Kodansha’s English-language *Encyclopedia of Japan*. Half of us were American and half were Japanese. All of us had

some degree of literacy with regard to the cultural “other.” While there were many good times working in this binational group, there were also some notable strains, largely due to cultural differences in the way the Japanese and American participants conceptualized the process of getting a job done. An early intimation of culture clash centered on a debate over how to arrange work desks in the large room we occupied in Memorial Hall on the Harvard campus. The Japanese leaders of the project had placed the desks much as you would find them in a typical Japanese company, an island of front-to-front desks in the center of the room. We Americans immediately protested that we could not work well in such close proximity and with such lack of privacy. On this particular issue (but on few others) the American concept of work prevailed. Desks were rearranged along the walls of the room, facing outward, each with a window view.

After I departed from Cambridge and traveled to Los Angeles as a visiting assistant professor of anthropology at UCLA, I had the opportunity to look more systematically at what I call “binational” work settings. It was the time when popular books like William Ouchi’s *Theory Z: How American Business Can Meet the Japanese Challenge* (Reading, Mass.: Addison Wesley, 1981) reflected the U.S. preoccupation with Japan’s postwar “economic miracle.” UCLA’s Graduate School of Management funded a pilot study in which I examined the interaction of Japanese and American employees in Japanese-owned and -managed firms in Southern California. This project led to external funding, which allowed me to do long-term participant observation in one Japanese subsidiary in Los Angeles and, later, in its headquarters and a sister subsidiary in Tokyo.⁴ My ability as an ethnographer to grasp the cultural knowledge that comprised Japanese and American concepts of work, so critical to the research, rested on my prior understanding of both societies. Gaining the trust of the Japanese managers was essential, and considerably more difficult than gaining the trust of the Americans. It would have been impossible to achieve had I not had a certain degree of Japanese cultural and linguistic fluency, and had I not had the luxury of conducting prolonged ethnographic fieldwork.

Working in this way with large Japanese firms launched me on the unexpected and, in fact, at one time inconceivable path of professional business educator. In responding to a recognized need for employees who could compete effectively in a global economic environment, the University of Kansas Business School took the admittedly unconventional step of hiring of a person who is both an area specialist and cultural anthropologist. The greatest challenge for me has been learning to translate a culturally informed and focused view of organization into a language that has meaning to students, scholars, and practitioners of business and management. How do I make the unwieldy construct of culture, and its complex implications for organization,

readily understood? How do I avoid simplifying “the Japanese” or “the Americans” to the point that these constructs lose analytical utility?

The courses that I offer on comparative and cross-cultural management, business and society in Japan, and cross-cultural negotiation have become well attended and well received. Gradually, I have learned how to show students the practical relevance of books and articles representing diverse disciplines that they never imagined reading in a business school course. And, happily, we see more and more business students who know Japanese or another foreign language and who enter the business school with an area studies background. At their age, with my “liberal” academic bent, I would have been disdainful of a business education and business career. It was an unwarranted arrogance even then, but so much more so today when business is the major forum for global communication.

NOTES

1. Clifford Geertz, “Suq: The Bazaar Economy in Sefrou,” in *Meaning and Order in Moroccan Society: Three Essays in Cultural Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1979).
2. The conceptualization of culture and the method for discovering culture presented here draw on the work and words (in quotation marks) of the anthropologist Charles Frake. See, for example, Charles O. Frake, “Playing Frames Can Be Dangerous: Some Reflections on Methodology in Cognitive Anthropology,” *Quarterly Newsletter of the Institute for Comparative Human Development* 3 (1997): 1–7, and Charles O. Frake, “Ethnography,” in Robert M. Emerson, ed., *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1983), 60–67.
3. See Jill Kleinberg, “Where Work and Family Are Almost One: The Lives of Folkcraft Potters,” in David W. Plath, ed., *Work and Lifecourse in Japan* (Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press, 1983), 215–47.
4. Examples of my research on U.S.-Japan binational firms are found in “Culture Clash Between Managers: America’s Japanese Firms,” *Advances in International Comparative Management* 4 (Greenwich, Conn.: JAI Press, 1989): 221–44; “Practical Implications of Organizational Culture Where Japanese and Americans Work Together,” *National Association for the Practice of Anthropology Bulletin* 14 (1994): 48–65; and “Negotiating a Japanese Buyout of a U.S. Company: Concepts of Work as Subtext,” in Beverly D. Sypher, ed., *Cases in Organizational Communication: Perspectives on Contemporary Work Life* (New York: Guilford Press, 1997), 145–69.

Learning from Japan: From Toyota City to the Motor City— Twenty Years of Learning about Each Other

John Shook

I went to Japan in 1983 with an explicit purpose: to work for the biggest and most Japanese company I could find, so I could grasp what there was to learn and bring it back to my own country. I had no natural connection with Japan. I never even met a Japanese person until I was well into my twenties, and I had begun studying Japanese in 1977 with no explicit or even implicit purpose. Yet here I was, after picking up a graduate degree in Hawaii, speaking marginal Japanese, knocking on doors in Japan looking for a job. At that time it wasn't easy; Japanese companies didn't hire foreigners, a fact I was reminded of many times. But, as luck (fate?) would have it, I found my company, or my company found me. Toyota had just signed a "letter of intent" with General Motors to form a joint venture in California to build Corollas. They figured they should hire an American to work with them in Toyota City to help make that a success. That American was me.

More specifically, they decided that they needed an American to help with training. So they offered me a job teaching their management and production systems to the employees of the new company. This fit my plans perfectly. Before I could teach anything to anybody, they had to teach me first. Little did I know what was in store. My auto-related experience was limited to a year of overhauling big American V8s at auto mechanic school in the coal-mining hills of Kentucky. So, I expected some training for me, which I would in turn share with my California compatriots. And that is indeed what happened. What I didn't know, however, was that fifteen years later, I would still be struggling alongside much of U.S. industry to understand what it was that I had been trained in and had trained others to do.

The early 1980s were a truly exciting time to be working in the manufacturing world of Toyota City. The idea of taking their production system overseas was not a trivial matter to the people of Toyota. For over thirty years

they had built and refined their system to get it to work as it did. They knew it was effective, and they had complete confidence that they knew how to make it work. Then as today, you could ask a Toyota manufacturing person about any aspect of their production, why they do this, or that, and you would get an incredibly detailed explanation of philosophy, principles, and techniques. But in 1983 they had no confidence whatsoever that they could make the system work as it should outside of Japan (or even outside of Toyota City)—certainly not in California with United Auto Workers (UAW) members.

So the Toyota people were all excited about the prospect of what was ahead, and they were concerned. Toyota people, though, are always “concerned”; that is one of their strengths. On January 2, 1984, I heard my first “President’s New Year Address,” where Dr. Toyoda Shoichiro expressed absolute alarm over the clear reality that the Korean automakers were just about to make their move and leapfrog the Japanese domestic market as never before. This was just when Toyota was poised for a major push in overseas operations, and when it had more money in the bank than any company in the world.

The excitement created a great atmosphere in which to learn. I was quickly accepted as a member of the team, contrary to some of my own “concerns” stemming from all the books about how the Japanese never really accepted “outsiders” into the fold. Perhaps I was fortunate due to the unique circumstances, but the overriding atmosphere was one of “There is a huge task ahead and we can’t do it alone.” That atmosphere more than drowned out the “There’s a foreigner in our midst” mentality. That was important to me since I was the *only* foreigner in their Toyota City midst for a period of time. Thus began an eleven-year journey of learning with Toyota, including about eight years of living in Japan.

In terms of “learning from Japan,” what from my Japanese anthropological studies at the university benefited me while working for Toyota in Japan? Much, actually. When it came to dealing with Japanese situations as an outsider, rather than as an insider—when dealing with the public in general, other companies, the government—I felt very prepared and experienced few difficulties. However, little in Japanese studies or international business studies prepared me to actually work *inside* a Japanese company. My studies prepared me to understand the structure and business practices of Japanese companies, perhaps to negotiate with them or to do business with them as a buyer or seller with an American company, but not to work within one.

To illustrate, examples of what we learn about Japanese business include: that everything is well planned out, that Japanese are polite, even deferential, to a fault, and that in the interest of harmony they will never say “no” directly. Really? These things are true as far as they go, but they are true from a perspective of looking from the outside in and are not necessarily represen-

tative of what one experiences as an insider. It usually takes one, after joining a Japanese firm, several years of looking for it to realize that there is no master plan. It doesn't take nearly that long to discover that the famous Japanese politeness is often discarded as a luxury and a waste of time. The open disagreements and infighting I encountered certainly didn't look like my idea of "harmony." As for the famous reluctance to say "no," nothing could be further from the truth *within* the group: the entire management decision-making process is based on the saying of "no."

Regarding the internal processes, to be sure, much has been said of Japanese decision-making—the "bottom-up" process—and the general lack of job descriptions, but, at least when I was studying international business, nothing was explained regarding the impact of these phenomena on the individual. What does it mean to not have a job description? Or to be the initiating "bottom" of a "bottom-up" decision-making process? I certainly didn't know, but from what I presumed, it certainly sounded like a pretty good deal: "no job description, decisions made at the bottom (where I was)—hmm, sounds like a good deal to me!"

A key insight that took me about three years to figure out was that a particularly confounding component of this equation lay in the "Japanese don't say 'no'" myth. The decision-making system and job descriptions are based on the superior—whoever is above the "bottom" of the "bottom-up" hierarchy—replying "no" to proposals from the bottom. So, one is always being said "no" to. Now, when we Americans—expecting to find an enlightened, self-governing bottom-up process wherein we can essentially do what we want—encounter this eternal and resounding "no!" we tend to become surprised, confused, and discouraged and finally to assume that the whole "bottom-up" thing is just another myth.

To explain from another angle: I think most Americans would agree that we do not want to be in a position of having responsibility with no authority. In fact, we explicitly teach that, as managers, we should never place our people in that situation. At Toyota, however, one is always and intentionally in that situation—eight hours a day, five days a week, or twelve hours a day, seven days a week, as the case may be. Bottom-up decision making is based on superiors retaining authority while assigning responsibility to subordinates, and on managers never telling their people exactly what to do. As I was taught by my first *kacho*: "Never tell your people what to do. The minute you do so, you take the responsibility for that decision away from them." Instead, you, as the manager, should retain the authority, while assigning the responsibility to come up with a solution to the subordinate. So, front line people, the ones who know the real situation the best, are free to come up with solutions to real problems without someone who knows less telling them what to do. Management maintains control and assures adherence to depart-

mental and company objectives and policies through liberal use of the word “no” in reply to proposals. In fact, the initial reply is typically *expected* to be “no.” This begins an essentially standardized problem-solving process through which all employees learn the basic company logic. With practice, one becomes able to pass more and more grandiose proposals with fewer and fewer “no’s” in the process. Being good at this game defines the successful employee.

When we first encounter this, to repeat myself, we become surprised, confused, and discouraged. After some experience with the process, however, we realize (if we persevere and think about it enough) that, since no one is telling us what to do, we are quite free to get the authority we need whenever we need it. It is not given to us in the form of a job description, but it is available if we avail ourselves of it. Learning to “avail oneself of it” becomes key to success. And learning to do so takes time.

Of course, you know the complaint of American managers working at Japanese companies that periodically raises its head: “They don’t give us any authority.” Well, the complaint is probably often true as far as it goes. But what is missing from that observation/complaint is the realization that “they” don’t have authority given to them either. The difference is simply that “they” know how to manipulate the system (the process of getting authority when you need it) better.

So, most such complaints from American managers are based not on discrimination so much as on a lack of understanding of how this decision-making process works. Yet that fact does not lessen its importance as a problem. In fact, I think this essential nature of the problem is rarely properly identified, and therefore, even more rarely dealt with. To this day, no Japanese multinationals have come to grips with this issue.

My point is that this ongoing dynamic interplay that I have tried to describe was more overwhelming than any other process that I encountered in Japan, and I encountered it on a daily basis. Yet *nothing* I had learned in Japanese studies or international business had prepared me for it. In fact, some of what I had learned probably hindered rather than helped. This was in spite of the fact that I was relatively well prepared, with an M.A. in Japanese studies and having graduated from an institution specializing in Japanese management.

The impact of Japanese multinationals on mid-America has reached a new plateau. It has been intensive in many instances up to now, to be sure, but mostly at the individual level; it was always confined within certain bounds, such as within a particular organization or project. Now, however, the interaction and impact has reached new levels of intensity and has spread beyond those previous boundaries.

When Japanese firms first set up business operations in this country, they began with marketing. Now, marketing may cause large-scale trade and

economic—and therefore political—problems, but it causes little in terms of cultural difficulties on the individual level. This is simply because marketing is generally recognized as being most effective if done “the local way.”

Next came manufacturing, which, unlike marketing, did bring with it many cultural considerations (work attitudes, work force organization, labor issues, employee motivation, etc.). But the manufacturing operations were, originally, self-contained, so that the “damage” could be contained if not totally controlled.

Now, however, we see local product development and procurement expanding, bringing with them Japanese practices regarding interfirm relations. The result is an unprecedented number of individuals coming into direct contact with Japan.

This leads me to an observation for consideration regarding Japanese studies in today's world. Compared to when I first began my studies of Japan, economics have drawn Japanese studies much closer to the real world. When I encountered Japan by accident twenty years ago, most of the content of Japanese studies was pretty esoteric stuff: Buddhism, the arts, and village ethnographic studies such as the Center's program in Okayama. That was fine, since few outside a quite small world of similarly interested specialists had any concern for Japan. Those who carried their studies to even a moderate degree of depth did so out of love of the Japanese culture. Now, of course, that is not the case.

Thus, the first generation of postwar Western Japan scholars were social scientists. Next came the business majors, who saw Japan as a place to make their fortune. Their interest in culture for its own sake was limited at best, and they were impatient with the social/cultural/linguistic inconveniences that would impede them from accomplishing their objectives.

Now we also have the engineer/scientist. Their interests seem to be—to give a frank opinion—more serious than the business majors, but still, their interests are largely quite narrow, and certainly not inspired by a “love of the culture.”

Most recently, we have the unprecedented phenomenon of a general population of individuals who are profoundly impacted by Japanese culture (and now by other East Asian cultures as well) but who have the slightest interest in or knowledge of that culture(s). Often those being impacted are not even aware of it. I am talking about the thousands of people here in the heartland who work for companies that are owned by, have joint ventures with, do business with, or compete against East Asian organizations. A challenge for regional specialists could be to play a positive role in the interface and assimilation that is taking place.

What I found in Japan was different from what I expected. I was looking, basically, for “culture.” I was one of the many who read books on

“Japanese management” and “quality circles” and the rest, and who thought that there must be mysterious *cultural* reasons underlying the “Japanese economic miracle.” Years later I can say now that I still don’t really know “the reason” for the Japanese economic miracle, but I know that the most profound business practice to be uncovered in Japan seems to have surprisingly little to do with being “Japanese.” That business practice is the Toyota Production System. While it’s not strictly a cultural thing, it certainly is something that strikes to the very heart of how we think about things, specifically about how we make things, how we organize ourselves for collective activities, and how we conduct business for customers. The Toyota Production System is not Japanese in that very few Japanese companies use it. Aspects of it are shared with many Japanese companies; yet, other aspects—in particular, just-in-time—are as foreign to the typical Japanese company as they are in America. It was a total coincidence that Toyota was the company that I found; I didn’t specifically seek it out. I assumed that what makes Toyota tick would be the same things that make every Japanese company tick. Only over time did I discover that I had landed myself inside a very unique company that had discovered its own unique way of doing things. To my delight, I discovered that those ways of doing things provide great lessons for all manufacturing and, in fact, all of business. So, quite by accident, I was able to fulfill my original mission of learning from “Japan” and bringing that learning back with me to my own country.

Some of this learning is indeed coming “back,” as technology that traversed the Pacific once is finding its way back again (demonstrating that technology transfer *can* be accomplished if approached properly). For example, the central idea of *flow*, that everything should flow from raw material to customer, came directly from Henry Ford. Another interesting example is that of the U.S. Training Within Industry program, which was developed by top minds in U.S. industry to support the war production effort beginning in 1941. Following the war, this proven set of productivity enhancement training modules (four modules: Job Instruction, Job Methods, Job Relations, and Project Management) was brought to Japan and spread among Japanese industries. I discovered them in a roundabout way, in the process of “adapting” some Toyota training materials to make them appropriate for New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc. (NUMMI). When I found myself struggling with some of the concepts of a certain training program, my Japanese colleagues fetched from a back room file a yellowed, dog-eared, coffee-stained copy of the English language original training manual, just as they had received it, minus the coffee stains I trust, some thirty years before. To my absolute amazement, the program Toyota was going to great expense to “transfer” to NUMMI was *exactly* the same as the Americans had taught to the Japanese decades before. Toyota still uses it to this day, yet rarely do I find an American manufacturer

who has even heard of it, much less uses it here in the country of its origin. So, we had to repatriate the expatriated technology.

While it may be observed that there has been a recent decline in general interest in Japan, for example, in Japanese language class enrollments, there is in the U.S. auto industry, at least, an intensive effort underway to learn from the Japanese auto industry. This effort differs in nature from the previous efforts that may appear similar, and similarly superficial, on the surface. Whereas the Big Three went through periods of learning SPC and quality circles and through a misguided attempt at just-in-time delivery, the present initiatives go much deeper, impacting whole business systems with intricate subsystems and practices, including corporate governance policies and procedures. Learning from Japan in the auto industry was talked about more in the '80s and early '90s, but is quietly more intensive now than ever.

Twin Displeasure on Two Sides of the Pacific

Kondo Motohiro

Good afternoon, ladies and gentlemen. I am honored to have the opportunity to speak to you today about one aspect of the relationship between the United States and Japan.

First of all, I'll have to explain the meaning of today's title, "Twin Displeasure on Two Sides of the Pacific." This refers to the fact that whenever, wherever I make a speech, it incurs displeasure. American audiences generally expect me to speak about the Japanese view of Americans doing business in Japan, or how the Japanese perceive Americans and America. Japanese, however, generally ask me to talk about America. After my speech, or sometimes even while I am speaking, Americans and Japanese show the same reaction: both are displeased.

Today, some of you may also begin to be displeased with me for my strange pronunciation. Of course, my English-speaking ability is very limited, so it is not unusual that I fail to satisfy my audience in this way. However, I beg you to bear with me in this regard. As for the content, you have been warned. So, if you'd like to leave now to avoid getting annoyed, I won't be offended. I do hope, though, that today's audience is very patient, and I'll try to speak about what I've learned from my experience as a journalist and TV commentator.

Almost ten years ago, in 1988, the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan kindly invited me to be a visiting scholar. When I told my second son, who was then six years old and in first grade, about my decision to take him with me to the U.S., he suddenly burst into tears and refused to go. Can you guess his reason? In his own words, "It is too dangerous to live in America. America is the kind of place where devils live." Totally surprised, I asked him, "Why do you think so?" He said that a lot of TV programs taught him so.

Upon reflection, I realized it was not so strange for him to have developed this notion, given all the violence and crime in American TV shows and in Japanese programs about the U.S. The effect of these TV images is very powerful. Equally influential are remarks by Japanese commentators that America does nothing but blame Japan for its own political and economic shortcomings. Almost every day there are reports about serious crimes in the U.S., such as brutal murders, drug-related problems, and so on. Unfortunately, these images shape the thinking not only of six-year-old boys but also of adult Japanese, including so-called opinion leaders. A friend of mine kindly advised me that I should buy a gun as soon as I got to the U.S. From personal experience, having lived in Ann Arbor for nearly a year, I know these negative images are highly exaggerated.

So far, I have only spoken about the image portrayed on television, but the same pattern can be seen in newspapers and magazines. American newspapers don't carry much news about Japan, but events in the U.S. almost daily make front page news in Japan. The majority of articles, moreover, suggest that there is a real problem in the bilateral relationship. The fact is that in economic and security terms, Japan is more dependent on the U.S. than vice versa. Both politically and economically, Japan has to pay close attention to the moves that America makes. Perhaps this explains the difference in how Japan and the U.S. treat news about the other country.

The U.S. media also like to report on racial tension, the breakdown of the educational system, and the drug crisis. I think the objective is to recognize where the problems lie and to work toward the development of a better system, a better society. When such news is introduced in Japan, however, Japanese readers get only part of the picture. It really is difficult to obtain a correct image of another country through the media. Imagine the effect of being exposed on a daily basis to story after story about all kinds of problems in the U.S. If you were to read only the stories about crime in New York, what kind of an image would you develop of the city?

I must add a few words here concerning Japanese magazines. Major intellectual magazines published in Japan, including *Chūō kōron*, are not entirely blameless. Japanese magazines are, of course, published in the Japanese language and directed at a Japanese audience. Editors and contributors feel that it is unlikely that foreigners will read anything written in a language as difficult as Japanese. Thus, their articles merely tend to give vent to the irritation felt by Japanese over bilateral friction without making efforts to find valid solutions. This tendency in Japan must be redressed by recognizing that articles appearing in the media have been, and will be, examined by the world at large. Japanese today must learn to write and edit with a global perspective.

Japanese who have never lived in the U.S. often hold preconceived negative views, like my son did. Interestingly enough, though, after living in

the U.S. for a while, they often find many things about the U.S. that they like better than Japan. It happened to my son. He was sorry to leave this city. If more Japanese gain first-hand experience of living abroad, the collective image that the Japanese have of America will change. Unfortunately, only a small proportion of Japanese will have such a chance.

If I were in Japan, speaking to a Japanese audience, I would probably see many disgruntled faces. This is because my speech has failed to live up to expectations, and my viewpoint is completely different from those held by the members of the audience. People do not like to discard their preconceived notions, even when they are based on prejudice. This proves the principle that many of you may be familiar with: "If as a journalist you want to be well-off, don't miss the cognitive maps of the readers." When I talk about the problems of the Japanese media in Japan, some people ask me, "Then what about the American media? It's worse, isn't it?" I am not sure which is better or worse, but I must tell you that the American media have the same tendency as the Japanese to try to fit the cognitive maps of the readers. Basically, the news-gathering organizations everywhere like to focus on problems and controversial issues.

Although the U.S. media, especially the print media, prides itself on objectivity and fairness, one American journalist whom I met in Tokyo this summer told me that the American media harbors biases.

I'd like to introduce you to an article titled "The U.S. Media Is Tarnished by its Coverage of Japan," written by Charles Burress, a staff writer for the *San Francisco Chronicle*. His article appeared in the *Japan Times* on August 18 and 23 this year. Mr. Burress pointed out that the U.S. media harbors four types of biases: war metaphors, making Japan a monolith, cultural condescension, and failure to tell the other side of the story. I don't think I have enough time to explain each type here, so I'll try to bring up just a few points. I think that all of you would agree that it is very dangerous to use terms like "invade" or "invasion" in stories when two countries are making an effort to meet each other halfway. When American reporters describe actions by a particular Japanese company, such as Sony or Toyota, they commonly substitute the name of the company with "Japan" and "the Japanese." Are Japanese always marching together monolithically?

According to Mr. Burress's analysis, when the U.S. media carries a story or feature that focuses on Japanese culture and lifestyle, the majority point to some fault, failure, or weakness of Japanese society. The Japanese, according to these articles, tolerate "train molesters"; make their three-year-olds go to cram school; don't use birth control and thus have a lot of abortions; allow schoolkids to get bullied, driving them to suicide; and have the least liberated female population in the industrialized world.

Mr. Burress also found that American newspapers are eager to carry articles and features about Japanese women. Some ridiculously claim that women

in Japan must still walk three steps behind men. I wish the reporters who write such nonsense would come see and talk to my wife and her friends. They would then notice how the women of Japan are now very powerful and have a great deal of confidence about themselves. Why are such wildly exaggerated descriptions fed to American readers? Mr. Burrell says, "One explanation could be that the role of Japanese women, according to American standards of gender equality, is one area where Americans can say, 'Aha, see how backward Japan really is.'"

Surely and clearly Japan is behind the United States in various areas. Yet it is unnecessary to accentuate the differences between the two countries. Instead, there should be greater efforts to discuss the relative merits of each country. Needless to say, every manifestation in society is the product of a historical process. Japanese and American media both have their biases. It really is difficult for either to portray the other accurately.

Before I say more, let me point out that I know many journalists and reporters on both sides of the Pacific who are bright, hard-working, and well-educated. I don't want to put the entire blame on them, but at the same time I must say that I have seen many articles they've written that seem biased.

I may not be invited to offer my comments on television much longer. When I am on TV, I am frequently criticized by producers and directors for being too pro-American, although my speech here today may sound to you to be anti-American.

I don't claim to be the only person who has an accurate understanding of both countries, but I must try to tell people on both sides of the Pacific that the other side is suffering from biased, stereotyped, over-simplified, exaggerated media coverage in the same way. Very frequently my Japanese readers and listeners get displeased when I suggest that they are prejudiced against America and Americans. Today, I tried to suggest to you that Americans have prejudices against the Japanese and Japan because of the biased news coverage just as much as the Japanese have prejudices against Americans. I have had many chances to speak on this topic to Americans, and my speeches have often incurred the audience's displeasure. I do hope, though, that you do not become displeased at my speech and grow angry with me.

I am running out of time. In closing, I'd like to quote Mr. Burrell's conclusion.

As the world becomes increasingly globalized, I think we reporters have to become more international in outlook. Of course, we must still report from our home-country perspective for our own readers or viewers, but we should do it as non-partisan observers without the taint of jingoism and without favoring the political propaganda

of either side. I think we should strive to produce stories that people in both countries will find fair.

Thank you very much.

Looking Ahead to a New Global Age

Marx vs. Area Studies: Social Science Illusions

Irwin Scheiner

I arrived at the University of Michigan in the wake of McCarthyism and after the turmoil of loyalty investigations at the university. I certainly could not then and would dare not now seek to assess the emotional effect upon the faculty of such intrusions upon the academic and intellectual life of the academy. What was clear, however, was the tenor and climate of social science investigation both at large and at the University of Michigan. Coming from New York City and one of its City Colleges (where both city and state education administrators were eager “red” faculty busters) and having participated in both left and liberal protest meetings about most things political, social, and cultural, I may have been hypercritical of the political passivity of Michigan academics. Yet one recent assessment of the effects of the investigations at the university does conclude that “in the short run, there were some obvious indications at Michigan of the kinds of caution said to be characteristic of the academy nationally in the wake of the HUAC [House Un-American Activities Committee] investigations.”¹

About the time I arrived at the university in the winter of 1955, I read Edward Shils' *Encounter* essay “The End of Ideology.” In his summary account of a European conference on “The Future of Freedom,” he wrote that there was extraordinary unanimity among the participating Western intellectuals of all political affiliations (excepting Communist). No political debate took place, he reported, between left and right; the traditional issues separating the left and right had declined to relative insignificance. This essay was followed by a flurry of publications with the same title confirming (as an essay by Seymour Martin Lipset did) that in the U.S., as in Europe, the fundamental political problems of the industrial revolution had been solved. These works also asserted (as in essays written by David Riesman and Daniel Bell) that ideological conflict was in full decline in American domestic politics.

Alex Inkeles's *Becoming Modern* (which very openly declared that in becoming modern, all societies, whether communist or capitalist, Islamic or Christian, were on an inevitable path to convergence) had not yet appeared,² but it represented merely one end point in American social sciences' universalization of the process of natural institutional evolution and rational adaptation to modernity. In our own field of Japanese studies, for example, Robert Bellah's 1957 *Tokugawa Religion* followed Weber's elaboration on "formal rational norms" and adapted Talcott Parsons's notions of universalism and performance in order to identify a process in the relation of religion to economic change in early modern Japan that offered a "functional analogue to the Protestant ethic."³ "[A]n industrial society," Bellah wrote, "may develop without a shift in basic values, but rather through a process in which economic values become very important in certain spheres."⁴ The precipitant of change (with only some exaggeration) would be the rationalizations of means "governed only by formal rational norms." The "end of ideology" had made a somewhat premature visit to Japan.

University of Michigan social studies scientists of the fifties did not engage in the political cultural debates sketched above. (The one exception I can offer is that of Kenneth Boulding of the economics department. Boulding had been an active defender of academic freedom at the university in the early fifties and in the late sixties published a book, using his own version of modernization theory, entitled *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century*.⁵) No grand theorist like Parsons offered his "pattern variables" to graduate students; nor were there middle-ranged theorists like Robert Merton. Nor did C. Wright Mills or Barrington Moore, who attacked much of the contemporary social scientific enterprise, appear on the roster of the university. Michigan social scientists did write about theoretical issues; their work tended to consist of deft, concrete, and clearly manageable research projects.

Modernization theory did not dominate the Japanese studies M.A. program I began in the mid-1950s. At the "core" was a year-long seminar, directed in my time by the anthropologist Richard Beardsley, with guest lecturers coming from the entire Japanese studies faculty and an occasional visitor from another university. Unselfconsciously universalistic and liberal, the "core" program offered a large bibliography of readings and an admirably wide array of disciplines, theories, methods, and concepts to consider. From our current conceptual perspective, the program lacked, as all (most, at least) American scholarship and studies of the time did, any self-critical awareness of the Western cultural parochialism of its universalistic approaches to exotic Japan.

I suspect that many of us entering the Japan program in the 1950s, and, I assume, even later, had been "seduced" or "allured" into the Japan field "by the exhilaration of discovering simultaneously the radical otherness and human comprehensibility of exotic cultures" (to borrow from William Sewell's

characterization of the anthropologist's life experience).⁶ I must also say that this is the common experience of even Western historians, who often find in their own historical past a "foreign country" where motivations for action or assumptions about the cosmic order are totally unfamiliar.

The "core" seminar did not indulge "exoticism." At its best (as my friend Harry Harootunian has said of the work of Jack Hall), it made what had been formerly considered exotic comprehensible to a Western audience. *Twelve Doors to Japan* (a book inspired by the "core" seminar and which I use here as a surrogate for the syllabus and my failing memory) offers ample evidence of this effort to find the familiar in the different. Ruth Benedict's analysis of traditional obligations in *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*, for example, had been made to demonstrate how unique the all-pervasive Japanese tradition of *on*, or personal obligation, was. When Beardsley wrote of these same obligations *functionally*, he concluded somewhat differently: "Japanese society differs not in categories or species of behavior but in extending to more public situations the attitudes and actions that Euro-American societies, for example, reserve for their narrowest, most intimate relations."⁷

What also characterized the course was a profound unease with the discussion of ideology or class conflict. We read and listened to discussions of culture and personality—paying more attention to the ideas of psychoanalyst Doi Takeo than to the analysis of social or political thought. Unlike historians (also area specialists, by virtue of their general concern with a single national state) who focus on change and process, our lectures (and readings) described a society in apparent equilibrium, where modern patterns intermingled with relations based on traditional assumptions. In an essay in *Twelve Doors* describing his choice of the "structural-functional" approach to study the Japanese political system, I think Robert Ward nicely captured the conceptual and normative objectives of the course.

Above all, the structural-functional approach eschews the question of whether a system is democratic or authoritarian, socialistic or imperialistic, but seeks its criteria of comparative judgment in the assessment of efficiency in functional terms. An efficient political system has an element of stability balanced against an element of change.⁸

My reading list prior to graduate school included much more Marx than Weber. Lenin and Plekhanov, Kautsky and Bernstein studies much preceded any reading I did in Parsons or Merton. I certainly still find reading Marx's "the history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class struggles" haunting, persuasive, and thought-provoking. It was important for me to know whether a society was socialist or fascist, democratic, or authoritarian; to discover the reasons why a society had one political system rather than another; and to learn why one ideology came to the fore and another was renounced.

Much of my research has centered on the question of ideology but rarely on the formal analysis of radical thought. My doctoral thesis and book, *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan*, for example, allowed me to consider questions of value disjuncture and dissensus in Meiji Japan in a way I had not anticipated. Of course, in Western history such moments marked the collapse of entire value systems and the possibility of creating new ones. As Andrew Barshay writes in his analysis and paraphrase of the political scientist and intellectual historian, Maruyama Masao: "These are the essential moments of negation, simultaneously pregnant with a further growth in the human capacity that drove society toward openness or transparency in the use of political power."⁹

Ultimately (and surprisingly to me) my doctoral thesis, begun as an analysis of a Meiji Christian social democrat, Abe Isoo, allowed me to attend to just these questions but within a context I had not previously imagined. I was forced to consider the radical ideological effects upon Meiji Japan of the conversion to Protestant Christianity of a samurai elite. Even before discussing this problem, I had to examine the effective and functional significance of tradition upon individuals facing a social debacle and a value crisis. Radical transformation and adept adaptation, Marx and Weber came together for me in writing my book.

I subtitled my talk "social science illusions." I will very briefly explain what I mean. Not too long ago I would have spoken of the useful heuristic effects for my research of concepts and ideas borrowed from the various social sciences, which, for me, includes Marxist social science. Today I would argue that it is the normative and ideological implication of these systems (not the alleged objectivity of their conceptual systems) that offers the most significant impulse to thinking and research.

NOTES

1. David A. Hollinger, *Science, Jews, and Secular Culture* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1996), 132.
2. Alex Inkeles, *Becoming Modern: Individual Change in Six Developing Countries* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1974).
3. Robert Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion: The Values of Pre-Industrial Japan* (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1957), 2.
4. Bellah, *Tokugawa Religion*, 5.
5. Kenneth Boulding, *The Meaning of the Twentieth Century: The Great Transition* (New York: Harper & Row, 1964).
6. William Sewell, "Geertz and History: From Synchrony to Transformation," *Representations* 59 (summer 1997): 37–38.
7. John Whitney Hall and Richard K. Beardsley, *Twelve Doors to Japan* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), 93.
8. Hall and Beardsley, *Twelve Doors to Japan*, 434.
9. Andrew Barshay, "On (No) Revolution: Maruyama on Historical Change," unpublished essay, 8.

The Politics of Modernism in Japan: Once Again the Problem of Fascism

Bernard Silberman

First of all, I want to warn you that this paper is cut down from a larger version, and I used a form of decimation that eliminated one out of every five pages. So if there's any disjuncture, that's what it's due to. My analysis is motivated by the absence of a concept of modernist politics in comparative politics in history, both generally and in the histories of Japan specifically. I think the problem is of more than passing interest. The crisis of modernity has long been associated with the rise of fascism, in its generic sense and in other totalitarian or authoritarian political social systems, and almost never with the rise of any democratic system. Often the association is seen as a consequence of the uneven development of society, as in Japan, Germany, Italy, and other latecomers to modernization. Unevenness is viewed as the consequence of the persistence of traditional conservative classes, institutions, and ideologies, which serve as a source of resistance to the rationalization or modernization of society. This resistance, it is argued, produces conflict over how society should be reintegrated.

The institutions or movements that we have come to call fascist, in a general sense, are seen by political elites and the middle classes as the only alternative to the plan of social integration presented by the movements of the Left. Fascism is thus seen as structurally determined. The quandary this presents is that fascism, in the general sense, has a range of organizational structures. If one believes that fascism is structurally determined, then the variation needs to be explained somehow, or one has to deny that the variations belong in a category of fascism. This has long been the central problem of talking about fascism. Because Japan did not have an organizational structure similar to the Italian or German forms, some critics have argued that Japan between 1936 and 1945 (for example) was not fascist but authoritarian. This does take a bit of the bite out of the characterization of such regimes.

Today I want to argue, using Japan as the example, that the relationship between modernity and modernization of fascism does not lie in static structural constraints. That is, we have continued to use the word “fascist,” not on the basis of structural similarities but rather on the basis of a similarity of elite strategies aimed at overcoming the problems of social integration—strategies that resort to the aestheticization of politics. It is this process that is the basis of what I try to bring to political modernism. Although modernism continues to be seen as a problem of either aesthetic, philosophic, or critical nature, it is fundamentally concerned with problems that we all can think of as social and political. That is, modernism deals with the problem of attempting to find order or immutability in the increasingly rapid transformation of a context that informs our everyday choices. It is my contention here that there is something we can call political modernism, which is distinct from the more common political perspective of modernization. In brief, political modernism is the perception of the new as a paradoxically persistent recurring object requiring new contingent strategies for organizing and legitimizing individual and collective choices. To put it in language that you can understand, or at least I can understand, political modernism is concerned with organizing and institutionalizing power. The analysis here is directed toward attempting to understand how major refigurations, and their language and ideas, modernism and modernization, produce political strategies that have led to different understandings of Japan and other transformed societies.

In the seminal essay “The Painter of Modern Life,” written in 1863, Baudelaire wrote, “Modernity is the transient, the fleeting, the contingent.” It is one half of art, the other being the eternal and the immutable. Modernism in this sense was a direct consequence of the Enlightenment’s rejection of custom and tradition. Let us say, in political and organizational terms, it is the rejection of the ritualization of rules of procedure and decision making in favor of self-reflecting reason of subjective rationality. Self-reflecting reason in this sense had two elements: subjectivity—the idea of contingent reason or autonomy—and instrumentality—the idea of universal reason. With the destruction of the capacity to ritualize the present and thereby link it to the past came a present that was constantly changing. It was a present without an ordering principle, changing because the basis of the ritualization of rules of action no longer had an eternal or immutable external source of reference. The source of authority with regard to the mutable became, of necessity, self-referential. Such was the unease of this condition that the search for metasystems became increasingly intense throughout the nineteenth century. Systems characterized by the universality of the subjective, or the autonomous rationality of actors emerged literally all over the place. Thus, Baudelaire’s understanding of modernity as having two seemingly opposing forces was apparently resolved by the subjectivity or autonomous will of the reasoning or rational actor.

What I wish to call attention to now is the dichotomous character of modernism and its political form as it evolved in the nineteenth century as a strategy. The stress on the self as the reference point for observing and organizing the world produced two different understandings of how individuals made choices and the constraints upon these choices. One of these was a conception of man that can be described best perhaps as oversocialized. This was a conception of individuals whose choices were overwhelmingly mediated by their social relations, their sensitivity to the judgments of others. They were thus obedient to the dictates of systems of norms and values, which were seemingly the result of social consensus, and one might say of history. Reason was thus seen as historical in character and contingent on the historical context. The second kind of strategy was derived from a view of individuals that can be called undersocialized. Individuals were seen to make choices and organize strategies unhampered by any social relations. The nonliberal economist saw choice as a function of internalized class role. The undersocialized view of choice was a product of a conception that championed the notion of self-referential, reasonable choice constrained by the actions of a multitude of other individuals also making self-referential, reasonable choices. Markets were in this view metasocial structures of order that depended on choices made without reference to social constraints.

It becomes apparent from these searches for metasystems in the nineteenth century that the essential aspect of modernism was the search for order. What is noticeable in these two aspects of modernism is the problem of finding an underlying or immutable structure of order governing choice and decision making. This was resolved by elevating subjectivity to the basic principle of social behavior. By this I mean that both oversocialized and undersocialized views of the individual conceived of decision making and choice as functions of individuals completely separated from social relations and context. In the undersocialized story, decision making was a function of rational choice: individuals pursuing their own best interests regardless of what others did. The oversocialized story stressed behavioral patterns that had become internalized, and contextual social relations had only minor effects on actors' choices or decisions. Here, culture was directly determined by choice. Thus, in both aspects of modernist social theory and strategy, culture became a powerful determinant of choice. Culture became a kind of transcendent superorganic metasocial choice or force that produced an underlying order to a seemingly inconstant and fluctuating world.

If modernism came to be centered on the cognitive problem of order, then modernization was and is a concept centered on the problem of pragmatic instrumentality. Modernization also had its inception in the concern over and description of a fluctuating world. Here, however, the guide to this flux was seen to be self-regarding instrumentality, which was teleological in char-

acter. This goal was seen in two different forms, depending once again on the conception of what determined the actor's rational choice. First, the undersocialized conception of man produced a self-regarding utilitarianism. Under this view, society was best ordered when its institutions were arranged so as to achieve the greatest net balance of satisfaction summed over all the individuals belonging to it—a kind of classic utilitarian notion. Modernization in this version thus came to mean the self-conscious construction of social procedures that would allow society to maximize the balance of satisfaction taken over all its members. In this system, there was no inherent organizational structure. It was, however, quite natural to think of rationality as a constraint on choices that could be made. This might be accomplished by allowing each actor, so to speak, to vote or express his or her rational desires through a system of publicly regulated choices. Or it could be accomplished by creating an organizational form of the impartial spectator—that is to say, the expert.

The modern in modernization was signaled by the appearance of a bureaucratic structure organized around the concept of the rational or instrumental relationship between means and ends. In this utilitarian version of the world, modernization had a universal quality. That is, since rational self-regard and subjective rationality were believed to be qualities of actors everywhere, there was no reason to suppose that once the organized constraints on traditional regimes were removed, modernization could not emerge everywhere.

The transfiguration of society, politics, economic structure, and modes of thought in the nineteenth century led to strategies and understandings of the world in terms that became known as modernism and modernization. Out of this cognitive reconstruction emerged strategies of power and theories of social behavior more or less dominated by two views of the social actor. Underlying these views, however, were fundamental features of what self-conscious actors saw as the basic elements of the transformed society of the nineteenth century: rational subjectivity and social atomization of actors. Max Weber's plaintive declaration made in Vienna in 1909 is a fitting summation of where modernity and modernism left social actors. He said:

We know of no scientifically demonstrable ideals to be sure; our labors are now rendered more difficult, since we must create our ideals from within our chests in the very age of subjectivist culture. But we must not and cannot promise a fool's paradise and an easy street—neither in here and now, nor in or the out, neither in thought nor in action, and it is the stigma of our human dignity that the peace of our souls cannot be as great as the peace of one who dreams of such a paradise.

I will now turn to Japan. Japan has presented a profoundly interesting case of both modernization and modernism, as the vast literature on Japan's

development reveals. As a case or example of critical modernism, it is equally or more significantly interesting, despite the relative neglect of attempts at constructing a metatheory of order consonant with the profound changes that occurred after 1868. Indeed, the strategies designed and carried out by those who came to lead Japan in the 1870s are often seen as part of a universal set of stages of modernization that somehow went wrong. The Meiji Restoration, in this sense, can be seen as an exercise in modernity.

Japanese leadership itself became engaged in a modernist or modernism project distinct from the project of state building, although the two were closely related. The modernist project in which the Meiji leadership became engaged was focused on the construction of a new imperial myth. This has usually been seen as a strategy dictated by the continuing hold of tradition; that is, the new samurai leaders had little choice in their quite desperate need for symbols of legitimate authority. Now surely, there's a great deal of truth in this view, but what it overlooks is precisely the modernist problem, as opposed to the problem of creating a legitimate authoritative state mechanism that would satisfy the holders of power and elevate Japan to the status of a recognized Western state. By the modernist problem, I mean the quandary faced by the new leadership after 1872: how to make sense out of what was emerging as an extraordinarily fluctuating world. After all, it was their action of bringing down the Tokugawa Bakufu that created the modernist problem for Japan. They had in fact shown that history was not natural, but quite capable of being directly tampered with at any given moment. Perhaps more than anything else, this made it evident that the world was an exceptionally contingent and unnatural place. The destruction of the old regime had produced an extraordinary revelation: that, in fact, there were no natural institutions. Underlying this revelation was the even more disturbing understanding that a natural order did not exist. This left the Meiji leaders with a striking conclusion, which rose to full consciousness gradually over the decade or so after 1872—there existed no natural constraint on human desires. It was the pursuit of their own desires, as a matter of fact, which had led them to attack the old regime and bring it to its knees. What was to prevent others, then, from doing the exactly the same thing, in a never-ending progression of change and disorder? In political and social terms, this was, I suggest, a true modernist dilemma. What was truly modernist was the destruction of a divinely mandated natural order with absolutely nothing in sight to replace it. The existence of individual desires that were derived from subjective rather than objective rationality had to be acknowledged. A former lower samurai could become a leader.

Japan's leaders by 1872 were faced with a dilemma no less serious than that which was to be faced by European leaders from the turn of the nineteenth century and especially following World War I. The trauma of the break with the past that emerged after 1868 in Japan was functionally similar,

I would argue, to the trauma of the first two decades of the twentieth century visited upon Eastern and Western Europe. As in the West, Japanese political leaders, more so than intellectuals, found themselves in search of a myth that would rescue them from a formless universe of contingency or provide an impetus and a teleology for a new project of human endeavor. The Meiji leaders came to practice modernist strategies in much the same way as the young man who discovered that he had been writing prose all his life but hadn't known it. It is clear, I think, that the Meiji leaders surely by the 1870s had come to believe that social actors were driven by subjective interests. Once they made this assumption, they had basically only two choices before them if they wished to ensure their own continued residence in places of power. They had to select from the possibilities open to them from their assumptions about the pursuit of interests—the undersocialized view of the social actor. They could not select from the prospects available from oversocialized assumptions. One class of such assumptions had already been disregarded: that there were natural orders of superior and inferior deriving from some natural order. That is, that individuals were connected to society by inequality. Nor were the Meiji leaders in any position to make any but the most fearful assumptions about class constraints on role, given their early and unwavering commitment to individual property rights. Faced with the consequences of their own assumptions about the nature of social actors, the Meiji leaders proceeded to construct a new view of Japanese society that contained all the elements of an aesthetic ideology characterized by its view of and desire for the atomization of social actors.

I say desire, because they realized that society could be controlled only if the actors, once bereft of those institutional boundaries that had hitherto been sacrosanct, because they were thought to be natural, were placed in a different frame of reference that was the functional equivalent of inequality as the natural order. This view was to be characterized by the creation of an imperial myth that would serve as the means for connecting individuals with society and thus constraining atomized social behavior and endowing it with a substantive goal. What is interesting and significant is the manner in which the atomized version of social actors produced a myth of imperial transcendence that aestheticized politics in a manner that was to foreshadow in the clearest possible way the nature of post-World War I European politics.

Despite what appeared to be a continued deployment of traditional institutions throughout the Meiji period, a close examination reveals that the substance of these traditional institutions—family, community, and emperor—was removed and replaced with a system of positive law and aesthetic formulation. The Meiji leaders had just destroyed any possibility of relying on ascriptive right. They were thus faced with at least minimal claims of social equality. Admitting to social equality meant each individual system of choices was some-

how equally significant. In effect this led the Meiji leaders inevitably and irretrievably to a notion that what they faced was a demand for a system of satisfying desires that was not a product solely of their own private interests—a system, that is, that would maximize the net balance of satisfaction over all the members of society. To do so, however, meant that the Meiji leaders had to choose between two classic modernist solutions to the problem of equality of desires. They could choose an elective system or they could choose the system of the impartial spectator. To choose the former, however, meant the possibility of being unceremoniously thrown out of office, as the popularity of the Jiominkan movement in the Meiji period suggested. They were not willing to risk this. This left them with little alternative but the impartial spectator. The impartial spectator was to train the imperial civil servant. Administration not only came to substitute for politics, it became the representative of the public interest. From the Meiji leaders' point of view the public interest was simply too important to be left to the public.

By the end of the 1880s, the Meiji leaders had come to embrace the utilitarian compilation of society's interest from the interest of the single individual. They sought to legitimize the dominance of experts by making them accountable to the most impartial of spectators, the emperor. In fact, the Meiji leaders were forced to produce a source of accountability whose very existence would appear to ensure the pursuit of the public interest yet would not be based on a mechanical procedure of counting atomized individual preferences. This couldn't be done by making one of themselves, or a group of themselves—the *Genro* for example—transcendent, because that would leave them open to the charge of *lèse-majesté*. They were thus placed in the position of having to parade an emperor, even if one had not already existed. But this would have to be an emperor whose qualities ensured the pursuit of the public as opposed to private interests and provided the means of linking equal individuals to society. The only way in which this dilemma could be resolved was to provide a divine pedigree for a political institution. Divinity promised a means by which the private interest of any subject or emperor could be constrained. The Meiji leaders proceeded quite self-consciously to create an emperor who was unapproachable, mystical, magical, and possessed of the qualities that created bonds between all of his subjects. Most importantly, he also delegated his authority to the bureaucratic institutions that encompassed the day-to-day functioning of society. By necessity, before this divine being, all individuals were equal. There could be no great names. All institutions were thus subordinated to his existence. Family and community did not exist by natural right but by benign delegation of imperial dominance. In this construct of the Meiji leaders, what remained was a society of atomized individuals integrated by the wonderful dramaturgical aesthetics of imperial divinity and timelessness.

In many ways the imperial pomp and kitsch that the Meiji leaders created was later mirrored in the dramaturgical apparatus of the Nazis and the Italian fascists. All were cases of the aestheticization of politics described by Walter Benjamin. In the process of displacing all accountability to a divine being, politics as an occasion, to use Weber's felicitous phrase, was closed down. One could only serve the emperor of rationality by the everyday enactment and participation in the drama of divine transcendence and unapproachability. One could not seek to impose the public interest to evade an individual choice. Pielt's created tradition or culture, summed up in the nurturing kitsch of divine emperor, constituted the modern strategy: the ideology of aestheticism.

In reducing politics to aesthetics to imperial myth and sustaining bureaucratic rationality through imperial divinity, the Meiji leaders produced a fateful tension. The stress led increasingly in the 1920s and 1930s to an attack on modernity as a subjectivist, rational endeavor. The political emphasis on interest and the public display of subjective rationality, public and private, in the decades following the turn of the century, led to an escalation of both ambiguity and ambivalence about what the nature of the subject was—about who and what were the Japanese. To say that the Japanese were just like the Europeans in their collective rationality of modernization was to leave Japanese identity devoid of history, even its modern history. Out of this emerged a growing rejection of universalistic conceptions of Japanese identity, behavior, and progress. In the place of universalism, there were an increasing number of intellectuals and bureaucratic elites who were willing to accept the technological modernization of Japan but were unwilling to accept the universal wrapping in which it arrived. Instead modernity and modernization came to be viewed as products of a uniquely Japanese identity as evinced by the persistence of Japanese behavioral patterns. In this emergent social theory, Japan's modernization had a specific and uniquely Japanese origin. As a consequence, a uniquely Japanese identity, coming from the existence of specific internalized patterns of culture, was posited—a kind of natural rationality unique to the Japanese.

The tension between the subjective rationality encased in the civil and military bureaucratic structure and the aesthetic ambiguity of a sublimely divine emperor eliminated the possibility of the institutionalization of democratic practice. Democratic practice had neither the constraint of bureaucratic rules on individual rationality nor the constraint of solidarity on individual desires. Political parties in the '20s and '30s can thus be seen only as individuals pursuing private interests without constraints. The collapse of any notion of party government in 1936 ushered in a politics that resembled those of Germany and Italy by virtue of its elevation of myth as the binding force of society.

The civil bureaucracy, I would argue, emerged as the functional equivalent of the so-called mass parties. The bureaucracies served as mediators between state and society in the same hapless manner as the Nazi and fascist parties. Capitalism was not constrained in any of these systems, regardless of any and all popular sentiment. But most important of all, these three systems shared a common solution to the problem of modernity.

The “Paranoid Style” in Japanese Foreign Policy

Peter Duus

From the spring of 1941 Japan’s military leaders began to complain about “ABCD encirclement”—the encirclement of Japan by the Americans, the British, the Chinese, and the Dutch East Indies. Such complaints at a time when Japanese armies occupied Manchuria, much of northern and coastal China and northern French Indochina struck most Western observers as absurd. The British cartoonist David Low spoofed them in a cartoon showing President Roosevelt, Secretary of State Cordell Hull, and Assistant Secretary of State Sumner Welles staring in astonishment as General Tōjō ran in a circle around them, ranting about encirclement. In retrospect the idea of “ABCD encirclement” seems to belong to a world of Orwellian political language where a word means its opposite—where “peace” means “war,” where “justice” means “oppression,” where “truth” means “falsehood,” where “encirclement” means “aggression.”

It is clear, however, that the Japanese leadership took the idea of “ABCD encirclement” quite seriously. Tōjō Hideki certainly did, before and during the war—and even during his interrogations after the war ended. So did popular culture. While David Low lampooned “encirclement,” Japanese cartoonists treated it as historical fact. For example, a two-page cartoon spread in the April 1942 *Manga* magazine showed Uncle Sam, John Bull, Chiang Kai-shek, and a fat figure intended to represent the Dutch East Indies plotting to surround Japan. Furthermore, the cartoon linked the “encirclement” of 1941 to a much longer history of earlier “encirclements,” represented by panels showing Uncle Sam and John Bull reaching out with their sharp-nailed claws toward East Asia in a constant but unsuccessful effort to thwart plucky little Japan’s efforts to plant brave new societies in the region.

This self-identification of Japan as embattled victim of sinister foreign forces brings to mind Richard Hofstadter’s 1964 essay on the “paranoid style”

in American politics. Hofstadter used the term “paranoid style” to describe the “heated exaggeration, suspiciousness, and conspiratorial fantasy” that had characterized right-wing political movements in the United States from the early nineteenth century onward. He was not using the term in a clinical sense but was trying to evoke a way of viewing the world marked, as true paranoia was, by a sense of persecution and delusions of grandeur. His point was that paranoid modes of expressions could also be deployed by “more or less normal people.” To be sure, he added, paranoid visions were not conjured out of thin air. There was always plausible evidence to support the anxieties they revealed. What characterized the “paranoid style” was not “the absence of verifiable facts” but “a curious leap in imagination that is always made at some critical point in the recital of events.” Nor were paranoid visions lacking in coherence or logic. Indeed, the opposite was true. Often they seemed to make more rational sense than the real world did, though invariably they wove the “verifiable facts” into a neatly patterned fabric of fear, threat, and evil.

It is clear that many Japanese, high and low, cleaved to a “paranoid style” of thinking in 1941, but unlike the American right wing, which traditionally feared the “enemy within”—whether Freemasons, Catholics, Jewish capitalists, or Communists—the Japanese saw only “enemies without.” And they saw a conspiracy directed not simply at Japan but at the whole of East Asia—or at least at the new Asia they were building—the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.

The questions I’d like to raise today are: What manifest or latent rhetorical, psychological, or cultural functions did the vision of “ABCD encirclement” serve? Was this vision a sudden or periodic eruption of paranoid thinking or was it a reflection of a perennial aspect of modern Japanese political culture? I have no assured answers to these questions, particularly the second one, but I would like to throw out some speculative ones.

The first question might be answered quite simply. As some wag once put it, paranoia may be a “heightened sense of reality.” In other words, the vision of an “ABCD encirclement” was not an unreasonable description of the situation in which Japan found itself. Japan was not literally encircled in a military sense, but since the fall of 1940 it had been hemmed in strategically by an informal coalition among the United States, Great Britain, and China—and even more important, it had been hemmed in economically by an American campaign of sanctions and embargoes. In other words, Tōjō (and the cartoonist in *Manga* magazine) were speaking in metaphorical terms, not literal ones.

Yet the question still remains: Why this construction of the situation rather than some other one? Why did the Japanese not portray the ABCD powers cowering in fright as they faced a powerful and forthright Japan standing up to change the course of history? Why did the Japanese not place more emphasis on Japan’s strength and advantage rather than on its vulnerability?

Why, in short, did the Japanese describe an “encirclement” by the ABCD powers rather than “advance” against them?

The answer is that the vision of “encirclement” allowed the Japanese to portray themselves as “victims” rather than “victimizers”—and this, of course, had several consequences. First, the portrayal of Japan as threatened rather than threatening made it easier to mobilize public anxiety over the looming crisis. By delineating an external frontier of fear, the vision of ABCD “encirclement” could galvanize that anxiety into war fever. By eroding any sense of complacency, the vision of “encirclement” put the public on notice that a potentially overwhelming confrontation with the ABCD allies had to be met by more than ordinary efforts.

Second, the portrayal of Japan as victim allowed the Japanese to bond with their own victims. If the Japanese were the object of conspiracies by “white imperialists” or “Anglo-Saxon imperialists” just as the Chinese and their other Asian neighbors were, then it was possible to transform Japan’s aggression into an act of mutual self-defense. By 1941 the notion that Japan was fighting a war for the “liberation of Asia” was firmly fixed in the public consciousness, and so was the notion that Japan was a “have not” nation seeking the overthrow of an international order dominated by the “haves.” The vision of “ABCD encirclement” simply redefined or reinforced these ideas.

Finally, the portrayal of Japan as victim was also a way of displacing responsibility for the probable (and then the actual) outbreak of war with the United States. If Japan were the victim of an encirclement, how could it be blamed for striking back at its tormentors? Indeed, this was precisely the message that the Japanese government conveyed in its final note to the Americans on December 7—a document filled with recrimination against the American government for obstructing Japan in its efforts toward a peaceful resolution with China, for pressuring the Dutch and the French in Indochina to resist Japanese diplomatic overtures, for its buildup of military forces in preparation for a confrontation with Japan, and so forth. In so many words, the Japanese were complaining that the U.S. had backed them into a corner—encircled them—with its wantonly inflexible machinations.

So it is quite simple to explain the eruption of paranoia toward the outside world in 1941 as a rational response to a particular political, diplomatic, and military impasse—and perhaps to suggest that the sense of threat was cynically manipulated to stir up public sentiment. Yet as one looks over the history of modern Japan, there seem to be constant eruptions of “paranoid thinking”—so many, in fact, that the “paranoid style” seems to be a permanent fixture of its political culture rather than an episodic one.

Certainly all of us have encountered Japanese in the 1960s (and after) who told us that the government of Japan (duly elected by the Japanese people) could not make a foreign policy move without the consent of the State Depart-

ment; all of us have talked with Japanese convinced that the atomic bombs were dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki as an “experiment” rather than as a military weapon; and all of us have read political cartoons that portray Japan as an innocent victim being bashed (literally) by the American congress or the American president.

Yet paranoid thinking was also quite visible before 1941. One can find it in the predictions of a “crisis of 1936,” in the spate of books that predicted war with the United States in the early 1920s, in the heated denunciations of the Russian threat at the turn of the century, in the constant litany of fear about Western colonial encroachment in the *jiyū minken* press of the 1880s and 1890s, in Iwakura’s pronouncements about the hostile nature of the outer world at the moment of the Meiji Restoration, all the way back to the literature of alarm in the 1850s. Even from the Bakumatsu period, or more accurately *especially* from the Bakumatsu period, many (if not most) Japanese viewed relations with the outside world through a paranoid lens, seeing outsiders, specifically the Europeans and Americans, as hostile, aggressive, covetous, predatory, and intent on doing harm to Japan.

Indeed, the classic statement of the “paranoid style” may have been Yoshida Shoin’s *Kyōfu no gen*, an impassioned tract written at the time of the Harris negotiations, that bewailed the “great calamity” facing the country. Yoshida conjured up a vision of “numberless” foreign countries spying on Japan, of a sinister American plot to infiltrate the country by opening the ports, of cynical American schemes to subvert the “hearts” of the ignorant masses with apparently humanitarian gestures, and of an American plot to hold sway over the daimyo by making them loans or selling them steamships. Yoshida even claimed that if the Japanese were not careful, the American president—Buchanan, at the time—intended to interfere in the question of shogunal succession. These paranoid assertions were all based on “verifiable facts.” The presence of the Americans and their demands were a palpable reality, but Yoshida subjected these facts to one of those “curious leaps in imagination” that Hofstadter spoke of and, in doing so, was able to construct an image of the foreigners as intent on the downfall of Japan. It is no surprise that Yoshida was resurrected as a visionary in the 1940s, precisely at the moment of “ABCD encirclement.”

In any case, it seems to me that a plausible argument can be made that a “paranoid style” of thinking about the outside world was a persistent feature of Japan’s modernization—and perhaps even part of its modern political culture. In other words, the language of “victimhood” had been central to the Japanese image of itself since the 1850s—evoked at moments of crisis, large and small—and it continues to be evoked today as a powerful metaphor for Japan’s uncomfortable relationship with the outside world, most particularly the world of the West.

No doubt by suggesting this I open myself to the charge that I am “essentializing” Japanese political culture, but that is not my intention. Rather, I am trying to decipher the historical specificity of this culture, which might, of course, be quite different from the political culture of (say) the late Muromachi period. In explaining the historical context of the paranoid strain in political culture (if there is one), Hofstadter’s essay offers some helpful suggestions.

Hofstadter hypothesizes that “[c]atastrophe or fear of catastrophe is most likely to elicit the syndrome of paranoid rhetoric.” What I would like to suggest is that the Japanese elite, for the past century and a half, has lived in an almost perpetual state of fear of catastrophe, induced by a sense of vulnerability, whether political, military, economic, or cultural—a sense that outsiders (whether in the guise of foreign investment, foreign missionaries, foreign movies, or foreign workers) are constantly hovering at the gate, waiting to disrupt the orderly household within. Foreign intrusion, in other words, is seen neither as normal nor as desirable, except perhaps under conditions dictated or controlled by the Japanese themselves. The susceptibility of Japan to such unwanted intrusions may well be the most important factor in keeping alive the “paranoid style” in looking at the outside world.

However, I suspect there is more to it than a perennial sense of vulnerability—which is certainly shared by other small countries, like Korea, for example. So let me invoke Hofstadter’s suggestion that “the paranoid disposition is mobilized into action chiefly by social conflicts that involve ultimate schemes of values and that bring fundamental fears and hatreds, rather than negotiable interests, into political action.” So often the outsider (or outsiders) facing Japan refuse to accommodate the feelings, interests, or desire of the insiders. The “paranoid style” may therefore be a natural response to encounters in which it was not possible to negotiate nor to engage in the reciprocities that lubricate social relationships within Japanese society. Since encounters with the outsider offer no possibility of exchange, of negotiation, of *quid pro quo*, or of gestures of connection—as certainly there were not in 1858 or in 1941—the outsider can be seen only as implacably hostile, his unwillingness to negotiate a demonstration that he has only sinister intentions toward Japan. So while the sense of encirclement, of victimhood, or of persecution by foreigners has always been firmly rooted in concrete realities, it has also been linked to the difficulties of dealing with an “other” that does not follow the expected rules of social behavior.

My Middle University

Edward Seidensticker

I was going to start my remarks today with a mild objection. Every program until the last one listed me as being from the Army Language School here in Ann Arbor. They deleted that for the very last version of the program, but they did not say where I did go to school. The year I was studying Japanese was probably the most important year of my life. It changed my life utterly. Before that I was an undergraduate in English. My plans were to go to graduate school, and my ambition was to become an English professor in some nice little eastern college like Amherst or Williams. I might well have done that, but then I went to Boulder. Well, now I've spilled the beans. I went to the Navy Language School, and that changed my life completely and utterly.

I would like to revive, just for a moment, a friendly rivalry between the Army Language School and the Navy Language School. We of course thought that our school was the better, and I am inclined still to say that we were right. But we were right for a very simple reason: the navy school was much less military than the army school. I think that that was very important. We had an hour of drill every week, and we had a special course in military terminology, but aside from that we might as well have not been in the navy, for all the difference it made. We got word from Ann Arbor (we had good connections with Ann Arbor) that the army was not as forbearing as the navy. The Army Language School was a much more military place than the Navy Language School. In the course of the discussions, we heard talk of marching back and forth between dormitory and flats. We did nothing of that sort at Boulder. We straggled off exactly as we wished to straggle off. If we were ten or fifteen minutes late, nobody really cared. They assumed we were serious about our studies and left us alone. And I think that was really very important; it was the key to what I consider to be a fact that the navy school was better than the army school. I think we came out of the navy school knowing more than they did.

Another mild objection is that I do not really belong down here with the globalists. Where I would be most comfortable would be back among the people who talked on the first day and reminisced. I cannot pretend to have been one of the founders of the training center—the field station, I guess they called it—down in Okayama. I was in Japan during most of those years but I had nothing to do with that. Yet I would find it much more congenial to be up there with them rather than down here with all the prophets and sages. I am no prophet and I am no sage. I would like in particular to be cuddled up there somewhere near Grace Beardsley. I have very little hope that my paper will have the charm of Grace's, but it needed to be in the same conversational, colloquial, informal style. I have another reason for wanting to be there beside dear old Grace, who is not here today. I always called her "Bace Greadsley." She had that little transformation, you know, of Doug and Og becoming Dog and Oug. Well, I made a similar transposition with Grace. She liked it.

I have another reason for wanting to be with that group. I never visited the Okayama Field Station. I had very little notion, although I was in Japan, of what they were up to. Yet I benefited in what I consider a major manner from the station. In her paper, Grace lists several of what she calls a "wide variety of activities besides studying in which we . . . participated. One of them is architectural digs." It was an Iron Age tomb in which she dug. It is of this that I am the beneficiary. During my Ann Arbor years, Grace gave me an unglazed gray pot that came from the tomb. It is a very good pot and it belongs in a museum. It is almost undamaged, though there are repairs at the lip, and there is a blemish that I treasure. Just below the neck is a pick mark. I do not doubt that it is from Grace's pick. I hope Grace does not think that all this is by way of preparation for returning the pot to her. I did not bring it with me from Honolulu, where it reposes, and I am steady in my conviction that it belongs in a museum, I mean to give it to the Honolulu Academy of Arts. Grace says that it is Iron Age, which is fine. The inventory prepared by the academy describes it thus: "Vase, Sueki, 6th–7th c., Okayama prefecture excavated; comb pattern."

The adjective in my title has a double meaning. We students of literature love double meanings. It refers to the fact that Michigan was the second of the three American universities I taught at. It was preceded and followed by universities on the two coasts, Stanford and Columbia. Hence the second meaning of the adjective: it was the only university by which I was employed in the middle part of the country.

People are always asking—not so much recently as back when I was on active duty, so to speak—which of my universities I have liked the best. They are always surprised by my answer: Michigan was much the nicest. "But Michigan is in the *Middle West*," they reply, the tone suggesting something less

than ideal objectivity. "Undeniably true," I reply. Yet I have given an honest answer to the question.

"But what about students?" they often ask. "Surely you got better ones in the Ivy League and at the Harvard of the West." "Not so," I reply. The best ones were at Michigan. My graduate seminars at Michigan, especially those on *The Tale of Genji*, were the best classes I had anywhere. I gave everyone an A, for the simple reason that everyone deserved an A. The pertinent administrative office, whatever it might be, never questioned my grade sheets. I think there was an awareness that it is possible to have such classes. Michigan is the only university at which I personally had experience of them.

I liked Michigan from the start, and I think a reason was that I felt at home here as I did not in California. I will make bold to quote from my diary, a part of an entry in September 1966, shortly after my arrival in Ann Arbor. My esteemed and lamented colleague, Bob Brower, his friend Laura Gray, also esteemed and lamented, and I that day drove to the northern suburbs of Detroit, some of which, as you know, are very beautiful.

The colors have deepened considerably this one week, the pumpkins lie in the fields awaiting Halloween and Thanksgiving. This is a land of nostalgia, even for one who grew up in a very different sort of land—as California, more similar to Colorado on the surface, is not. For this is the land of the mythical American, of blueberries and bare feet and pumpkin pies and sumacs. . . . Hence, I suppose, I feel at home, as never in California.

I grew up in Colorado. We Coloradans did not hate Midwesterners as we hated Texans, but we resented any suggestion that we were Midwesterners. We were Westerners, we insisted. As any sensible person knew, the West began when Pikes Peak hove into sight. Yet, as the quotation tells us, Colorado is, for me at least, a part of the great Mississippi basin. It might be objected that Michigan lies not in the Mississippi but the St. Lawrence basin, but I think we need not worry about that. I felt that I had come home when I moved from California to Michigan.

Another reason for thinking that I am out of place down here among those who look ahead to a global age is that I am no prophet, in the modern sense of the term (the biblical sense is somewhat different). I am not good at predictions and have found myself in hot water when, unwisely, I have made them. Once I addressed a women's club in Tokyo about Hawaii. I tried very hard to avoid politics, but in answer to a question about the future of Hawaii I said that since it was already a part of the Japanese empire it might as well become so formally. I found myself in the middle of a fire storm. How dare I, said the women of the club speaking as one voice, accuse Japan of imperial-

ism when America in this case was the original imperialist. I tried to point out that the statement was in answer to a question I should have declined to answer, since I am no prophet. I also pointed out, I think it was again unwisely, that if we were to roll history back a century and a half we would find Hokkaido in an interesting position. Disclaimers and rebuttals were to no avail. I will not be invited to address the club again. Which is fine. It does not pay well, and in Japan, given an exchange rate that works entirely to the Japanese advantage, one wishes to be paid well.

I think that if I were to seek to be global and prophetic I would have to step outside of the only field in which I feel at all competent, Japanese literature. One does not make predictions about literature. It happens, and no one can venture to say when and where and how it will happen. I am inclined to think that Japanese fiction, at any rate—I have always specialized in prose—is in for a very bleak period. One of the golden ages of Japanese literature, in my view, occurred after the war, and it ended, I think, with the deaths in quick succession of Mishima and Kawabata. The young lions seem to me more like puppy dogs scampering after leftovers. This may be *oi no kurigoto*, rendered by Kenkyūsha, which does not mind being a touch prolix, as “the long and tedious talks old folks are apt to indulge in.” A genius could come along at any time and change everything. One does well not to predict.

And as for being global? Some of us have tried very hard to find for Japanese literature, classical and modern, a global audience. We are very proud of and grateful for such successes as we have achieved in this regard. Yet this says little about the origins of the literature we have worked with. It has been said of politics that all of it is local. I doubt that the same thing, quite, could be said of literature. It is possible to find a Japanese novel so French that it might as well be French, but I am inclined to think that most good Japanese novels are of Japan. They may be so utterly Japanese as to be losers in the international market, and yet be good. I think much of Izumi Kyōka falls in this category. Writers like Tanizaki and Kawabata can be very Japanese and still speak to an international audience. They are not global, they are local; but they can be put to global uses. I doubt that there really is any considerable entity that may be called global literature.

I have already told you that I liked Ann Arbor and Michigan and the university better than the other places and universities I have taught at. I do not think that the global is anything that can be planned for. I do not think it possible to say “Well now boys, and girls, we are going to be global,” and then proceed to be it. These things happen without planning. There are circumstances that are friendly to it, and those circumstances were more amply present at Michigan than at my other American universities.

The thing about Michigan is that we got on so well with one another. After I left Michigan for Columbia, I started picking up rumors of dissension in

the former place. What a pity if true, I thought. When I was there it was much freer of factional and personal feuding than either of my other two universities. These things are the worst possible wasters of good scholarly time. I did occasionally get annoyed at one or another of my colleagues in what was then the East Asian Languages and Cultures Department (EALAC) and is something else now. I am sure that the annoyance was reciprocated. We never let it last long, however. We had nothing of what I call the *chūshingura* spirit—the spirit of the famous forty-seven, which, deprived of its romance, signifies holding grudges forever. We quickly let arguments pass, as devotees of the spirit would never, never do.

We did have our annual quarrel with the China Center over the division of government money for student support. Perhaps this sort of thing has disappeared because of the dwindling and even disappearance of such funds. In those days it was serious business, and, after an amount of huffing and puffing, it always ended the same way, by dividing the funds equally. Each side had a good case. China is a bigger and older country than Japan, but the Japan side, in those days, had better students. What could be more sensible than to go halvers, and the sensible thing always prevailed. That aside, everything was most friendly, as it was not at my other two universities. I left Stanford because of a quarrel with the chairman of the department. When I left Michigan I told people, and it was true, that I was not going to Columbia, I was going to New York. I was glad enough to leave Columbia, not at all glad to leave New York.

If an endeavor like your (formerly my) Center for Japanese Studies wishes to be global, it must wait for the global thing to come if and as it will. The thing cannot be forced to come. No amount of crafty planning will prevail upon it to come. What such a center can do is provide congenial surroundings for erudite and intelligent ladies and gentlemen to work in, then wait and hope. This function my middle university performed far better than either of the other two. I might have thought of coming here to retire but for the fact that an old bachelor does not do very well in ice storms.

War and Ethnicity in the Study of Modern Japan

Samuel Hideo Yamashita

When I began my graduate work at Michigan in 1968, modernization theory was the prevailing orthodoxy in the Japanese studies field. It was a new orthodoxy, but an orthodoxy nonetheless. I was quickly introduced to the *Studies in the Modernization of Japan* series that Princeton University Press was publishing; at that point four volumes were available and the last one was on its way.¹ I also made my way through the now sizable body of scholarly studies on Japan's modernization—Albert Craig's *Chōshū in the Meiji Restoration*; a host of articles on the restoration by Marius Jansen, William Beasley, Robert Sakata, and others; the new work on the Meiji state by Joseph Pittau and George Akita; studies of the Meiji economy by Henry Rosovsky and a platoon of economists; and the new work on Meiji entrepreneurship by Johannes Hirschmeier.² Of special interest to me, as a fledgling intellectual historian, were Craig's groundbreaking "Science and Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan" and the articles and book on Nishi Amane by Roger Hackett and Thomas Havens.³ Two years later, Harry Harootunian's *Toward Restoration* and Irwin Scheiner's *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan* appeared.⁴ I also was introduced to the work of the philosophical fathers of modernization theory—Max Weber and Talcott Parsons.

Of the many things I read as a beginning graduate student, John Hall's brilliant essay on Japanese feudalism, which appeared in *Comparative Studies in Society and History*, was the most memorable.⁵ It was a tour de force that offered nothing less than a Weberian interpretation of Japanese history from prehistory to the eighteenth century. Looking back, I now realize that Hall's essay reveals that what was happening in Japanese studies at Michigan in the late 1960s was part of two larger movements then under way in the American historical community: the appearance of a new institutional history and a new comparative history, both of which were well represented at Michigan.⁶ That

is, Hall's essay reminds us that the study of Japan's modern history as modernization was an up-to-date and cutting edge approach in the late 1960s. It is clear to me now, of course, that I was being initiated into the dominant interpretive community in the field and thus learning its distinctive language and implicit methodology, metaphysics, and politics as well.

My initiation as a modernization scholar was taking place at a memorable moment—as the Vietnam War was escalating. Most of us graduate students, and faculty as well, were fiercely opposed to the Vietnam War. Demonstrations were held almost every day on the steps of Hatcher Library, along with marches and door-to-door campaigns to gather signatures for one or another antiwar petition. Protests occasionally turned violent and became riots, as happened one night in the summer of 1969 when students lobbed Molotov cocktails at the police right in front of the Residential College on East University. The police responded by firing tear gas over the heads of the protesting students and then charging down East University, knocking down and clubbing everyone in their path, protesters and innocent bystanders alike.

Those of us who came to Michigan to do graduate work in the fall of 1968 were soon involved. How could we not be? We were the first entering graduate class without draft deferments, and our hometown draft boards had found us by the spring of 1969, all of us, and we were drafted. Most of us were deferred for medical, and—dare I say—political, reasons, but a few went willingly. The latter never returned to continue their graduate work; after the war, they choose more practical careers—in law, business, and the like.

The 1960s were also the era of civil rights. We witnessed the awakening of ethnic consciousness—first, Black Power and then the power of groups of different hues. Militant Asian American undergraduates at Michigan formed a group called *Issho igong* (“together” in Japanese and Chinese), but with a few exceptions, most of us doing graduate work were not directly involved, although Daniel Okimoto's *American in Disguise* suggested that it was possible to be involved simultaneously in serious scholarship and what we now call identity politics.⁷ Many of us sympathized with the activists until they tried to claim Asian studies as their territory.

I remember one activist, a Eurasian fellow, who, after discovering his slumbering Asian identity, took his Asian mother's maiden name, and adopted the word *tōsō* (struggle) as his sobriquet. Tōsō believed that his metamorphosis gave him ownership of all things Asian. One night he crashed the showing of a Japanese film on campus, marching to the front of a packed auditorium just when the lights were about to be turned off. Affecting the voice and posture of a native informant revealing the secrets of his culture to outsiders, he proceeded to introduce the film to the mostly non-Asian audience. His condescension was palpable. It was also unwarranted: the audience included

faculty and graduate students who knew much more about Asia than he did. Tōsō's performance was pathetic.

Ironically, however, despite my own personal preoccupation with the Vietnam War and civil rights, war and ethnicity were not part of my thinking about modern Japan. Even though World War II was arguably the most dramatic and most affecting event in Japan's modern history, I had managed to leave it out of my study of modern Japan. No doubt, this was partly because there were so few good studies in English on the war. As of 1968, American Japan specialists had not written, in English, any first-rate scholarly studies of the Pacific war. But it also was because most of us—faculty and graduate students alike—were preoccupied with Japan's successful transformation from a feudal kingdom into a modern state and an ally of the United States. The war was simply not an issue to those of us studying modern Japan at Michigan, that is, not an explicit issue. There were exceptions, notably Hilary Conroy, a distinguished Japan specialist at the University of Pennsylvania, who saw parallels between Japan's occupation of China and America's involvement in Vietnam.⁸

Three decades later, the story is completely different. We have a swelling corpus of books and articles on the war: Alvin Coox's prize-winning study of the Battle of Nomonhan; several excellent volumes on Japan's colonial and wartime empires by Peter Duus, Ramon Myers, and Mark Peattie; Joyce Lebra's books on Japanese-trained armies in Southeast Asia; Thomas Haven's important *Valley of Darkness*; Ben-Ami Shillony's essays on Japan's wartime culture; John Dower's *War Without Mercy*; John Stephan's *Hawaii Under the Rising Sun*; Grant Goodman's articles on Asian students who spent the war in Japan; George Hicks's *Comfort Women*; Gavan Daws's *Prisoners of the Japanese*; Roger Dingman's *The Sinking of the Awa Maru and Japanese-American Relations, 1945–1995*; and *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887–1947*, a new history of the Japanese navy by Mark Peattie and David Evans.⁹ Although it deals with postwar Japan, we also have John Dower's *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II*, a brilliant study of how Japanese coped with defeat.¹⁰

We even have works that give us the voices of the Japanese themselves—Theodore and Haruko Cook's *Japan at War*, Frank Gibney's *Sensō*—and more and more English translations of memoirs by Japanese and others who experienced the war—Kappa Senoh's *A Boy Called H*, Kiyosawa Kiyoshi's *A Diary of Darkness*, Ōoka Shohei's *Taken Captive*, Yoshida Mitsuru's *Requiem for Battleship Yamato*, and Sakai Saburō's *Samurai*, to name but a few.¹¹

What we still have in only short supply are the wartime voices of Japanese, Japanese colonial subjects, and those in Japanese-controlled areas. This is surprising because reams of material from the wartime period have survived—letters and diaries of servicemen, civilians, and children. *Kike*

wadatsumi no koe, the most famous collection of wartime letters written by students—Tokyo University students—was recently republished in English as *Listen to the Voices from the Sea: Writings of the Fallen Japanese Students*.¹² Although I am not a World War II specialist, I am aware of the abundance of these sources because I was driven in desperation to search for material written by ordinary Japanese during the war. I found whole libraries of wartime material. I began with the servicemen. I collected all, or at least most, of the so-called last letters of special-attack pilots that have been published; I have about 250 and have read, translated, and analyzed about 130. I also have substantial excerpts from the diaries of thirty special-attack pilots, which I have read and translated, and know of the existence of several dozen more diaries. Because this is not the place to describe what I have found, suffice it to say that I have learned a lot about the war, the Japanese military, and what ordinary Japanese felt about serving their country.

I have even found evidence of resistance. There is a revealing entry in the diary of a Keio graduate who was drafted in 1944 and ended up in a special-attack unit in the spring of 1945. The writer describes how he got drunk at a party one night and expressed his real feelings about the war:

April 23 [1945]. Night flights have begun. After air operations ended for the day, we had a welcome party for Kamiōsako and broke out the beer. We got pretty drunk. I got mad at Lieutenant Kamiōsako about the status of those of us reserve officers in the Imperial Japanese Navy. I declared:

"I am not fighting for the Imperial Navy. If I live and die, it is for the sake of the homeland and, I would say, for my own pride. I hate the Imperial Japanese Navy and have no positive feelings [about it]. Let me speak from the heart: if I were to do it for my own pride, I could die, but I could never die for the Imperial Japanese Navy. How oppressed are the pilots in my group, the thirteenth class of student pilots? Who is doing the fighting? Half of my war buddies who were classmates already have boarded special-attack aircraft and died. From today onward, I declare that I will not line up with those in our group of student pilots. I will hole up in my own shell and defend my own "ism." From now on, I will raise high the "flag of nonaffiliation." This is nothing more than a lonely, small resistance, but this is the bitter, bitter fruit produced by my short life in the navy."¹³

This college student turned navy pilot almost survived the war but then was killed in a special-attack sortie on August 9, 1945.

I also found a diary kept by an ordinary soldier who was part of the Japanese force defending Okinawa in the late spring of 1945. He survived the

Allied invasion and hid out in the caves and bunkers in the hills north of Shuri for two and a half months, one of many thousands of Japanese stragglers and civilians. His August 10, 1945 entry is revealing:

August 10. Friday. Rain, then clear and windy. I hear stories about officers and men who shouted "Long live the emperor" and then went off to die, and I feel even more than before how pointless this is. . . . I could never do this. If people say that we as citizens of Japan never cease to benefit from the emperor's generosity, that is fine, but are the emperor's virtue and authority really that sort of thing? There is so much that is not convincing to me. . . . The emperor is too distant, a presence that has nothing to do with me. Somehow I cannot work myself into a state of mind in which I shout "banzai" and die for the emperor. So I have fought not for the emperor but for the homeland where more familiar parents and siblings, relatives and friends live, and also for my ancestral country. And even now those thoughts haven't changed. This view is not mine alone. Except for that group of officers and men who shout "Long live the emperor" don't most feel as I do?¹⁴

These are striking and poignant observations. That both passages were written during the war by Japanese servicemen is remarkable, and if they seem incredible, it may be because we still know so very little about what ordinary Japanese felt and thought during the war. I suspect that these views were not so unusual and that many other servicemen, writing in other places during the war, harbored similar views.

A lot of the surviving wartime material was written by children. There were more than one million *sokaiji*, the so-called evacuated children, whose exodus from Japanese cities to the safety of the countryside began in 1944. Many kept diaries, some of which have been published. One of these diarists, Nakane Mihoko, was nine when she was evacuated from Tokyo to Toyama in March 1945. On August 16, 1945, Nakane and her classmates got the news about the surrender, and here is what she wrote:

August 16. Today at breakfast I heard very sad news from Miyajisensei. At long last, Japan was forced to surrender unconditionally to the Soviet-American-British alliance. It was because of the atomic bomb. On August 14, His Majesty said, "We have endured hardships and sadness, but we have been defeated by that atomic bomb, and all Japanese could be injured and killed. It is too pitiful for even one of my dear subjects to be killed. I do not care what happens to me." We heard that he then took off the white gloves he was wearing and began to cry out loud. We cried out loud too. Watch out you terrible Americans and British! I will be sure to seek revenge! I thought to myself that I must be more responsible than I have been. So I wrote

a reaction essay which I called "After Observing the Rescript on the Conclusion of the Great East Asian War."¹⁵

A day later, young Nakane is back in her old routine:

August 17. Today we had the day off. This morning I went back to my dormitory to do laundry, tidy up my belongings, and write in my diary. I tidied up, did my laundry, and wrote in my diary. When I was going through my belongings, I found the crayons I had lost. I was so happy. Then I did my laundry. My heart feels so clean when there are no dirty clothes piled up. I took a nap this afternoon. It felt wonderful! When I woke up, Maeda had gotten some ice from his family. I ate it with some blue water. I also had one and a half cookies that Hakusui's family sent. I had some glucose too. This was all very delicious!¹⁶

There are dozens of diaries like this that have been published—and, I suspect, many more.

I have had a much harder time finding wartime letters and diaries written by women. To date, I have found only five diaries and two collections of letters. I am sure that many were written, but only a few have been preserved. Interestingly, two of the diaries I found are anonymous: apparently their authors did not believe they were worth anything and actually discarded them. Vigilant booksellers, however, found them and had them published. Yoshizawa Hisako was one of the female diarists who saved her diary and had it published. Here is her entry for February 26, 1945, written in the wake of Allied air raids on Tokyo where she lived:

It was clear. I was deeply moved as I gazed at the expanse of burned-out [buildings]. It was an area that bore the imprint of the many years that countless numbers of people had spent there. We were sad, too, because the coffee shop we used to go to burned down. Living each day amidst this destruction has become unbearable. In broader terms is this natural selection?

Seeing figures trudging along in footbags on snow covered roads, piling burned *futon* on carts, noticing people's blackened faces and hands, and witnessing the movement of troops—*somehow I can't feel that our country is winning the war. After all is said and done, I may not be able to bear the war any longer. I cannot live a life without hope. While waging war, with the fate of the country at stake, not to have any chance of success is to have no hope.* I thought of [the poet] Miyazawa Kenji's "until the whole world has achieved happiness, individual happiness is unattainable."¹⁷ (Italics in original)

In her February 28 entry, Yoshizawa discusses the rumors circulating at the company where she worked:

About the recent rumors, at the company today I heard people talking about the following:

The first went like this. When someone mentioned that no one in her neighborhood association had eaten tofu for some time, the wife of a lieutenant who had just moved into the neighborhood heard this and asked, "Hasn't anyone been eating much tofu? In my house we eat it every day. Well, shall I order some?"

She made a phone call to someone, and a truck delivered a full load of tofu. *Everyone in the neighborhood was furious.*

In the second rumor, someone mentioned to a soldier that they were having trouble getting oil [for heating]. The soldier made one phone call, and a military truck drove up, piled high with material for firewood. The whole lot cost only five yen.

*These [rumors] are the manifestation of the weakening of the people's trust in the military. Most of the recent rumors are like this, and soldiers make an appearance in many of them.*¹⁸ (Italics in original)

Takahashi Aiko was another woman whose diary survived. She started her diary in 1932 and kept writing throughout the war. She kept the diary, she tells us, so that her children would know what their parents went through. Her August 9, 1945 entry is about the "strange bomb" dropped on Hiroshima and Nagasaki:

The same sort of strange bomb that was dropped on Hiroshima three days ago was dropped today on Nagasaki, and it was wiped out. This bomb possesses extraordinary power, and there were photographs that revealed that Chinese characters written in black [on signs] had burned, and it was explained that white things wouldn't burn. Up to now, we have been ordered not to wear white garments, not even when it was hot, because they were easy for enemy planes to see. Now we are warned not to wear black garments because they burn easily. So what in the world is safe for us to wear? We have absolutely no idea. That a single aircraft can raze a great city in an instant is driving us to nervous breakdowns, and we feel as though we have no choice but to die or go crazy.¹⁹

Takahashi then vents her anger at Japan's leaders: "Placing human beings in this situation and continuing the war—I can't help but detest those responsible for this. At this point, wanting to continue the war will not rescue us or our country." She also is critical of her fellow Japanese and attributes their passivity to what she calls "feudalistic thinking":

In this country, where human morality is based on [the relationship between] masters and followers, [we] submit to our leaders' will and uncritically do as we are told. Because ours is a country in which each person cannot possess [any kind of] individuality and ours is a citizenry that does not realize that we ourselves have the power to

revere our own individuality, we have fought this unprofitable war right up to the present, saying all the while “We will win, we will win.” At the very start of the war, Japanese declared in unison, “Today we take pride in our good fortune to be born a Japanese.” I myself could not but lament “my misfortune at being born a Japanese today.” If Japanese had not been cursed by this sort of feudalistic thinking, I believe we might have expected Japan to have ended the war sooner than Germany or Italy did. At the start of the war, I saw that we would lose in the way that we have and worried about it. My arguing that we should have stopped the war at Singapore was an earnest voice crying out from my heart. Those of us who had these thoughts were called traitors, our beliefs were regarded as unthinkable, and we were seen as potential spies. I blamed this on the ignorance caused by feudalistic thinking.²⁰

Japan surrendered six days after Takahashi wrote this entry.

These firsthand accounts tell us a lot about the war and confirm what we already knew about how the Japanese government attempted to control the home front population.²¹ But this material also reveals precisely how that population was affected by the war and even how they spent each day and night. In addition, these accounts give us the responses of ordinary men, women, and children to wartime policies, the war itself, and its effects and thus are invaluable because they correct the simplistic notion that all Japanese were uniformly loyal, obedient, and willing to sacrifice themselves for the emperor and the nation.

I now realize that I left out another important topic from my study of modern Japan: ethnicity. I overlooked the “others” who were a part of the Japanese empire and involved in the war—I am referring to Taiwanese, Koreans, Manchurians, and those in areas occupied by the Japanese forces. By some estimates, nearly 400,000 Koreans and Taiwanese fought for the Japanese. We know that the conscription of Koreans began in 1943 and that close to four million Koreans were working outside Korea—in Japan, Manchuria, and the occupied areas.²² I use the words *working* and *fighting* advisedly, since many were forced to do what they did—as the case of the so-called comfort women reminds us. The available testimony of the women forced by the Japanese military into sexual slavery is the most powerful and moving of accounts by these neglected groups. Hwang Kŭmju was nineteen when she was abducted by Japanese colonial officials in Korea and sent to Manchuria as a sexual slave. When interviewed in the early 1990s, she remembered that she volunteered to work in a munitions factory in Japan but quickly realized that things were not what they seemed:

Two people went from my village. The wife of the head of the neighborhood informed me of the gathering date, time, and place.

On that day, I went to Hamhŭng Station. When I got there, I saw about twenty women from different counties. The average age of the women seemed to be about fifteen or sixteen, and I was one of the oldest. There was no farewell ceremony, but many families came to see us off. I was wearing a black skirt and a white silk blouse. In a black cotton bag, I carried things like underwear, pads, soap, a toothbrush, comb, digestive medicine, and winter and summer clothes for three years. At the station a Korean man in his fifties who was in charge of our group handed us over to a Japanese soldier. The soldier put us on the military train. The train had many cars, and the other cars were full of soldiers. Our group of women and one other, numbering about fifty in all, rode in one car. I wasn't quite sure, but there seemed to be more women in other cars. Even in my own car, I knew only the twenty who were from Hamhung and didn't know the others. Black oiled paper blinds were drawn over the windows. Everyone had a seat and was sad about having to leave their families. Peeking out through a gap between the blinds, I saw the Japanese soldier who led us into the train giving some papers to another soldier, a private. What I saw frightened me for reasons I didn't understand. I still remember that scene. Even now, that memory is vivid.²³

Although more and more is being written in English on the experiences of these women and other Japanese colonial subjects, the number of firsthand accounts available in English is still very small.²⁴

These Taiwanese, Korean, and Manchurian subjects of the Japanese were not so extraordinary but were part of a larger and truly global phenomenon, part of the approximately three million colonial subjects who fought in World War II for their home countries. In addition to those who fought and worked for the Japanese, there were 2.4 million Indians, as well as other South Asians, Africans, Malays, Chinese, and Pacific Islanders who served in the British armed forces. Asian Americans, Polynesians, and Filipinos fought for the United States. The French and Dutch, too, used their colonial subjects in the war. We obviously need comparative studies of Japanese colonial subjects who fought in World War II, work that is already being done. Takashi Fujitani, for instance, has been doing interesting work on *nisei* who fought for the United States and Koreans who served in the Japanese military in World War II.²⁵

What about those in areas that the Japanese occupied during the Pacific war? Several autobiographical accounts are available in English, and many more are waiting to be translated. The best of the former is Leocadio de Asis's *From Bataan to Tokyo: Diary of a Filipino Student in Wartime Japan, 1943–44*.²⁶ Asis was a young Filipino lawyer who was captured when Bataan fell. He was imprisoned, and then selected by the Japanese to serve in their constabulary force. He and nine other Filipino constabulary officers were sent to Tokyo

in the summer of 1943 for further schooling, and Asis remained there until October 2, 1944. His diary, which he kept the whole time he was in Japan, contains vivid descriptions of the harrowing trip by sea to Japan, meeting Taiwanese soldiers who “look like Filipinos but . . . speak Japanese,” his accommodations in Tokyo, his teachers and what they taught him, the Japanese he met, and meetings with prominent Filipino collaborators during their trips to Tokyo.²⁷ Most revealing, however, is Asis’s record of the other non-Japanese students he met—Annamese, Burmese, Chinese, Indonesians, Javanese, Malays, Manchurians, and Sumatrans, as well as a few from Borneo, the Celebes, and Ceram—and his impressions of these future leaders of the Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere.²⁸

I also omitted another group from my study of modern Japan—Asian Americans. Many Asian Americans were in Asia just before and during the war. Some Chinese Americans were sent back to China before the war for more schooling, many to St. John’s University in Shanghai. No doubt, Korean Americans and Filipino Americans were in Asia as well. But I know most about the Japanese Americans. John Stephan estimates that there were 100,000 Japanese Americans living and working in the Japanese empire between 1895 and 1945, two-thirds of whom were *nisei* and *sansei* born outside Japan.²⁹ Most were what were conventionally called *kibei*, “returned Americans,” who had been sent back to Japan for a variety of reasons: many were sent back to visit relatives they had never met or went as *yōshi* (adopted sons) to families who lacked sons and thus heirs.

Nisei also were sent back for schooling. Mary Kimoto was born and raised in Los Angeles and graduated from Modesto Junior College. In 1939 she was sent to Japan and first attended a college preparatory school in Tokyo before entering Tokyo Women’s College (Tōkyō Joshi Daigaku) in 1942. She graduated in 1944. Like many *nisei*, Mary was initially captivated by Tokyo and the social and cultural life there. In November 1940, for example, she participated in the celebrations commemorating the 2,600th anniversary of the founding of Japan and wrote about this to a friend back in the States:

I skipped school nearly all last week. Reason: Dobo Kai. Don’t know how to translate it—it’s a celebration of the 2,600th anniversary and the government called lots of the *issei* from all over the world—America, South America, South Seas, Philippines, China, etc. And they had a program all made out for them. My friend Hiroko from Java persuaded me to join, so I did. It was very educational and lots of fun. Many *nisei* were there, too.

On the first day, Monday, we all got Japan flags and marched from Hibiya Park to the palace to pay our respects. The streets were lined with grammar school students who waved flags and shouted *banzai* to welcome us. There were about 1,200 of us. We shouted *banzai* too and fluttered our flags and felt gay and carefree. Then

we gathered at Hibiya Public Hall and heard addresses by Prince Konoye and members of his cabinet. They all read their speeches, so it was not impressive. Konoye is tall and handsome—best looking of the whole bunch. His assets are his title and his handsomeness. Otherwise they say he is not much—only a kind of robot. But I like Matsuoka [Yōsuke]. He looks insignificant but he is a good speaker. And he's almost a *nisei* because he went to America when fourteen years old. Oh—we are lucky to be able to see all these great men! They gave us [a] delicious lunch. Then afterwards I took Yabe-san to see an *odori* (traditional dance). We stayed so long that we were late for dinner, so ate out ourselves. Then we walked around Ueno Park. In the park there were many lovers. It is really beautiful and quiet there. The pond is still and reflects the lights of the city. It is strange how there are lovely quiet spots right in the center of busy Tokyo.³⁰

Mary was not so unusual. *Nisei* were enrolled at many universities: Waseda, Meiji, Tsuda, Japan Women's, and other schools.

Japanese Americans also returned to Japan to work. We shouldn't forget that it was not easy for Japanese Americans with college degrees to find suitable work on the West Coast and in Hawaii, and as Stephan points out, Japan and its colonies offered opportunities not available in the United States and Hawaii. Thousands of young Japanese Americans from the West Coast and Hawaii were sent by their families on *kenshū* trips to Japan. Many stayed, found jobs, and married Japanese nationals.

Some even ended up in the Japanese military. I don't have firm statistics yet, but I believe that they numbered several thousand or even more. One, Ensign Nakatani, served as a communications officer on the battleship *Yamato* and is remembered by Yoshida Mitsuru as one of the saddest men on the ship: "He lies in his hammock, sobbing into his pillow," writes Yoshida.³¹ Apparently, Nakatani had just received a letter from his mother in California, and it would be his last letter from home. The *Yamato* was sunk four days later, and Nakatani went down with the ship. There were even Japanese Americans in the Kwantung Army, the Japanese unit based in Manchuria. One of these, Peter Sano, who was born and raised in the Imperial Valley in Southern California, recently published a memoir about his experiences. Sano was sent back to Japan in 1939 to be adopted into a relative's family, was drafted in 1945, and ended up in the Kwantung Army. He remembers well his reception as a new recruit sent to Hailar in Manchuria:

That evening we entered the gate of the 118th Regiment of the Kwantung Army. Sixteen of us were placed in one squad, and each of us in turn was interviewed by the personnel officer, and I was the last one. From my records, the officer knew I was born in the United States. He gave me a stern warning that I was to work extra hard to

prove my loyalty to Japan because of my birthplace. He mentioned that my parents in America had been sent to a concentration camp and told me how important it was for me to become a good Japanese soldier and fight and even die, if necessary, for Japan.

Now I would be fighting with weapon in hand against the country of my birth. I was relieved that I was stationed in Manchuria, not in the South Pacific, where I would actually be in battle against American soldiers, perhaps even my own brother among them. I accepted my fate to fight for Japan as an “adopted” Japanese, but at the same time I did not have a strong sense that Americans were my enemy. As strange and confused as it may sound, the Doolittle raid on Tokyo or the sight of B-29 formations flying overhead on their bombing runs did not evoke in me an enormous amount of hostility or hatred toward Americans.

I recalled the time in Tokyo when one of my classmates at school and I saw a formation of warplanes flying above us. My friend said, “Look at those planes; we’ve got a lot of them, and we are strong enough to defeat Americans. See, we are well prepared for a war with the country you came from. How about that?” It was clear that he looked on me as his enemy. There were other such occasions when my schoolmates would talk to me as if I were not a Japanese like them but an American. They would compare the two countries and say that Japan was superior, implying that they and theirs were better than I and whatever I represented. I looked back on my days in America, where sometimes I was not treated as a true American, and now, here in Japan, I realized that I was not considered a true Japanese either. It was as though I did not really belong to either country.

By the time I went into my squad room, everyone had turned in. I sat in utter darkness. My heart was heavy. Here I was, about to begin group living, which I never liked; worse, this group living was that of the military. Sadness, anger, and despair over this turn of events was more than I could bear. I felt as if I had been thrown into a dark, cold, and bottomless pit from where there was no escape.³²

At the war’s end, Sano was captured by the Russians and imprisoned. He was released in 1947. His memoir is entitled *One Thousand Days in Siberia*.

Japanese Americans even appear in the testimony of former Allied prisoners of war. Gregory “Pappy” Boyington, an American ace, remembers that when he was shot down over Rabaul and captured, one of his handlers was a Japanese American from Hawaii who gave him valuable advice about how to survive as a Japanese POW. Boyington remembers him saying:

“These Japs” are going to question you and question you again. So whatever you tell them, always stick to the same story. As long as you more or less pass the time of the day with them, you will get along OK and live normally.³³

Another Japanese American who appears in POW accounts is identified only by his accent. Eric Lomax, a British POW taken at Singapore, remembers what he describes as his “American-speaking” interrogator, a man who helped torture him.³⁴ Was this the Japanese American named Isamu Ishihara who was known to Allied POWs as the “Beast of the East” and whose specialty was a modern form of water torture?³⁵

Why does any of this matter? Closer scholarly attention to the war would continue to fill out a conspicuous lacuna in the English-language literature on modern Japan. It would tell us more about the way that the war affected ordinary Japanese and would be a fitting recognition of the impact of the war on those who experienced it. Attention to the non-Japanese involved in the war—Koreans, Manchurians, Taiwanese, and Asian Americans—would give voice to the millions who labored, fought, and suffered as much as, if not more than, the Japanese did and add complexity to our accounts of the war. Careful and close analysis of firsthand accounts written by Japanese, Japanese colonial subjects, and those living and working in occupied areas would challenge facile and stereotypical notions of the Japanese people’s unwavering loyalty and obedience and also allow scholars to examine their culpability for what happened during the war. In addition, more articles and books on the war written in English and other Western languages would reduce the isolation of wartime Japan as a historical topic, encourage exchanges among historians studying different theaters of the war, enable comparative studies of different aspects of World War II, and even permit full discussions of the important and often difficult issues that the war raises—slave labor, atrocities, forced relocations, attacks on civilians, and war responsibility.³⁶ All of this would establish, once and for all, the place of war and ethnicity in our study of modern Japan, and perhaps the role of ethnicity in all modern wars.

NOTES

1. The four published volumes are Marius B. Jansen, ed., *Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965); William W. Lockwood, ed., *The State and Economic Enterprise in Japan: Essays in the Political Economy of Growth* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1965); Ronald P. Dore, ed., *Aspects of Social Change in Modern Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1967); and Robert E. Ward, ed., *Political Development in Modern Japan* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1968). Donald H. Shively, ed., *Tradition and Modernization in Japanese Culture* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1971) was published three years later.
2. Albert Craig, *Chōshū in the Meiji Restoration* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1961); Marius Jansen, “Takechi Zuizan and the Tosa Loyalist Party,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (1959): 199–212; William G. Beasley, “Political Groups in Tosa, 1858–68,” *Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Studies* 30 (1967): 382–90; Joseph Pittau, *Political Thought in Early Meiji Japan, 1868–1889* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967); George Akita, *Foundations of Constitutional Government in Modern Japan, 1868–1900* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1967); Henry Rosovsky, “Japan’s Transition to Modern Eco-

- conomic Growth, 1865–1885,” in Henry Rosovsky, ed., *Industrialization in Two Systems: Essays in Honor of Alexander Gerschenkron by a Group of His Students* (New York: Wiley, 1966), 91–139; and Johannes Hirschmeier, *The Origins of Entrepreneurship in Meiji Japan* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1965).
3. Albert Craig, “Science and Confucianism in Tokugawa Japan,” in Jansen, *Changing Japanese Attitudes Toward Modernization*, 133–60; Roger Hackett, “Nishi Amane—A Tokugawa-Meiji Bureaucrat,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 18 (1959): 213–25; and Thomas R. H. Havens, “Comte, Mill and the Thought of Nishi Amane in Meiji Japan,” *Journal of Asian Studies* 27 (1968): 217–26, and *Nishi Amane and Modern Japanese Thought* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1970).
4. Harry Harootunian, *Toward Restoration: The Growth of Political Consciousness in Tokugawa Japan* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970); and Irwin Scheiner, *Christian Converts and Social Protest in Meiji Japan* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1970).
5. John W. Hall, “Feudalism in Japan—A Reassessment,” *Comparative Studies in Society and History* 5 (1962): 15–51.
6. For a discussion of the new institutional and comparative histories, see John Higham, *Writing American History: Essays on Modern Scholarship* (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1970), 157–74.
7. Daniel I. Okimoto, *American in Disguise* (New York: Weatherhill, 1970).
8. Hilary Conroy, “Japan’s War in China: Historical Parallel to Vietnam?” *Pacific Affairs* 43 (1970): 61–72.
9. Alvin D. Coox, *Nomonhan: Japan Against Russia, 1939* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1985); Mark Peattie, *Nanyō: The Rise and Fall of the Japanese in Micronesia, 1885–1945* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1988); Peter Duus, Ramon Meyers, and Mark Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Informal Empire in China, 1895–1937* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1995); Peter Duus, *The Abacus and the Sword: the Japanese Penetration of Korea, 1895–1910* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1995); Peter Duus, Ramon Meyers, and Mark Peattie, eds., *The Japanese Wartime Empire, 1931–1945* (Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1996); Joyce Chapman Lebra, *Jungle Alliance: Japan and the Indian National Army* (Singapore: Asia Pacific Press, 1971); and *Japanese-Trained Armies in Southeast Asia: Independence and Volunteer Forces in World War II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1977); Thomas R. H. Havens, *Valley of Darkness: The Japanese People and World War II* (New York: Norton, 1978); Ben-Ami Shillony, *Politics and Culture in Wartime Japan* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1981); John W. Dower, *War Without Mercy: Race and Power in the Pacific War* (New York: Pantheon Books, 1986); John Stephan, *Hawaii Under the Rising Sun: Japan’s Plans for Conquest After Pearl Harbor* (Honolulu: University of Hawaii Press, 1984); Grant Goodman, “24 in ‘44: Filipino Students in Wartime Japan,” *Occasional Papers*, Series II, No. 4 (1985): 1–21, and “Forgotten Soldiers: Indian Students in Japan in World War II,” *Japan Forum* 7 (Autumn 1995): 207–16; George Hicks, *The Comfort Women: Japan’s Brutal Regime of Enforced Prostitution in the Second World War* (New York: Norton, 1995); Gavan Daws, *Prisoners of the Japanese: POWs of World War II in the Pacific* (New York: Morrow, 1994); Roger Dingman, *The Sinking of the Awa Maru and Japanese-American Relations, 1945–1995* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 1997); and Mark Peattie and David Evans, *Kaigun: Strategy, Tactics, and Technology in the Imperial Japanese Navy, 1887–1941* (Annapolis, Md.: Naval Institute Press, 1997).
10. John W. Dower, *Embracing Defeat: Japan in the Wake of World War II* (New York: W. W. Norton, 1999).
11. Haruko Taya Cook and Theodore F. Cook, *Japan at War: An Oral History* (New York: New Press, 1992); Frank Gibney, ed., *Sensō: The Japanese Remember the Pacific War—Letters to the Editors of Asahi Shimbun* (New York: Sharpe, 1995); Kappa Senoh, *A Boy Called H: A Childhood in Wartime Japan*, trans. John Bester (Tokyo: Kodansha International, 1999); Eugene Sowiak, ed., *A Diary of Darkness: The Wartime Diary of Kiyosawa Kiyoshi*, trans. Eugene Sowiak and Tamie Kamiyama (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1999); Ōoka Shohei,

Taken Captive: A Japanese POW's Story, trans. Wayne Lammers (New York: Wiley, 1996); and Yoshida Mitsuru, *Requiem for Battleship Yamato*, trans. Richard Minear (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1985).

In the 1950s Ballantine Books published several firsthand Japanese accounts of the war: Saburo Sakai with Martin Caidin and Fred Saito, *Samurai* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1957); Yasuo Kuwahara and Gordon T. Allred, *Kamikaze* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1957); Tameichi Hara, with Fred Saito and Roger Pinneau, *Japanese Destroyer Captain* (New York: Ballantine Books, 1961).

12. Midori Yamanouchi, trans., *Listen to the Voices from the Sea: Writings of the Fallen Japanese Students* (Scranton, Penn.: University of Scranton Press, 2000).
13. Nihon Senbotsu Gakusei Kinenkai, comp., *Kike wadatsumi no koe* (Tokyo: Kōbunsha, 1959), 181–82.
14. Nomura Masaki, *Okinawa senpaihei nikki* (Tokyo: Taihei Shuppansha, 1974), 194–95.
15. Nakane Mihoko, *Sokaiji nikki* (Tokyo: Chūō Kōronsha, 1965), 85–86.
16. *Ibid.*, 86.
17. Yoshizawa Hisako, “Shūsen made,” in *Shimin no nikki, Shōwa sensō bungaku zenshū*, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1972), 367.
18. *Ibid.*
19. Takahashi Aiko, “Kaisen kara no nikki,” in *Shimin no nikki, Shōwa sensō bungaku zenshū*, vol. 14 (Tokyo: Shūeisha, 1972), 353.
20. *Ibid.*, 363–64.
21. See Samuel Hideo Yamashita, “Confucianism and the Japanese state, 1904–45,” in Tu Wei-ming, ed., *Confucian Traditions in East Asian Modernity: Moral Education and Economic Culture in Japan and the Four Dragons* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1996), 132–54.
22. Carter J. Eckert et al., *Korea Old and New: A History* (Seoul: Ilchokak, 1990), 322.
23. Soo Hyon Kim, “Korean ‘Comfort Women’” (Senior thesis, Pomona College, 1996), 73.
24. See Keith Howard, ed., *True Stories of the Korean Comfort Women* (London: Cassell, 1999).
25. Takashi Fujitani, *Nisei Soldiers as Citizens: Japanese Americans in U.S. National, Military, and Racial Discourses* (Honolulu: East-West Center, 1995).
26. Leocadio de Asis, *From Bataan to Tokyo: Diary of a Filipino Student in Wartime Japan* (New York: Paragon Book Gallery, 1979).
27. *Ibid.*, 4. These collaborators included Jose Laurel, Jorge Vargas, and Benigno Aquino.
28. *Ibid.*, 2, 4, 10, 12, 19–21, 33, 44, 73, 77, 83, 86, 90, 110, 117.
29. John Stephan, “Hijacked by Utopia: American Nikkei in Manchuria,” *Amerasia Journal* 23 (1998): 3, 30.
30. Mary Kimoto Tomita, *Dear Miye: Letters Home from Japan, 1939–1946* (Stanford, Calif.: Stanford University Press, 1995), 106.
31. Yoshida, *Requiem for Battleship Yamato*, 10.
32. Peter Sano, *One Thousand Days in Siberia: The Odyssey of a Japanese-American POW* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1997), 38–39.
33. Gregory “Pappy” Boyington, *Baa Baa Black Sheep* (New York: Bantam, 1977), 235–36.
34. Eric Lomax, *The Railway Man: A POW's Searing Account of War, Brutality and Forgiveness* (New York: Norton, 1995), 116, 121.
35. Gavan Daws, *Prisoners of the Japanese: POWs of World War II in the Pacific* (New York: Morrow, 1994), 149–50.
36. Thus far only two books have addressed the question of war responsibility in comparative terms: Ian Buruma's *The Wages of Guilt: Memories of War in Germany and Japan* (New York: Meridian, 1994), and Lisa Yoneyama's *Hiroshima Traces: Time, Space, and the Dialectics of Memory* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1999). See also Norma Field, *In the Realm of a Dying Emperor: A Portrait of Japan at Century's End* (New York: Pantheon, 1991).

Internationalism in Interwar Japanese Financial Politics

Richard J. Smethurst

Robert Ward, Dick Beardsley, and John Hall, the Niiike three, were teaching at the University of Michigan when I entered graduate school in the autumn of 1959. For an academically naive ex-soldier, fresh from a year-and-a-half tour of duty in Japan, it was a heady place to study in the late Eisenhower years. Robert Ward's lecturing technique in courses on Japanese and Chinese politics remains vivid in my memory to this day. He would enter the classroom, open his loose-leaf notebook to the appropriate place, and then deliver a tightly structured lecture in carefully modulated tones, without "ums" or "ers," and not so much as glance at those notes. He was a lecturer to emulate.

As for Dick Beardsley, I can still remember the shock of my first day in his "Twelve Doors" seminar set up for new M.A. students at the Center for Japanese Studies. Handing us a reading list of twenty books, Dick instructed us to read them all before returning to class in three weeks. Last year, when cleaning our attic, I came across my notes from that course: fifty pages, single-spaced for the first book read, Robert Bellah's *Tokugawa Religion*, five pages for the last, Thomas Smith's *Agrarian Origins of Modern Japan*. The difference reflects not one of value in the books, since Smith's work is still a classic in 1997, but rather a sense of my panic as the three weeks passed by ever so quickly. It was Dick Beardsley who, along with necessity, taught me in the fall of 1959 how to read a book quickly for its significance. It was also he, ironically, who introduced me to the lesson that social historians need not depend on books and archival materials—interviews and questionnaires are also useful research tools. (By sending me to the airport for Nomura Manzō, the *kyōgen* actor and intangible national treasure, and Mansaku and his other sons when they performed in Ann Arbor in the early 1960s, Dick provided me with an added bonus, a human experience—and with Mansaku, a friendship—I cherish to this day.)

While John Hall was in Japan for the 1959–60 academic year, I, fresh from two years' military service in Japan during which I had developed a romantic view of the beauties of Japanese aesthetics, learned what it meant to be skeptical from his replacement, Jim Crowley. Jim taught his students how to focus on historically significant events and actors, how to eschew epiphenomena, and how to distrust orthodox interpretations, all valuable lessons for a fledgling historian. They were also excellent preparation for John Hall's course on premodern Japanese history, one of the best courses of my graduate school career, which he taught on his return to Ann Arbor in 1960. His teaching technique was somewhat less combative than Jim Crowley's, to be sure, but it was certainly no less heterodox. In the 1990s, the Hall/Smith/Jansen interpretation of Tokugawa phenomena as the precursors to modern Japan has become standard, and John Hall's fundamental view, that changes in the economic, political, and institutional substructure of Japanese society underlie the surface story, that is, who won which battle, is generally accepted. In the early 1960s, however, before the publication of *Government and Local Power in Japan*, his views were unorthodox to those students brought up on Murdock and the other survey histories of the time. Hall's lesson, to focus on fundamentals, is one that I follow and teach to this day.

Finally, during my tenure at Michigan, the history department and the Center for Japanese Studies brought Roger Hackett to Ann Arbor, the man with whom I had the privilege of writing my doctoral dissertation. It was in a memorable seminar with Roger in the spring term of 1962 that my paper on Tanaka Giichi, which later grew into a book on rural militarism in prewar Japan, took shape. One of Roger's greatest influences on my career was his insistence that I use the active voice. In the fall of 1966, as Strunk and White was read by me (just kidding), as I read Strunk and White under Roger's rigorous efforts to force me to turn out a readable thesis, I enrolled in one last course—a reading of *Sanshirō*, taught by Ed Seidensticker. At a time when I should have been writing about Japanese militarism, the opportunity to benefit from the insights of one of the great “sages” of Japanese literature and to enjoy reading a novel set in a place, Tokyo University, where I had just spent two years doing research, was too good to pass up.

I want to thank the Center for Japanese Studies for its role in bringing together these scholars who helped shape me as an historian, and I want to add one more thank you before I turn to my short discussion of internationalist financial statesmen. The Center invited a number of leading Japanese academics to Ann Arbor for long periods of time in the early 1960s, and thus provided us students the opportunity to meet and learn from some of Japan's outstanding scholars. (I was pleased to hear from another friend, Yoshida Teigo, who spent the fall term of 1996 in Ann Arbor, that the Center for Japanese Studies continues the tradition of inviting Japanese scholars to Michigan.)

Between 1959 and 1965, I befriended the late Fukutake Tadashi, dean of writers on Japanese rural society; Morioka Kiyomi, sociologist of religion; Akimoto Ritsuo, scholar of sociological theory; Motoyama Yukihiko, Meiji historian; Nakano Tadashi, historical sociologist; Umetani Noboru, Meiji historian and editor of the Ogata Kōan papers at the Tekijuku in Osaka; Furihata Takehiko, business economist from Kyoto University; Saeki Shōichi, literary critic with whom some of us read Kawabata's *Yama no oto*; and Masumi Junnosuke, the prolific author of books on modern Japanese political history. (In my library alone, I have twelve of his books and hope he sends me the next—he is currently working on one about the late Emperor Hirohito.) Three of these eminent scholars have helped me since they were in Ann Arbor. Morioka introduced me to the communities where, using Dick Beardsley's methods, I did fieldwork for my books on Japanese militarism. Masumi had asserted that the rural middle class of owner and upper tenant farmers replaced their landlords as village leaders in the Taisho and early Showa periods. Using John Hall's ideas about fundamentals, this argument helped me develop my view of interwar rural social change in my book on Japanese agriculture. The work of Umetani, whom I met through Roger Hackett, on foreign advisors to the Meiji government is helping me in my current work on Takahashi Korekiyo and the creation of Japan's twentieth-century financial leadership.

In the fall of 1967, I left Ann Arbor to assume a job teaching Japanese history at the University of Pittsburgh with three goals in mind. First, I hoped to carry on John Whitney Hall's mission of teaching Americans about Japan. Although in 1967 Americans knew more about Japan than they had in the 1930s, when, according to his obituary in *The New York Times*, John Hall took up this task, Americans in 1967, and even in 1997, still knew and know far too little. Second, I wanted to chip away at students' ethnocentricity by introducing them to another culture and to the idea that cultures that differ from ours in values and mores can be equally valid within their own contexts. Third, I tried to counter the idea that Japan is exotic, "uniquely" different and impossible to understand, a notion one still finds expressed by journalists and unfortunately even scholars writing about Japan. But as many of you know, these people are wrong. By the 1920s at the very least, Japan had already joined the modern world, not as a student of the West as it had been in the Meiji period, but as a full participant. Many of its leaders both before the war and after were cosmopolitan men who moved unselfconsciously in an international milieu. As Beate Sirota Gordon told us in her inspiring talk, the same was true in the world of the arts.

I would like to illustrate briefly this last point by citing the examples of Takahashi Korekiyo, seven-time finance minister between 1913 and 1936, and a few of the men around him: Inoue Junnosuke, Fukai Eigo, Soeda Juichi, and Tsushima Juichi. These remarkable men and others like them in the Fi-

nance Ministry and Bank of Japan knew modern fiscal and monetary theory, spoke and read English fluently, had numerous friends abroad, and operated in the international world of finance as equals to their European and North American counterparts in the prewar twentieth century. Thomas Lamont of the Morgan Bank grieved when his friend Inoue was assassinated in 1932. Fukai, a scholar of monetary theory as well as a bureaucrat, contributed to a festschrift in honor of Irving Fisher, the Yale economist, in 1937. Soeda served as Japanese correspondent for John Maynard Keynes' *Economic Journal* until 1929. Tsushima sought the advice of his friends in the New York Federal Reserve Bank, the Morgan Bank, and the Bank of England when Japan returned to the gold standard in 1930 and left it in 1931. The Constitutional History Room of the National Diet Library in Tokyo holds many letters in English exchanged between Takahashi and his American and British friends, particularly Jacob Schiff and A. A. Shand, in the decades before and after World War I. In other words, Takahashi and his colleagues were part of a worldwide fraternity of financiers and financial officials.

As is widely known among economic historians of Japan, Takahashi, when he became finance minister for the fourth of seven times in the Inukai cabinet in December 1931, undertook what we would now call Keynesian countercyclical fiscal and monetary policies to bring about Japan's economic recovery from the Great Depression. Takahashi devalued the yen, lowered interest rates, expanded government spending, and made up the deficit by selling treasury bonds to the Bank of Japan rather than on the open market, to avoid the problem of crowding out private investment. By the time of Takahashi's death in 1936, Japan had reached full employment and use of industrial capacity—in other words, Japan had recovered from the depression.

Robert Skidelsky, in his superb multivolume biography of Keynes, tells us that only two countries tried “what would now be called Keynesian methods of fighting the depression” in the early 1930s, Sweden and Japan. He then goes on to say that the Swedish finance minister was probably influenced by the British economist, but “It is unlikely that Takahashi . . . drew much inspiration from Keynes.” I do not know for certain yet whether or not Takahashi knew of Keynes' ideas in 1932 when he began the fiscal expansion that brought Japan out of the depression; however, I see no reason to believe that he could not have known of them. If I am correct that by the 1920s and 1930s men like Takahashi, Tsushima, and Fukai were cosmopolitan officials who read widely in economic theory and had large networks of friends in Europe and North America, then there is no reason to think that they would be any less likely than their foreign counterparts to undertake Keynesian policies. I do not mean by this that Takahashi necessarily got his ideas from Keynes; what I mean is that he was part of an internationalist group of scholars and bureaucrats who,

because of their knowledge of English and of the world, were schooled in modern economic theory.

Takahashi and the others became the cosmopolitan men they were because of the nature of their educations, even when, as in his case, the educations were unorthodox. Born in 1854, Takahashi was the illegitimate son of a shogunal court artist and a family maid and was adopted as an infant into a low-ranking *ashigaru* family from Sendai-han. His road to internationalism began when his *ban* sent him at age eleven to study English with an American missionary in Yokohama. After a variety of adventures that included working as a “boy” at a British bank in Yokohama in 1866 for the Scottish banker A. A. Shand, who later became a close friend and adviser, and inadvertently selling himself into bonded servitude in San Francisco in 1867, Takahashi at age fifteen joined the government in 1869 as an English-language teacher. While still a teenager, Takahashi served as an interpreter for the American educational advisor David Murray, studied with and assisted the renowned American teachers Guido Verbeck and William Eliot Griffis, and ran an English-language school in Karatsu. In 1883, Takahashi’s superiors presented him with multivolume sets of British and American trademark and patent laws and told him to read them and write laws for Japan. When he was finished in 1885, Takahashi became Japan’s first patent and copyright commissioner. What underlies all of Takahashi’s early service is his knowledge and use of English, a rare and valuable skill in the early Meiji government, and his exposure to Western thought.

In the late 1880s Takahashi used his English-language skills to enlarge his network of foreign friends. In 1885, the Meiji government sent him abroad to discuss copyright and patent laws with his Western counterparts, and when he came home assigned him the task of rewriting Japan’s regulations. In 1889, he managed a silver mine in Peru before joining the Bank of Japan in 1892. In 1904–5, while serving as vice-governor of the Bank of Japan, he performed an important service for his country that depended on his English-language skill and his ability to move easily among foreign investment bankers: he went to London in 1904 to sell Japanese treasury bonds during Japan’s 1904–5 war with Russia. His contacts with powerful people like A. A. Shand, Ernest Cassel, and Jacob Schiff, British and American financiers, enabled Takahashi to raise eight hundred million yen, almost half the total cost of the war, from British, American, and even German and French sources. Takahashi then went on to serve as governor of the Bank of Japan, before becoming finance minister for the first of seven times in 1913 and prime minister in 1921.

Fukai and Tsushima, although younger than Takahashi, also had cosmopolitan backgrounds. Fukai studied at Doshisha University in the 1880s where Nijima Jō, the famous samurai-Christian, had built a truly international

school. This is evident in his memoirs when Fukai praises his teachers, half of whom were British or American men and women who taught in English. After graduation, Fukai joined Tokutomi Sohō's *Kokumin shinbun*, where he served as a foreign correspondent, wrote synopses of English- and German-language books, and served as Tokutomi's interpreter when he traveled abroad in 1898. In his memoirs, Fukai describes a scene in which he and Tokutomi sang the Japanese national anthem for Tolstoy. After the turn of the century, Fukai joined the Bank of Japan, read widely in foreign-language works on monetary theory and practice, and wrote extensively on Japan's monetary system. He served on the Japanese delegations to a number of important conferences in the interwar years, including the Paris peace talks after World War I. Throughout his career, he met and talked with many foreign officials, including Franklin D. Roosevelt, Cordell Hull, and Montagu Norman, governor of the Bank of England.

Tsushima, a product of Tokyo Imperial University, traveled abroad under a program established by Takahashi early in the twentieth century to send bright young ministry bureaucrats to study in London. Tsushima later served for over half a decade as the Finance Ministry's attaché at the London embassy and was in New York and London both when Japan returned to the gold standard in January 1930 and left it again in December 1931. He served in these two major Western financial capitals throughout much of the depression, until he returned to Tokyo in 1934 to serve as Takahashi's deputy minister. Tsushima, like Fukai, had extensive contacts among foreign financial officials and bankers.

The internationalism of these three men (and others) grew from their knowledge of English, their extensive reading about Western economic and political affairs, and their networks of foreign friends and informants. Thus, although Takahashi's primary goal as civil servant throughout his career was a nationalist one, to use governmental policy to stimulate Japanese economic growth, he took a decidedly internationalist approach to achieving this goal. He believed Japan could best grow economically by functioning as part of the world economy, that is, by cooperation with the major powers. He called for the use of diplomacy and international agreement, not unilateral military expansion, in pursuing Japan's foreign policy goals. The territorial acquisitions gained in the Portsmouth Treaty at the end of the Russo-Japanese War were justifiable because they were sanctioned by Theodore Roosevelt and the European powers. But after the war, Takahashi fought the army's proposal to nationalize the railroad system on the grounds that nationalization was neither cost-efficient nor economically efficacious. He fought its demand for two new divisions because of his fear that a larger army would lead to pressure for unilateral expansion and to unsound fiscal policies. He opposed the Twenty-One Demands in 1915 because they placed the Japanese government's China

policy in conflict with that of the Western powers. He even called for the abolition of the army and navy general staffs during the Siberian Intervention in 1920. In the late Taisho and early Showa period, he consistently advocated limiting defense spending to fiscally sound levels, levels that made unilateral Japanese military activism impossible. He regularly confronted Army Minister Araki Sadao in 1932–33 and had a shouting match with Army Minister Kawashima when during an all-night cabinet meeting in December 1935 Kawashima demanded a fiscally irresponsible increase in the army's budget. The latter disagreement, widely reported in the press, probably cost Takahashi his life on February 26, 1936. He opposed making the yen or even some newly created monetary unit the currency of Manchukuo in 1933–35 on the grounds that Manchuria was part of China and therefore should circulate Chinese money. This could not have been a mainstream view among Japanese government officials in the years after the Manchurian Incident. When he introduced his countercyclical fiscal and monetary policies during the depression, he used the works of European and American economists to justify them. The last photograph taken of Takahashi, snapped in January 1936, shows him sitting in his garden reading Sydney and Beatrice Webb's book on the Soviet Union, a book that Takahashi's own government considered subversive and thus prohibited from legal import into Japan.

Unfortunately for Japan, others, particularly in the army, did not share the internationalism and cosmopolitan outlook of men like Takahashi, Fukai, Tsushima, Inoue, and Soeda. Instead the solutions to Japan's problems were seen in unilateral and autarkic terms, so that after Takahashi's brutal murder at the hands of young army officers in 1936, Fukai and Tsushima fell out of favor and economic policy based on international norms became one of many victims of Japan's involvement in World War II. However, Japan was not destined to a future of isolationism that would make her exotic and impossible to understand. After 1945, Takahashi's, Fukai's, and Tsushima's younger colleagues, men like Arai Seiichirō, Kuroda Hideo, Kubo Bunzō, and Saitō Toragorō rose to power in the Finance Ministry and the Bank of Japan, and Japan returned to internationalism that it practices today.

Discovering Korea at Michigan: The Making of an Interarea Historian

Michael Robinson

Today I want to focus not on a specific issue, but more generally on the topic of Korea, as I am here at a fiftieth-year celebration of the Metropolitan Countries Area Center in Michigan. I was a bit taken aback to be invited here, partly because I would be in such an august company of fellow alumni and also because I wondered how I would link my Michigan connection to what has been a career focused on a colony of Japan.

I think that I discovered Korea at Michigan more in its absence than its presence; what drew me into East Asian studies was my junior-year experience in an East Asia survey course taught by Roger Hackett. I was a history major without any knowledge of the new language of cultural criticism and narrative theory and all of the business of the nation as a subject. I had been inculcated into national histories and the nation as the subject quite effortlessly—as undergraduates mostly we learn in ignorance. But the fact of the matter is the East Asia survey was one of the most important courses I took. As a historian who has now taught these courses, I know how unstructured they are, and probably how much Professor Hackett hated teaching it—how he walked in and hoped that there would be a guest lecturer from literature or somebody else to pick up the slack that day. Maybe this is just my own projection, but I've talked to enough people who have offered these “rice paddy courses” to know that in some ways, it's an impossible task and yet you have no idea what the impact on your students will be. I remember vividly in the fall of 1967 sitting in this course thinking I'd finally arrived in heaven. I got to hear not one professor droning on for a semester, but a whole group of people talking about an entire region. We were allowed to read across disciplines, to read across cultures. It was that course that drew me into an interest in Asia.

Simultaneously in the mid-1960s when I was here the Vietnam War and the discussions about Vietnam were reaching a peak. Unfortunately, I was

not medically deferrable. I had to make a choice in 1968 about what to do: either go into the army, leave the country, or become some kind of objector. Then I discovered that our government, in its wisdom, first announced here on the steps of the Michigan Union that it could send you abroad. While it was not alternate service, it would provide yet another deferment in a series of deferments. I felt that it would be better to have two years somewhere else and then face the draft than to go in in 1968. Given a smorgasbord of countries to pick from, by sheer happenstance, I saw English teaching in Korea on the list, which I was happy to apply for. I followed the rather slippery logic that Korea was quite close to China, so it must be something like it. Ultimately, I ended up in Korea for several years, coming back only to be redrafted in 1971. As I entered graduate school I was waiting to be called up, but luckily I never was. I drifted into Korean studies, again thinking of this earlier experience. I remembered studying the larger civilization of East Asia—the core of its civilization, embodied in Chinese thought, its elaborations in Korea, and to a certain extent in Japan (though I saw Japan as a unique national subject as well). I also remembered vividly the interest in Maoism and the Chinese Revolution as some way to understand the Vietnam War, to understand different forms of national and social revolution in Asia. The intellectual interest in Maoism was clearly study directed against what our generation saw as the misplaced belief in the verities of the Cold War in the late 1960s and early 1970s.

In order to study Korea, I discovered that one cannot just dive into the national subject. Lacking something like Michigan's Japan program or its cluster of courses and experts in China, I couldn't go deeply into Korea directly. I found myself in graduate school being told, "Well, you'll just have to pick it up wherever you can." In a sense, when you start in one field on Korea, you end up being pushed back to the great, sovereign civilizations in Korea's modern experience, Japan, and in its ancient experience, China. The experience of having to do the region throughout is exhausting and has produced enormous resentments within me at times, as I wonder how many fields I can keep current with. Yet if you just hang around long enough, you find that countries go from wards of the United States and third-world basket cases to economically developing miracles. As Korea developed, it started to seed money to fund the study of its own national subject at university centers by the mid-1970s. This trend picked up steam in the 1980s, and by the 1990s they were dropping millions of dollars. Now we have Korean money chasing very few scholars on Korea. At the same time as interest in establishing centers for Korean studies grows, the Japan field in particular, and to a lesser extent the China field, finds itself casting around for new interdisciplinary paradigms for studying Asia. In the case of modern Japanese history, scholars are seeking a historical subject that is more decentered from Japan. They are also looking back at the empire and the role of its constituent additions and dynamics in

constituting the modern sense of the Japanese themselves. So I find the ironies in the emergence of Korean studies in the 1990s to be twofold. The Koreans would like to establish centers like those that existed in the 1950s and 1960s for the single, focused study of a country in its exotic guise and perhaps in the particular and unique story of its national becoming. Yet at the same time the University of Michigan (like other universities) is reshaping its Asian studies and international programs to bring Korea into a decentered, multinational sort of program of courses that talk across disciplines and look at the interconnections of larger themes like modernity.

As an American scholar studying a place like Korea, you find yourself representing subjects that are intertwined with governments' strategic and economic interests, against all intellectual rationality. You try to come out with your own voice, writing about a place that you end up knowing a tremendous amount about, and yet you are stimulated to write about this country for all the wrong reasons. If I look back at why I was allowed to continue in Korean studies, it really is because of strategic interests. Why would the United States need people who know Korean, other than for the fact that the country was drawn into the Korean Conflict and Korea became an important strategic linchpin of their overall Northeast Asia strategy? The enmity and animosity between Korea and Japan, engendered really only in modern times by the colonial experience, has also been a very difficult thing to maneuver as an American. You can at once represent the orientalist view and yet find yourself within the hegemony of the Cold War narrative, attempting to explain yet another individual national narrative. It is sort of analogous to the experience I had in Peace Corps, where I was at once a draft dodger and an agent of the Central Intelligence Agency, all at the same time. So in effect that experience is a metaphor for working with an area or a national subject that is at once part of a region, and yet part of a certain political narrative at the same time. To represent it is to destabilize the metropolitan narrative of Japan, perhaps to recenter views on China, and to fight the representations of the Koreans themselves as well, all while we take their money in order to establish professorships for such studies.

So I had no intentions of becoming an Asian specialist; I just happened to walk into that course in 1967. I'm delighted to be back here, and still enough of a kid to think, "Gosh, here I am, sitting with my intellectual grandfathers and great-grandfathers in front of all these people." I've been socialized well enough in the study of Confucian filial piety to understand the importance of generational progression and my place on the program—very late on Saturday afternoon. I'd just like to conclude with a comment for Professor Seidensticker, that the argument is no longer which students are going to get the money—students of Japan or China. Now it's a three-part problem: What are we going to do about these people who want to study Korea?

Japanese Studies in Korea: Past Developments and Future Prospects

Jung-Suk Youn

HISTORY OF JAPANESE STUDIES IN KOREA

The development of Japanese studies in Korea has been linked with the progress of diplomatic relations between Japan and Korea at every point. To know about the history of Japan-Korea relations is ultimately to study when Japanese studies began in Korea. The major difficulty lies in that there are not enough sources to identify the Japan specialists.

This short essay is based on a survey conducted between December 1987 and March 1988. It consists of several parts, including a history of Japanese studies in Korea, an analysis of research projects on Japan as area studies, a discussion of the significance of Japanese studies in Korean academic circles, and findings about institutions relating to Japanese studies in Korea. With regard to Japanese studies as area studies, we look at the processes of its development within the academic circles in Korea. To a certain extent, we look at the origin of Japanese studies in Korea in comparison with Japanese studies in the United States.

Since this survey is the first one to identify the Japan specialists in Korea, we focused on basic questions, attempting to find out who those specialists are, what interests they have, and where they are conducting their research.¹ The survey provided a profile of 243 persons who described themselves as participants in Japanese studies. This number omitted government employees, journalists, and others who might have left the field.

While Japan became an emerging European counterpart state in Asia at the end of the nineteenth century, Korea was under a diplomatic siege, with Japan controlling Korea's military and diplomatic activities vis-à-vis the European powers. Korean intellectual leaders and the bureaucratic elite began to realize the need for governmental reform and for modernization of Korea in

general. They were much impressed with the great progress made in Japan since the Meiji Restoration and began to look for a model there.

The Korean government finally took the initiative to modernize the country. In 1881 a large fact-finding mission was sent to Japan for a stay of seventy days. They were to collect information about Japanese government offices, factories, military and police organizations, and business practices. They also acquired some knowledge of Japan's reform measures for the government, especially on the proposed constitution. Each group of mission members duly prepared reports for the throne upon their return to Korea. This became, in fact, the first group of Koreans to analyze and assess information about Japan.

Following the mission, many young scholars and technocrats in the government began to learn the Japanese language and to read about European affairs and European technology imported to Japan. At the beginning, they had to know about Japan in order to widen their knowledge of world affairs. Out of twelve mission members in 1881, four young officials went to Japan again in order to study at Keio University and foreign language institutes in Tokyo. They were the first group of Korean students to study abroad at Japanese universities.

Finally, the Korean government sent more government-sponsored students to Japanese institutions—three students to the Japanese Military Academy in September 1881. The next year, more students were sent abroad, with individual assignments to study certain subjects. At Keio University and the Military Academy, they surveyed and studied the politics, legal systems, economics, and military science of Japan. A group of fifty students left for further study in Japan in 1883. They were mostly part of a reform group that later participated in the coup d'état in 1884. The imperial government of Korea continued its policy of sending groups of students to Japan until it became an instrument of Japan's expansionists in 1905.

This practice of study abroad cannot be interpreted as serious area study about Japan. Its purpose was rather to learn about a modernizing state as a nation-building model. The students were mostly interested in changes in Japanese society, state governance, and management. Korean students in Tokyo stayed for two to three years and returned to their jobs, but they were not necessarily assigned to positions working with Japan. None taught at colleges or conducted serious research on Japan, though some occasionally translated Japanese books for the Korean public.

We also cannot deny that through the early contacts with Japanese academic circles, Korean scholars and elites began to understand modern science and technology. Among the elite in Korea, some began to use Japanese as a medium of publication and communication. Until this time, the Chinese written language was the only means available to publish a book or to acquire

new knowledge from Europe. The use of the Japanese language as a medium for acquiring modern scientific knowledge was a great step forward for Japanese studies in Korea.

Some of the young scholars and government elites quickly learned Japanese and utilized the language for expanding their scope of knowledge, even though they were never educated in Japan. For example, my grandfather, Mr. Sung-Hee Youn, was one of the first graduates of the Department of Economics at Korea University. He finished his college training in 1907. After several years in the imperial government of Korea he was appointed head of the tax office in a local government branch. Simultaneously, he taught at the College of Public Finance and Taxation using his translation of a Japanese college text. One of his translations appeared in the journal *Hosei gakkei*, volume 15 (1908) two years before Japan annexed Korea. The title of his article was "The History of Public Finance," written originally by Professor Takano Iwasaburo of Tokyo Imperial University.

What these early scholars learned about Japan was not in the context of Japanese studies as area studies. It was viewed as a learning process about the management of a modern state, that is, how Japan accomplished the modernization of the government after the Meiji Restoration in 1868. In this sense, for the Korean elite, study about Japan meant learning how to modernize.

Before Korea was annexed to Japan in 1910, Korean students arrived as foreign students to Japan, but, after the annexation, Koreans became nationals of the Japanese imperial state. The contents of their education in Korea gradually became the same, as other cultural subjects were taught in Korean public schools. Up until Japan was defeated and left Korea, all Korean public educational institutions for a period of thirty-six years had to teach about Japan in order to bring up Korean children as good subjects of the Japanese imperial house. Japan specialists over sixty years old at the time of the survey had learned about Japan through the formal educational institutions under Japanese colonial administration

Based on the survey data in 1988, those over forty years old comprised 60 percent of the 243 identified scholars and specialists in Japanese studies. This fact reveals the strong impact of nonacademics on knowledge about Japan. Many learned about Japan through their life experiences. Although these nonacademics cannot use the concepts and methods of academic discipline to understand Japan's social organizations, in some cases they have provided brilliantly insightful analyses of patterns in Japanese society and culture.

In conducting the survey, we also wanted to know how Korean graduates of Japanese institutions would respond with regard to their specialization. We sent out questionnaires to 204 postwar graduates from liberal arts and social science departments of Japanese universities. Fifty-nine respondents

declined to be included in the category of Japan specialists. We came to think that recent returnees from the Japanese universities do not have substantial interest in continuing to do research on Japan.

Among the 243 currently identified Japan specialists in the survey, 22.2 percent received their Ph.D. degrees from universities in Korea; 15.2 percent from Japanese universities; 9.9 percent from American universities; and 3.3 percent from universities in Europe. These facts indicate that one does not have to study in Japan to be a Japanese specialist in Korea. However, the survey results reveal that one-half of the identified Japan specialists in Korea teaching in colleges and universities are without doctoral degrees.

JAPANESE STUDIES AS AREA STUDIES

Scholarly interest in Japan has existed since the Korean government elites' encounters with the Western powers at the end of the nineteenth century. However, how to approach Japanese studies has only recently been discussed among scholars. Unlike in the United States, Japan specialists in Korea, in general, pursue their research from a single academic discipline.

As for my own training in area studies, I attended the M.A. program at the Center for Far Eastern Studies (1966–68) at the University of Michigan. Specializing in Japanese studies, I earned the degree in 1968. The approach to Japanese studies at Michigan has been interdisciplinary; that is, I had to take courses on Japan offered from several departments, such as history, population studies, ethnomusicology, law, languages, and philosophy. A broad perspective on Japan acquired during my graduate studies gave me powerful insight into Japanese studies and eventually into Japanese society. As a political scientist, my approach to Japanese affairs is quite different from those trained in other countries. It is a more policy-oriented study of Japan.

With regard to the Japanese approach to area studies, some scholars in Southeast Asian studies in Japan use the term area studies (*jiyoku genkyu*) to refer to a methodology of studying developing areas.² Apart from a general trend in the United States, in Japan area studies means an approach to the study of a nation or an area, such as the Middle East or China.

In the United States, Japanese studies grew out of military activities during the period of the 1940s and was closely related to the international relations of the time. It is evident that area studies regarding Japan actually developed within theater operation programs, as the military faced questions such as how to accept the Japanese surrender, and how to manage Japan's governance after the war. For example, the Army Special Training Programs of the Civil Affairs Training School had programs for army officers and civilian specialists on Japan to learn Japanese language, culture, and other subjects related to Occupation policies. Some officers who participated in the Occupa-

tion programs later returned to graduate studies in Japanese affairs. This naturally brought them into area studies on Japan.³

In the early 1970s, American social scientists attempted to assess the situation of Japanese studies in U.S. higher education institutions. They found that scholars on Japan paid particular attention to their individual disciplines when conducting research. As a result there are more anthropologists, linguists, political scientists, and economists in Japanese studies.

With regard to Japan specialists in the United States, a study done in 1974–75 by Elizabeth T. Massey and Joseph A. Massey revealed that in American universities and colleges, there were 637 Japan-related courses offered to undergraduates and 361 courses at the graduate level. Courses in history, literature, political science, and religion of Japan were offered most frequently in the United States at that time.⁴

Even though the Masseys' data are a bit old, comparatively speaking, they are still good enough to compare with that of Korea. The most commonly offered courses in the United States in the 1970s were Japanese literature and language, history, and political science in that order; the same is true in Korea today. In Japanese studies in the United States, it was possible from the beginning to conduct research and teaching at the college level using an interdisciplinary approach because there were enough specialists on Japan early in the 1950s.

Among Japanese scholars, many consider area studies to be related to the development of international politics. They argue that Asian studies is a genuine field of area studies. Generally speaking, Japanese area specialists usually break down the object of study into different disciplines and attempt to put the research results together later into an interdisciplinary perspective. So-called "area studies" for them is not the object of research but a methodology used to study a nation or a geographical region. Here again, in Japan, some of the area specialists approach the study of a nation or a society in the developing countries under the concept of "area studies." However, one should not concentrate on the society per se, but should deal with an independent state and society from a comprehensive and interdisciplinary perspective.⁵

It is not an issue anymore among scholars in American universities whether or not one can use an interdisciplinary approach. However, in Korea only recently have scholars begun to realize that to understand other countries, area specialists should undertake serious research from interdisciplinary perspectives.⁵

Up to now, Japan specialists in Korea approached a subject from the microanalysis of a single discipline; if one is a linguist, one pursues a linguistic approach to Japan. Scholars need to continue to broaden their interdisciplinary analysis. Namely, the studies must be approached from anthropological, sociological, and historical perspectives in order to explain something related

to Japanese language and culture. It is imperative among Japan specialists in Korea to pursue their research activities in a comprehensive manner. That is, scholars from various disciplines should begin to conduct research jointly on Japan to enhance the theoretical contribution of social scientists in Korea.

CURRENT STATUS OF JAPANESE STUDIES

Scholars on Japan

Unlike the nineteenth-century students in Japan, postwar graduates from Japanese universities did not play any major role as Japan specialists in Korea. Strong anti-Japanese feelings immediately after the war discouraged any study about Japan. A few years later interest in Japanese affairs rose due to the normalization of Korea's relationship with Japan in 1965. Accordingly, scholarly interest in Japanese studies in Korea began to emerge, particularly because of the change in government policy that allowed high school students to take Japanese language as an elective course, and because of the fact that Japanese language and literature began to be taught as a major field of study in junior colleges in Korea after 1974. These developments created a sudden demand for teaching staff in high schools and colleges, and, as a result, many began to look for teaching jobs in the field.

Two hundred forty-three scholars among over two thousand professors in Korea's higher education institutions identified themselves as Japan specialists in our survey, from whom the following data were generated. Scholars under fifty years old comprised 77.4 percent of the total, over three quarters of all Japan specialists, most of whom graduated from postwar Korean colleges and universities. Those under forty years old (40 percent out of 243) joined the field during the last twenty years, after the normalization of political relationships between Japan and Korea.

There is an increasing proportion of female teachers as the age bracket goes down to younger generations. At the age of thirty about 25 percent of the Japan specialists are female. This trend may be coincidental with the general trend of a larger proportion of female faculty members in the fields of language and literature in Korean higher education institutions in general. It seems the same pattern is emerging in the field of Japanese language and literature. Among 36 female specialists, 29 professors and lecturers (82 percent) teach in the fields of literature and language relating to Japan.

With regard to specialization, 45.4 percent (110 persons) of the survey respondents declared Japanese language (or linguistics) and literature as their specialization; and 22.6 percent (55 persons) identified their academic specialization as Japanese politics and international relations. Economics is the third favorite subject for Japan specialists in Korea, but the figure is low: only 8.3 percent (20 persons). The history and archaeology of Japan is the fourth popu-

lar subject of study (16 persons; 6.6 percent). Sociology and education is fifth (13 persons; 5.3 percent). Five to six specialists identified their specialization as anthropology, philosophy, law, and business administration.

Compared with Japan specialists in the United States in the 1970s, the pattern of distribution in subject specialization for Japan specialists in Korea is almost the same today: language and literature (31.5 percent), history (26.5 percent), political science (12.5 percent), and other fields (6–7 percent). In Korean institutions, the number of specialists in Japanese history is proportionally smaller than those in the United States. This may be due to anti-Japanese feeling among students who have a bias against learning about Japanese history.

Among Korean specialists in Japanese language and literature, only 16 professors (14.5 percent) out of 110 hold Ph.D. degrees, while most of the professors in the other fields hold doctorates. In the fields of economics, sociology, education, and anthropology, most professors earned their doctoral degrees in Japanese institutions. It is peculiar to note that even though they are all social scientists, a large number of the political scientists have been trained either in the United States or Europe rather than in Japan.

There are only 32 persons who wrote their doctoral dissertations on or directly related to Japan out of the 123 Ph.D. holders in Japanese studies. None of these professors finished their graduate work in Korea; they earned their degrees from foreign education institutions.

Recently, the 1990s brought an important development in the study of Japanese public policy. Over twenty new Ph.D. holders returned from foreign universities, mainly American institutions like Michigan, Chicago, Ohio State, Stanford, and the University of California, Berkeley. They added new specialties in Japanese studies in Korea, such as industrial policies, trade relations, welfare policies, and foreign policies of the prewar and postwar periods. Graduates of foreign universities are exceeding domestic graduates. However, they are mostly political scientists and historians.

Research Areas and Contents

Due to my personal orientation in area studies, I have argued for the fusion of theory and area studies in the Japanese field, but the situation has not always allowed us to do that. Earlier generations of Japan specialists faced a situation during the postnormalization of relations with Japan that demanded a lot of expertise in dealing with Japanese businessmen and tourists pouring into Korea. Former employees of Japanese banks in Korea and some officials under the governor general's office were brought onto the scene of Japanese studies from the beginning.

With their fluency in Japanese, those scholars in various disciplines had to start collecting materials and doing analysis as the need for explana-

tions appeared. They taught Japanese at colleges and guided businessmen to Japanese companies, no matter what their major in college had been during the Japanese era. Some government officials in Korea contacted Japanese counterparts directly without going through the diplomatic channels. They could communicate in Japanese and promote close relationships on a personal basis. Sometimes they met a classmate as their Japanese counterpart in negotiations. These situations did not draw the new generation into Japanese studies.

I still remember vividly what some of the older history professors in Korea told me: I did not have to study Japan because they knew about Japan and many of those who spoke Japanese were active in every field at that time in Korea. This was when the University of Michigan had celebrated its 150th anniversary in 1967 and held the International Congress of Orientalists meeting on campus. Those Korean history professors were participants in the conference, but none are active anymore.

The earlier Japan specialists in Korea had never accepted the “cultural uniqueness” approach to Japanese institutions. They did not accept the ideology of *Nihonjinron* (Japan theory) to explain the postwar Japanese combination of high labor productivity and low wages due to “unique Japanese cultural traits that could not be duplicated elsewhere.” They believed that if the Japanese could do it, then Koreans could also do it.

As a matter of fact, they copied all of the Japanese institutions from the beginning. After Japan left Korea, the legal system, which is the backbone of social institutions, remained as it was under the Japanese rule. What the Koreans copied from these Japanese institutions incorporated Japan’s adjustments to a new environment during the postwar period. For example, under President Park Chung Hee’s government, many ideas, institutions, and innovations were copied from the Japanese systems. Sometimes, they simply translated the regulations and codes of Japan into Korean laws and used them in the new institutions, to inject reform and innovation into Korean society. These practices were initially in the field of political system changes and later extended to innovations and adjustments in industrial structures in order to enter the global economy.

Having described so much of the background, we will now discuss current research interests of Japan specialists in Japanese culture and society. Our survey provided the following themes and fields of ongoing research projects.

Almost half of the respondents are in the field of Japanese language and literature. As mentioned earlier, language teaching staffs are relatively young and new in Japanese studies. Together with those in the fields of premodern and modern history and comparative culture of Japan and Korea, the number of scholars in these humanities disciplines comes to 85 persons, that is, over 61 percent of those who reported their areas of study.

Only a few researchers in social sciences focus their work on the governmental policies pertaining to Japan's current international relations. Even though on several occasions we as a country adopted many institutions and policies similar to those in Japan, Japan specialists in Korea have not paid much attention to those areas. Japan specialists on the Diet Library and the Agency for Legislature in the government have translated and introduced new laws and regulations from Japan. Only recently have new graduates from American universities published on Japan's industrial policies, but they are not included in this survey.

Using the reports from the respondents, our survey collected the major lists of their publications and analyzed them to find what topics were the most common in research. Thirty scholars out of 243 apparently had no publications, but they were mostly over fifty years old or new faculty members who had not yet published.

The large numbers of professors who teach Japanese language courses reported publications focused on the comparative analysis of the use of Chinese characters in the Korean and Japanese languages, or the methods of teaching Japanese and Korean students, which are not genuine topics for Japanese studies.

The studies of Japanese literature include topics such as the novels of Sōseki and Kawabata; comparative analyses of Japanese and Korean literature; *haiku*, *waka*, and *tanka*; and Japanese mythology relating to the *Kojiki* or *Nihon shoki*. Japanese drama and modern poetry were not topics of research.

The number of college students studying Japanese language at various levels exceeds 14,000 every semester. This has brought about a large quantity of published teaching materials in spoken Japanese, in grammar, and in composition.

Political scientists were the second largest group among the Japan specialists. They have been more interested in Japan's international relations than in domestic politics, covering topics such as Japan's occupation of the Korean Peninsula, the Korean dimension of Japan-Korea relations, and Japan's colonial policies during the prewar period.

The third largest group was economists. As area studies in the traditional approach meant the application of various social science theories to some exotic non-Western case or the collection of new data for later theorists to explain, we can see a form of sheer mindless empiricism in some of this work. An understanding of the relationship between theory and area studies has never been realized among the Korean economists in doing research on the Japanese postwar economy.

The inadequacy of Western theory in explaining the most advanced industrial economy that ever existed means that the study of the Japanese economy is today itself an exercise in theorizing.⁶ It is, therefore, a truism that

research on Japanese economic institutions has unavoidably included analysis of the history of such institutions and the reconstruction of new theoretical concepts in order to understand them. Korean economists in Japanese studies have two different approaches in their research. One is to pursue an ideological analysis of Japan's development into modern capitalism, and the other is to introduce and explain the postwar Japanese-type economies. There are more scholars who study the former, because most economists were educated in Japanese universities after the war. At the same time, there have not been many attempts to reconstruct a theoretical explanation of Japanese postwar economic development.

Historians are the fourth largest group in number, but they have reported more active research endeavors than other area disciplines. Unlike American historians of Japan, they have much more interest in doing research on the seven or eight centuries of Japan-Korea relationships, the patterns of cultural transmission from Korea to Japan, and Japan-Korea relations in the Yi Dynasty, than on the historical development of Japanese institutions, the historiography of Japanese history, the modernization of the Japanese state, archaeological studies, etc. It seems to me that Korean historians are much more nationalistic and try to prove the superiority of Koreans and Korean culture over the Japanese—fruitless work in terms of scholarship. Comments like this make me a very pro-Japanese scholar by their standards.

There are only a very small number of studies done on Japan by sociologists, anthropologists, and scholars of religion. Their research subjects are mostly on the comparative aspects of chosen topics rather than on Japanese society, culture, and religion per se. Japanese social thought, social and political values, and beliefs were not popular topics among Korean scholars. Perhaps the introduction of a Japanese philosopher or religious figure is an unimaginable academic venture in Korea. These areas of research may too easily bring the accusation that the researcher is pro-Japanese in Korean society.

Of course, there is no study in Korea on the regional history of Japan, Japanese music or ethnomusicology, or Japanese history of science. It is not even agreed upon among modern historians and political scientists in Korea whether the history of Japanese colonialism should be studied by historians of Japanese history or Korean history.

It is, however, clear by now Japanese studies is taking root in many college programs. The survey conducted in 1988 provided a profile of the Japanese studies curriculum in colleges and universities. There are fifty-two higher education institutions in Korea that offer courses on Japan. Including Seoul National University, eight national and public universities are also offering courses related to Japanese society and culture. Yonsei University, the Hankook University of Foreign Studies, and Kyemyung University are the universities with comprehensive programs leading to a degree in Japanese stud-

ies. Eleven other colleges offer mainly Japanese language courses for tourism purposes, and the study of marketing for undergraduate students.

The total number of courses—divided into introductory courses, specialized subjects, language, and Literature—offered in the fifty-two universities and colleges in Korea are 208 courses at the undergraduate level and 32 courses at graduate level. Courses are heavily concentrated in language studies and introductory Japanese studies.

At the time of the survey in 1988, there were a total of 120 higher education institutions in Korea. Of 120 universities and colleges, a little less than 50 percent offered courses relating to Japan. By 1989, a total of 43 universities and colleges had departments of Japanese language and/or literatures on their campuses. Of them, 8 national universities, 28 private universities, 7 undergraduate colleges, and 11 vocational colleges had established such departments.

There seems to be great enthusiasm for promoting Japanese studies in Korea. However, some of the conservative professors in the major universities such as Seoul National University, Yonsei University, Korea University, and Ewha Women's University are very reluctant to establish either a department of Japanese language and literature or a center for Japanese studies on campus.

Japanese Studies Centers and Scholars

Japan specialists in Korea are usually located within the disciplinary departments of the universities and colleges. A few have special ties with networks of scholars in Japanese studies, but this is not common. Around the end of 1970s, about twenty senior scholars on Japan formed an informal organization called the Association for the Study of Modern Japan. This happened some years before universities began to have formal courses in the curriculum.

Throughout the survey we found that most of the scholars on Japan remain in the department where they teach students, even though they do not teach about Japan. Most of them were associated with fifty-eight universities and colleges; some other language teachers were at eighteen junior colleges. There were fifteen additional scholars associated with thirteen research institutions and business associations.

Out of 243 scholars, 149 persons (61.3 percent) were active in Seoul, and 94 (38.7 percent) were working on local campuses of colleges and universities in Korea. In general, where Japan centers were established on campus, there were many scholars on Japan. However, this is not always the case. Seoul National University had 16 faculty members in various departments as Japanese specialists. This pattern is the same for Chung-Ang University, with 14 faculty members; Korea University, with 11 faculty members; Hankook University of Foreign Studies, with 9 members; and Dankook University and Hanyang University, with 7 and 8 faculty members identified as Japan specialists, respectively.

One hundred fifty-two Japan specialists out of 243 persons have some sort of relationship with Japanese institutions, such as Tokyo University (55 persons), Waseda University (12 persons), Tsukuba University (10 persons), Osaka University (6 persons), Meiji University (6 persons), and Keio University (6 persons). The total number of Japanese institutions associated, to a certain extent, with Korean scholars was thirty-two research institutions and institutions of higher education. Almost no report of joint research was received during the survey. Through the generous grants of the Japan Foundation, many fellowship scholars of Korea had the chance to visit Japan and had maintained their interests in Japanese studies afterward. During the past few years, there has been an increase in joint research opportunities for Korean scholars due to Japan's Monbusho grants to Japanese universities.

NOTES

1. Japan Foundation, "Kangoku ni okeru Nihongenkyu" (Japanese studies in Korea), *Directory Series* 19 (Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, 1989). This report was originally prepared by the author of this essay in the summer of 1988 as a project report to the Institute of Area Studies, Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea.
2. Uno Toru, *Jiyoku genkyu* (Tokyo: Sanshin Shobō, 1987). Professor Uno quoted from an article written by Bryce Wood, "Area Studies," in *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. David L. Sills (New York: Macmillan, 1968), 1:401-7.
3. Uno, *Jiyoku genkyu*, 4.
4. Elizabeth T. Massey and Joseph A. Massey, *Culcon Report on Japanese Studies at Colleges and Universities in The United States in the Mid-70s* (New York: The Japan Society, Inc., 1977), 23.
5. Itagaki Koichi, ed., *Ajiya kenkyū no katai to boba* (Tokyo: Tōyō Keizai Shinbunsha, 1986), i-ii.
6. Chalmers Johnson, "Studies of Japanese Political Economy: A Crisis in Theory," in *Japanese Studies in the United States: Part I—History and Present Condition*, Japanese Studies Series 17 (Tokyo: The Japan Foundation, 1988), 95-113, esp. 99.

Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s and Beyond

Patricia G. Steinhoff

For the past decade I have been tracking down American Japan specialists to produce two editions of the *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States and Canada*, and having found most of them, to study the development and current state of Japanese studies in the United States. That work has been influenced heavily by the particular time and place in which I was first exposed to Japanese studies: as an undergraduate majoring in Japanese language and literature at the University of Michigan in the early 1960s.

When I began taking intensive Japanese as a sophomore in the fall of 1960, virtually all of my classmates were graduate students who had served with the U.S. military in Japan during the 1950s. I represented the beginning of a quite different generation of students who became interested in Japanese for its sheer intellectual challenge, without any prior exposure to the language or culture. However, the rarity in those days of an undergraduate who was seriously interested in Japanese studies meant that I was surrounded by graduate students and even permitted to take the core course for the Japanese studies M.A. the following year. Studying *Village Japan* and *Twelve Doors to Japan* (in mimeograph) with their authors connected me vicariously to the Okayama Field Station and to the pioneering work in Japanese studies done by University of Michigan faculty and graduate students during the 1950s.

The language program that first semester also connected me to an even earlier generation of Japanese language students, since in pre-Jorden 1960 we were still using the old Army Language School textbooks. I learned all the dialogues about the sergeant reporting to the lieutenant and the lieutenant to the captain, but some of the subtleties were lost on me because I had no idea what the military ranks meant.

And so, despite the fact that I had missed the wartime mobilization of Japanese language training and the first fifteen years of postwar Japanese studies in the United States, I felt personally connected to all of my *senpai* through the Center for Japanese Studies. I have been a direct participant observer of the rest of the postwar history of Japanese studies in the United States since the 1960s. It is from this special vantage point that I have tried to understand how Japanese studies has grown and changed in fifty years, and where it is now headed. The results of my research, based largely on data submitted for the 1995 *Directory* and supplementary surveys but also informed by my own experiences and observations and through comparisons with earlier studies, were published last year by The Japan Foundation and the Association for Asian Studies as *Japanese Studies in the United States: The 1990s*.

The program of this symposium over the past three days not only reflects the history of the postwar development of Japanese studies, but offers a vivid illustration of the five major themes that characterize Japanese studies in the United States in the 1990s. In the time remaining I would like to outline these five themes briefly, and then suggest where I think we are headed.

The first theme, which drives all of the others, is the tremendous growth that Japanese studies has experienced, which could not have been imagined in the early postwar years when the University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies began. Even in 1970, nearly twenty-five years after the Center was founded, there were only 408 Japan specialists counted in the whole United States. By 1995 that number had almost quadrupled. Japanese studies and Japan specialists cannot take credit for this remarkable growth because much of it, particularly since the mid-1980s, has clearly been fueled externally by changes in the economic position of Japan and its relationship to the United States. This shift in the mid-1980s, which elsewhere I have characterized as the "loss of irrelevance" of Japanese studies, has profoundly changed the nature of our field.

The University of Michigan has of course played a major role in the development of the field and the training of its participants. In our sample of 1,552 professional Japan specialists currently active in the United States, 185, or nearly 12 percent, have received one or more academic degrees from the University of Michigan. Although Michigan's share of the field of Japanese studies was larger in the earlier years when far fewer institutions even offered concentrations on Japan, the University of Michigan has been holding its own through the 1990s among a much larger number of programs. In a series of studies, each of which reported where currently active Japan specialists had obtained their doctorates, the University of Michigan ranked second in 1970, bested only by Harvard, and third in 1977, 1984, and 1995, behind Harvard and Columbia.

The picture is slightly different when we look at current doctoral candidates, because many new institutions have begun training doctoral candidates in Japanese studies since the 1970s and now have very large programs. In 1989 the University of Michigan ranked second in the number of current doctoral candidates in Japanese studies, exceeded only by the University of Hawaii, but it had dropped to seventh place in the 1995 study, where it tied with Harvard. Nonetheless, Michigan remains a major player in the production of professional Japan specialists, even though the scale of the enterprise has grown tremendously.

The second major theme of Japanese studies in the 1990s is normalization, which points to the way that Japanese studies has become integrated into the general life of American society and is now less isolated as an obscure field of academic study than it was prior to the 1980s. One measure of the normalization of Japanese studies within the University of Michigan is the large number of undergraduate courses offered on Japan and their substantial enrollments, reflecting the fact that today many students who have no intention of majoring in Japanese studies or becoming professional Japan specialists still feel that knowing something about Japan is an important part of their general education. A related aspect of normalization is the much broader public audience for information about Japan in the 1990s, and the enormous popular literature on Japan that feeds the public demand, much of which is no longer being written by academic Japan specialists.

At the professional level, normalization is evident in the growing number of Japan specialists who work not in academic institutions, and not in specialized institutions that study Japan, but in the normal workplaces of America: in banks, brokerage houses, corporations, government offices, media companies, and secondary schools. There were hints of this normalization in the career paths of some of the speakers at Friday's sessions. To see how the ripples have spread even more broadly, we would need to look at the current occupations of all those who have been trained by those speakers and, indeed, by all the symposium's participants over the past decade.

The fact that one day of three in the Center's Fiftieth Anniversary Symposium has been devoted to "Connecting with the Professional World" stands as evidence of both the normalization and the differentiation of contemporary Japanese studies in the United States. The third theme of Japanese studies in the 1990s, differentiation, refers to internal changes in the training, interests, affiliations, and orientations of Japan specialists that make the field of Japanese studies vastly more complex than it was just a decade ago, let alone during the early years of the Center for Japanese Studies.

Although the first aim of interdisciplinary area studies as practiced at the Center was to bring to bear the different perspectives of many academic

disciplines on Japan as an object of study, the second part of the agenda was to provide a common base of pooled knowledge and shared perspective to the study of Japan in the postwar United States. *Twelve Doors to Japan* seemed like a pretty broad range in the early 1960s, but each author was able to summarize the state of knowledge about Japan in his field in one chapter so that readers from other disciplines could understand and appreciate it.

Today the University of Michigan offers at least nineteen doors to Japan, which are opened by over thirty faculty members. Who would have dreamed in 1950 that one could be a Japan specialist in industrial and operations engineering, yet it is precisely the demand for specializations such as this that have so profoundly altered Japanese studies in the 1990s. The University of Michigan has led the way in the training of Japan specialist professionals in law, business, economics, and engineering, but inevitably, the demands of professional training have preempted the earlier vision of the broadly trained interdisciplinary area specialist.

While I believe there remains some intellectual merit to the concept of interdisciplinary area studies despite the attacks on its Cold War origins, the stubborn fact is that today Japan specialists working in different professional fields simply need to know different things and to have different skills in order to do their jobs. Interdisciplinary area studies may provide a useful intellectual foundation for their approach to Japan, but it has to be combined with highly sophisticated and specialized training that Japan specialists in other fields do not want or need to know. The result of this differentiation is that today Japan specialists in different disciplines and professional fields share less common intellectual ground that they did in the past, and are less and less likely to communicate across disciplinary lines.

Differentiation is closely related to the fourth theme of the 1990s, specialization. Specialization refers to a narrowing and deepening of individual aspects of the study of Japan and the focus of individual Japan specialists, even as the field as a whole has become broader and more diverse. The range of very specific topics presented by our three days of symposium speakers attests to the degree of specialization in contemporary Japanese studies, and, in addition, some of our symposium speakers have addressed the problems of specialization directly. There is no question that specialization has become a mixed blessing for Japanese studies.

Up until the mid-1970s, the entire English-language academic literature on Japan was modest enough that graduate students in Japanese studies were generally expected to read all of it, regardless of their discipline. Now the academic English-language literature on Japan has grown so large that in some fields such as history, specialists are hard-pressed just to keep up with everything that is published in their own discipline. Academic Japan specialists are expected not only to know that literature, but to make original contributions to

it, based on their own research in Japanese language sources. Those contributions have necessarily become more and more specialized and narrow. While research in Japanese studies has unquestionably increased in quality and sophistication as a result of specialization, there is inevitably a trade-off in breadth of focus, communicability, and the capacity to deal with large intellectual questions.

In addition, particularly in the social sciences, doctoral candidates and young faculty facing tenure decisions must make research contributions that will be evaluated favorably by departmental colleagues who are not Japan specialists at all, but disciplinary specialists. Young scholars must therefore orient their research to questions that relate to current disciplinary concerns, whether or not those issues are relevant to Japanese studies, and they must publish in journals that are recognized by the discipline, where they are less likely to be read by other Japan specialists. The result is that research in Japanese studies becomes more and more specialized within the theoretical language of each discipline, making it both harder to find and harder to understand across disciplinary lines.

Differentiation and specialization, while they are analytically distinct, are mutually reinforcing tendencies. Whether one regards their cumulative effects as positive or negative on balance, we have passed the point of no return for both of them. In fact, I think we have already reached the level at which differentiation and specialization within Japanese studies, combined with growth and normalization, have begun to generate emergent new categories of professional Japan specialists whose function is to translate the specialized and differentiated research findings of Japanese studies for the broader audience of nonspecialists who now want various kinds of information about Japan.

This brings us to the fifth and final theme of Japanese studies in the 1990s, its internationalization or globalization. This theme is boldly represented in the title of the Fiftieth Anniversary Symposium, "Japan in the World, the World in Japan." It has also appeared in the content of several symposium presentations, and in the international composition of our speakers and audience overall. Indeed, one of the most positive and valuable aspects of the internationalization of Japanese studies in the 1990s is the egalitarian and mutually respectful international collegial relations that now characterize Japanese studies. Thanks to both the high level of scholarship and the high standard of living in Japan, our relationships with Japanese colleagues are now remarkably free of colonialism. Mentor-student relations flow in both directions across the Pacific, as do research collaborations among academic equals.

Japanese studies in the United States is by definition international since it involves the study of one nation by another. By the 1990s, however, Japanese studies in the United States has become international or global in

new ways. Some of these involve the subject matter of Japanese studies, as reflected in the symposium title. As part of Japanese studies, we now must study the presence and impact of Japan in other parts of the world, as well as the presence and impact of other parts of the world within Japan. These topics are no longer limited to interactions between Japan and the United States, or with Japan's East Asian neighbors, but encompass Japan's interactions with the economies, politics, cultures, and citizens of virtually the entire world.

Precisely because Japan is such a significant force in the contemporary world, and because Japanese studies in the United States has developed so astonishingly over the past fifty years, American academic Japanese studies now attracts students from all over the world. I estimate that between 20 and 30 percent of doctoral candidates in Japan-related fields at American institutions are now foreign students. While the majority of them are Japanese nationals, growing numbers of our foreign graduate students in Japanese studies are from countries other than Japan—perhaps as many as 5 to 10 percent of all current doctoral candidates in Japanese studies in the United States. Their presence brings the globalization of Japanese studies into our classrooms in new ways and potentially extends the range of American Japanese studies globally as well.

Related to this phenomenon is the globalization of job opportunities for Americans trained in Japanese studies. The combination of a relatively high percentage of foreign students receiving Japanese studies training in the United States, plus the overseas job markets for American Japan specialists, means that American academic institutions offering Japanese studies are no longer simply training Japan specialists to meet American needs. We are training Japan specialists for the borderless world of the twenty-first century. That entails new challenges that we are just beginning to recognize.

Over the next decade, I think two trends will become increasingly visible in Japanese studies. The first is that our academic institutions will be training specialists for careers that involve transmitting specialized knowledge about Japan to a wide public audience. These specialists will not be producers of primary academic research, but they will know how to find and evaluate research and put it to broader use. Many of them will have M.A. degrees from the University of Michigan Center for Japanese Studies, in addition to other professional training.

The second trend is that Japanese studies will be increasingly fused with the study of other areas, peoples, and languages. Over the past fifty years Japanese studies has thrived in part by separating itself from China and East Asia and by promoting a single-minded focus on Japan. Now we need to reconnect Japanese studies to the rest of the world, and in this symposium you have already heard from some of the people who are leading the way.

From this brief review of the state of Japanese studies in the United States in the 1990s and where it is headed, it is now apparent that in celebrating the fiftieth anniversary of the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Michigan we are also celebrating the successful development of Japanese studies in the postwar United States. Many aspects of the success of Japanese studies are attributable to factors beyond our control, but it is also true that we have, all of us, participated in and contributed to its development. While there are new challenges to face as we approach the twenty-first century, I am confident that Japanese studies in the United States, and at the University of Michigan in particular, will rise to meet them.

Contributors

Grace Beardsley has been a happy nobody, wife, and mother, for years. Her professional experience has included being either an Assistant or Associate Professor at Russel Sage College, 1936-38; University of the Pacific, 1938-40; and Mills College, 1941; an Editor at the University of Michigan Institute for Social Research, 1956-59; and an Independent Textile Scholar, 1936-40, 1978-94.

John Creighton Campbell is Professor of Political Science at the University of Michigan. His field is Japanese politics and decision making in general, but in recent years he has focused on the social policy field, including the health-care system and the new public long-term-care insurance system. During his thirty-year stay in Ann Arbor he has served as Director of the Center for Japanese Studies and as Secretary-Treasurer of the Association for Asian Studies.

Jennifer Corbett was born in Canada but grew up and was educated in Australia. She took a B.A. from the Australian National University in the Department of Economics with a major in Japanese language. She spent some time in Japan and in England before coming to the University of Michigan in 1977 to start a Ph.D. in the Economics Department. She spent 1981-82 in Japan at the Economic Planning Agency working on her thesis on "Monetary Policy in Japan" and in 1983 went to the University of Oxford as the University Lecturer in the Economic and Social Development of Japan. At Oxford, she is attached to the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies and the Sub-Faculty of Economics, where she teaches courses on the Japanese economy to students in both faculties. She is also a fellow of St. Antony's College, a graduate college of the University of Oxford. She spends regular periods as a Visiting Fellow at the Australia-Japan Research Centre, Australian National University. Her main research interests are in the areas of corporate governance and finance, money, and banking.

Peter Duus is the William H. Bonsall Professor of History at Stanford University. After taking an M.A. in Far Eastern Studies at Michigan in 1959, he returned to Harvard, his undergraduate alma mater, where he received his Ph.D. in History in 1964. Over the years, Professor Duus has written on a variety of subjects, from Japanese feudalism to Taishō politics, but his most recent books have focused on Japan as an imperialist power (*The Abacus and the Sword: The Japanese Penetration of Korea*) and as a semicolonized country (*The Japanese Discovery of America*). He has also written a textbook on modern Japan and edited volume 6 of *The Cambridge History of Japan*.

J. Douglas Eyre served on the University of Washington faculty (1951-57) following completion of the Ph.D. degree at the University of Michigan. From 1957-92, he taught at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, where he also served as departmental chair, director of international programs, academic advisor and member of the Asian Studies program. The economic and urban geography of Japan has been his principal research focus. He is active in Chapel Hill community organizations and in UNC-CH library and alumni affairs, and, since 1990, he has made numerous trips to East Asia and Southeast Asia.

B. J. George, Jr. is Professor of Law Emeritus, New York Law School, and minister for pastoral care, First United Methodist Church, Castle Rock, Colorado. He has served as chairperson for the ABA Standing Committee on Association Standards for Criminal Justice and former chairperson and section delegate, ABA Section on Criminal Justice. He is a member of the American Law Institute and an American Bar Fellow, as well as an honorary member of the Penal Law Society of Japan (Nihon Keihō Gakkai). He has served as a visiting expert for the United Nations, Asia, and Far East Institute for the Prevention of Crime and the Treatment of Offenders (UNAFED) in 1970, 1980, 1982, 1985, 1987, and 1990. In 1962 and 1987 he was a visiting lecturer at Tokyo University. In November of 1996, he was awarded the Order of Sacred Treasure with Gold Rays and Neck Ribbon by the Government of Japan.

Grant K. Goodman is Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Kansas, Lawrence, Kansas. He is a specialist both in Tokugawa intellectual history and in Japan's cultural relations with South and Southeast Asia since the Meiji Period. He has written, edited or coedited fifteen books and has published over sixty articles. He has been a Visiting Professor at Sophia University (three times), the University of Hong Kong (three times), the University of the Philippines (twice), as well as at the University College of Dublin (Ireland), Leicester University (England), the University of Warsaw (Poland), Griffith University (Australia), the University of Tübingen (Germany), and Fukuoka University. He has also been a Fellow of the Netherlands Institute of Advanced Studies in

the Humanities and Social Sciences and a Visiting Professor at the International Research Center for Japanese Studies in Kyoto. The Grant K. Goodman Prize in Philippine History of the Association for Asian Studies was endowed by a gift from Professor Goodman.

Beate Sirota Gordon was born in Vienna, educated in Tokyo, and has lived in the United States since 1947. She arrived in Japan in 1929 when her father, the world-renowned pianist Leo Sirota, accepted a position at the Imperial Academy of Music in Tokyo; the family remained in Japan for some sixteen years. Sirota came to the United States to attend Mills College and, at the outbreak of war in 1941, was one of only sixty Caucasians in the country to be fluent in Japanese.

After working for the U.S. Office of War Information as well as a stint at TIME Magazine as a researcher on Japan, she returned to Tokyo in December 1945 as the first civilian woman attached to the Occupation Army. Assigned to the Political Affairs staff of GATT's Government Section, she worked on the political and economic purges and on Japan's new Constitution, for which she drafted the Article on Women's Rights. Upon returning to the United States, she married Joseph Gordon, with whom she had worked in the Occupation.

In 1954, she joined the Japan Society of New York as Director of Student Programs, providing career counseling to Japanese students, working with performing and visual artists, and arranging exhibits and lecture demonstrations. In 1958, she was appointed the Society's Director of Performing Arts. In addition, in 1960, Beate Gordon became a consultant to the Asia Society, expanding her activities from Japan to other Asian countries as well; in this capacity, she introduced a great number of Asian performing artists to the U.S. public.

In 1970, Beate Gordon was named Director of the Performing Arts Program of the Asia Society in New York, and in 1987, Director of Performances, Films, and Lectures. She retired from the Asia Society in 1991. A Japanese-language biography, *Christmas 1945 (The Biography of the Woman Who Wrote the Equal Rights Clause of the Japanese Constitution)* was published on October 20, 1995. An English translation of this book was published in 1998 by Kodansha International under the title *The Only Woman in the Room—A Memoir*.

Whitmore Gray is Professor Emeritus at the University of Michigan. He is also an occasional visiting professor at Fordham Law School. He has served on several Fulbright Selection Committees, as Chair of the American Association of Law Schools, Comparative Law Section, and on the editorial board of the *American Journal of Comparative Law*, among other organizations. His publications include "Use and Non-Use of Contract Law in Japan," in *Law in Japan* and *E Pluribus Unum: A Bicentennial Report on Unification of Law in the U.S.*

Roger F. Hackett is Professor Emeritus of History at the University of Michigan. He received his B.A. from Carleton College and his A.M. and Ph.D. from Harvard University. Professor Hackett taught at Northwestern University from 1953-61 before coming to the University of Michigan. He was Editor of the *Journal of Asian Studies* from 1959-62; a member of the Executive Committee and Board of Directors for the Association for Asian Studies from 1966-69; Director of the Center for Japanese Studies at Michigan from 1968-71; and Chairman of the Department of History, the University of Michigan, from 1975-77.

Betty Bolce "Robin" Hall was born in Cincinnati, Ohio in 1918. She received a B.A. in English Literature and Drama from Mount Holyoke College in 1940 and an M.A. in Theater and Comparative Literature from the University of North Carolina two years later. Entering a developing field, she introduced programs in children's theater and educational drama at three state universities—Eastern Michigan, Douglas College/Rutgers, and Southern Connecticut State, from which she retired after twenty years of teaching in 1983. She has published a number of articles on children's theater in Japan and England and a play, *Story Theatre-Japan*, based on Japanese folk tales, which was performed extensively throughout this country and in Hawaii. She served as Regional Representative of the Children's Theater Division of the American Educational Theater Association and received the Presidential Award from that organization.

Dan Fenno Henderson has been Professor of Law at Hastings College of Law, University of California in San Francisco since 1991. He served as Director, Asian Law Program at the School of Law, University of Washington (Seattle) from 1962 to 1991. He is a member of the Bars of Washington (1949), California (1956), and Japan (1954), and has practiced law for many years in U.S.-Japanese relations. His specialty is transnational litigation.

Merit E. Janow is a Professor in the Practice of International Trade at Columbia University's School of International and Public Affairs (SIPA). She is also Director of the International Economic Policy program at SIPA and Co-Director of Columbia's APEC Study Center. Professor Janow teaches graduate courses in international economic and trade policy at SIPA and international trade law at Columbia Law School. During 1998-2000 she served as Executive Director of a new *International Competition Policy Advisory Committee* to the Attorney General and Assistant Attorney General for Antitrust at the Department of Justice, Washington, D.C. During the 1990-93 period, she served as Deputy Assistant U.S. Trade Representative for Japan and China at the Office of the U.S. Trade Representative. She is the author of numerous articles on U.S.-Asian trade and economic matters as well as international trade and competition

subjects. She received a B.A. in Asian Studies from the University of Michigan and a J.D. from Columbia Law School.

Arthur E. Klauser is director emeritus of the Mitsui (USA) Foundation and a life trustee of DePauw University. Previously, he served for seven years in Japan as an intelligence officer with the U.S. government. From 1957, he was a business executive with the Vicks Chemical Co. & Richardson Foundation; Royal Crown Cola; AMF; Pfizer International, and Dow Corning Corp., serving in South America, Europe, the UK and Japan. Retiring from Dow Corning as VP of Corporate Communications and Public Affairs, he joined Mitsui USA, Inc. as Senior VP and Director of Corporate Communications. He opened and managed Mitsui's Washington, D.C. office. He was the first foreign senior executive and office manager. Retiring from this position in 1990, he joined the Mitsui (USA) Foundation board. He lectures and has written many articles on Japanese business, history, and art. He translated into Japanese Irwin Shaw's *The Young Lions*. Mr. Klauser has donated his art and historical artifacts from Japan and China to DePauw. This is a working collection and is on permanent display and use for students, faculty, and visitors as the Klauser Asian World Community Collection.

Jill Kleinberg is Associate Professor in the School of Business at the University of Kansas, where she teaches courses on comparative and cross-cultural management, business, and society in Japan, cross-cultural negotiation, organizational behavior, and organizational ethnography. Her research and publications have focused primarily on cross-cultural management issues and emergent organizational cultures in binational (Japan-U.S.) organizational settings. She received an M.A. in Japanese Studies and a Ph.D. in Cultural Anthropology from the University of Michigan.

Kondo Motohiro is a professor at Nihon University, Graduate School of Social and Cultural Studies. He is also an advisor for the *Gaiko Forum* and the *Japan Echo*. He was the first Toyota Visiting Professor at the University of Michigan for the 1988-89 academic year, teaching a course in media, public opinion, and policy. He was previously with Chuokoron-sha Publishers as the Editor-in-Chief of *Chuokoron*.

Edwin Neville was a professor at Canisius College in Buffalo, New York. He was born in Japan in 1926 and attended the Navy Language School at Boulder, Colorado before receiving his A.B. from Harvard. Dr. Neville received both his M.A. and Ph.D. from the University of Michigan. He served as the Chair of the History Department at Canisius College from 1985 to 1991. Previously, he was the Chair of the Erie-Ontario Japan Seminar from 1971 until 1995; President of

the National Association of Self-Instruction Language (NASILP) in 1975, Board of Directors 1975-1978; Editor, NASILP Journal, 1975-1978. He has presented papers at the 10th, 12th, 13th, and 14th International Conferences of the Historians of Asia (IAHA), in Singapore, Hong Kong, Tokyo, Bangkok and at numerous regional conferences of the Association for Asian Studies. Professor Neville died after a brief illness on October 1, 2000; he was seventy-four.

Margaret Norbeck, archaeologist, was a lecturer at the University of Houston from 1969-1974 then a lecturer at the University of Houston's Continuing Education from 1976-1978. She co-authored with Edward Norbeck an article titled "Child Training in a Japanese Fishing Community" in *Personal Character and Cultural Milieu*, edited by B.G. Haring (Syracuse University Press, 1956). Principal career: Raising four children.

Hugh Patrick is the R.D. Calkins Professor of International Business and Director of the Center on Japanese Economy and Business at Columbia University Graduate School of Business. He joined the Columbia faculty in 1984 after some years as Professor of Economics and Director of the Economic Growth Center at Yale University. He has been awarded Guggenheim and Fulbright Fellowships and the Ohira Prize. His professional publications include fourteen books and some sixty articles and essays. He served as one of the four American members of the binational Japan-United States Economic Relations Group appointed by President Carter and Prime Minister Ohira, 1979-1981. He is chairman of the International Steering Committee for the conference series on Pacific Trade and Development (PAFTAD), having served on it since PAFTAD's inauguration in 1968. In November 1994, the Government of Japan awarded him the Order of the Sacred Treasure, Gold, and Silver Star (*Kunshô nitô*).

Forrest R. Pitts is a retired geographer living in Santa Rosa, California. He taught at the University of Oregon for nine years, the University of Pittsburgh for a year, and the University of Hawaii at Manoa for twenty-five years. He advised the Economic Development Council in Seoul, 1960-61, on the mechanization of agriculture, and in 1966 was called the "father of the hand tractor in Korea." He taught computer programming and network analysis on a Fulbright at Seoul National University. For eight years, he was Executive Director of the International Geographical Union's Commission on Quantitative Methods. He has studied Japanese, Chinese, and Korean and did fieldwork in Okinawa. Mr. Pitts was a founding member of the Center for Korean Studies at the University of Hawaii, 1972.

Philip H. Power (B.A., University of Michigan; M.A., Oxford University) is a Regent Emeritus of the University of Michigan. He was acquainted with many

of the founders of the Center for Japanese Studies.

Mark Ramseyer is the Mitsubishi Professor of Japanese Legal Studies, Harvard University. His books include *Japanese Law* (with Minoru Nakazato, University of Chicago Press, 1999), *Odd Markets in Japanese History* (Cambridge University Press, 1996), *The Politics of Oligarchy* (with Frances Rosenbluth, Cambridge University Press, 1995), *Law and Investment in Japan* (with Yukio Yanagida, et al., eds., Harvard EALS, 1994), *Japan's Political Marketplace* (with Frances Rosenbluth, Harvard University Press, 1993), and *Ho to keizaigaku* (written in Japanese, Kobundo, 1990). He is an editor of the *Studies in Law & Economics* series at the University of Chicago Press, and an associate editor of the *Journal of the Japanese & International Economies*. Ramseyer taught at UCLA from 1986-92, at the University of Chicago from 1992-98, and has been at Harvard ever since. He has also taught at Virginia, and—in Japanese—at Waseda University, the University of Tokyo, Tohoku University, and Hitotsubashi University. Other than three years in the Ann Arbor public schools, he spent most of his childhood in Japan. He earned his A.M. at the Center for Japanese Studies in 1978.

Michael Robinson is Associate Professor of East Asian Languages and Cultures at Indiana University. He received his B.A. in History from the University of Michigan. In addition to his serving as a consultant to the *American Historical Review* and editor for *Education About Asia*, Dr. Robinson has received research grants from the Korean Foundation and Social Science Research Council. His most recent publications are "Broadcasting in Korea 1924-1937: Colonial Modernity and Cultural Hegemony," in *Competing Modernities in Twentieth Century Japan* (University of Hawaii Press, forthcoming), and coeditor, with Gi-Wook Shin, *Colonial Modernity in Korea* (Council for East Asian Publications, Harvard University, 1999).

Gary Saxonhouse is Professor of Economics at The University of Michigan and Director of its Committee on Comparative and Historical Research on Market Economies (CCHROME). Besides holding his present position, Professor Saxonhouse has taught at Harvard, Yale, and Brown. While at Brown, Professor Saxonhouse was the Henry Luce Professor of Comparative Development.

Professor Saxonhouse has written numerous articles in professional journals and conference volumes on topics ranging from the structure and operation of the Japanese economy, international trade, technology transfer, and econometrics to English, Japanese, and Russian economic history. His research has appeared in leading economics journals in the United States, including *The American Economic Review*, *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *The Review of Economics and Statistics*, *The Journal of Political Economy*,

and in leading journals in Japan. At present, Professor Saxonhouse is a member of the editorial board of the *Japan Economic Review*, the journal of Japan's leading association of academic economists.

In addition to his research papers, Professor Saxonhouse has co-authored or co-edited six books. In 2000, *Finance, Governance and Competitiveness in Japan*, his co-edited volume (a *festschrift* in honor of Hugh Patrick), was published by Oxford University Press.

Among other academic honors, Professor Saxonhouse has been a Fellow at the Center for Advanced Study in the Behavioral Sciences at Stanford during the academic years 1984-85, 1995-96, and 1999-2000. He has also been named a Member of the Faculty at the Institute for Advanced Study at Princeton and a Fellow at Woodrow Wilson Center at the Smithsonian Institution.

Irwin Scheiner is Professor of History at the University of California, Berkeley. He received an M.A. in Far Eastern Studies and a Ph.D. in History from the University of Michigan. Dr. Scheiner has conducted his latest study in Japan on the Yonaoshi Rebellions. In 1995, he served as a Senior Fellow at the Reischauer Institute at Harvard University.

Edward Seidensticker was born in Colorado and attended the University of Colorado. Upon graduation, a few months after Pearl Harbor, he entered the Navy Japanese Language School. He served in the Pacific and in the Occupation of Japan. He returned to the United States in 1962, after living in Tokyo for fourteen years, to take a position at Stanford. Stanford was followed by Michigan, where he was a professor of Japanese literature from 1966 to 1977. He taught at Columbia University from 1977 to 1985. He has translated novels by Kawabata Yasunari, Tanizaki Jun'ichirô, and Mishima Yukio, as well as the classical *Gossamer Years* and *Tale of Genji*. In his recent work is a two-volume cultural history of Tokyo from the Meiji Restoration down to the time of the writing.

Bernard Silberman is Professor of Political Science at the University of Chicago. He received his M.A. in Far Eastern Studies and his Ph.D. in History from the University of Michigan. He has taught at Oberlin College, University of Arizona, and Duke University. His most recent book, *Cages of Reason: The Rise of the Rational State in France, Japan, the United States and Great Britain* was published by the University of Chicago Press in 1993.

Richard J. Smethurst is University Center for International Studies Research Professor in the History Department at the University of Pittsburgh. He has written two books, *A Social Basis for Prewar Japanese Militarism: The Army and the Rural Community* (1974) and *Agricultural Development and the Ten-*

ancy Disputes in Japan, 1870-1940 (1987). Professor Smethurst served as chair of his department for five-and-one-half years between 1988 and 1994. In the 1990s, he has been a research associate in the Institute for Monetary and Economic Studies of the Bank of Japan and in the Business Faculty of Keio University. The subject of his current research is Takahashi Korekiyo, Japan's Finance Minister during the depression years, 1931-1936. Professor Smethurst also serves on the board of the Pittsburgh Chamber Music Society.

Robert J. Smith is Goldwin Smith Professor Emeritus of Anthropology and Asian Studies at Cornell University. He has served as President of the Association for Asian Studies, Chair of the Joint Committee on Japanese Studies of the Social Science Research Council and the American Council of Learned Societies, and editor of *Human Organization*, the journal of the Society for Applied Anthropology. The Government of Japan conferred the Order of the Rising Sun on him in 1993.

Following his training in the Japanese Language and Area Program of the U.S. Army at the University of Minnesota and Yale University in 1944-45, Professor Smith was stationed in Osaka with the 25th Division. In 1947, he returned to the University of Minnesota where he received a B.A. in 1949. He took a Ph.D. at Cornell University in 1953 and joined the faculty that same year.

He delivered the Lewis Henry Morgan Lectures at the University of Rochester (1980), the Edward H. Hume Memorial Lecture at Yale University (1980), the Richard K. Beardsley Memorial Lecture at the University of Michigan (1986), the Donald W. Flaherty Lecture at Dickinson College (1988), and the John W. Hall Lecture in Japanese Studies at Yale University (2000).

Professor Smith's publications include *Two Japanese Villages* (with John B. Cornell, 1956), *Japanese Culture: Its Development and Characteristics* (editor, with Richard K. Beardsley, 1962), *Ancestor Worship in Contemporary Japan* (1974), *Kurusu: The Price of Progress in a Japanese Village* (1978), *The Women of Suyu Mura* (with Ella Lury Wiswell, 1982), and *Japanese Society: Tradition, Self, and the Social Order* (1983).

Patricia G. Steinhoff is Professor of Sociology at the University of Hawaii and the author or editor of ten books and sixty articles and book chapters. She is known in the Japanese Studies field for her research on conflict in Japan, including the books *Tenko: Ideology and Societal Integration in Prewar Japan* and *Conflict in Japan* (co-edited with Ellis Krauss and Thomas Rohlen), and for her work on Japanese Studies in the United States, including the *Directory of Japan Specialists and Japanese Studies Institutions in the United States: the 1990s*. She has also published two books in Japanese: *Nihon Sekigunba: Sono Shakaigakuteki Monogatari* and *Rengô Sekigun to Aum Shinrikyô: Nihon Shakai*

o *Kataru* (with Ito Yoshinori and Takahashi Mayumi). She was Director of the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Hawaii for eight years, and has served on several national committees in the Japanese Studies field.

Yuzuru Takeshita is Professor Emeritus of Health Behavior and Health Education, School of Public Health, the University of Michigan. Professor Takeshita received his B.A. in Sociology from Park College (1951), and his M.A. (1952) and Ph.D. (1962) in Sociology from the University of Michigan.

George O. Totten III is Distinguished Professor Emeritus of Political Science at the University of Southern California. He taught there from 1965 to 1992. After teaching at the Center for Japanese Studies at the University of Hawaii, he became a Senior Affiliated Scholar at the Center for Multiethnic and Transnational Studies at USC until 1998. Since then he has served as Chair of the USC Korea Project. He received his A.B. from Columbia in 1946 and his Ph.D. from Yale in 1954. During World War II he entered the first group in the Military Intelligence Japanese Language School at the University of Michigan in 1943 and later took part in the landing on Mindanao. After the surrender, he served in the Occupation of Japan. At USC, he founded both the Year-In-Japan Program with Waseda University in 1967 and the USC-UCLA Joint East Asian Language and Area Studies Center in 1977. After that he taught at the University of Stockholm in Sweden but returned to USC to serve as Chair of the Department of Political Science, after which in 1986 he returned to Stockholm and became the first Director of its Center for Pacific Asia Studies in 1989. His most well-known book, *The Social Democratic Movement in Prewar Japan* (Yale, 1966), was translated into Chinese (1987) and Korean (1997). He has authored, edited, contributed to, or translated (with or without collaborators) over forty books, such as *Sources of Japanese Tradition* (1958), *Japan's Invisible Race* (1966), *Socialist Parties in Postwar Japan* (1966), *Japan in Crisis* (1974), *The Whaling Issue in U.S.-Japan Relations* (1978), *The Russian Impact on Japan* (1981), *Japan and the New Ocean Regime* (1984), and *Community in Crisis* (1994), and over a hundred articles on subjects ranging from prewar and contemporary Japanese politics, Chinese institutional history, and Korean security and reunification, as well as uses of romanization in Chinese, Japanese, and Korean.

Robert E. Ward is Professor Emeritus of Political Science and Director Emeritus of the Center for Research in International Studies at Stanford University. His areas of professional interest are comparative politics (especially Japanese), international relations, and political development. He is the author or editor of eight books and many articles in these fields. Dr. Ward is a past president of the American Political Science Association and the Association for

Asian Studies. He has been a member of the National Endowment for the Humanities National Council and of President Carter's Commission on Foreign Language and International Studies. He has also served as Chairman of the Board of Directors of the Social Science Research Council, of the Japan-United States Friendship Commission and of the United States-Japan Conference on Cultural and Educational Interchange. Dr. Ward is a Fellow of the American Philosophical Society and of the American Academy of the Arts and Sciences.

Samuel Hideo Yamashita is the Henry E. Sheffield Professor of History at Pomona College and the Coordinator of the Asian Studies Program there. A specialist in Japanese intellectual history, he is the author of *Master Sorai's Responsals: An Annotated Translation of "Sorai sensei tômonsbo"* (Hawaii, 1994) and the cotranslator of *The Four-Seven Debate: An Annotated Translation of the Most Famous Controversy in Korean Neo-Confucian Thought* (SUNY, 1993). Currently he is completing a study of Confucian academies in early modern Japan and continuing his research on the experiences of ordinary Asians during World War II.

Jung-Suk Youn is a Professor of Political Science at Chung-Ang University, Seoul, Korea, since 1978 after he completed his graduate education in the United States. He has served in a variety of leadership roles: Dean of Students, Dean of College of Social Sciences, Dean of International Education, and Director of Institute of Area Studies at the University. Professor Youn also became President of the Korean Association of International Studies, Inc., President of Korean Association for Public Policy Studies, in Korea. His advisory roles to the Korean government show his leadership in many areas: national defense, political reforms, national welfare, and training programs for officers.

Index

- AAS. *See* Association for Asian Studies
 ABCD encirclement, 169–71, 172
 Abe Isoo, 158
 Ackley, Gardner, 90
 Adachi, James, 117
 Ainu, 14
 Akimoto Ritsuo, 199
 Akita, George, 181
 Allied Translators and Information Service, 11
 Amberley, Viscount (John Russell), 24
 American Council of Learned Societies, 43
American Economic Review (journal), 101
 Anderson, Astrid, 14
 Angell, President, 2, 124
 Aoki Masahiko, 91
 Arai Seiichirō, 203
 Araki, James, 24
 Araki Sadao, 203
 Army Japanese Language School, 2, 19, 29, 47, 49, 115, 175, 221
 Asia Foundation, 21
 Asia Society, 80, 86
 Asis, Leocadio de, 189–90
 Association for Asian Studies, 21, 42, 90
 Association for the Study of Modern Japan, 219
 ATIS. *See* Allied Translators and Information Service
 automobile industry, 139–45
 Avon Japan International, 73–74
 Bailey, Don, 30
 Bakumatsu period, 172
 Barshay, Andrew, 158
 Baudelaire, Charles-Pierre, 160
 Beardsley, Betsy, 1, 50, 54
 Beardsley, Grace, 1, 50, 53–56, 58, 65, 176
 Beardsley, Kelcey, 50, 54
 Beardsley, Richard K., 1, 23, 50, 70, 89, 104, 109, 156, 157, 197, 199
 and Okayama Field Station, 51, 52, 54, 60, 61
 Beasley, William, 181
 Befu, Harumi, 89
 Bell, Daniel, 155
 Bellah, Robert, 156, 197
 Benedict, Ruth, 59, 157
 Benjamin, Walter, 166
 Biggerstaff, Knight, 22
 Bishop, William W., 108
 Bloch, Bernard, 58
 Boulding, Kenneth, 156
 Boxer, Charles, 30
 Boyington, Gregory (Pappy), 192
 Bronfenbrenner, Martin, 90–91
 Brower, Bob, 37, 104, 177
 Brown, Delmar, 50, 116
 Buchanan, James, 172
 Burrell, Charles, 149–51
 Bush, George, 21
 business management, 139–45
 Campbell, John Creighton, 39–40, 130
 Carnegie Corporation, 44, 46, 47
 Carter, Jimmy, 17

INDEX

- Cash, Wilbur J., 24
 Cass, Lewis, 100
 Cassel, Ernest, 201
 Cavers, David F., 108
 Central Intelligence Agency, 21, 207
 Centre for Economic Policy Research, 96
 Chambers, Whitaker, 80
 Chiang Kai-shek, 10, 169
 Ch'ien Mu, 15
 China, 15, 47, 105, 124, 206
 language romanization, 17–18
 and World War II, 10, 11, 189
 Chinese studies, 45–46
 Chou Shu-lien, 15
 CIA. *See* Central Intelligence Agency
 Cohen, Jerry, 91
 cold war, 11–12, 206, 207
 Cole, Alan, 13
 Columbia University, 45, 46, 47, 222, 223
 comfort women, 188–89
 Committee on Japanese Economic Studies, 91
 Committee on World Area Research, 43–44
 Conference on Modern Japan (1960, 1962), 22
 Conroy, Hilary, 183
 Constitution of Japan, 107, 110
 drafting of, 74, 82–86
 Cook, Theodore and Haruko, 183
 Coox, Alvin, 183
 Corbett, Jennifer, 95–97
 Cornell, John, 37, 51, 54, 59, 66
 Cornell University, 47
 Craig, Albert, 181
 Crowley, Jim, 89, 198
 cultural anthropology, 135–38

 Daiwa Anglo Japanese Foundation, 95
 Daws, Gavan, 183
 DeVos, George, 24
 Dingman, Roger, 183
 Dixon, Bonnie, 123
 Doi Takeo, 157
 Dore, Ronald, 51
 Dower, John, 183
 Duus, Peter, 169–73, 183

 economic relations, U.S.-Japanese, 129–34
 economic studies, 89–102, 135–38, 217–18
 Elisséeff, Serge, 31
 Embree, John, 59
 England, 95–96, 189
 ethnicity, 188–90
 European Network on the Japanese Economy, 96
 Evans, David, 183
 Eyre, J. Douglas, 23, 37, 49–52, 54, 61
 Eyre, Olga, 49, 50, 52, 54

 Far Eastern Association, 42
 fascism, 159–67
 FBIS. *See* Foreign Broadcast Information Service
 Fideler Company, 25
 Field, Russell, 32
 Filipinos, 11, 189–90
 finance, international, 199–203
 Fine, Sidney, 32
 Fisher, Irving, 200
 Ford, Henry, 144
 Ford Foundation, 108, 109
 Foreign Broadcast Information Service (FCC), 77–79
 foreign policy
 Japanese, 169–73
 United States, 21–22, 47
 France, 96, 189
 Fujishima Akira, 108
 Fukai Eigo, 199, 200, 201–2, 203
 Fukutake Tadashi, 199
 Fulbright Commission, 108
 Furihata Takehiko, 199

 Geertz, Clifford, 136
 General Motors, 139
 George, B. J., 107–10, 121, 122, 123, 124
 Germany, 10, 77, 159, 166
 Gibney, Frank, 183
 Glacken, Clarence, 25
 globalization, 2, 134, 178, 225–26
 Goodman, Grant K., 19, 29–33, 183
 Gordon, Beate Sirota, 73–86, 199
 Gordon, Joseph, 84, 85, 86
 Gray, Laura, 177
 Gray, Whitmore, 121–24
 Griffis, William Eliot, 201
 Gulf War, 14

- Hackett, Roger F., 7–8, 130, 181, 198, 199, 205
 Hagiike family, 24, 26
 Hall, John Whitney, 7, 22, 23, 30, 31, 69–70, 89, 109, 157, 181–82, 197, 198, 199
 and Okayama Field Station, 60, 61
 Hall, Pauline, 60
 Hall, Robert Burnett, Sr., 1, 2, 20, 21, 23, 24, 30, 32, 38, 58, 104
 and Center for Japanese Studies
 origins, 35, 41–47, 50, 69
 and Okayama Field Station, 3, 51, 52, 53, 55, 60, 61, 69
 Hall, Robin, 7, 60, 61, 69–70
 Hall Report (1947), 2, 43–46
 Hamada Koichi, 91
 Harada, Mr., 51
 Harootunian, Harry, 157, 181
 Harris, Townsend, 100
 Harvard University, 45, 46, 47, 108, 222
 Havens, Thomas, 181, 183
 Hearn, Lafcadio, 130
 Heifetz, Jascha, 76
 Henderson, Dan Fenno, 115–19, 123
 Hicks, George, 183
 Hills, Carla A., 133
 Hindmarsh, Commander, 19
 Hirschmeier, Johannes, 181
 Hitler, Adolf, 10
 Hofstadter, Richard, 169–70, 172, 173
 Hollerman, Leon, 91
 household enterprise, 136
 Hull, Cordell, 169, 202
 Hussey, Commander, 83
 Hwang Jong-Yop, 17
 Hwang Kümju, 188–89
byōjun (Hepburn) system, 18

 identity politics, 182
 ideology, political, 155–58
 Imai Ryukichi, 121
 imperial myth, 163–66
 India, 189
 Industrial Bank of Japan, 101
 Inkeles, Alex, 156
 Inoue Junnosuke, 199, 200, 203
 internationalism, 199–203, 225–26
 internment camps, 103, 105
 Ishida Hiroshi, 24, 26
 Ishihara Isamu, 193
 Italy, 159, 166
 Iwanami Shōten, 27
 Izumi Kyōka, 178

 Janow, Merit E., 123, 125, 129–34
 Jansen, Marius, 181
 Japan Economic Seminar, 91
 Japanese American Program for Cooperation in Legal Studies, 108, 109
 Japanese Americans
 in Japan, 190–93
 U.S. internment camps for, 103, 105
 Japan Foundation, 95–96
 Japan Political Economy Research Committee, 91
 Japan Society, 80, 86
 Johns Hopkins University, 47
 Johnson, Lyndon, 21–22
 Joint Committee of Japanese Studies, 91
 Jorden, Eleanor, 58
 JPERC. *See* Japan Political Economy Research Committee
 Jung-Suk Youn, 209–20

 Kades, Colonel, 82, 83, 84, 85–86
 Kaji-san, 64
 Kakiuchi, George, 104
 Kang Young-hoon, 15
 Kappa Senoh, 183
 Kase, Hiroyuki, 102
 Kawabata (writer), 178, 199, 217
 Kawashima, Army Minister, 203
 Kelsen, Hans, 116
 Keynes, John Maynard, 200
 Kim, E. Han, 89
 Kim Dae Jung, 15
 Kimoto, Mary, 190–91
 Kish, George, 23, 24
 Kish, Vin, 24
 Kiyosawa Kiyoshi, 183
 Klausner, Arthur E. (Bud), 21, 35–38, 103
 Kleinberg, Jill, 135–38
 Kokoris, Jim, 20–21, 23, 37
 Kondo Motohiro, 147–51
 Korea, 11–12, 14–15, 104–5, 173
 automobile industry in, 140
 Japanese colonialism in, 11, 207, 211, 218

- Japanese studies in, 209–20
- as study area, 205–7
- and World War II, 188–89, 193
- See also* North Korea; South Korea
- Krause, Larry, 99
- Kubo Bunzō, 203
- kunrei* system, 18
- Kuroda Hideo, 203
- Kuznets, Simon, 90
- Lamont, Thomas, 200
- language, romanization of, 17–18
- Laporte, Otto and Eleanor, 1
- Lebra, Joyce, 183
- Lebra, Takie, 23
- Lebra, William P., 25
- legal studies, 107–28
- Lennon, John, 36, 102
- Levine, Solomon, 91
- Li, Lilia Huiying (Li Dajie), 14, 15
- Library of Congress, 12–13, 50
- Lipset, Seymour Martin, 155
- literature, Japanese, 178, 217
- Lobanov-Rostovsky, Andre, 31–32
- Lockwood, William, 90
- Lomax, Eric, 193
- Low, David, 169
- Lundberg, George, 103
- MacArthur, Douglas, 12, 51, 53, 82
- Maeda Tamon, 42, 51
- Malaysia, 105
- management practices, 139–45
- Manchuria, 169, 188, 189, 193, 203
- Maoism, 206
- Mao Zedong, 14
- Martin, Samuel E., 23, 24
- Maruyama Masao, 13, 158
- Marx, Karl, 157, 158
- Massey, Elizabeth T., 213
- Massey, Joseph A., 213
- Masumi Junnosuke, 199
- Matsukada family, 121
- Matsumoto, Minister, 82
- Maxwell, William, 57, 60
- McCarthyism, 155
- McElrath, Miles, 89
- media, 147–51
- Meiji period, 100, 127, 163–66, 172, 181
- Merton, Robert, 156
- Mills, C. Wright, 156
- Mio-san (Sirota family's cook), 76
- Mishima (writer), 178
- Miyakawa Seiko, 55
- Miyazawa Kenji, 186
- modernism, political, 159–67
- modernization
 - in Japan, 22, 90, 156, 159–67, 172, 181–82
 - in Korea, 209–10, 211
- Moore, Barrington, 156
- Morganthau, Professor, 116
- Morioka Kiyomi, 199
- Motoyama Yukihiko, 199
- multinational corporations, Japanese, 142–43
- Murray, David, 201
- Musgrave, Richard, 90
- Myers, Ramon, 183
- Nakamura, Jim, 91
- Nakane Mihoko, 185–86
- Nakano Tadashi, 199
- Nakasone, Prime Minister, 21
- Nakatani, Ensign, 191
- Navy Japanese Language School, 19, 23, 175
- Netherlands, 189
- Netke, Mrs., 81
- Neville, Edwin, 19–22
- New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc., 144
- Niijima Jō, 201–2
- Nishi Amane, 181
- Nixon, Richard, 21
- Nomura Mansaku, 197
- Nomura Manzō, 197
- Norbeck, Edward, 30, 37, 51, 54, 59, 63–65
- Norbeck, Margaret, 51, 54, 63–67
- Norman, Montagu, 202
- North Korea, 14, 17, 18. *See also* Korea
- NUMMI. *See* New United Motor Manufacturing, Inc.
- NYK Shipping Line, 116
- Occasional Papers, 69
- OECD. *See* Organization for Economic

- Cooperation and Development
 Office of War Information, U.S., 79–80
 Ogasawara Yoshikatsu, 54
 Okayama Field Station, Japan, 2, 3, 24,
 39–40, 42, 47, 49–67, 176, 221
 Okazaki Ayanori, 104
 Okimoto, Daniel, 182
 Okinawa, 17, 18, 25
 Okuno, Mr., 104
 Ono, Yoko, 102
 Ono Eijiro, 2, 101–2
 Ōoka Shōhei, 183
 Organization for Economic Cooperation
 and Development, 96
 Oshima, Harry, 91
 Ouchi, William, 137
 Oxford University, 95
- “paranoid style,” in politics, 169–72
 Park Chung Hee, 26, 216
 Parsons, Talcott, 156, 181
 Patrick, Hugh, 89–93
 Peattie, Mark, 183
 Pike, Kenneth, 23
pinyin, 18
 Pittau, Joseph, 181
 Pitts, Forrest R. (Woody), 19, 23–27, 30, 59
 Plummer, James, 50
 Poidatz, Roger, 27
 political studies, 217
 ideology, 155–58
 modernism and fascism, 159–67
 “paranoid style,” 169–73
 Power, Philip, 1–3, 7
 primogeniture, 127
- Rahder, Johannes, 31
 Ramseyer, Mark, 123, 125–28
 Rand, Christopher, 78–79
 Reinhart, Aurelia Henry, 77
 Reischauer, Edwin O., 22, 70
 Remer, Charles, 23, 30, 50, 90
 Riesman, David, 155
 Robinson, Michael, 205–7
 Rockefeller Foundation, 44, 46, 47
 Roest, Colonel, 82, 83
 romanization of language, 17–18
 Roosevelt, Franklin, 169, 202
 Roosevelt, Theodore, 202
- Rosovsky, Henry, 91, 181
 Rowell, Colonel, 83
 Rubinstein, Arthur, 76
 Russell, John (Viscount Amberley), 24
 Russia, 12, 201
- Saeki Shōichi, 199
 Saito, Morse, 89
 Saitō Toragorō, 203
 Sakai Saburō, 183
 Sakakibara Eisuke, 101
 Sakanishi Shio, 60
 Sakata, Robert, 181
 Sano, Peter, 191–92
 Sansom, George, 59
 Sato Kazuo, 91
 Saxonhouse, Gary, 91, 99–102, 123
 Scalapino, Bob, 116
 Scheiner, Irwin, 155–58, 181
 Schiff, Jacob, 200, 201
 Seidensticker, Edward, 23, 24, 130, 175–
 79, 198, 207
 Sewell, William, 156–57
 Shand, A. A., 200, 201
 Sharp, Lauriston, 58
 Shea, George, 30
shibui, 65
 Shillony, Ben-Ami, 183
 Shils, Edward, 155
 Shirasu Jiro, 85
 Shohara, Professor, 104
 Shook, John, 139–45
 Showa Constitution. *See* Constitution of
 Japan
 Shun Yao, 122
 Sigur, Gaston, 20–21, 22, 24, 30, 37
 Silberman, Bernard, 159–67
 Sirota, Leo, 81
 Skidelsky, Robert, 200
 Smethurst, Richard J., 197–203
 Smith, Kazuko, 61
 Smith, Robert J., 24, 57–61
 Smith, Thomas, 197
 Snow, Edgar, 15
 Snow, Helen Fost, 15
 Social Science Research Council, 2, 42–
 44, 91
 Soeda Juichi, 199, 200, 203
 Sōseki (novelist), 217

- South Korea, 13–14, 17, 18, 25–26. *See also* Korea
- SSRC. *See* Social Science Research Council
- Stanford University, 47, 108
- Steinhoff, Patricia G., 221–27
- Steitz, George, 89
- Stephan, John, 183, 190, 191
- Stern, Dr., 37
- Stevenson, Harold, 39
- Stolper, Wolfgang, 90
- Sung-Hee Youn, 211
- Sun Yat-sen, 14
- Suttles, Wayne P., 24, 25
- Sutton, Joe, 20–21, 30, 37
- Suwa family, 24
- Sweden, 200
- Taira Koji, 91
- Taiwan, 14, 15, 18, 104, 188, 189, 193
- Takahashi Aiko, 187–88
- Takahashi Korekiyo, 199, 200–203
- Takano Iwasaburo, 211
- Takashi Fujitani, 189
- Takeshita, Yuzuru, 103–5
- Tanaka Giichi, 198
- Tanizaki (writer), 178
- Thorpe, Colonel, 104
- Titiev, Mischa, 23, 30, 50
- Tōjō Hideki, 169, 170
- Tokugawa, Iehiro, 100, 102
- Tokutomi Sohō, 202
- Tokyo Rose, 79–80
- Tonomura, Professor, 2, 7
- Tōsō (activist), 182–83
- Totten, George Oakley III, 9–18
- Toyama Masakazu, 2, 100–101
- Toyoda Shoichiro, 140
- Toyota, 139–42
- Toyota Production System, 144
- Trezise, Philip, 99
- Tsushima Juichi, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203
- Twelve Doors to Japan* (Hall and Beardsley), 23, 109, 157, 221, 224
- Umetani Noboru, 199
- United Kingdom. *See* England
- United States Educational Foundation in Japan, 108
- University of California (Berkeley), 47
- University of Hawaii, 26, 223
- University of Tokyo, 101
- University of Washington, 45, 46, 47, 118–19
- U.S. Military Intelligence Japanese Language School, 49
- U.S. Training Within Industry program, 144
- Uyehara, Cecil H., 13
- Uyemura Fukushima (Dick), 25
- Veblen, Thorstein, 115
- Verbeck, Guido, 201
- Vietnam War, 14, 182, 205–6
- Village Japan*, 39, 40, 52, 221
- WACS. *See* Women's Army Corps, U.S.
- Ward, Connie, 51, 53
- Ward, Erica, 53
- Ward, Robert E., 1, 20, 23, 30–31, 32, 70, 89, 104, 157, 197
and Center for Japanese Studies origins, 41–47, 50
and Okayama Field Station, 51, 52, 53, 54
- Webb, Sydney and Beatrice, 203
- Weber, Max, 156, 158, 162, 166, 181
- Weinstein, David, 89
- Weinstein, Martin, 22
- Welles, Sumner, 169
- Wells, Warner, 51
- Wheatly, Dr., 37
- Whitney, General, 82
- Wickel, Fumi, 22
- Wickel, Jim, 21–22
- Wildes, Professor, 82, 83
- Wilson, Edmund, 24
- Women's Army Corps, U.S., 80–81
- World War II, 9–11, 17, 49–50, 77–80, 212
ABCD encirclement view, 169–71, 172
colonial subjects, 188–90
Japanese-American internment camps, 103, 105
Japanese Americans in Japan, 190–93
Japanese perspectives, 183–88
- Yale University, 45, 46, 47

INDEX

- | | |
|---|-----------------------------|
| Yamada Kosaku, 75 | Yntema, Hessel, 108 |
| Yamagiwa, Joseph K., 1, 23, 25, 30, 31,
35, 36, 38, 47, 49, 50, 73, 104, 122 | Yoshida, Prime Minister, 86 |
| Yamagiwa, Roseanna, 1, 49 | Yoshida Mitsuru, 183, 191 |
| Yamashita, Samuel Hideo, 181–93 | Yoshida Shoin, 172 |
| Yanaga, Chitoshi, 12 | Yoshida Teigo, 198 |
| | Yoshizawa Hisako, 186–87 |

