

日本人類学研究会

JAWS

Japan Anthropology Workshop
Newsletter No. 41

August 2007



ISSN 1356-5621

<http://www.asiainstitute.unimelb.edu.au/programs/japanese/jaws.html>

JAPAN ANTHROPOLOGY WORKSHOP NEWSLETTER NO.41

AUGUST 2007

Contents	Page
From the JAWS Officers	4
Report on the Oslo JAWS Conference 2007	9
Minutes of JAWS Business Meeting in Oslo	29
Call For Papers for Lecce JAWS/Eajs Conference 2008	34
JAWS Publication News	37
テーマ : The Cygnet's Progress: Making Your PhD into a Book	39
テーマ : Getting Published in Japanese Studies Journals	56
Research Reports	67
Book Reviews	73
Conference Reports and Announcements	84
Updates to the Register of Members	91

Photo credit: The cover photo of Okinawan festival banner poles is © Ann Christine Eek / Museum of Cultural History, University of Oslo, and appears by kind permission.

**According to the records of the JAWS Treasurer, you, ,
have paid the JAWS membership subscription effective until April**

JAWS Officers

- Hon. Japanese Representative: Teigo Yoshida
3-17-19 Minami-cho
Kichijōji, Musashino-shi
Tokyo 180-0003, Japan
- Secretary-General: D. P. (Lola) Martinez
Dm6@soas.ac.uk
Department of Anthropology
SOAS
University of London
Thornhaugh St., Russell Square
London WC1H 0XG
Tel: +44 207 898-4425
- Treasurer: Lynne Nakano
lynnenakano@cuhk.edu.hk
Department of Japanese Studies
The Chinese University of Hong Kong
Shatin, New Territories
Hong Kong, China.
Tel: +852 2609-6569
Fax. +852 2603-5118
- Newsletter Editors: Peter Cave
peter.cave@manchester.ac.uk
[In Japan September-December 2007]
School of Languages, Linguistics and
Cultures
The University of Manchester
Humanities Lime Grove Building
Oxford Road
Manchester M13 9PL
United Kingdom
Tel: Not yet known
Fax: +44 (0)161 275-3031

Gordon Mathews
 cmgordon@cuhk.edu.hk
 Department of Anthropology
 The Chinese University of Hong Kong
 Shatin, New Territories
 Hong Kong, China.
 Tel: +852 2609-7670/7677
 Fax: +852 2603-5218

Web Manager:

Carolyn Stevens
 css@unimelb.edu.au
 Asia Institute, Melbourne
 University of Melbourne
 Victoria, Australia 3010

JAWS RoutledgeCurzon Series:

Editorial Board:
 Joy Hendry *Senior Editor*
 jhendry@brookes.ac.uk
 Pamela Asquith
 pamela.asquith@ualberta.ca
 Eyal Ben-Ari
 mseba@mscc.huji.ac.il
 Hirochika Nakamaki
 nakahiro@idc.minpaku.ac.jp
 Kirsten Refsing
 kre@hum.ku.dk
 Wendy Smith
 wendy.smith@buseco.monash.edu.au

EAJS Liaison Officer:

Josef Kreiner
 Japanologisches Seminar
 Universität Bonn
 Regina-Pacis-Weg 7
 D-53113 Bonn 1, Germany

FROM THE JAWS OFFICERS

FROM THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Lola Martinez

This newsletter comes to you after a highly successful conference in Oslo Norway which was ably hosted by Arne Røkkum. We had a series of fascinating panels and TWO opening addresses, which followed one of the most wonderful and formal (appropriately so, given that we are anthropologists in the main) opening ceremonies. This newsletter includes reports from all the panels, as well as the minutes of the JAWS meeting, which was held at the end of the conference. The highlight of our days in Oslo must have been the superb dinner in a restaurant overlooking the harbour to which Arne treated all the conference attendees. Some of us will also remember the fruitless search for a Thai restaurant large enough to hold 14 people and others the more successful search for the cheapest beer in Oslo!

Our next meeting, announced in this Newsletter, will be our 19th Conference and will be held concurrently with the 12th International Conference of the European Association for Japanese Studies in Lecce, Italy, 20-23 September 2008. Dr. Ingrid Getreuer-Kargl (University of Vienna) and Dr. Anemone Platz (Aarhus University) will be convening; Ingrid bringing her past experience of organising JAWS within EAJIS to bear and Anemone being the first point of contact at the moment. I hope to see many of you there. Finally, we have decided to stay with our conference rotation between Japan/Pacific Rim, North America and Europe by holding the 2009 JAWS meeting in Austin, Texas (with a clamouring for Japan next!), convened by Prof. John Traphagan. We are hoping to once again benefit from the Toshiba Foundation (who so generously helped with the costs of the Oslo Conference) and John has already secured some funding from Austin. We have an exciting few years ahead of us.

My thanks, as General Secretary, go out once again to the team of officers who support all of the JAWS work: Carolyn, Lynne, Peter, and Gordon. The advisory committee, particularly Professors Nakamaki, Hendry and Goodman are always on hand (or email) to offer their ideas and Margarita Winkel, our former treasurer, continues to do a bit of 'treasuring' for us. I am grateful for their

support and must thank all of you, our members, for continuing to make JAWS such an exciting organisation to belong to.

FROM THE JAWS OFFICERS

FROM THE TREASURER

Lynne Nakano

The Japan Anthropology Workshop account at the Hang Seng Bank in Hong Kong currently contains HK \$49,032.05 (4542.13 EUR). As of March 2007, the ABN AMRO account in Leiden contained 1,517.72 EUR. Total JAWS assets are 6059.85 EUR.

The membership fee is **15 Euros** per year. You may pay in Euros, Hong Kong dollars, or US dollars (15 Euro is about US \$20 at the moment). You can find the current rate at websites such as www.oanda.com/convert/classic.

Bank Transfer Payment Method for EU members

At the JAWS Business Meeting in Oslo, it was agreed to continue to maintain the ABN AMRO account in Leiden, as Guita Winkel has generously agreed to continue to manage it. Therefore EU members can pay JAWS dues through international bank transfer at very little (usually 1 or 2 Euro) or even no extra cost (e.g. Germany), as long as they include the IBAN and BIC codes.

Payment (for EU members) should then include the following information:

ABN AMRO, account 58.40.21.399. IBAN-code NL41ABNA0584021399. BIC-code ABNANL2A.

Bank address: Stationsweg, Postbus 66, 2300 AB Leiden, Netherlands, c/o Stichting Jaws Anthropology Workshop, TCJK, Universiteit Leiden, P.O. Box 9515, 2300 RA Leiden.

Please include as a reference:

YOUR LAST NAME and YEARS OF PAYMENT. For example: WINKEL0608 if Winkel is paying for April 2006 to April 2008. Payment should be 30 Euro for the two years subscription, plus additional costs for the transfer.

Payment Instructions for non-EU members

Please note that the Hong Kong Hang Seng Bank will not accept credit card payment. Payment should be made through bank check/draft or electronic/telegraphic transfer. Personal checks are NOT accepted.

FROM THE JAWS OFFICERS

If you pay by bank check, please add 5 Euros per check (about US \$6) to cover processing fees. If you pay by electronic/telegraphic transfer, please add 3 Euro per transfer (about US \$4). If possible, please pay for more than one year at a time.

Payment by telegraphic transfer should be made to the following account:

Bank Name: Hang Seng Bank Ltd Head Office

Address: 83 Des Voeux Road Central Hong Kong

Swift Code: HASE HKHH

Bank Code: 024

Account Number: 290-034263-001

Account Name: Japan Anthropology Workshop

Bank drafts or bank checks (no personal checks please) should be made out to "Japan Anthropology Workshop" (checks made out to "JAWS" will NOT be accepted) and mailed to the following address (please pay in US dollars if possible).

Lynne Nakano

The Department of Japanese Studies

The Chinese University of Hong Kong

Shatin, New Territories

Hong Kong, CHINA

It is also possible to pay one of the JAWS officers in cash, in which case there is no extra charge for processing fees.

The payment form may be downloaded from the following website
www.asiainstitute.unimelb.edu.au/programs/japanese/jaws.html

Please find a statement of your current payment status written on the contents page of your copy of this Newsletter.

FROM THE JAWS OFFICERS

FROM THE EDITORS

Peter Cave and Gordon Mathews

Welcome to the latest action-packed issue of the JAWS Newsletter. This issue contains a report on the wonderful JAWS conference in Oslo, as well as the call for papers for the next JAWS/Eajs conference in Lecce. We also have two special features to do with the issue of publishing your work: one on the issue of writing a PhD thesis versus writing a book, and one on getting published in Japanese Studies journals. In both cases, we have received great contributions from distinguished and busy authors and editors, and we would like to thank them for taking the time to participate. It is our intention that the JAWS Newsletter publish features that will not only be useful and stimulating for members, but that they would be hard put to find elsewhere, and we believe that these features certainly fit the bill. We are also pleased that these features demonstrate the truly global nature of JAWS, since they draw on contributions from several different academic communities in four continents. Suggestions for future features are very welcome.

We also have two reports from members about fascinating research they are carrying out or planning, and five meaty book reviews, plus regular features such as JAWS publication news, conference information, and members' updates.

So far we haven't received any submissions to the sections 'Positions', where we invite members to put forward an argument or point of view on a particular issue; nor have we had any submissions to 'Comments' responding to previous Newsletter items. However, perhaps such submissions will be sparked off by something in this issue. In fact, it's interesting to note that coincidentally, several contributions do raise important questions that might be debated: both Gordon Mathews and David Willis discuss the issue of readership and anthropological style (who should we write for, and how?), and Gordon also advocates more engagement with Japanese intellectual debates in his book review. Perhaps members would like to respond to or enlarge on these or other questions in the

next issue. We plan to put the final version of that issue together in April-May 2008, but naturally the process of creation will start much earlier – probably January or February – so it's not too early to think of or even to write a submission. We are always happy to hear from you. You will notice from the

FROM THE JAWS OFFICERS

Officers' details above that one of the editors has moved to a new position since the last issue of the Newsletter, so please ensure that you send your emails and other communications to the correct address.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

**REPORT ON
THE JAPAN ANTHROPOLOGY WORKSHOP 18TH CONFERENCE
University of Oslo, Museum of Cultural History
14-17 March 2007**

Peter Cave

The theme of the 18th JAWS conference was 'Japan and Materiality in a Broader Perspective'. The conference opened in the magnificent surroundings of the Gamle Festsal of the University of Oslo's Law Faculty, surely one of the most beautiful settings ever for a JAWS event. After the opening ceremony, participants enjoyed an enthralling keynote speech from Joy Hendry on the theme, 'Rewrapping the Message: Museums, Healing and Communicative Power', complete with a wide selection of pictures to illustrate how museums around the world attempt to communicate about culture. A short walk then took us to another grand building, the Museum of Cultural History, where Brian Moeran's Special Lecture, 'Making Scents of Smell: Incense in Japan' shed light on a further aspect of materiality in Japan. Brian explained the production of incense in Japan and raised questions about how, or whether, we can articulate our experience of smell in linguistic terms. This was followed by the opening ceremony of an exhibition entitled 'Signs of Society: Masks and Festival Banner Poles from Okinawa, Japan', at which Arne Røkkum's explanation of the magnificent festival masks and poles on display (shown on the Newsletter cover) was followed by a *sanshin* and vocal performance by Yuko Uchima, the conference secretary. The day was then rounded off in splendid style by a wonderful conference dinner at the historic Ekebergrestauranten.

The remaining days of the conference took place in the Georg Sverdrups hus, a modern building as beautiful as the Gamle Festsal, but utterly different in style, thus allowing participants to savour the best of Oslo old and new. Saturday sessions were rendered even more delightful by the sound of the Norwegian Chamber Orchestra rehearsing a Mozart piano concerto in the atrium. As will be apparent from the summaries of some panels below, sessions were consistently

stimulating, and discussion continued during the coffee breaks and the delicious lunches that were provided.

I am sure that all those who participated would want to join me in thanking Arne Røkkum and all who helped him for their great efforts in putting on such a very well-organized, intellectually stimulating, and altogether

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

enjoyable event. Not only the conference but also the experience of Oslo itself will no doubt lure many back for another visit.

Panel summaries were solicited from chairs and/or organizers; where no summary was received, only the titles of the papers have been listed.

Animals at the Crossroads: Material and Mental Landscapes of Pet Loss and Pet Mortuary Rites in Contemporary Japan

Panel organizers: Barbara Ambros and Fabienne Duteil-Ogata

- Barbara AMBROS, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill: 'Contested Ashes in the Margins: The Necrogeography of Mortuary Rites for Pets in Contemporary Japan'
- Fabienne DUTEIL-OGATA, University Paris X, Nanterre: 'New Practices, New Bodies: Urban Funerary Rites for Pets'
- Noriko NIIJIMA, University of Tokyo: 'Discrepant Attitudes and Views by Pet Owners on Their Dead "Family Members"'
- Elizabeth KENNEY, Kansai Gaidai University: 'Facing Death : Pet Gravestones in Today's Japan'

Discussant: Mark ROWE (McMaster University)

This panel discussed the practices associated with pet death and pet loss in contemporary Japan. Barbara Ambros' paper focused on the spacial aspects of pet mortuary rites, namely on the ways in which the ritual specialists and cemeteries drew boundaries between humans and animals. She concluded that pets were placed in a liminal category as marginal family members. Niijima Noriko's presentation outlined the attitudes of owners toward their dead pet animals. She noted a distinct shift that occurred from the owner's attitude before the animal's death to after the animal's death. This shift was not always predictable: some changed from positive (love) to negative (revulsion toward carcass); others changed from negative (burden) to positive (protective spirit). Fabienne Duteil-Ogata presented a close

reading of the material culture surrounding the mortuary rites for pets at Buddhist temples. She pointed out how closely the rites mimicked those for humans. Elizabeth Kenney's paper surveyed pet gravestones. She noted that pet gravestones tend to be more individualized than human gravestones: not only are the gravestones engraved with the

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

individual names of the pets but they also typically feature their photographs. She hypothesized that pet gravestones may be more elaborate precisely because pet funerals tend to be simpler than human rites. Mark Rowe commented on the papers and encouraged the participants to place pet mortuary rites into the broader contexts of funerary rites for humans and attitudes toward human ancestors.

De-materializing *Ie*: fragmentation and diversification in the Japanese home and family

Panel organizer: Alison Alexy

- Allison ALEXY, Yale University: 'When I got divorced, my single friends said "welcome home!"'
- Karl Jacob KROGNESS, University of Copenhagen: 'Paper House'
- Anemone PLATZ, University of Aarhus: 'Rethinking and Reorganizing Living Spaces: Elderly Japanese anticipating their *ie* when old'
- Richard RONALD, Delft University of Technology: 'Constructing, Deconstructing and Reconstructing the Japanese Home: Housing Systems, Housing Markets and Household Formation'

In this panel, the four presentations considered the multiple meanings of "ie" in contemporary Japan, alternatively highlighting literal and figurative understandings of the term, in order to describe the many ways that homes and families are being deconstructed and reconstructed. Together the papers tried to ask how family relationships are shaped by the structures in which families live and the contested ideologies of the "family system" (*ie seido*). To these ends, Richard Ronald discussed housing trends in contemporary Japan, describing how the housing market and mortgage financing have changed in recent decades. Bridging the gap between literal houses and metaphoric understanding of family, Anemone Platz presented her research comparing urban and rural experiences of aging, and how elderly people understand their place in their houses and families. Similarly considering the link between houses as metaphoric objects and as staging grounds for family relationships, Allison

Alexy described how houses and "ie" consciousness became relevant during divorces. By discussing the family registry system (*koseki*), Karl Jacob Krogness described the state ideology and bureaucratic processes that locate people within households, and households within the nation-state. These presentations elicited a lively discussion about the importance of houses in contemporary Japan,
JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

possible acts of resistance or ways of subverting the system, and more diverse regional experiences of houses and family.

Materializing Selves – Performing Personhood through Material Culture

Panel organizer: Philomena Keet

- Fabio GYGI, University of Tokyo: 'Consumed by Chaos – Hoarding and Disposal in Tokyo'.
- Joseph HANKINS, University of Chicago: 'Purifying Water, Purifying the Buraku'.
- Philomena KEET, SOAS, University of London: 'You can put it on, but can you pull it off? – Fashion and Identity in Tokyo'.
- Philip SAWKINS, Oxford Brookes University: ' "Keitai are not new!" – Just another portable (playful) object? '.
- Ayako TAKAMORI, New York University: 'Performing ethnicity, performing Japanese/American identity'.

Discussant: William Beeman, Brown University

The papers in this panel explored the construction and performance of personhood via material mediums in contemporary Japan, particularly those of and relating to the body.

The session started with a fascinating paper on hoarders and their particular relationship with their possessions. Among other insights, Fabio Gygi explained how in this situation 'things' are not merely instruments in social exchanges between people, but themselves become the object of these exchanges.

Next the room was transported to the sounds, sights and smells of a tannery through Joseph Hankins' wonderfully evocative rendering of the leather factory where he conducted part of his fieldwork. We learnt of the changes affecting the production of leather along Tokyo's Arakawa River, and how these material changes inform the construction of Burakumin identity.

Philomena Keet then addressed how a group of Tokyo trendsetters achieved 'fashionable' status amongst their peers. She described how for these

people wearing fashionable clothes is not enough to construct a fashionable 'self' but rather these clothes must be authenticated by other more intrinsic qualities of the wearer.

We were then taken back in time by Philip Sawkins on an intriguing journey of the portable plaything in Japanese history, of which he showed that
JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

the *keitai* may be seen as the most recent manifestation. He also treated us to a display of such historical and modern portable objects.

Finally Ayako Takamori examined in an absorbing paper how Japanese Americans in Japan experience their alterity through embodied means such as their movement, clothes, speech and so on. She discussed how these formulation and performance of identities differ in manner depending on whether in Japan or America.

All papers received numerous pertinent and thought-provoking questions.

Materializing Dreams: Performing Imagination through Consumer Culture

Panel organizers: Erica Baffelli and Keiko Yamaki

- Erica BAFFELLI, Hosei University and Keiko YAMAKI, The Graduate University for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI): 'Welcome home, master! Meido cafés, moe and Akihabara (sub)culture.'
- Kazunori SUNAGAWA, Chuo University: 'Bricolaging "Fordism": The Arts and Crafts of the Custom Cars.'
- Hirofumi KATSUNO, University of Hawaii: 'Robot Dreams: The formation of self and masculine identity in Japanese techno-culture.'

Discussant: Roger Goodman, Oxford University

3 発表は、特定の行動やモノを通じてファンタジーや夢を楽しみとする人々の、消費の文化に関する調査の経過報告である。報告1は東京の秋葉原に点在する「メイドカフェ」のサービスとホスピタリティについて、報告2は独自のペイントを施したオリジナルの改造車で国道16号線に集まる人たちの行動について、報告3は自作ロボットを趣味として秋葉原に集まる人々とロボットとの交流についてである。DiscussantのRoger Goodman教授は3報告の共通点として、1. Personhood、2. structure and agency、3. rich symbolic and ritual universe、4. time and spaceの4点を指摘しながら、「メイドカフェとロボットの2事例が秋葉原という場所について言及しているのは偶然ではなく、現在の日本の消費文化を語る上でspaceの重要性を示すものである。特定の場所が歴史的にどう変容しているの

かを検証することが必要である。メイドカフェは珈琲一杯を飲むまでに複雑な儀式を経験し、Custom Cars の事例は複雑なシンボルの体系を示している。ロボットビルダーの事例共々、3 報告は現代の消費社会においても儀式的な経験が際立っていることを示す顕著な例である。誰がどのようにしてこのような複雑なシンボル・儀式体系の規則を作り出すのか、その structure と agency の関係性が問題

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

になってくる。興味深いのはオタクの personhood であり、オタクの社会的 roll と self の形成を見ると双方はあまり絡んでないように見える。一方メイドカフェでは役割が明確だというギャップはおもしろい」といったコメントがあった。

Sex in Contemporary Japan: Publicity, Performance, Participation

Panel organizer: T.J.M. Holden

- Sarah CHAPLIN, Kingston University: 'The Shifting Material Context of the Japanese Love Hotel.'
- Jermaine GORDON, University of Chicago: 'Media, Globalization, and Sexual Hearsay: How do the Japanese Learn about Sex?'
- T.J.M. HOLDEN, Tohoku University: 'Intimate Connections: Sexuality and Mediated Intimacy in Japan's Teleuchi.'
- Erick LAURENT, Gifu Keizai University: 'Japanese Specificities Regarding "Sexual Participation" while Doing Fieldwork in Sexual Anthropology.'

Body, Self and Conduct in Gendered Spaces

Panel chair: Dolores Martinez, SOAS, University of London

- Paul CHRISTENSEN, University of Hawai'i at Manoa: '(De)Classified Drinking: Alcohol, Masculinity and Modern Japan.'
- Anna FRASER, Oxford Brookes University: 'Medical Use of Mineral Hot Springs in Misasa Onsen.'
- Shiho SATO, Norwegian School of Sports Sciences: 'Myths Surrounding the Female Body in Japan: Locating the Japanese Perception of "Health".'

Socialization and Incorporation in a Changing Society

Panel chair: Peter Cave

- Peter CAVE, University of Hong Kong: 'Well-connected Individuals? Educational Reform in Japan's Primary Schools.'

- Andrew MACNAUGHTON, University of Hong Kong: 'De-Mystifying the "Samurai Manager": A Critical Examination of Personal Character and Transparency in the Japanese *Eikaiwa* Industry.'
- Naomi Ichihara RØKKUM, University of Oslo: 'Japan's Role in the Second World War and in the Japanese Invasion: The Historiographical Presentation in Japanese Junior High School Textbooks.'

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Peter Cave began this session by summarizing educational reform policies in Japan over the last 15 years, explaining how they placed a new emphasis on the individual and individuality. He then discussed primary classroom teaching at his fieldwork site in the subjects of Japanese (*kokugo*) and Integrated Studies (*sōgō gakushū*), arguing that teachers balance stress on individuality with a more traditional emphasis on children's interdependence and class togetherness. Andrew MacNaughton interrogated the notion of the 'samurai manager' in publications on Japanese management, with reference to his fieldwork in a private English conversation school in Sapporo. Andrew suggested that in the company he researched, the ideology of charismatic management was mainly a façade, masking effective management by less conspicuous middle managers who dealt pragmatically with the realities of clients' needs. Finally, Naomi Ichihara Røkkum presented an analysis of the 2001 edition of the controversial New History Textbook (*Atarashii Rekishi Kyōkasho*), explaining also the Japanese Ministry of Education's textbook screening system, and the reasons why the screening system and the New History Textbook have aroused such criticism. The papers were followed by valuable questions and comments from the audience.

Material culture in global encounters between Japan and the "West"

Panel organizer: Davide Torsello, University of Bergamo, Italy

- Anne-Mette FISKER-NIELSEN, SOAS, University of London: 'To what extent do Japanese images of western political systems shape the understanding of the role of religion in politics for Soka Gakkai?'
- Catherine ATHERTON, Oxford Brookes University: 'The European body in Japan/ the Japanese body in Europe'
- Melinda PAPPOVA, University of Bergamo: 'Distant and romantic weddings in today's Japan'

- Tina PENEVA, Kyoto University: 'Breeding cows and breeding images. The invention of *wagyū* beef, or "The more expensive it is the better it tastes"'
- Mao WADA, SOAS, University of London. 'Being Japanese abroad: identity of Japanese wives of non-Japanese husbands living in the UK'

The panel addressed several multifaceted issues on the common topic of the Japanese perception of the "west" in present times. The main assumption from which the discussion developed is that the categories "Japan" and "the west"

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

have been increasingly losing significance in globalizing contexts. The panelists all succeeded in tackling the problem of how Japanese society has benefited from the adoption of foreign features of material culture, using different perspectives ranging from food production and consumption to fashion, religious politics and marriage. From the discussion it emerged that the importance of these features in contemporary Japan can be read from the parameters that dictate the adaptability, communicability and compatibility of what is imported to and given meaning in Japan. Anthropology can provide important future insights on the problem of how Japanese perceive the importance of adopting these features and to what extent the market and consumption tendencies, as well as political discourses, shape such a perception.

Sensibility and Space in Japanese Organizations

Panel organized and chaired by Mitchell W. Sedgwick

Jettisoning the tradition of linking the physical environments of Japanese organizations, broadly construed, and their ideological effects on individuals, this panel sought to examine organizing among Japanese persons in terms of its 'social aesthetics': the interactions of body, society, emotion and intellect. We included methodological discussion of the (co-)production of fresh images and representations of organizations while engaging them as anthropologists: that is, making explicit the bodily, emotional, social and intellectual experience of our ethnographic fieldwork as part of our understanding, analysis and, importantly, explanation.

- Ofra GOLDSTEIN-GIDONI, Tel Aviv University: 'Housewifery and Materiality: Domesticating Charisma in Japan Today'

While the *daughters* of women captured by the slogan 'good wives, wise mothers' are known for their happy and hedonistic consumer lifestyle, they

can only dream of becoming the 'charisma housewives' [*karisuma shufu*] of their idols in the magazines they read. This paper revealed the dialectical of stability and change in the context of a consumer and media saturated Japan, which offers these 'bubble generation' housewives new types of 'materialistic' femininity. It included reflection on long term field research and relations with informants both in Japan and at-a-distance through electronic media.

- Brian MOERAN, Copenhagen Business School: 'Pottering about with the Senses: A-theoretical Anecdotes'

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Building on his keynote speech in Oslo on the manufacture, use and the analysis of incense in Japan, this presentation addressed ways in which different senses – in particular, sight, touch and taste, but also weight, balance and movement – are brought to bear in the production, appreciation, organization, aesthetics and use of folk art (*mingei*) pottery.

- Mitchell W. SEDGWICK, Oxford Brookes University: 'Collaborating Architectures of Social Relations: Taking Place at a Japanese Multinational in France'

This paper sought to hone appreciation of human volition over the expansion and compression of perceptions of, and authority over, space and time. At the core of the presentation was the work of a group of French engineer informants who produced a set of extremely rich and analytically clarifying diagrams and descriptions regarding social relations in a large open plan office space in a Japanese-French factory. Revealing with regard to the subtleties of how data is organised and communicated among engineers, their work related the organizational life of the office before the ethnographer arrived on the scene. The presentation exposed the diagrams as focal points through which the French engineers' and the anthropologist's knowledge and understanding about time and social relations in an organised space are collaboratively produced. It sought to cue discussion regarding who is 'the ethnographer', who 'an informant', and what constitutes, and validates, data and interpretation

- Dixon Heung Wah WONG, University of Hong Kong: "'Taki Love his Fans", "No, Taki Loves Me!": An Anthropological Study of the Female Fans of Takizawa Hideaki in Hong Kong'

This paper elaborated a study of how five female Hong Kong Chinese fans consume a famous Japanese male idol, Takizawa Hideaki, both as an object

and as a text. Intensively tracing the life stories of these five women, and sharing events surrounding their fandom, the paper demonstrated that while they came from similar social backgrounds, each has different motivations undergoes different processes in becoming a fan, and each has different readings of Takizawa as a text and object. The paper reiterated convincingly the mediation of the 'individual', and Society and Culture, or the 'collective', as co-productions.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Multi-aspects of hands (*te*) in Japanese culture: what hands represent in person-to-person and person-to-materials relations

Panel organizer: Noriya Sumihara

- Noriya SUMIHARA, Tenri University: 'The Myth and Meaning of *tezukuri* (Handmade) in Increasingly Mechanized Sake Brewing Industry.'
- Izumi MITSUI, Nihon University: "'*Tezukuri* (Handmade)" in Hi-Tech Industry: A Case of a Japanese Watch Factory.'
- Keiko YAMAKI, Graduate Institute for Advanced Studies (SOKENDAI) and National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka: "'*Te wo Kakeru*" Work and "*Te ga Kakeru*" Work: Transnational Work of Japanese Cabin Attendants in "D Airlines".'
- Isao HAYASHI, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka: 'To Give a Hand and to Lend a Hand: Focusing on Volunteer Activities at Quake-Devastated Regions.'
- Hirochika NAKAMAKI, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka: 'Representations of *te* (Hands) in Japanese New Religions.'

Materiality and social interaction in time and space

Panel chair: Brigitte Steger

- Isabelle PROHASKA, University of Vienna: 'Space as seen through a "spiritual" lens. Materialisation of the spiritual'.
- Brigitte STEGER, University of Vienna: 'Materialising the immaterial: clocks, bells and the timing of everyday life in the Edo period'

The two papers were based on the assumption that materiality, time and space immanently belong together and that they have to be discussed within social interaction and discourses.

Prohaska explored how the meaning of space changes by the influence of different agents and how power and social authority is expressed. By regarding space as a materialisation of the spiritual, she focused on changes in policy concerning sacred sites in Okinawa, called *utaki*. Many *utaki* have been destroyed and changed to communal places in the past, partly with the aim of preventing the “superstitious” practices of the *yuta* (spirit mediums). Recently, sacred sites have become valued and promoted as cultural heritage and *yuta* are often portrayed as one feature of Okinawan distinct spiritual identity.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Steger asked what kind of material objects – time pieces and tools to announce time – influenced life in the Edo period and how such material objects prepared for modernisation. She showed that people integrated various sound and light signals (that were measured and announced individually by *wadokei*, temple bells, the rooster’s crow, personal sundials or vendors’ voices). It was such signals, rather than objective time, that were important for co-ordinating community life and for following horoscopes. Thus, it had been relatively easy to adjust to modern school bells and company tunes announcing equinoctial time.

Japanese styles captured through metaphor, drama, and lifestyle roles

Panel chair: Mikako Iwatake

- Mikako IWATAKE, University of Helsinki: ‘Kamome Shokudo, Cultural Asymmetry and the Dialectics of Otherness’
- Michael PELUSE, Wesleyan University: ‘Not Your Grandfather’s Music: Tsugaru Shamisen’s Popularity in 21st Century Japan’
- Samuel Chi-Hang WONG, University of Hong Kong: ‘The changing consumption pattern of Japanese TV dramas in Hong Kong’

As the first speaker, Edward Budayev (Nizhnii Tagil State Social Pedagogical Academy), did not show up, we missed his scheduled presentation, ‘Contemporary Japan in the metaphorical mirror of Russian press’. Our panel, having consisted of three speakers, turned out to be comfortably small and consistent on the theme. My own presentation discussed a Japanese movie, *Kamome Diner* (2006), set in Finland. The paper dealt with Japanese women’s desire to be diaspora residents, transnational disjunctions of imagined otherness as well as the totalizing and domineering tendency of the concept of cute (*karwaii*).

Michael Peluse discussed the resurgence of *Tsugaru Shamisen* over recent decades in Japan. Having its roots among blind beggars in northern Japan in the late 19th century, it has been recreated as pop, a dynamic and hybrid musical genre, most notably by the Yoshida Brothers. Michael Peluse locates *Tsugaru Shamisen's* popularity within the current dynamics of global cultural landscape. Samuel Chi-Hang Wong gave an overview of the reception of Japanese TV dramas in Hong Kong since the 1960s. While Japanese TV dramas have provided an image of modernity, their popularity and exposure have fluctuated each decade in relation to the programs made in Hong Kong and in the West. Presentations were followed by good discussions. Organizers were very helpful in providing assistance, and computer facilities worked in a flawless manner.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Material objects

Panel chair: Mitchell Sedgwick, Oxford Brookes University

- Sylvie GUICHARD-ANGUIS, CREOPS Paris-Sorbonne / French National Center of Scientific Research: 'Bamboo Works in Japanese Culture: Between Everyday Life and Cultural Heritage.'
- Nadezda MAYKOVA, Peter the Great Museum of Anthropology and Ethnography, Russian Academy of Science: 'Bast-fibre Traditional Textiles of Japan: Ancient History and Modern Trends.'
- Iris WIECZOREK, GIGA Institute of Asian Affairs, Hamburg: 'New Religious Movements in Japan and their Sacred Buildings of Power.'
- Margarita WINKEL, Leiden University: 'Materiality and Japanese Identity: Archaeological Artifacts and the Japanese Culture Debate in Tokugawa Japan.'

All that You Can't Leave Behind: Materiality while Alive, Dead, and Beyond.

Panel organizer: Hikaru Suzuki

- Gordon MATHEWS, Chinese University of Hong Kong: '*Ikigai*, Death, and What Remains.'
- Lynne NAKANO, Chinese University of Hong Kong: 'Beyond Consumption: How Unmarried Women in Japan Discuss their Contribution to Society, Purpose on Life, and Stake in the Future.'
- Hikaru SUZUKI, Singapore Management University: ' "All I Want is You": Beloved Pets and Japanese Pursuit of Well-being.'

- John TRAPHAGAN, University of Texas at Austin: 'Consuming Old Age: Elder Services, Well-Being, and Elder Care Entrepreneurialism in Japan.'
- Bruce WHITE, Dōshisha University: ' "Be Your Own Vessel!" Living Life and Changing Society the Def Tech Way: The Lyrics, Showmanship, and Ideology of Japan's Jawaiian Popular Music Scene and How the Scene is Transforming the Life of its Fans.'

Discussant: John MOCK (Akita International University)

Our session focused on the tangible and intangible materials that influence or reflect the well-being of Japanese people today. Gordon Mathews' presentation on "*Ikigai*, Death and What Remains" illustrated what remains with *ikigai*, and the two forms of *ikigai*, namely self-realization and commitment to groups. What **JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES**

remains is "seen as one's legacy, whether it is children, scholarship, or art." Furthermore, *ikigai* is on the one hand, a commitment of oneself to a group (family, children, company & country) – when one dies the self perishes but one's being lives on through the group. On the other hand, *ikigai* is a self-realization and if one lives purely on this kind of *ikigai*, one's own death brings only the end of *ikigai*. John Traphagan's presentation on "Consuming Old Age: Elder services, Well-Being, and Elder Care Entrepreneurialism in Japan" demonstrated that Elderly Care Centers assist elders (*rōjin*) to engage in activities and empower them for the purpose of self-maintenance to become a "good *rōjin*". What elders attempt to leave behind (as a legacy) by participating in various activities and maintaining discipline is this sense of "good *rōjin*." For young people, a new music scene, DefTech, is unfolding the sense of wellbeing. Bruce White's presentation on "Be Your Own Vessel, Living Life and Changing Society the DefTech Way" examined how this mixture of Reggae and Surfing sound and ideology facilitates and shares the intergenerational relationships, inter- and intra-cultural cosmopolitanism and social change in the social space. In Lynne Nakano's presentation, "Beyond Consumption: How Unmarried Women in Japan Discuss Their Contribution" she portrays different classes of unmarried women and their views on marriage. Career women wish to marry, but less educated women see problems arising in marriage due to constraints or responsibilities to their natal family. These women highlight "enjoyment of everyday life" as a reason not to marry. Many of the women rejecting marriage, and those single women waiting for the right partner, own dogs. Hikaru Suzuki's presentation "Beloved Pets and Pursuit of Well-being" looked at how dogs have been adopted as "children" by single women. The conspicuous

consumption of these single women is not merely about pampering their animals, but rather the way they are seeking *ikigai* through their pets.

Shibusawa Keizô and the possibilities of social science in modern Japan

Panel organizer: Wakako Kusumoto

- Alan CHRISTY, University of California, Santa Cruz: 'Home Movies: Filming Ethnographic Experience at the Attic Museum, 1930-37.'
- Wakako KUSUMOTO, Shibusawa Ei'ichi Memorial Foundation: 'Looking for Shibusawa Keizô: An Exploration of the Junctions (or Discontinuities) among Anthropology, Folklore, and the Studies of Japan.'
- Kenji SATO, University of Tokyo: 'Thinking of Images/Thinking through Images: Shibusawa Keizô's Ebiki Project.'

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

- Taro TSURUMI, Waseda University: 'The Legacy of Shibusawa Keizô and His Family of Folklorists.'

Discussant: Michael SHACKLETON, Osaka Gakuin University

Individual presentations

- John ESPOSITO, Kwansei Gakuin University: 'The Eco-logic of Japanese Culture.'
- Pauline CHAKMAKJIAN, University College London: '50 Years of the Grand Lodge of Japan.'

Objects of difference

Panel organizer and chair: Arne Røkkum

- Patrick BEILLEVAIRE, Japan Research Center / French National Center for Scientific Research and Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales: 'Fabricating the exotic: Ryukyu *koten yaki* ("antique" ceramics) in a historical perspective.'
- Leonor LEIRIA, Oxford Brookes University: 'Materiality matters: Reconsidering materiality of lacquerware.'
- Frances Marguerite MAMMANA, University of the Ryukyus: 'Marumunscapes: mimetic and diegetic materialization of the Ryukyuan landscape in *kumiodori*.'

- Stanislaw Jan MEYER, University of Hong Kong: 'Japan but not quite: popular images of Okinawa in prewar Japan.'
- Arne RØKKUM, University of Oslo: 'Material belongings: Festival artifacts as qualifiers for society membership in the South Ryukyus.'
- Tom G. SVENSSON, University of Oslo: 'Materiality and identity manifestation case: the Ainu in Hokkaido.'

In this panel, whose introductory note raised a methodological query about the appositeness of a perspective on "a cultural essence of the Japanese," Patrick Beillevaire first introduced the paradox of prewar discourses on Okinawans portraying Okinawans as imperial subjects but with a ceramic craftsmanship found reminiscent of Egypt or India. The next presenter, Leonor Leiria, addressed the general issue of "materiality" with a note on its adaptability and persistence in other forms, then proceeded with a historical account of attempts

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

in the 16th and 17th centuries to establish a production of "true" Japanese lacquer in Europe. After that, Frances Marguerite Mammana followed with a presentation laying out the case of plot, play structure, and ideological narratives of the Okinawan *kumiodori* dance materializing authority over a portrayed Ryukyuan landscape. The next presenter, Stanislaw Jan Meyer, investigated the image of Okinawa in Japanese colonial discourses from the point of view of an apparent paradox of, on the one hand, an inseparable part of the Japanese civilization, on the other, carrying the celebrated otherness of a "foreign country." Arne Røkkum, again with an Okinawan case, raised the issue of studying objects not just as cultural representations but as semiotic agents in their own right, as illustrated by the relationships Okinawans have to their festival artifacts. Finally, Tom Svensson portrayed an Ainu materiality-based knowledge as transmitted by creative crafts and art persons as well as through special Ainu Museums and Cultural Centers. This concluded a panel which certainly met its objective of viewing Japan as a trans-border cultural entity from a perspective of a flow of objects and acts.

Communication and development

Panel chair: John Mock

- Michal (Miki) DALIOT-BUL, University of Haifa: 'Cell Phones in Twenty-First Century Japan as Cultural Playscape.'

- Alyne DELANEY, North Sea Centre, Denmark: 'Whither Maritime Resource Harvesting in Japan? Consolidation and Notions of Territoriality in the Coastal Zone.'
- John MOCK, Akita International University: 'Life After Depopulation: Local Resources for Sustainable Development.'
- Kensuke SHIMIZU, University of Turku: 'Natural and Artificial Lights as Part of the Japanese Landscape.'

Landscapes of identity, community, and difference

Co-Chairs: David Blake Willis and Michael Shackleton

- David Blake WILLIS, Oxford University and Soai University: 'Dejima: Enclaves of Difference and Place in Japan.'
- Michael SHACKLETON, Osaka Gakuin University: 'Satoyama and Chinju-no-mori - An Anthropology of Village Landscapes in Western Japan.'

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

-
- ZHOU Fang, University of Hong Kong: 'Affinity with Japan and Identity Formation - a Study of the Native Taiwanese in the Postwar Period.'

Discussant: Roger GOODMAN, Oxford University

Our papers considered changing landscapes in Japan marked by difference, especially in the ways individual identity and society intermingle and coexist. The obvious sources of friction arising from what is traditional with what is new, something especially unsettling in Japanese society, were juxtaposed with those cultural negotiations carried out leading to new cultural spaces and perspectives.

The first paper on Dejima argued that Kobe's 'international-ness,' and by extension international spaces in Japan as perceived by the Japanese, contained significant interior images of difference. The international presence in Kobe could be found in "imagined islands of foreignness": Gaijin churches, clubs, and schools. These are in fact more than Gaijin communities. As transnational imagined communities, communities which have historically existed in Japan since the small island of Dejima in Nagasaki Bay, they have played a critical role in Japan understanding its Others. Dejima can be seen as one of the most powerful symbols of treatment of the Other in the Japanese context and continues to occupy an important place in the Japanese consciousness. As a metaphor of external relations and internal prejudices, Dejima is, in many ways, where the Othering of Japan began. The paper discussed ethnographic research

in an international school community in Kobe called the 'Columbia Academy.' The transnational imagined community of Columbia Academy both confirmed these propositions about Dejima as well as revealed new ways in which difference is negotiated in Japan. Responses to the paper focused on the continuing power of the image of Dejima and questions about the school community in terms of educational anthropology.

The paper on Satoyama and Chinju-no-mori demonstrated the need for a renewed anthropology of village landscapes. It had a variety of targets, including the need for research on life in the countryside, rather than just towns, the depopulation of the countryside, and the dominating presence of the elderly in village society. Perhaps more critically for the future trajectory of village Japan, the paper examined the opposition between *satoyama* and *chinju no mori* as championed by local folks, who are concerned with the preservation of cultural tradition; versus scientists, who would like to see the preservation of species; versus religious organizations; versus what works with kids/teachers; versus general green/re-cycling etc. movements and so on.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

Satoyama is even seen in an international perspective, notably that of foreign scholars adopting '*satoyama*' as a favoured missing term for the village/nature inter-face. For local people, of course, *satoyama* represents a very ancient tradition of managing landscapes. Japan is not simply a 'rice culture' but also a 'hillside & forest management' culture, something that environmental archaeologists world-wide are waking up to. Interestingly, there is Shinto and Buddhist involvement and varying agendas in the *satoyama* movement as well. We see here another kind of imagined community: envisioning peasants as wonderful managers of nature, whereas their traditional image had been dirty, half-naked, and un-cultured. The 'early modern'/'modernization' aspects of this has drawn interest from socio-economic historians, but not from anthropologists. A return to collaborative dialogue might not be such a bad idea.

The third paper concerning the affinity with Japan and identity formation of the Taiwanese noted that startling and relatively positive and friendly attitude towards Japan by the Taiwanese, especially when compared with Korea. The paper explored senior Taiwanese who lived through the colonial era, particularly the ways their attitudes towards Japan changed through history. How they identify themselves, as Chinese, Japanese, or Taiwanese, was reported on a time scale through their 60 years. The paper noted a correlation between affinity and identity, notably in terms of the perspective of identity formation process and political needs.

As Roger Goodman, our discussant pointed out, these papers demonstrated that anthropology has the ability to bring together the work of other specialists, and through fieldwork etc., get the wider perspective. Unfortunately, 'environment' has been off the agenda, and this has in part been due to our colonial past, on top of our belief in 'development' and 'modernization'. The *satoyama* research is in large part revisionist, in the sense that it gives a voice to the older generation, and traditional knowledge. The Dejima research targets transient and permanent communities holding to conservative values about education while engaging in provocative social transformations. And the paper on the Taiwanese re-examines what had been seen in very stereotyped ways.

The authors expected questions/comments on school and village life and identity, but none came: no doubt because people's research is now elsewhere. The main interest appeared to be in environmental issues and the government, at least partly because this removes the spotlight from Yasukuni Jinja and related issues. Afterwards however, a lot of folks came up to say that they found the papers interesting and provocative.

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

At the same time, the authors are realistic about what is happening now. These are definitely good areas to get into, and in part it might be considered how we can make Japanese research relevant to research in more 'third world' hunting grounds. Is JAWS aware/ready for this? No, but enough folk seem to want to branch out in these directions (e.g., problems of modern youth, etc.). Time for a special workshop?

Japan and the global: roots and branches

Panel organizer: Merry White

- Griseldis KIRSCH, University of Trier: 'The "Self" and the "Other" - Japanese-Chinese Encounters in Japanese TV Dramas (2000-2002)
- Wolfram MANZENREITER, University of Vienna and John HORNE, University of Edinburgh: 'Football in the Community: Japanese Ways of Playing out the Perils of Globalization'
- Dolores P. MARTINEZ, SOAS, University of London: 'Japanese Films in the Global'
- Merry WHITE, Boston University: 'Café Society in Japan: Global Coffee and Urban Spaces'
- Christine YANO, University of Hawai'i at Manoa: ' "A Japanese in Every Jet": Globalism and Gendered Service in the Air'

Our panel was shaped by D.P. Martinez's initial statement that "globalisms" have long engaged Japan's cultural engagements, as well as the political and economic realms more commonly recognized. The panel treated the history of cultural practices such as coffee houses, television dramas, soccer and film-making as well as the important role women have had as "shock troops" of internationalisation. Performances of "global" culture were shown to be deeply enmeshed with "Japanese" ordinary practices, and the processes were examined by which these have come to be taken for granted as part of the everyday landscape. In order of presentation, Griseldis Kirsch discussed the presentation of "Asian," particularly Chinese characters in Japanese TV dramas in the early 21st century, in the context of large numbers of Chinese residents in Japan, political friction and threats in the "real" world. Wolfram Manzenweiter and John Horne discussed community and football in Japan in the "play" of globalization, using ideas of local and national in the growing popularity of this initially "foreign" game. Lola Martinez showed the meeting point of Hollywood's "globalization" and the influences of such leading Japanese

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

directors as Kurosawa in the local and global filmmaking industry. Merry White described the growth of "café society" in Japan from the late 19th century to the present in a look at Japan's participation in the global artistic, political and cultural changes seen in the urban social space of the café. Finally, Christine Yano told the story of Pan American World Airways and its promotion of Japanese-American stewardesses as "flying geisha" both breaking a racial barrier and engaging gender and cultural stereotypes.

Other materialities: angama mask performances of the southern Ryukyus (media presentation)

Panel organizer: Evgeny BAKSHEEV, The Russian Institute for Cultural Research, Moscow

Discussion Panel:

- Patrick BEILLEVAIRE, Japan Research Center / French National Center for Scientific Research and Ecole des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales
- Frances Marguerite MAMMANA, University of the Ryukyus
- Isabelle PROCHASKA, Department of East Asian Studies, University of Vienna
- Arne RØKKUM, University of Oslo

JAWS Final Plenary Session: *Taminzoku Nihon*: Multiculturalism at Minpaku

Panel organizer: Nelson GRABURN, University of California, Berkeley.

Discussion Panel:

Hiroshi SHOJI, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka.

Hirochika NAKAMAKI, National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka

Joy HENDRY, Oxford Brookes University.

Professor Nelson Graburn opened the session with a paper on the exhibition "*Taminzoku Nihon*" directed and curated by Professor Hiroshi Shoji at the National Museum of Ethnology, Osaka, which was opened 25th March 2004 and ran to 15 June. He pointed out the uniqueness of this exhibition: it was the first of Minpaku's temporary exhibitions to focus on immigrant minorities in Japan and by international standards it was achieved through unprecedented collaboration with the ethnic communities represented who supplied over 95% of the artefacts and helped organize the exhibition and its public events. The exhibition

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCES

reviewed the history of immigration to Japan, emphasized the common predicament of immigrants in finding housing, employment, health care and schooling, their grass roots actions with NPOs, the media, negotiating with local governments, and means of maintaining their familiar foods and cultural milieux. It had separate sections displaying aspects of the lives of immigrant Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, Pilipinos, Brazilians, and Pakistani Muslim. Following the theme of Joy Hendry's keynote speech, Graburn's talk showed how this outstanding Minpaku exhibition was a major public effort to espouse multiculturalism and to honour the immigrants and their hybrid cultures. The excellent catalogue has been used as a social science textbook and the exhibition has been the subject of continuing interest and media attention.

Professor Hiroshi Shoji then showed more than seventy slides of the exhibition. He mentioned some of the resistance to his ideas at Minpaku but assured us that he had stuck to his original plans. He was thankful for the collaboration of many graduate students and social scientists and activists who helped him put on the exhibition, as well as for the enthusiastic cooperation of the minority communities in the Kansai region. He showed us the catalogue and brochures and encouraged us to read them and pass them on.

Professor Hirochika Nakamaki told us that Professor Shoji had previously worked with him curate the Minpaku exhibition “Ethnic Cultures Crossing Borders: People Moving, Cultures Mixing” (September 9, 1999 to January 11, 2000). That exhibit was about the movement and survival of ethnic minorities in the era of globalization, including “a number of foreigners living in Japan who come from many different cultural backgrounds . . .” However, he only claimed to be a “silent partner” in *Taminzoku Nihon*. He told us that he had also worked to put on the exhibition at the JICA (Japan International Cooperation Agency) Japanese Overseas Migration Museum in Yokohama in 2003.

Professor Joy Hendry gave the final commentary. She noted how few anthropologists of Japan knew Minpaku personally, perhaps only a quarter of those in the room. Stating that Minpaku not only put on important temporary exhibitions, but is the largest research centre for anthropology in Japan, she encouraged everyone to visit Minpaku and to get to know the research staff in addition to professors Nakamaki and Shoji.

JAWS NEWS: BUSINESS MEETING

MINUTES OF JAWS BUSINESS MEETING

17 March 2007

Oslo, Norway

I Opening comments and thanks by Secretary-General, Lola Martinez.

II Report from conference convener, Arne Røkkum:

- a) Wanted to thank the advice given him by Hong Kong team, especially on finances. Recommended that the following information be institutionalized for next organizer and that all future conferences really need to start planning 18 months before it happens.
- b) Arne began using 3 electronic lists...has developed single contact lists since, that can be handled in different ways. Something to hand on/discuss with future organizers.
- c) Payment link NOT listed on registration web-page because of spam danger. Arne still had some ‘mock’ payments and these would otherwise have found their way into the payments system, which would have been a big problem.

- d) Also beware false applications, e.g. seeking visas. Once Arne confirmed registration, then the link to the official website was sent out to avoid these complications.
- e) Reg. fee orig. 100 Norwegian kroner for presenters, 1,000 for non-presenters. This became 800 NOK. Generous funds from Toshiba/Museum etc. Arne then made available the list of registrants (along with payment link) to facilitate horizontal linking for setting up panels.
- f) However Arne didn't get much response for individual call for papers/horizontal linking.
- g) The museum only helped with establishing a team for the conference at the last minute. But the funding & specialized services from the museum were very helpful, and the University of Oslo has been very positive about everything.

III Treasurer's Report – Lynne Nakano:

- a) The finances are currently in a healthy state and there was a discussion in relation to whether or not to maintain two separate bank accounts, one in Leiden in Euros, and the other in Hong Kong in HK dollars. It was decided to keep both accounts for the convenience of saving a bit

JAWS NEWS: BUSINESS MEETING

on money transfer fees. EU JAWS members can continue to pay through the Leiden account (managed by Guita Winkel) and she will make periodic transfers to Hong Kong. The credit card payment connection is now closed, it was too expensive to maintain. Joy Hendry reminded us that a healthy account is one that is so because members have paid several years in advance.

- b) Peter Cave noted an amendment to the accounts in relation to the last JAWS newsletter.
- c) A discussion of paying by PayPal ensued. It was left to the treasurer to explore further, but Todd Holden noted that it worked for his organizations without problems thus far.
- d) Lola thanked both treasurers for their work and dedication.

IV Newsletter Editors' Report – Peter Cave and Gordon Mathews:

- a) Peter and Gordon keen to get feedback on the changes made and are open to any new suggestions.
- b) Both editors agree that their thrust is to provide services/features that provide a unique selling point, i.e. things not got from other academic organizations. So JAWS membership offers added value. They are

unsure what benefit members get from JAWS membership except the newsletter, so it needs to be as good as possible to attract new members.

- c) The issue of moving to an electronic newsletter was raised again and it was agreed to be revisited in the following year. Both sides have good points, but the factor of JAWS dues being put to other uses such as sponsoring students at conferences, rather than publishing the Newsletter, was an interesting suggestion.
- d) Thanks to the team for a revitalized and attractive Newsletter.

V Website Manager's report – Carolyn Stevens (*in absentia*):

- a) Carolyn wanted it noted that the website is housed on the University of Melbourne website as a service to her, and that sometimes people ask her to do things she cannot do because of the university's format.
- b) This was followed by a discussion on whether JAWS should be setting up its own website. This was important given the occasional difficulty new members had in locating the site, problems with Routledge and EAJS links. Todd Holden offered to help Carolyn look at options.
- c) It was left to the Secretary-General to discuss with the website administrator.

JAWS NEWS: BUSINESS MEETING

VI Routledge Series Report by General Editor, Joy Hendry

- a) Nasreen, the liaison between JAWS and Routledge was at Vienna EAJS. Really good proposals for books, several are in the pipeline.
- b) Joy wanted to remind JAWS members that they can order for selves and students at £20 (e.g. on the JAWS website, though at the time still impossible to access this form). The Newsletter has always included a copy of the order form, but most seem unaware of the discount. It was noted that ordering the discounted books should be possible online, but seems impossible. Joy will email both Nasreen and Carolyn to work on this and clarify the nature of any problems.
- c) There was also discussion of the original agreement with Curzon before the Routledge takeover. They had originally said 400 hardback sales were needed before books were issued in paperback. But de Silva now was quoted 600. Joy will proceed on this with Peter Sowden, to confirm that the figure is 400, including copies obtained at JAWS discount. It was also asked whether we should continue with Curzon/Routledge, given the changes in structure. Joy argued for the importance of having such a good working relationship with Peter Sowden. Gordon noted

that Routledge beats the opposition on distribution, but as it's so large, communication glitches too easy.

- d) Joy keen to hear from members on all aspects of this discussion.
- e) Lola reminded members involved with book propositions to please put these forward as soon as possible.

VII EAJS conference in 2008

- a) The next EAJS will take place in southern Italy (Lecce) on the theme of fragmentation etc. Announcement of dates will be from June 2007. (NB dates unfixed except August 2008) For more information, members should email Anemone Platz, who is our EAJS link (ostap@hum.au.dk) not Ingrid Gertreuer-Kargl (our second liaison person), who is rather busy at the moment.
- b) A discussion followed on whether to maintain our links with EAJS. Brigitte Steger pointed out that EAJS will always have sociology/anthropology section at their conferences, whether or not JAWS is organizing these sessions. The discussion looked at the fact that aside from organizing a conference every 18 months (taking a burden off JAWS members), that the benefits of 'belonging' to EAJS were not great. For students especially, the cost of belonging to both organizations was a

JAWS NEWS: BUSINESS MEETING

problem and for members of JAWS who did not belong to EAJS, the difference in conference registration fees could be an issue. It was thought that the issue could remain open for some time, as long as JAWS members continued to volunteer to organize a session within EAJS, but that perhaps some way of helping non-EAJS members with registration fees could be considered in the future.

- c) Lola reminded members that a smaller JAWS workshop could take place anywhere and at any time a JAWS member wanted to organize one and that perhaps, in future, these smaller workshops could replace the EAJS cycle?
- d) Todd Holden and Mitch Sedgwick noted that AJJ served this function in Japan, it is linked to JAWS. Spontaneous thanks for all the good work AJJ does with our fieldwork students was given by all, led by Roger Goodman.

VII The 2010 JAWS conference

- a) Lola had offers for the 2010 conference from Beijing, Singapore and Austin (Texas). There was discussion as to how viable the Beijing and Singapore offers were at this point in time.

- b) Guita reminded members that there was an informal cycle to our three yearly conferences: Asia, Europe, the USA and it was the USA's turn.
- c) It was decided to accept John W. Traphagan's offer of the venue at Austin (John has since been informed and has already had an offer of funds from the University).
- d) Arne reminded members that Toshiba were keen to continue an association with JAWS and our conferences, and he will pass this information onto the next conference convener.
- e) Todd Holden suggested a return to Japan in 2013.

IX Joy Hendry on panel organization

- a) Was there a better way of organizing panels? Oslo had seen several different methods such as discussion/a discussant at the end of several papers – this could create problems for people who were 'panel hopping' and not able to ask questions. Also the workshop (good discussion) element was at heart of JAWS. Roger Goodman noted that the original JAWS conferences did not have parallel sessions and the convener could pick which papers would be presented.
- b) This brought the discussion back to members organizing smaller workshops in-between the larger JAWS conferences.

JAWS NEWS: BUSINESS MEETING

- c) Could conveners of the larger conferences exclude papers? Was also asked, but this was seen to be a problem since most institutions will not fund a conference trip if the person does not give a paper. The issue of gatekeeping and the consequences of being seen to be 'weeding' out people with weaker English could be terrible. Perhaps other ways of accommodating this could be found: students to have a separate more workshop-like session, for example? Other ways of presenting at the conference? Should be kept in mind for the future.

X Any other business

- a) There was a return to a discussion of what conference registration fees and dues were for in JAWS. Should we use any extra treasury money to help fund students' and others' registration at conferences? Should we help with expenses such as the JAWS luncheon at Vienna? We need to remember that registration fees were often necessary for a University to back a conference and also acted as a way to cut out people offering to give papers in the hopes of having their conference fees paid by JAWS. Perhaps each convener would have to decide how to cope with this

issue, but Lola suggested that if we had spare funds, the treasury could consider helping students in future.

- b) Peter Cave wondered if we should be holding JAWS currency in more than Euros and HK dollars. This was left to be decided by the Treasurer.
- c) Mitch has formally inherited Jan van Bremen's library, and it is now in his office at Oxford Brookes. It was a very moving offer from Jan's children. (All contributors to the 'Deconstructing' volume in the JAWS series were asked if they would like to take the library. Only Mitch however was able to volunteer. Well done Mitch.)
- d) Lola reminded members that the current JAWS team has been in place for two years (our Website Manager even longer) and would be considering stepping down at the next JAWS conference in 2008. All volunteers for the posts of Secretary General, Treasurer, Website, and Newsletter Editors welcomed.

Michael Shackleton

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR PAPERS

CALL FOR PAPERS

**Japan Anthropology Workshop 19th Conference
(Concurrent with 12th International Conference of the European Association
for Japanese Studies)
Lecce, Italy, 20-23 September 2008**

Convenors: Dr. Ingrid Getreuer-Kargl (University of Vienna) and Dr. Anemone Platz (Aarhus University)

As in previous years, the Anthropology and Sociology Section in the upcoming EAJS conference is also the biannual JAWS conference. We herewith invite all members to participate and contribute with their projects to the section. For more details on the conference, see the EAJS website: www.eajs.org

Theme: 'Fragmentation, continuity and change: Japan in times of changing population structure'

Although many societies around the world will be facing an inverted demographic pyramid sooner or later, Japan is the country where the effects of this development will be seen earliest. Many experts turn their eyes towards Japan therefore, and few if any are sanguine in view of this trend. Even the latest fertility rate rise to 1.32 in 2006, although the first rise in six years, only led to gloomy comments in the mass media. The disillusionment mainly stems from the realisation that the rise is probably a temporary one, given that it is primarily attributed to the second baby boom generation born in the early 1970s, who have just entered the child-bearing age. Measures taken by the Japanese government since the 1990s to reverse the declining birth rates have been to practically no effect.

On the other hand, recent economic recovery has allegedly improved the employment situation, thereby encouraging marriage and childbirth for the hesitant who have been delaying it due to employment insecurity. At the same time, from 2007 on the first generation of baby boomers is leaving the labour force in huge numbers, thus providing many companies with possibilities to restructure their employment system for the better or worse of those seeking regular employment. Although a few major Japanese companies have started to upgrade some of their non-regular employees to regular ones, one third of the

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR PAPERS

nation's total workforce belongs to the non-regular segment. Moreover, the income gap between regular and non-regular employees continues to widen, producing a new kind of poverty among young men, and forcing more and more middle aged workers to use up the savings destined for their retirement.

In spite of the many negative aspects of this development alongside with socio-political structures that rather aim at maintaining the status quo than at supporting changes, the reality many Japanese face has led to a broad variety of individualized life styles. This has opened new trends in consumer culture, living and working styles, family roles and patterns, and so on, which are worth looking at. Most analyses so far have relied heavily on numbers and statistics or on well-known and anticipated difficulties arising from the changing population structure. We would therefore like to especially encourage papers dealing with the reality of everyday responses, be they on an individual or organisational level. What respective "places" in society are allocated to or even accessible for persons of different age groups, especially the very young and the old? How desirable are they for the target population and for others? Do they change and how? "Places" may refer to actual spatial arrangements such as restaurants, train stations or entertainment facilities but may likewise refer to virtual places such as

advertisement, TV programmes or strategic planning. Also, changes in the age structure need not necessarily be viewed pessimistically although they will necessitate fundamental changes in the present social arrangements and structures. It may be assumed that many of the changes will take place “bottom-up” as everybody struggles to make the best of his or her individual situation.

We have chosen a very broad overall theme in order to give as many participants as possible the chance to contribute. Anyone is however welcome to suggest panels or send in individual proposals which at first glance may not fit into the overall theme.

Proposals should reach the convenors by **31 October 2007** and should be sent to: anthropology@eajs.eu

Individual paper proposals

A paper proposal submission should provide the following information:

- Title
- Author name(s) and contact details (e-mail address)
- Abstract of up to 300 words
- Keywords (list at least three)

JAWS NEWS: CONFERENCE ANNOUNCEMENT AND CALL FOR PAPERS

Panel Proposals

We encourage proposals for **a panel of three or four presenters** on a particular topic.

The panel organizer should provide the following information:

- Panel Title/Theme
- Panel organizer and contact details
- Panel abstract of up to 500 words
- Names of paper presenters, panel chairperson, and commentator(s)/discussant(s) if applicable.

Note: each paper presenter must submit an abstract as outlined above to the panel organizer. The panel organizer should then submit them together with the panel proposal either by mail or e-mail (as an attached file).

Acceptance Notification: Expected by the **end of January 2008**

JAWS NEWS: PUBLICATIONS

JAWS PUBLICATION NEWS THE JAWS ROUTLEDGECURZON SERIES

Joy Hendry, Series Editor

Another new book has been published and three more are in press in the JAWS RoutledgeCurzon series. Already out is *Pilgrimages and Spiritual Quests in Japan*, a collection edited by Maria Rodriguez del Alisal, Peter Ackermann and Lola Martinez that brings out our deliberations from the JAWS meetings in Santiago: a wide-ranging collection of papers covering comparisons with Spain as well as a broad interpretation of pilgrimage in Japan. In the autumn, Rupert Cox's inspired edited volume, *Japan and the Culture of Copying*, should see the light of day, and his collection from the Warsaw conference, co-edited with Christoph Brumann, *Making Japanese Heritage*, is billed for the following year.

Two good new monographs are due out later this year: first an analysis of *Self, individuality and learning* in the context of Japanese elementary school, based on an ethnographic study of teachers and 5th grade pupils of two specific schools,

but set in a much broader theoretical context – all put together by your newsletter editor, Peter Cave! The second is our first contribution to organisational anthropology, again based on an ethnographic study – this time of a Japanese corporation in France – but pitched into some five complex theoretical frameworks in the general field of *Globalisation and Japanese Organisational Culture*, by Mitchell Sedgwick.

We are delighted to receive interesting proposals for new books from JAWS members, and several are going through the review and preparation process at the moment, so our list will keep growing. Don't forget you can get up to 15 copies of all these volumes at paperback prices, as a JAWS member, and don't hesitate to let me know if you have a good proposal to add to the list.

Already Published:

A Japanese View of Nature: The World of Living Things by Kinji Imanishi
Translated by Pamela J. Asquith, Heita Kawakatsu, Shusuke Yagi and Hiroyuki Takasaki; edited and introduced by Pamela J. Asquith

Japan's Changing Generations: Are Japanese Young People Creating A New Society?
Edited by Gordon Mathews and Bruce White **Now in paperback!**
JAWS NEWS: PUBLICATIONS

Community Volunteers in Japan: Everyday Stories of Social Change
Lynne Nakano

The Care of the Elderly in Japan
Yongmei Wu

Nature, Ritual and Society in Japan's Ryukyu Islands
Arne Røkkum

Dismantling the East West Dichotomy: Essays in Honour of Jan van Bremen
Edited by Joy Hendry and Dixon Wong

Psychotherapy and Religion in Japan: The Japanese Introspection Practice of Naikan
Chikako Ozawa-de Silva

New!

Pilgrimages and Spiritual Quests in Japan

Edited by Maria Rodriguez del Alisal, Instituto de Japonologia, Madrid, Peter Ackermann, University of Erlangen, and D.P. Martinez, University of London

Forthcoming:*Japan and the Culture of Copying*

Edited by Rupert Cox

Primary School in Japan: Self, individuality and learning in elementary education

Peter Cave

Globalization and Japanese Organization Culture: An Ethnography of a Japanese Corporation in France

Mitchell Sedgwick

Making Japanese Heritage

Edited by Christoph Brumann and Rupert Cox

テーマ: **MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK**

THE CYGNET'S PROGRESS: MAKING YOUR PH.D. INTO A BOOK

In this issue, the first of two special features looks at the process by which the metaphorical duckling (hopefully not ugly) of the academic world, the PhD thesis, can be transformed to a swan-line monograph, ready to take its glorious place on publishers' booklists. We are lucky enough to have insights from three JAWS members with more experience than most of publishing books and also mentoring doctoral students from fledgling to flight, as well as from one who has more recently experienced the transition from PhD student to the published professoriate – and we attempt to achieve some geographical diversity too, since the PhD process and its aftermath is not the same across the globe. I (PC) would like to thank Gordon Mathews for the idea for this feature. And, dear members, if you would like to add anything or respond to anything in the feature, please remember that we are happy to print responses on our (as yet blank) 'Comments' pages.

First, Take a Pause. Then, Connect with Your Reader.

Katarzyna J. Cwiertka
Leiden University

A PhD defence in the Netherlands is a big event. What once used to be a scholarly debate within a closed circle of academics has over the decades turned into a public ceremony heavily immersed in tradition. The committee members wear their stuffy gowns and male PhD candidates customarily rent a full 'white tie' gear for the occasion (an official prescription, not compulsory though). The highly ritualised questioning by the committee is for real, not infrequently including a heated exchange of arguments. However, due to a solid informal screening that takes place *before* the candidate is allowed to defend his/her thesis in public, at this point hardly anybody ever fails. The defence ritual always concludes with a happy end.

I adore this 'academic folklore' and enjoy it tremendously every time I have a chance to witness it. It is most unfortunate that I do not remember much from my own defence ceremony eight years ago. It must be those two cognacs that I needed so badly to calm my poor nerves...

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

The defence itself is one of a range of differences that acquiring a PhD in the Netherlands entails. For example, the status of a PhD dissertation differs considerably from its counterparts elsewhere, especially in the UK and the US. A thesis is generally considered a completed monograph, and it is by no means unusual to have it published simultaneously with or shortly after the defence. A substantial rewriting of a PhD thesis that takes several years, which is customary in the United States for example, is not an established practice here. A quick survey among recent dissertations in our own department clearly shows that PhD theses tend to appear as monographs within no later than 1-2 years.¹ So far, most have found a home in the academic series *Japonica Neerlandica* of Hotei Publishing, currently operating as an imprint of Brill.² An attractive alternative is the CNWS Publications, a publishing branch of the CNWS Research School (School of Asian, African and Amerindian Studies), where graduate students from the Japanese department are also affiliated.³ Since 2006, it is also possible to publish PhD theses with Leiden University Press – a special 'printing on demand' service provided for Leiden by the Amsterdam University Press.⁴

I guess that the main reason why I did not choose any of those options was the fact that I felt that my topic had a potential to reach a general audience. I

was not motivated by a prospect of fat royalties flowing into my bank account (although it would actually have been nice, when you think of it...). Rather, I had been repeatedly annoyed by the distorted image of Japanese cuisine created by the media, a kind of culinary myth-making that has become particularly pronounced since the 1990s. By publishing a book that would be accessible to a general reader for a reasonable price I have hoped to be making a difference.

I enjoyed the rewriting of my dissertation much more than writing the thesis in the first place. I guess this is because I already learned from the first process and, moreover, was working with the very familiar material. Still, the main difference that mattered most was probably the fact that I was writing for a very different audience. The thesis is written clearly with the PhD committee in mind, it is yet another 'exam' to pass. This does not necessarily need to be a conscious attitude – the committee members are the ones that comment on drafts along the way, so we learn instinctively to anticipate their criticism.

In the Netherlands, as elsewhere, the supervisor ('promotor' in Dutch) of a PhD research study is the person with whom the candidate works most closely throughout the entire process of acquiring a PhD. To conform with the regulations he/she must be a full professor. However, since in reality this is not always practical, often the so-called 'co-supervisor' – who is not a full professor – assumes the responsibility of supervision, while the 'supervisor' only performs

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

official functions. Only after the supervisor(s) have approved the thesis, can it be sent for inspection to a referee who should be a specialist on the topic, but in no way dependent on the supervisor. Ideally, he/she should be affiliated with a different university. The approval of those people is absolutely necessary before a date for public defence of the thesis can be set. In theory, other members of the PhD committee (which must consist in total of at least 6 members) still have a voice, since the decision is taken by the majority of votes.

Personally, writing a monograph was for me a much more creative process than writing a dissertation. Thanks to very thorough (and, honestly, at times quite irritating) remarks of my publisher, I fully realized that monographs are not supposed to be written with the sole purpose of embellishing one's CV. Somebody out there will actually read my book! It became clear to me that when converting a dissertation into a monograph, and especially into one targeted at a general readership, squeezing as many references as possible in order to demonstrate one's erudition turns out to be entirely irrelevant. Instead, connecting with the reader becomes the absolute priority. A thoughtful writer has in advance judged his/her readers, by imagining who they are, what they know, and need to know in order to fully understand and enjoy the book.⁵ This

might entail cutting out parts of the manuscript that have taken months to research, and including background information that to the author might seem marginal or even redundant.

Finally, it definitely helps to be able to look at one's PhD thesis from a distance before starting to rewrite it. I have not yet met anybody who was not entirely fed up with his/her PhD research when it was eventually finished. Having to digest the manuscript yet another time at that point does not seem like a good idea to me. How much time is needed to create a healthy distance depends very much on individual circumstances. In my case, it was five years, probably too long. On the other hand, the experience I gained in these years might have helped in rewriting (or so I hope...).

The day following my PhD defence I had lunch with my external committee member who had flown from the US especially for the occasion. She was generous with her advice on how to rewrite the manuscript for publication, dropping names, titles, and concepts that might be useful. I kept taking notes, but was unable to fully grasp the content of the conversation, even after carefully studying the pages I scribbled on. I read those notes again five years later, before setting out on rewriting my thesis. They were crystal clear.

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

PhD Thesis:

The Making of Modern Culinary Tradition in Japan, Leiden University 1999.

Monograph:

Modern Japanese Cuisine: Food, Power and National Identity, Reaktion Books 2006.

NOTES

¹I. Smits, Franz Steiner Verlag 1995 (1994); M. Teeuwen, CNWS Publications 1996 (1996); J. Lamers, Hotei Publishing 2000 (1998); H. van der Veere, Hotei Publishing 2000 (1998); M. Chaiklin, CNWS Publishing 2003 (2003); L. Bruschke-Johnson, Hotei Publishing 2004 (2002); A. Beerens, Leiden University Press 2006 (2006). [The year of the PhD defense is given in brackets]

² For more information see www.brill.nl

³ For more information see www.cnwspublications.com

⁴ I should add at this point that all PhD theses of Leiden University defended after January 1, 2006 are now available online through the Digital Academic Repository (<https://openaccess.leidenuniv.nl/handle/1887/492>). This implies that

the Dutch system is inevitably transforming toward the Anglo-Saxon model, since it shall become difficult in the future to find a publisher willing to publish a monograph that is already available online. Substantial rewriting will become necessary.

⁵ For details see W.C. Booth, G.G. Colomb and J.M. Williams, *The Craft of Research* (University of Chicago Press, 1995), pp. 17-33.

Writing a PhD, Writing a Book: Some Random Thoughts on a Thursday Morning

Roger Goodman
University of Oxford

As a result of the audit culture in the UK which requires me to include such information in the quinquennial Research Assessment Exercise, I have a complete list of all the 66 doctorates I have either supervised (30) or examined (36) over the past 13 years. 16 of these theses are now in print (Fiona Graham's thesis in two separate volumes) and a further six are currently in the process of being published. Around a third of the seventy or so volumes in the Nissan Institute/Routledge Japanese Studies Series, which I co-edit with Arthur Stockwin, have emanated from doctoral theses. Using these two databases, what can I say about the difference between writing a PhD and writing a book (as invited by Peter Cave who himself is part of the dataset)?

The first point to make is that what constitutes a PhD is very different in different countries; it follows therefore that the connection between the book and the PhD is also different. In the UK, a PhD is generally defined as what a graduate student can reasonably be expected to produce in three to four years of graduate work. At Oxford, for example, it is no longer defined (as it was when I completed my thesis exactly 20 years ago) as 'an original contribution to knowledge' (though it should be 'significant and substantial') but is considered a qualification to undertake unsupervised research using tax payers' money, just as an engineer is qualified to build bridges or a doctor to work in a hospital. Examiners look for competence in research methodology, disciplinary theory and, in the case of area studies, linguistic skills and local knowledge. (One of my students once startled his examiners who asked why he not written a longer conclusion by saying that he had already spent four years on this thesis and thought therefore that it was time to finish.) Those who follow this definition

literally end up with a thesis which is often a long way from looking like a finished book.

Doctorates in other countries operate with slightly different (sometimes higher) expectations about the contribution that the thesis should make to knowledge. I will not invoke examples here - since to do so would only incite over-excited comments - but the role of the internal examiner or the internal examination board in explaining the local examination culture to the external, especially foreign, examiner cannot be overestimated. Indeed, one of the most important roles of the supervisor is in identifying the most appropriate examination team for their doctoral students.

Despite such local variations in expectations about the finished product, there are several elements of the PhD thesis process which are universal. Writing a thesis is always at least as much a demonstration of perseverance as genius. It involves jumping through a series of institutional hoops where structure and form are given almost as much significance as content. Indeed it is *process and style* rather than content which often distinguishes writing a thesis from writing a non-academic book; in my experience, few people find the discipline of thesis writing harder than those who have already published a book outside an academic environment.

What constitutes the basis of the thesis form? Every thesis needs to demonstrate full awareness of what has already been undertaken in the field. It

テーマ: MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK

needs to introduce new material in the form of ethnographic, statistical or archival material, and it needs to show how that new material modifies or bolsters our understanding of the field. A good thesis needs to be driven by a research puzzle (or puzzles) that the researcher sets out to solve. And the very best theses draw on the researcher's own personal skills and experience; it is hard to imagine where Japanese studies would be today without the JET programme.

Turning a thesis into a book involves taking the manuscript through a series of gates. The first of these is the viva with the examiners serving as the gatekeepers. Examiners put their name to a thesis and so they want to be sure that it reflects well on them and their judgment; this is very different from the readers of manuscripts submitted to journals or publishers who can (and do) hide behind anonymity. Twenty or so years ago, a viva was still something of a

lottery in the UK;¹ these days much less so since students' work is much more closely monitored via a series of upgrade exercises and mini-vivas before it is finally submitted. As a result, very few theses are failed. Quite a large proportion (15-25%) however are referred at viva which means that the examiners need to write a lengthy report outlining exactly what needs to be amended or expanded before the thesis can be awarded a PhD. In effect this is 'guided rewriting' and the result is that referred and resubmitted theses tend, on average, to end up being published *faster* than theses which pass first time because of this extra guidance.

The extent to which a thesis needs to be rewritten in order to become a book is closely linked to national academic cultures. There is a big difference, for example, between the UK pressure to produce a Quick Book and the US pressure to produce a Great Book. In the UK, applicants for any tenurable position in the social sciences and humanities almost always need a book to their name and hence the faster they publish the better. This pressure is closely related to the Research Assessment Exercise which means that applicants are looked at less in terms of their total research record or even their research potential, but in terms of exactly what they will have published by a particular census date.

Fast publication means almost immediate submission of the thesis to a publisher. There is a hierarchy of publishers, normally with the University Presses at the top in terms of prestige if not in terms of marketing and potential

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

sales. There is, in my experience, no point second-guessing what the publishers (or their readers) will require in the way of changes to the thesis, so it makes sense only to cut the most obvious thesis markers, plus any sections which seem redundant to the overall argument, and to submit it as it is with a covering letter saying that the final version will be shorter than the present one. The best way to prove this last point is to write a short (no more than 2-page) covering letter. It does no harm to include the names of the supervisor and examiners of the thesis as well as possible readers of the manuscript. This is not improper; some publishers find it helpful, other will just ignore it, but none will be offended by it.

In the US, as far as I can tell, the doctoral research project is given much more respect in an individual's research career. For many, it will be the key research experience and hence it should be turned into the definitive work on the subject. This often involves further fieldwork and very extensive rewriting even

¹ For a devastating account of the failure of a doctoral degree in Oxford, see the account by the popular writer on religion, Karen Armstrong, in her autobiography *The Spiral Staircase* (Harper Collins 2004).

before the manuscript is submitted to a publisher for consideration. There tends therefore to be on average a longer gap between the theses and the book in the US than in the UK.

All manuscripts submitted to reputable publishers will receive readers' reports. These will always include suggestions for 'improving'. If more than one report is received, then these will sometimes contradict each other. As a rule, reports (however irritating) should always be responded to as if they contain the best advice and constructive criticism imaginable. When it comes to academic judgment, the publishers will generally believe the readers rather than the author otherwise they would not have gone to - and paid them - for their advice. It is possible though to talk through reports with your editor and they will not necessarily expect you to concede on every critical point made by readers. Authors should respond to the reports quickly and get the manuscript back in good shape as soon as possible. Editors like helpful authors, and authors will find it much easier to work with a helpful editor.

In the case of theses being turned into books, it is increasingly common for the revised manuscript to be sent back to the readers of the original manuscript to check that the required changes have been made. The next stage is negotiation over the contract. These tend to be standard for first books that come from doctoral theses and there is little room for manoeuvre. The percentage of royalties are generally irrelevant since little, if any, money will be earned by almost any academic first book. If possible, of course, paperback rights are worth pursuing but this is almost always based on how many copies of the hard back have sold first. The two areas where there is most flexibility tend to be the number of free copies of the book and percentages on translation rights. The

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

norm on the former of these is six, but it is sometimes possible to get eight. For translation rights, I have always asked for an exception for translation into Japanese at 66/33 author/publisher rather than the normal 50/50; this has actually earned me a few hundred pounds extra for my two monographs which have since appeared in Japanese editions.

Once the manuscript has been accepted, the balance in the relationship between editor and author changes slightly; it is now the author who needs to keep the pressure on the publisher to keep the process moving. One of the major mysteries of publishing in the US and UK is why modern technology appears to have had little effect on speeding up the publication process. Now that books no longer need to be laboriously type-set, but are printed from discs, one would imagine that the whole process would be much faster, but in fact there has been little change. It still takes around nine months for a book to appear in print from

the time that it is accepted. Japanese publishers can produce books in around four to six weeks, which begs certain questions about their western counterparts.

In general, the process following submission of the revised version consists of weeks of waiting and then short bursts of frenetic activity in response to impossible deadlines. The first process is dealing with the copy-editor. The better the publisher, the more they will invest in a copyeditor. The very top publishers will hire (and pay) copyeditors who will read the manuscript as if it was their own work, picking up every inconsistency in nuance and every example of shoddy grammar. Some authors take offence at the suggestions of such copyeditors but in my view they are probably the best thing that ever happened to your work. At the other end of the scale, there is no copyediting offered at all or else no more than a check of works referenced in the text against the bibliography. This puts much more responsibility on the shoulders of the author to check the quality of the final manuscript.

Publishers in the UK (perhaps less so in the US) normally have very strong views about titles and covers of their books. It pays therefore to have one's own version of both of these sorted out well in advance. Marketing departments of UK publishers like clear titles which help them place books in clear-cut categories; anthropological titles which often draw on metaphor ('The Bone on the Plate') are among their least favourite. In the US this seems to be less of an issue; indeed in the US and UK versions of Joy Hendry's anthropology textbook (*An introduction to social anthropology: Other people's worlds*), the two components of the title are reversed. In every situation, though, the best way to get on the good side of the marketing department is to invest effort in the Author's Questionnaire. This asks for precise accounts of the book in question

テーマ: **MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK**

(blurbs in 50 word and 200 word versions – academics are not good at these!) as well as suggestions for where to have the book reviewed and sold. This can be tedious but to be fair it is probably the author who knows these details best and it is not an unreasonable request. Much more tedious is making an index. Most publishers these days offer the option of either the author doing the index themselves or else the publisher doing it for a fee or for a reduction in royalties. I would always advise the former, if at all possible, not for financial but academic reasons. Indexes are a guide to how you want the book read. The choice of categories to index is a very subjective one and a mechanical index of the type produced by most publishers will not capture this nearly as well as the author can.

Perhaps the strangest part of the publication process occurs long after the book has appeared. Most academics have already started on a new project

sometime before the book is published and many turn to this new project full-time once it is out. There tends however to be a long lag between publication and the appearance of academic reviews, often as long as two years, and it is often only at this point that many academics in the field become aware of your work and invite you to come and talk about it. Suddenly, therefore, years after you have moved on from the project of the book, you suddenly find yourself in demand to talk about it when very often what you really want to talk about is something quite different!

Writing your PhD, Writing your Book? Not the Same Thing!

William W. Kelly
Yale University

For most of us anthropologists working in the American academy, the nature of American doctoral education and the structure of the university tenure system in the United States have created a necessary and anxious relationship between a doctoral dissertation and a first book. In the US academic world, the doctoral dissertation is our primary credential for the PhD and often for our first job; our first book, almost always based on the dissertation, is our primary credential for tenure.

How long this will remain the convention in US academics is an open question. Increasingly, new Ph.D.'s are taking up postdoctoral fellowships for a

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

year or two, during which they are expected to finish "revisions" to their dissertations and initiate a new project. Thus, they may well begin their first tenure-track job with the "dissertation book" already under review or even accepted, with the perverse effect of raising the stakes for their tenure decision six or so years after that. With rising expectations, the first book may not be sufficient, but it is certainly necessary in a monograph discipline like sociocultural anthropology, and the dissertation-first book relationship remains critical for most current doctoral students.

Another feature of the contemporary American Academy raises the stakes higher, and that is the perceived monograph crisis in university publishing. Over and over, we are told by university press editors that they are no longer interested in straightforward and narrow gauged monographs. Even for university presses, we must provide them with short books addressed to broad

readerships across several fields, attractive for course adoption, and written in accessible, “jargon-free” style, with apt illustration but not numbing detail. As an object of press interest, the old-fashioned dissertation, weighty with data and encrusted with baroque academic prose, would appear to be an endangered species.

So what should students do, arriving back from the field and confronted with “writing up”? If the dissertation is the first draft of your first book, and that first book must be broadly appealing, shouldn’t you thus write your dissertation from the start as a “publishable book” and not as a “dissertation monograph”? Shouldn’t you put the latest and trendiest slim book by a current academic star next to your computer and emulate that?

Perhaps, but my own advice to dissertation writers is rather more old school. I don’t think much is to be gained and in fact much may be lost in time and effort if you dwell too much on the eventual published book. Being too anxious about connecting the dissertation to the subsequent book risks undermining the dissertation writing process itself.

For most of us, the dissertation is something at least two or three times longer than anything we’ve ever written before. The problem here is not length per se; although students often worry that they will never be able to write 300 pages, this is seldom difficult if they have done a decent job in the research itself. Rather, the real challenge is structure: how to bring organization to all that field work material and how to formulate an argument that follows from a central animating question with that many topics and that much data.

Press editors have told me that the problem with dissertations is that they are written for three professor-readers. I think instead that is their strength, and I

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

urge my students to keep us three in mind. For most of us, it is very hard to write the first draft of our first book for a broad and imagined audience; it is much easier to write for a couple of people we know—and whom we know to be interested but critical supporters.

To me, the major pitfall in dissertation writing is trying to accomplish too much simultaneously. The standard writing guide wisdom is correct but too often overlooked. Write a first draft as fast as possible. It will be ugly and messy, and you will be embarrassed to show it to your best friend let alone faculty supervisor. But it will also be satisfying and useful. A first draft is an exercise in recovery and discovery – recovering the materials and memories of field research from your boxes of notes or computer files and from the recesses of your mind and discovering their potential substantive and analytical importance.

Everything is preliminary and provisional and tentative. Put aside style, put aside coherence, put aside conclusions.

Quality only comes after quantity, and that is why a second draft is such a very different act of thinking and composition than a first draft. Your first draft is an effort to find an argument, while your second draft is an effort to articulate and defend it—and only are third and subsequent drafts efforts to style it and tighten it up. I have never met a graduate student Zeus, producing a fully-formed Athenaic dissertation from the forehead (and I as supervisor have never cleaved an axe like Hephaestus).

Dissertation writing is a difficult but rewarding gestation, and I think its success comes from fully appreciating how much it is a step-by-step process and from having a small set of individuals as primary audience (or Lamaze partners?). Imagining your dissertation as a book on the tables of the presses in the book exhibits of the AAA annual meetings is a motivational fantasy but it is not a useful guideline for such a writing project itself.

In closing, I admit that my old-fashioned advice has two implications, one of which is to emphasize the distance rather than the connection between the dissertation and the first book. You write the dissertation for your supervisor and two or three other professor-readers; you write the book for a press editor and a tenure committee who are seldom fellow specialists. The dissertation is a scholarly monograph; the book may or may not be. The dissertation is a document of record that demonstrates that research has been done competently and thoroughly; the book is an appeal for an audience and an argument for tenure.

Dissertation supervisors think about problem, argument, and evidence. Press editors think about market appeal and cost containment. Tenure

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

committees think about, well, what? Their judgments of your scholarship will hopefully rest on competence and reputation, but how that is applied in your case will depend on the configurations of committees, the criteria of the university or college, and the vicissitudes of the moment. How can you predict these six years in advance? [Or one might say, do you write for the devil you know or that which lurks unknown?]

The second implication is my skepticism that the specialized monograph is as dead as press editors claim it to be. Is the "the monograph crisis" fact or fiction? I think it has elements of both, which is to say it is socially constructed and instrumentally motivated by presses to formulate and justify publishing decisions in these terms. It would exaggerate the import of academic publishing to call it a moral panic, but it troubles me that monograph crisis-mongering does

tend to stigmatize those who are usually the youngest and most vulnerable authors. There are surely very real constraints and challenges to American university presses that impinge especially on young academics—but when was there not such a time? Beneath the snazzy titles and colorful covers of the books that now decorate the AAS and AAA exhibits is some very serious scholarship that began years before as dissertations and still retains its valuable monographic qualities.

**Turning your Thesis into a Book:
Should Anthropology be Comprehensible to People without Ph.D.s?**

Gordon Mathews
Chinese University of Hong Kong

Ph.D. theses are written with a very tiny audience in mind – your supervisor and other professors on your thesis committee – and are meant to ascertain your academic qualifications for entering the anthropological profession. As such, most Ph.D. theses are unreadable. Unless it is a professional obligation, few in their right mind would want to read the convoluted argumentation of most Ph.D. theses, bristling with citations and crammed with footnotes. Indeed, the Ph.D. thesis is designed to be unreadable. It is proof that you have mastered the academic complexities of a particular area of anthropology, and engaged in original research that adds to that area; it is a testament that you are no longer a layperson but a professional anthropologist, able to write in professional

テーマ: MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK

anthropologese of a sort that laypeople find mystifying. The ability to write in such a specialized language is what makes you a member of our sanctified profession.

A book, on the other hand, is a different matter. There are, of course, books too that are unreadable. Some presses publish many hardcover books at exorbitant prices, with print runs of only a few hundred copies. Many of these books are not designed to be bought by individual readers but only by university libraries; there is no need to make them readable, and the editors at such presses may make little effort to make them so. Some such books are hidden treasures, undeservedly killed by being buried in hardcover, but others are simply dissertations, not designed to be actually read by anyone but only cited as necessary.

There are also books that are specifically written so as to be unreadable, following the premise that readability indicates a paucity of intelligence, while incomprehensibility is the mark of brilliance. Such books are on occasion quite successful, just as were the emperor's new clothes for a time; readers may assume that the inscrutability of a text is their own problem as readers, rather than the author's problem as a writer. On some occasions (Marx, Freud...) this assumption is accurate; on more occasions, the wool is being pulled over readers' eyes. In any case, after the postmodernist boom fizzled, by the mid-1990s, inscrutability largely lost its cachet. Except for a few books that become "must read" for the professoriat, books that are willfully difficult will not be read, but will merely hold space on library shelves. In general, books today must be readable to get into wide circulation.

Who, then, reads academic books? Professors and graduate students do; but the number of books written by professors is surprisingly large as compared to the number of books that professors buy and read, and the overall number of professors and graduate students is sufficiently small so that this alone is hardly a viable market for a book. There are some 250 members of JAWS, and another few hundred professors and graduate students in the anthropology of Japan who are not members of JAWS. If half of these buy a new ethnography of Japan – no doubt a highly optimistic assumption – then we are still talking about no more than 200-300 paying readers, a number that would hardly justify publication except perhaps in a prohibitively expensive hardcover edition of the book (which would, of course, lower these numbers of paying readers all the more). Many new authors assume that there will be a lay audience for one's book, and perhaps this can be the case if the book is well-enough written; but this is highly unlikely, overall. Go to any mass market bookstore, whether Borders or Waterstone's or

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

Barnes and Noble – the kinds of places where educated lay citizenry go to buy books – and you will find (except at some of the central outlets of these stores) that the number of academic books on their shelves is vanishingly small. Lay people – unless it is the author's parents, who must – overwhelmingly don't read academic books.

Who, then, does this leave? Students. The biggest market for academic books, and particularly for ethnographies, tends to be undergraduate students. Let us go back to our numbers offered above. If, of those 200-300 professors and graduate students who read a new book, 20 assign it to their classes the next semester, and each class averages 30 students, then the book has 600 more or less captive readers a year, many of whom, if the book is in softcover, may buy the book. If this continues for a few years, then a book may sell 2500 copies, a quite

healthy sales figure, more than justifying a book's publication and promotion. Students are the primary audience for academic books such as those that JAWS members may write. And what do students seek in a book? Above all, they seek readability and comprehensibility: that the book "be interesting." The average student – your typical second-year undergraduate – seeks a book that is fun to read, and that teaches something new but not so new that it can't be made ready sense of. The student seeks accessibility.

And this is the great irony of the anthropologist of Japan seeking to turn her dissertation into a book: the qualities required to write a successful dissertation may be the exact opposite of those required to write a successful book. If the successful dissertation demonstrates that the Ph.D. candidate is no longer a layperson, able to write in professional anthropologese that laypeople and beginning students find mystifying, the successful book will need to be written in a way that beginning students find comprehensible and interesting. This involves an unlearning of what one learned in order to become a professional anthropologist. From one vantage point, this may involve taking the complex and subtle findings of one's academic research and bludgeoning them into a black-and-white simplicity. From another vantage point, this may mean removing one's imperial clothing to let one's findings, naked, stand or fall on their own merits. Most neutrally, this involves writing for non-professional ordinary students what one earlier wrote only for academic specialists: one's professors.

This is an enormous leap, and is immensely difficult to do. A list of Ph.D. dissertations on Japan (http://research.yale.edu/wwkelly/Japan_anthropology/J_dissertation-list.htm)

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

shows that the majority of anthropological dissertations on Japan never become books. To take only the years 1990-2000 as a guide, of 92 doctoral dissertations written in English on the anthropology of Japan during those years, only 38 have as of now become English-language books, by my calculation. There are many reasons for this, but certainly one is the enormous difficulty involved in turning a dissertation into a book, one that may involve, as I have discussed, a counterintuitive backtracking away from the most cherished specialized knowledge that one learned as a graduate student.

The tension between the different aims of dissertation and book continues within the process of book publication itself, and the different parties involved in evaluating a manuscript for publication. Typically, a book manuscript or proposal is initially accepted by an editor on the basis of its potential interest and

marketability, and then evaluated by academic referees, who will probably read it with a somewhat different, more purely academic set of standards. If a book fails to pass the judgments of referees, it won't be published, but there is often a degree of leeway, in that there may be two or three referees, with varying opinions, all of which may influence the editor's decision. Finally, it is the editor and publishing house that make the decision. A manuscript may be acceptable academically, and praised by its referees, and yet be deemed unmarketable by a publisher, and therefore killed—this happens from time to time. (This, by the way, places a positive spin on the decision of some presses to publish obscure dissertation-like tomes in hardback: if they didn't, these books might never see print at all.)

And this tension between the academic and the marketable/readable continues well beyond the publication of one's dissertation; it is a tension in anthropology as a discipline. Is our purpose to convey our knowledge and insights to our fellow professional specialists? Or is our ultimate purpose to convey our knowledge and insights to the world at large? I have experienced this tension in my own work. The dissertation-turned-book *What Makes Life Worth Living? How Japanese and Americans Make Sense of Their Worlds* was criticized in some reviews in the popular press for being too academic ("Why does the author have to take these accounts of ordinary Japanese and American people and then subject them to such dense academic analysis?..."). On the other hand, some academic reviews occasionally offered exactly the opposite argument ("The author should have subjected these accounts to more rigorous scholarly analysis..."). In trying to fit two camps, I fell between them, at least according to these criticisms. This has happened in my subsequent writings as well: the theoretical chapters in *Global Culture/Individual Identity* "can't really be theory

テーマ: MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK

because they're too easy to understand," I've heard from more than one critic. Many of the most notable anthropologists of Japan are remarkably good and clear writers—Joy Hendry and Ted Bestor come instantly to mind, among a number of other scholars—but they may thereby be criticized with the damning adjective murmured by disapproving non-Japan anthropologists: "atheoretical." Who cares, one may ask. But unfortunately Japan anthropology is sometimes slighted within anthropology as a whole with exactly this criticism. Let me state my point baldly: One reason why the anthropology of Japan is not given sufficient respect within the anthropological world as a whole is that its leading practitioners write too well and too clearly. This is one of a number of reasons; but this reason should not be ignored.

So would it then be better if we anthropologists of Japan wrote more gibberish? Wrote our books more like we wrote our Ph.D. theses? We might then be more esteemed in the anthropological world at large, but we would have a harder time getting published (in books, although not in academic journals, which sometimes thrive on gibberish); we would certainly be less read. Let me conclude the somewhat cynical account I have just offered on a note of high idealism. What, again, is the purpose of anthropological writing? My sense is that anthropology at large over the past thirty years has moved away from writing for a larger public to emphasize instead writing for other anthropologists. This of itself is not necessarily a bad thing. When, for example, medical doctors or computer scientists or engineers write their highly specialized prose, the public may not understand what they write, but can generally rest assured as to its benefit. If I have a heart attack, the research reported in medical journals may be of immense benefit to me, even if I understand not a word of it. But this is not true of anthropology. If the larger public does not understand what we are talking about, then what we write may never benefit that public; we are in effect rendered solipsists, writing only for ourselves. This is profoundly unfortunate—anthropologists have messages of enormous importance to convey to the world concerning cross-cultural understanding, globalization, the evolution of the contemporary world, and certainly in terms of Japan, the world's second largest economy, a society whose comprehension is of vital importance to the world. But our discipline has evolved in such a way that such a comprehension is downgraded.

This all comes back to turning your Ph.D. thesis into a book. Who are you writing for and why? If you only write for your academic peers, you may have more difficulty getting your Ph.D. thesis published, as I have argued, but there are also professional benefits that will probably accrue over your career, in terms

テーマ: *MAKING YOUR PH.D INTO A BOOK*

of being taken more seriously within the larger world of anthropology. The question, ultimately, is one of what you want to do with your professional life, and how you want to position yourself between anthropology and the world at large.

I argue this: Anthropology can make the world a better place, but only if we write in such a way that someone beyond a narrow coterie of fellow specialists can understand what we are trying to say. My aim in life is to try and be so understood: not by oversimplifying, and certainly not by condescending to readers, but by making my points so clearly that they can be readily grasped even by some in that vast majority of human beings who lack a Ph.D. I have not succeeded in this aim, but I keep trying. Those of you who are thinking of

turning your Ph.D. into a book—please consider doing the same. After all, don't we want the world at large to better understand Japan in all its complexities? What better way to do so than to write a book that is not simply academically respectable, but that also can be read and enjoyed by your aunt, by your secondary school teacher, by your taxi driver? This is extremely difficult to do, as my own multiple failures reveal. But isn't it worth trying?

テーマ: GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS

GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS: TIPS FROM THE TOP

Following our feature on ‘getting your monograph published’ in the last issue of the JAWS Newsletter, this issue looks to shed light on the process of getting one’s article published in a Japanese Studies journal. For this purpose, we asked a series of questions to editors at four prominent journals, based in four different countries. In alphabetical order, they are: *Japanese Studies* (Australia), *Japan Forum* (UK), *The Journal of Japanese Studies* (US), and *Social Science Japan Journal* (Japan). The editors who dealt with our questions were Judith Snodgrass (*Japanese Studies*), Ann Waswo (*Japan Forum*), Marie Anchordoguy, John Treat, and Martha L. Walsh (*Journal of Japanese Studies*), and Jason Karlin (*Social Science Japan Journal*), and we are very grateful to them for their detailed answers, which are presented below. We hope that these will be of help to JAWS members in writing articles and deciding where to submit them; members are also reminded that each journal carries guidelines for submissions to that journal, which should be consulted.

Please outline the process from manuscript submission to publication at your journal, and estimate the average length of time from first submission to publication.

Japanese Studies (JS): Japanese Studies is an international, peer reviewed journal, and as such, we follow a pretty standard double blind review process. Papers received go through an initial assessment by members of the editorial team, and those considered potentially publishable are then sent to two anonymous, suitably qualified readers. We frequently call upon the expertise of the members of our international Editorial Advisory Board either to undertake this task, or to suggest readers. The reports received are considered by the editors, who decide whether the paper can be published as it is, published after major or minor revisions, or rejected. If major revisions are required, the paper will be sent back to readers after it is received.

As academics ourselves, well aware of the pressure to publish, we try and minimize the time between submission and publication, but the reality is that the refereeing process depends on the good will and generosity of our colleagues, and while we ask readers to submit a report within four weeks of receipt of the paper, it is usually worth while waiting for a specialist reader

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

who can offer constructive comment on the work. A thoughtful report is worth waiting for.

Papers that require revisions or editing will also extend the timeline. The production line is 16 weeks (four months) from the time we send final copy to the publisher to bound copies. All this adds up to a realistic minimum of six months from submission to publication. The reality for papers that require revision is closer to a year. Other factors that might impinge on the length of the process are the balance of content and the production of special issues. We are careful, however, to leave in or between special issues for unsolicited papers of high quality.

Japan Forum (JF): We operate a double-blind peer review system. New submissions, sent to the BAJIS Secretariat as email attachments, are first screened by the Senior Editor, and those that meet basic standards for the journal (appropriate subject matter for our readership, length, etc.) are then forwarded to an Associate Editor, who in turn secures two referees, asking for their reports within 4 to 6 weeks (somewhat longer during the summer vacation). Once the reports are received, the Associate Editor contacts the author(s) with the result: (a) acceptance (usually with some revisions) (b) a need for major revisions and resubmission, or (c) rejection. Authors who survive this stage are expected to attend to any comments made by the referees, which are copied to them in anonymised form, but no deadline for submitting final copy or making a resubmission on the basis of substantially revised copy is imposed. Once acceptable copy has been received, the Associate Editor sends the submission back to the Senior Editor, who may suggest stylistic edits to the author(s) before clearing the article for publication. Depending on how swiftly author(s) attend to revisions and preparing final copy, the article is likely to be published within 10 to 14 months of the original submission date.

Journal of Japanese Studies (JJS): New submissions are first screened by the co-editors to make sure they meet minimum standards (length, primary sources, focus on Japan, etc.). Manuscripts that meet those criteria are sent to two referees; these may be members of our Editorial Board and Editorial Advisory Board and/or scholars who work in the same area as the manuscript under consideration. Based on those reports, the coeditors (sometimes in consultation with a member of the Editorial Board) decide whether to accept or reject a manuscript and

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

whether to encourage the author to revise and resubmit. We try to reach this point within three months of receipt of the manuscript.

Very few manuscripts are accepted for publication without some revision. If revisions are minor, an author might be asked to send a final manuscript for editing within three months. More substantial revisions are left to the author's personal schedule; we have no deadlines for resubmissions. Usually at least six months elapse before a revised manuscript is received, and then it is subjected to the same refereeing process (by the same readers) that it originally received. We do not allow authors to resubmit more than once, so the referees and editors must recommend publication or the essay is rejected.

How quickly an accepted manuscript appears in print depends on the backlog of accepted articles and where we are in the publication cycle (*The Journal of Japanese Studies* appears twice each year). Generally, manuscripts are published within 6-12 months of acceptance.

For an author, the publication process involves reading the edited manuscript and answering queries from the manuscript editor and the coeditors, and then reading the galley proofs a couple of months later. The average length of time for a manuscript to move through this process from first submission to publication is probably 18-24 months, including time allowed for the author to revise, the refereeing process (twice), and the final publication process.

Social Science Japan Journal (SSJJ): All papers are first evaluated by the Editorial Board, which is composed of both faculty at the Institute of Social Science at the University of Tokyo and external faculty from universities within Japan (see the Editorial Board page of our journal or webpage for a list of the current editors). The editors all have differing backgrounds and specializations to provide coverage in all areas of the social sciences. The Editorial Board meets once a month at the University of Tokyo to discuss submissions. One editor, whose specialization is closest to the submitted paper, is designated as the lead editor, who has primary responsibility for determining the referees and specifying the conditions for publication. However, at the meeting, all board members openly discuss and exchange opinions regarding each submission. As a result, the review process is never determined solely by one individual, but reflects the consensus of the Editorial Board. Once papers pass this first evaluation, they are then sent on to at least three referees, who will

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

be chosen for their familiarity with the theme or approach of the submission. The review process is double blind, and the editors make certain that the anonymity of the referees and authors is maintained. We send papers to referees both within and outside of Japan in order to ensure that all submissions meet the highest standards of quality in both English and Japanese-language scholarship. In general, the Editorial Board reaches a final decision regarding new submissions in about 2-3 months. Generally, manuscripts are published within 6-12 months of submission.

Please estimate the percentage of submitted manuscripts that are eventually accepted for publication by your journal, and the percentage that are rejected.

JS: Our rejection rate on a count of the last three years is a little over 60 per cent.

JF: About 45 per cent rejected, 45 per cent published, and 10 per cent offered publication subject to major revisions and never seen again.

JJS: Over the last few years, we have eventually published 22 per cent of submitted manuscripts. The remainder are either rejected or the author is encouraged to revise and resubmit but never does.

SSJJ: Our acceptance rate in 2006 was 13 per cent, and 87 per cent of all submissions were rejected or never resubmitted. The average for the last four years (2003-2006) has been 31 per cent accepted and 69 per cent rejected or not resubmitted.

What are your main criteria when deciding whether or not to accept a manuscript article? To put it another way, what are you particularly looking for in a manuscript? What are the most common faults you see in submitted manuscripts?

JS: Japanese Studies is multidisciplinary, so we accept papers across a broad field of professional study. What we are looking for is original research that reflects or responds to current interests. From what I have seen of the kind of topics presented at JAWS conferences, Japan anthropologists seem well placed for this. While all academic papers will of course be specialist, we do

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

look for papers that are more generally accessible to our readership of Japanese academics. In practice this is seldom a problem. Articles are more likely to be rejected because they are too general, and therefore better suited to readers without previous knowledge of Japan; because they fail to engage with current scholarship; because what they have to say offers little that is new. A common cause for rejection – or delay while major revisions are undertaken – is that the paper is overly descriptive and insufficiently analysed.

To put these things in a more positive light, authors can enhance the possibility of acceptance, and reduce the production time, by making sure that the paper is in very good shape before they submit it. Make sure the paper is interesting, well argued and well presented. It isn't always the case, but in general, good reports then come back more quickly. This should not be surprising. It requires a lot more work to spell out what is wrong with a paper or to make suggestions for revisions. Many papers I receive could be improved simply by having a colleague read through it before submission to pick up repetitions, inconsistencies and such things. Get it in good order. Do I need to mention house style and presentation? The number of articles I receive that neglect it suggests so. Where this may impact on JAWS members is that we use a modified footnote style rather than in-text references. I am happy to process a paper in either format, but the change will need to be made before publication.

JF: We welcome manuscripts on a wide variety of topics related to Japan and accept those that raise interesting questions and answer those questions in a well-documented and persuasive manner, within a word limit of about 10,000 words. Most common faults: (1) very short (4-6,000 words), more of a research note than an article; (2) overly descriptive essays, with little original research.

JJS: We look for manuscripts that pass our double-blind peer review process. The co-editors must be satisfied that the essay will be of interest to a cross-section of our multidisciplinary readership. Some works are simply too narrow in their focus for us to consider for publication. We ask our referees whether an essay is suitable for JJS; whether it will change any current understanding or interpretation of a major event, topic, issue, or work of art or literature in Japan studies; whether it makes an original contribution to the field or duplicates research results

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

found elsewhere; and if it is well researched and well formulated with clear methodology and a clear argument.

We are especially pleased when JJS articles are regularly assigned for classroom use. This confirms the importance of the research findings we publish and of the peer-review process in identifying significant new research.

Some of the most common faults we see are authors who make little attempt to understand the kind of materials we publish or the appropriate length of a scholarly article. An increasing problem occurs when authors simultaneously submit a work to more than one publication venue; sometimes our referees point out to us that they have read the very same prose in a manuscript being considered or even published elsewhere—such as a book manuscript for a university press.

SSJJ: We are most interested in such things as original perspectives, innovative methodology and useful international comparative analysis. We welcome papers that will make an original contribution to the field through field work, primary source analysis, first-hand interviews, and/or surveys. As an international journal with the aim of bridging the gap between the English-language and Japanese language academic communities, we require that submissions demonstrate a familiarity with both English- and Japanese-language scholarship. Papers are most commonly rejected for a lack of originality, failure to address the existing Japanese-language scholarship, and lack of evidence or systematic analysis.

What is your journal's policy regarding (a) incorporation of an article published in your journal into a monograph by the same author (b) republication of an article published in your journal as a book chapter in an edited collection?

JS: *Japanese Studies*, like *Japan Forum*, is published by Taylor and Francis, and is therefore subject to the same regulations. Authors are completely free to republish any of their articles from *Japanese Studies* in their own monograph or any work they edit. Full acknowledgement and citation of the journal publication data should be given, and notification to Taylor & Francis is helpful to ensure rights are protected. In the case of an edited collection there

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

should also be an adequate lapse of time so that it does not detract from the distribution of the journal version.

JF: From our inside back cover, section on copyright: 'Authors may, of course, use the material elsewhere *after* publication without prior permission from Taylor & Francis, provided that acknowledgement is given to the Journal as the original source of publication, and that Taylor & Francis is notified so that our records show that it is properly authorised. Authors retain a number of other rights under the Taylor & Francis rights policies documents'.

JJS: We routinely grant permission for our authors to include their essays from JJS in their own subsequent monographs. We also grant permission for JJS articles to appear in edited collections. When we receive a request for the latter, we first obtain the author's permission for use of the work and we usually charge a fee for use of the JJS material. In either case, we request acknowledgment of the work's original publication in JJS.

SSJJ: Articles published in SSJJ can be reprinted in part or total in a monograph or edited volume, provided that it properly acknowledges that the work had been previously published in SSJJ. Authors will also be expected to request permission to reprint their work from Oxford University Press. For further information regarding SSJJ's policy on reprinting previously published articles, please refer to Oxford Journals permissions at the Oxford University Press website.

Anthropologists often consider that they have a professional obligation to attempt to benefit the communities that allow them to conduct their research. For anthropologists working in Japan, one way of fulfilling this obligation might be to publish research in Japanese. What would be your journal's attitude to a manuscript submission, at least some of whose substance had already been published in an academic publication written in Japanese?

JS: We have no problem with publishing an English language manuscript of material that has been published in Japanese, provided of course, that the Japanese publisher is happy to grant permission, prior publication is appropriately acknowledged, and that the journal has copyright of the

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

English version. It is up to the author to seek permission from the author and publisher.

JF: Previous publication in Japanese is not an obstacle to consideration. From our 'Information for Authors' pages: 'Submission of a manuscript to the journal will be taken to imply that it presents original work, not previously circulated widely electronically, published in English or under consideration for publication in English elsewhere'. Note in this connection that 'wide' circulation online – e.g. in an e-journal – *is* an obstacle. A working paper, suitably revised, might be okay. Our publisher's policy on this is accommodating but not open-ended.

JJS: As long as an author can assign copyright of the English-language work to us, we are happy to consider a submission. In fact, we strive to publish translations of articles originally published in Japanese.

SSJJ: For papers that have already been published in English elsewhere, we will not consider them for publication in our journal. Authors are expected to confirm that their work is not currently under consideration by another journal or has been previously published in another journal. For Japanese articles, we welcome previously published work as part of our policy of working to introduce Japanese-language scholarship to the English-language academic community. Nonetheless, authors are expected to make modest revisions to their paper, for an English-language audience, prior to submission. Through the refereeing process, papers will often be expected to undergo further revisions, which are likely to alter the paper from its original Japanese form prior to translation into English and final publication. SSJJ bears the expense of translating all Japanese-language papers that have been accepted for publication.

Please let our members have any other advice you would like to give them if they are thinking of submitting a manuscript article to your journal. (Feel free to write at some length, and to explain any particular merits of publishing in your journal, if you so wish.)

JS: I would very much like to see more papers from anthropology in the journal. There is strong interest in contemporary society and culture

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

among our readers and we strive to meet the need for papers across areas of study. So what can we offer JAWS members? An interested audience; an opportunity perhaps to focus on the theoretical issues or a particular argument without the level of ethnographic detail required by a specialist anthropology journal. In the terms of practical issues, we are genuinely international in our distribution, editorial advisory board and refereeing process. The online access and associated alerting system provides genuinely international distribution. Articles can be accessed or purchased individually. The student access-- all students enrolled at subscribing institutions have full text access--makes the articles available for reading lists. Please visit the website and think of us when you are seeking to publish your paper.

JF: Subject to the usual review process, we are happy to publish special issues from time to time: up to six or seven articles on a related subject. It's best to contact the Senior Editor in advance, to make sure the proposed theme is suitable. We can also publish unlimited black and white figures, and up to ten color plates per volume. All manuscripts must be submitted in English, but we are willing to edit the contributions of non-native speakers of English up to publishable standard once they have been reviewed successfully. We edit the native speakers, too!

JJS: JJS is read—in print and online—by Japan scholars in many disciplines and in many countries. Potential authors are advised to look at recent issues of JJS and understand the range of articles we publish and therefore the wide interests of our readers but also their expertise on Japan. Follow the guidelines for authors listed on our website—this includes the overall length of your essay.

SSJJ: Our journal is committed to promoting dialogue between the English-language and Japanese-language academic communities. As a rule, all papers are refereed evenly by scholars working both within and without Japan academia. In addition, we also publish numerous book reviews, particularly of Japanese language books. In general, we prefer to have scholars based in Japan review books published in English, and prefer that scholars outside Japan review Japanese-language works. Our journal publishes many articles and reviews that are submitted in Japanese. We arrange to have these works translated into English at the

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

time of publication. For these reasons, SSJJ is one of the best journals for keeping abreast of current Japanese-language scholarship.

In addition to general paper submissions, SSJJ also considers new submissions under the category of "survey articles." Unlike our general papers, survey articles do not require the same high degree of original research, but are expected to:

1. Provide well-organized coverage of key points relating to important social issues that particularly concern Japan. For example, the aging society.
2. Offer surveys of research being done on Japanese society in a particular country or area with which the writer is especially familiar. For example, work on Japan in France, or Brazil.
3. Survey materials relating to a particular research theme, based on essential publications and primary materials. For example, post-modernist views of Japanese society.

Survey articles are subjected to the same review process as research articles, but are usually only sent to one referee.

Would your journal be willing to publish a paper that had previously been published as a working or an occasional paper? And, would the mode of publication make any difference? For example, nowadays many series of working papers and occasional papers are available online, e.g. the Occasional Papers Series of the Nissan Institute of Japanese Studies, Oxford University, or the Working Papers of the European Institute of Japanese Studies, Stockholm School of Economics.

JS: I checked this one with the publisher, so here is the reply: If the article has previously appeared in an unrevised and unreviewed form there would be no objection to it being submitted for publication. The revised final version in the journal would be definitive and should be the only cited form. The author may keep his or her unrevised version (a "preprint") online as long it is linked by open URL to the final published version. After 18 months, the author may post the final version (a "post-print") online to an institutional depository or otherwise online as long as they are not-for-profit and full citation and acknowledgement is given.

JF: See answer to previous question on submissions in Japanese.

テーマ: *GETTING PUBLISHED IN JAPANESE STUDIES JOURNALS*

JJS: No. We do not publish works that have been previously published.

SSJJ: For articles published in SSJJ, although Oxford University Press will hold an exclusive license on the material, the author will retain the copyright. As part of this agreement, SSJJ and Oxford do not consider articles that have been previously published in English. While we do consider articles of similar content, the form is expected to differ from that of previously published work.

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

RESEARCH REPORTS

The Robot and Anthropological Questions

Mikako Iwatake, University of Helsinki

While issues related to bioscience have entered the gamut of anthropological inquiry, a forthcoming issue appears to concern the robot. There are international competitions to develop robotics – in the US, Japan, and China, among others. Robot uses could be military, medical, industrial or domestic. What concerns me here is research in Japan on robots for domestic use, such as for care of the aged and even for partnership. It has become technically possible for a robot to assist an immobilized person in taking a bath. While the robotic vacuum cleaner and the AIBO, the robotic pet or “entertainment robot”, have already become part of the daily scene for some (three thousand AIBOs were sold out in twenty minutes when they were first put on sale in Japan in 1999), the next challenge is to create humanoid robots which are equipped with a human-like appearance and a higher degree of intelligence. Honda’s ASIMO is already a thing of the past, since it is a bipedal robot that looks more like a robot than a human.

Now researchers are creating a humanoid robot which is both physically and intellectually as close as possible to the human. It has the real feel of skin and smooth joints which enable “natural” and not machine-like (that, is robot-like) movement. An artificial brain gives it abilities to learn and understand human language as well as non-verbal signs. It is communicative, interactive, and even has reflexive capacity. In other words, researchers are vigorously pursuing a robot that defies its own robot-ness. One of the ultimate forms of the humanoid robot has a Japanese woman’s body, modeled on a real person. Such a robot is enclosed in race and gender – it is as racialized and gendered as humans. Regarding this trend in robotic research, at least three points can be made.

First, behind the enthusiasm for developing robots in Japan seems to lie a desire to keep the country less dependent on foreign immigration for its work force. In short, Japan would rather have robots than immigrants. This is a rather exceptional strategy in the contemporary world, in which even the domestic work force is increasingly transnationally mobile. Although it is anticipated that Japan, like many other industrialized countries, will face serious depopulation in the near future, the robot would be an alternative to accepting immigrants, if the

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

latter is not within the range of desirable choices. The robot would also maintain “racial purity” at the cost of inability to reproduce.

Second, there is tension arising out of the contradictory aspects of proximity and difference to humans that are embedded in the robot. In which respects should it be close to or different from humans? What should be its relation to humans? The humanoid robot could provide contested and contradictory sites for fascination, discomfort and comfort, or pleasure and sadness. Historical precedents for mechanical fascination could be located in the automata like *karakuri ningyo* in the Edo period, which carried a tray of tea or wrote letters. Yet the humanoid robot of the future, no matter how interactive and communicative it might be, would never be exactly like a human. It is subordinated and colonized. Yet exactly these features could be sources of ease and healing for those who use the robot.

Third, the humanoid robot could have interesting implications for the nature/culture dichotomy. It needs to be as close to the human as possible both in its appearance and ability. In other words, the humanoid robot needs to be as “natural” as possible as a result of combined intervention by top technology, industrial design, behavioral and cognitive sciences and cultural norms. It is the cyborg, a hybrid of machine and organism, in the words of Donna Haraway. She has argued that the cyborg, an illegitimate child of patriarchy, colonialism and capitalism, could transcend the modern European dichotomy of nature/animal, human/machine, body/non-body. It remains to be seen whether the humanoid robot with racialized and gendered body, a product of mostly male scientists, will merely reproduce patriarchal, colonialist and capitalist domination.

Is Aikidō a Religion?

Andrea Molle

(JSPS Fellow, Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture,
Nanzan University, Nagoya: amolle@nanzan-u.ac.jp)

My PhD research centred on the anthropological study of a Japanese New Religious Movement (JNMR) which has been well established in Italy since 1974: Shūkyō Mahikari. I analysed its evolution in Italy and, on the basis of 18 months’ fieldwork, examined the social and organizational relations in the movement’s headquarters in Milan as well as in a month-long pilgrimage in Japan. My

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

ethnography, conducted with both Italian and Japanese worshippers and leaders, revealed the extent of the differences in the sense of belonging between Italian and Japanese followers as well as in the teaching and interpretation of multiple doctrinal elements. The many discrepancies and contradictions were reduced by continuous referral to the generic concept of a 'spiritual approach' which works as some sort of compromise. I've also noticed that many Italian followers were interested in other elements of Japanese culture, such as martial arts.

Currently, as JSPS fellow at the Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, Nagoya, I am continuing to explore this topic in a research project called: "*Spirituality as bridge-category to unite different worlds: the case of Japanese New Religions and Budō*". Indeed, the theoretical purpose of my research is to deepen our understanding of the allusion to a 'spiritual approach' and to emphasize how it can be helpful for social scientists involved in the study of Eastern Martial Arts and culture related topics (particularly their impact in the West). Together with concepts like 'religion' and 'philosophy' (Fitzgerald, 2003), 'spirituality' is one of the most interesting and currently debated issues (King, 1996; Houtman, 2005) for both Japanese and western scholars working on contemporary society. Still too often considered as a residual category, 'spirituality' is instead a valuable tool to capture a range of concepts and dimensions of Japanese religious experiences which have spread in recent years to reach and influence a global audience (Shimazono, 1999). Combining an anthropological and a sociological approach (Beckford, 1990), my project endorses some of these distinctive aspects of the perceived relationship between Japanese society and spirituality (Inoue, 1991) as they emerge in a particularly significant case: the world of *budō*.

In particular, the most recent literature (Bennet, 2005) claims that Japanese martial arts as perceived in Western countries are increasingly linked with the issue of spirituality and also, in a wider sense, to the typical concept of 'life' elaborated by various *budō* practitioners. Hence, my research is concerned with the examination of the increasingly influential connections between 'martial culture' and 'popular culture'. That means that my main concern is not to seek the truth of any real historical and philosophical connections. Instead, I am trying to identify a fundamental process whereby most western people seem to perceive *budō* as a 'way toward a spiritual path', i.e. enlightenment, or even as a 'way to turn into a spiritual warrior', resolving such a gap in the control of violence.

My point is that for many western practitioners, *budō* is viewed as a form of spiritual practice. The argument that *budō* is a form of *shugyō* is quite common,

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

with several books, websites, and numerous magazine articles published every year about how the practice of various *budō* can improve one as a person, or take one closer to enlightenment. This is true of all *budō* subculture, from *karate* to *iaidō*, from *kyudō* to *judō* and *aikidō*. However, for my purposes I concentrate on one particular martial art which seems to be the most widely perceived as spiritual activity: *aikidō*.

It is common sense that to Ueshiba Morihei, its founder, *aikidō* appeared as both a martial art as well as a form of intense religious practice for spiritual development strictly related to his Ōmoto-kyō experience. There seems to be a strong belief among many western *aikidō* practitioners that merely by practicing this Japanese martial art they will gain spiritually, or at the least, automatically develop into better people. This has been examined in a recent study of *aikidō* practitioners in the US (Boylan, 1999). Being part of the social group related to *aikidō* is one of the most common reasons, but within *aikidō* circles the spiritual and personal development aspects are also strong motivating factors for people, with most practitioners seeing their *aikidō* practice as a form of spiritual or religious practice that helps them to develop as human beings. From this point of view, instead of talking about an instance of 'orientalism', what needs to be examined is how those new elements might help a western audience to provide a balance of power between negative features (violence, panic, death, pain, sickness) and positive ones (love, calm, self-control, health). The leading question of my work is: how has this image been constructed or maintained in western countries?

Following up that issue, I spent the first part of my research in collecting information, identifying the relevant literature, and establishing preliminary contacts with the aim of building a strong theoretical framework. To this point my main task has been to work towards overcoming the failure of traditional analytical categories to describe the sense of such experience. On the basis of this effort I have established the main key concepts to work on. In order to show why such form of *budō* could be perceived, and lived, like a sort of religion (Bottelli, 2004) rather than a sport or an educational field, I think it is theoretically important to undertake the following tasks:

- 1) Describe the fundamental religious influences on *aikidō*, from its founder to his most prestigious pupils, as well as its ritual aspects.
- 2) Start to consider *keiko* as an interaction field for both physical and sociological elements involving body-mind integration. The main point is related to the neurological concept of *working memory*. In some cases,

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

- sensory information is retained for use in future behavior, and in other cases, action information is retained for performing an action at an appropriate time. It is also necessary to memorize the learned causal relationships and to read out the memory of relationships situation-dependently to perform the most appropriate behavior.
- 3) Treat *mushin* as an altered state of consciousness that is caused by something which can come about accidentally through indigestion, fever, sleep deprivation, starvation, oxygen deprivation, nitrogen narcosis (deep diving), or a traumatic accident. It can sometimes be reached intentionally by the use of a sensory deprivation tank or mind-control techniques, hypnosis, meditation, prayer, or disciplines. Naturally occurring altered states of consciousness include dreams, lucid dreams, euphoria, ecstasy and psychosis as well as purported premonitions, out-of-body experiences, and channeling.
 - 4) Examine, following Kiyota (1995), *mushin* as an altered state of consciousness in particular activities involving life and death related behaviours, and it could be also useful in understanding extreme behaviors like violence or suicide. My proposal is to extend this approach also to *misogi*. Indeed, as an altered state of consciousness or awareness linked with the concept of purity, it could work as a bridge factor between religious and martial experience,
 - 5) Study the concept of *Sacred Warrior* with regard to his archetypal pattern and the most recent evolution. The symbolic values and role of the sword are one of the core points.

Along these lines, the second part of my research is now devoted to improving my categories using actual fieldwork data. Clearly it has been necessary to devise a more detailed research design and to create further contacts to provide access to the various fieldwork sites. My data base consists of the data gathered informally during fieldwork, alongside interviews (mostly via email with privileged informants) and the content analysis of documents, emails, blogs or A/V.

Thus the remaining period of my research project will be devoted to the final analysis of the data and discussion of the results within the scientific community. In order to give a brief outline of the anticipated impacts, the primary result I expect from my research is to improve the understanding of the category of 'spirituality' and to refine the knowledge of *budō* presented in the literature and research projects of both Western and Japanese scholars. A

WORK IN PROGRESS: RESEARCH REPORTS

secondary impact will be to contribute to the enhancement of the scholarly networks between Japanese and western scholars and academic institutions involved in this topic. A third impact will be to produce a set of relevant publications and thus contribute to developing the scientific knowledge of the topic.

REFERENCES:

- BECKFORD, J. (1990) *The Sociology of Religion and Social Problems*, in «Sociological Analysis», 51:1.
- BENNET, A. ED. (2005) *Budo Perspective*, Kendo World Publications, Auckland.
- BOTTELLI C. (2004) *Arte marziale o religione? Il rapporto tra Aikidō e Ōmotokō*, M.A. Thesis, Università degli Studi di Torino.
- BOYLAN, P. (1999) *Aikido As Spiritual Practice in the United States*, M.A. Thesis, Kalamazoo: Western Michigan University.
- FITZGERALD, T. (2003) 'Religion' and 'the Secular' in Japan: Problems in History, Social Anthropology, and Religion, in «Electronic Journal of Contemporary Japanese Studies», Discussion Paper 3.
- HOUTMAN D. (2005) *Spirituality as a sociological concept*, paper presente at the International Conference "Una sociologia della 'spiritualità'", Associazione Italiana di Sociologia and University of Aosta, Aosta, Italy.
- INOUE, N. (1991) *Recent Trends in the Study of Japanese New Religions*, in «New Religions: Contemporary Papers on Japanese Religion», Institute for Japanese Culture and Classics, Kokugakuin Daigaku, Tōkyō.
- KING, A. S. (1996) *Spirituality: Transformation and Metamorphosis*, in «Religion», 26.
- KIYOTA M. (1995) *Kendo: Its Philosophy, History and Means to Personal Growth*, Kegan Paul, London and New York.
- SHIMAZONO S. (1999) *The Expansion of Japan's New Religions into Foreign Cultures*, in «Japanese Journal of Religious Studies», 18:2-3.

BOOK REVIEWS

BOOK REVIEWS

In this issue, we are happy to carry reviews of five books, three books in Japanese, and two in English. We are particularly grateful to Professor Nakamaki Hirochika for contributing reviews to two Newsletters in succession. Members are very welcome to put forward suggestions for books they would like to review to the editors. We especially welcome reviews of books in Japanese that members would benefit from knowing about.

中山和芳『ミカドの外交儀礼－明治天皇の時代』朝日新聞社、2007。

中牧弘允評（国立民族学博物館）

大宅壮一ノンフィクション賞の受賞作『ミカドの肖像』（猪瀬直樹著、小学館、1986年）以降、明治天皇の神秘のヴェールを剥ぐ作業が加速した。同時に、この20年のあいだ、ミカドやミヤコに焦点を当て、天皇の行動や首都の演出をとおして近代日本を解説しようとする研究が相次いだ。本書もその流れにあって、外交儀礼、つまり今でいうところの皇室外交に着目している。

中山和芳氏（東京外国語大学教授）は文化人類学者でオセアニアを専門地域としながら、西洋と日本の文化接触にも関心をいじめてきた。明治14（1881）年におけるハワイのカラカウア王の来日は、その意味で格好の研究材料だったにちがいない。

明治天皇はハワイ国王を国賓として迎えるが、国王はそのとき内密に、皇室との縁組をもちかけ、日本を盟主とするアジア連盟を提案している。このことはハワイ研究や日本近代史では重要事項だが、著者はそれ以上の詮索はしない。むしろ、カラカウア王が最初の外国元首であり、天皇は王とならんで歩き、手ずから大勲位菊花大綬章を王の左胸につけたとか、別れの挨拶のときしっかり手を握りあったことなどに注目している。また、19日間の滞在中の接待費が一万六六〇〇円あまりで、当時の外務省予算が二四万七〇〇〇円だったと淡々と述べている。

本書には奇をてらう解釈や大向こうをうならす議論はみられない。山口昌男氏のように「中心と周縁」を武器にミカドにせまっているわけではない。そのかわり、率直な感想や意見を述べる外国人の記録と『明治天皇紀』など日本側の文献とを対照し、資料に語らせる謙虚な姿勢と、目配りをきかせた最近の研究動向の紹介が持ち味となっている。

とくに天皇の可視化、視覚化を近代の特徴として重視し、その作法や趣向を欧化にはしる明治政府との葛藤のなかで記述した点は評価されてよい。化粧をし、お歯黒をつけ、衣冠束帯で座して謁見をしていた天皇が、断髪し、ひげを生やし、洋風の軍服に身を固め、立礼で外国の賓客を迎えるようになった。また、洋食に慣れ、宮中招宴を催し、皇后と一緒に並び、腕を組んで歩くようになった。こ

BOOK REVIEWS

の間、約 20 年。長かったのか短かったのか、その変化を地道に跡づけ、天皇・皇后の「文明開化」を儀礼面から描写している。

本書は『ミカドの肖像』には一言も触れていないが、明治天皇の御真影はイタリア人の画家キョソーネのえがいた西洋風の顔立ちをした肖像である。このことの意味もあわせて考察してしかるべきだったろう。

吉村典久『日本の企業統治—神話と実態』NTT 出版、2007。

中牧弘允評（国立民族学博物館）

経済バブル崩壊以降、日本の企業は自信を失いかけている。しかも、企業の不祥事がつづくなか、やれコンプライアンス(法令遵守)だの CSR(企業の社会的責任)だのと、耳慣れない用語が頻繁に使われるようになった。企業統治（コーポレート・ガバナンス）もそのひとつである。

本書は気鋭の経営学者である吉村典久氏（和歌山大学准教授）が企業統治の“神話”と“実態”にせまった良書である。もっとも良いのは日本の事例に即して概念を整理し、ジャーナリズムや巷間の通念を再検討している点である。端的に言う、英語の概念でありながらビジネス・アドミニストレーションに代表されるアメリカ流経営学の受け売りではないところがさすがいい。

たとえば「株式公開ブーム」とされるなか、「将来とも上場しない」とする会社が非上場有力ベンチャー企業約 500 社の 3 割近くを占めるという。また、上場を廃止し、株価に左右されない長期戦略をたてて業績を上げている会社の例（ワールド）が詳しく紹介されている。

他方、同族経営が不祥事の温床だとする論調がある。そして「ワンマン化」や「私物化」がしばしば槍玉に挙げられる。しかし著者は、同族が関与する企業に優良企業が少なくない点を指摘する。かつ、経営者になるために不可欠な「一皮むける」機会が豊富にあたえられることなど、一定の合理性があることにも目を向ける。同族＝悪とはかぎらないのである。

株の持ち合いやメーンバンク制もバブル崩壊後、衰退の過程にあるとみられてきた。ところが、敵対的買収から企業を守るために、関連事業会社同士による新たな株の持ち合いが盛んになってきたと本書は言及する。さらに、従業員を統治の核とするならば、従業員持株制度の充実をはかることも企業統治につながると示唆する。

こうしてみると本書が立脚する企業統治の定義、すなわち「経営者の任免と牽制を通じて、より良い企業経営が行われるようにする制度や慣行」（加護野忠男神戸大学教授による定義）が説得力をもってくる。それは短期的利益を追求する株主至上主義とはおよそ異質の世界である。

BOOK REVIEWS

日本の企業経営者は伝統にもっと自信をもっている。企業統治などと言わずとも、その線でちゃんとやっているではないか。そうしたメッセージを送ると同時に、豊富な事例と周到な統計でそれを裏付けている。

経営学は経済学にくらべ、ローカル・ノレッジがモノをいう分野である。評者も経営人類学と称し、経営学者たちと目下、会社神話の共同研究をつづけている。実態とは異なる神話的言説という意味で、本書はたいへん参考になった。

吉川徹「学歴と格差・不平等—成熟する日本型学歴社会」東京大学出版会、
2006. [Tōru Kikkawa (2006) Education and Social Inequality: Contemporary Educational Credentialism in Japan. Tokyo University Press]

Reviewer: Yoko Yamamoto (University of California, Berkeley)

How has *gakureki-shakai*, educational credentialism in Japan, created and perpetuated social inequalities? Tōru Kikkawa, a sociologist at Osaka University, once again grapples with the theme of educational attainment (*gakureki*) five years after his previous publication about educational processes among rural students. In the current book, he analyzes educational attainment (*gakureki*) as a key element which reproduces inequalities from generation to generation. Kikkawa attempts to depart from traditional class theories which focus on economic resources or occupational status as elements creating inequalities. According to him, *gakureki* has powerfully influenced the process of social reproduction and individuals' views about their status in Japan.

Japan's "uniqueness," he argues, lies in the significance of the border line between high school graduates and college graduates. "In current Japanese society, there is no other social category like the line between college graduates and high school graduates, which divides all Japanese into half, except for gender" (p. 62). While close to all students attend high school, percentages of students pursuing some college have stayed somewhere around 40 to 50 percent for the last ten years. Analyzing quantitative data, he demonstrates that in Japan, educational attainment, especially attending college or not, has become more influential in people's perspectives about social class status than occupational status or income.

Kikkawa's study suggests that the educational inequalities associated with family backgrounds, which several sociologists have demonstrated and which have existed throughout post-war Japan, have become a national concern only recently. During the period when most people attained higher education than

BOOK REVIEWS

their parents, educational inequalities across socioeconomic status were veiled. In the current age, when parents' and their children's educational levels do not differ much, people pay attention to what is going on with others. Kikkawa argues that people have not uniformly pursued higher education. Students with college educated parents have much higher chances of attending college than students with less educated parents.

In a society where education is valued and critical for future opportunities, why don't all people pursue college? Lack of resources and cultural capital (e.g., certain manners and skills necessary for academic success) do not fully explain this phenomenon. Kikkawa focuses on individuals' motivation and choice. "Only students whose parents had a certain educational level have been enthusiastic about education and participated in educational competition" (p. 126). Kikkawa further tries to understand the mechanism of this persisting process of educational inequalities, and proposes an interesting hypothesis named "incentives to avoid downward educational mobility (*gakureki kakō kaihi*)." According to this idea, individuals try to achieve at least the same level of education as their parents. Thus for students with college educated parents, college education is a must, while for children with high school educated parents, there is not such a strong incentive to go to college. While this hypothesis provides a thought-provoking and unique contribution to our understanding of social reproduction processes in Japan, it is not supported by any empirical data. One cannot ignore the role of parents in directing adolescents' decisions and choices. Kikkawa's argument could have been more convincing and could have provided richer illustrations by using observations of families or interviews with adolescents.

For the last several years, inequalities associated with socioeconomic status have received central attention in Japan. "Inequality (*fubyōdō*)" and "discrepancy (*kakusa*)" have become key terms in publications since the beginning of the 21st century. These studies have challenged the image of Japan in the 1970s and 1980s as an "all middle-class society (*ichioku sōchūryū*)" in which the majority of people viewed themselves as middle-class. This book, which includes reviews of previous work on social class, adds interesting insights about social reproduction through educational attainment. It is recommended for people who are interested in the issues of inequality and education in Japan.

BOOK REVIEWS

Japan After Japan: Social and Cultural Life From the Recessionary 1990s to the Present. Tomiko Yoda and Harry Harootunian, editors. Durham, N.C., and London: Duke University Press, 2006. 447 pp.

Reviewer: Gordon Mathews (Chinese University of Hong Kong)

The sixteen essays in this book, by historians, scholars of literature and film, and a few anthropologists, explore what has happened to Japan over the past fifteen years, years of economic downturn, and social and cultural uncertainty. The book's title evokes how, after postwar Japan in its relentless economic rise and surging cultural confidence passed by the way, Japan's present and future identity has become an open question. However, all but four of the book's chapters were written before 9/11 and thus bear a certain dated quality.

Yoda offers in her initial substantive chapter a "roadmap to millennial Japan": more specifically, an overview of Japanese intellectuals' interpretations of the 1990s and that decade's meaning for Japan. Thereafter, the book's essays explore a number of salient topics: Japanese universities and the "impasse of the Japanese intellectual environment today" (Miyoshi and Yoshimoto, chapters 2 and 3), recent Japanese arguments over how to interpret its wartime past, particularly focusing on the writings of Katō Norihiro (Harootunian and Koschmann, chapters 4 and 5), issues of Japanese placement between the U.S. and Asia, as past colonized and colonizer in today's postcolonial world (Ching and Sakai, chapters 6 and 7); the grisly murders of "Youth A" and the animated film *Mononokehime*, and what these indicate about Japanese unity and about the meanings of childhood in Japan (Ivy and Arai in chapters 8 and 9); Japan's characterization as a "maternal society" and its recent transmutations, "real events" as portrayed in Japanese media, and the double bind of the national and the global in Japan, all as linked to the relentless permutations of capitalism (Yoda, Cazdyn, and Nagahara, in chapters 10, 11, and 12); Pokémon and *otaku* and their larger social, economic, and cultural implications (Allison and LaMarre in chapters 13 and 14); and the Aichi Expo 2005, popular opposition to it, and the various emergent political movements in Japan, indicating hope for the future in opposing bureaucratic and capitalistic hegemony (Shunya and Kohso in chapters 15 and 16).

This book is very much under the rubric of cultural studies. In the early to mid- 1990s, cultural studies was a wave that seemed to threaten the foundations of anthropology: "literary critics are taking over the study of culture, our own field!" not a few American anthropologists bemoaned. Over the past decade, the tide has receded, and cultural studies seems to be simply one more discipline

BOOK REVIEWS

rather than a fundamental threat to anthropology's future. Still, it is well worth asking again the question anthropologists asked fifteen years ago: what can we anthropologists learn from cultural studies? What can this book, containing chapters by many of the leading cultural studies theorists analyzing Japan, teach us about the strengths and weaknesses of the anthropology of Japan? Let us explore this by considering the strengths and weaknesses of *Japan After Japan*.

The major weakness of the volume, from an anthropological perspective, is the lack of on-the-ground fieldwork. In many of the essays of the book, the realities of actual life are sacrificed before elaborate edifices of theory. Some of these essays are solid in their claims: Allison's theorizing is grounded in her actual conversations with producers and promoters of Pokémon; Koschmann's discussion of Katō Norihiro is based in a close reading of Katō's writings; Yoda's writing on Japan as a maternal society seems an appropriate mix of the theoretical and empirical; Miyoshi's discussion of Japanese universities seems solid in its empirical foundations. Other essays seem uprooted from reality in their theorizing. Sakai's exhortations that we dispense with referring to "the West" as a homogenous entity seem rather obvious to anyone stepping outside a book-lined study to actually behold "the West" in all its diversity, as many anthropologists have done for decades. Ivy's linkage of the decapitation committed by "Youth A" to "the cyborg economimesis of Japanese capitalism" is startling until one pauses to realize that the transmutations of Japanese and global capitalism are the catch-all explanation for virtually all the specific phenomena discussed throughout this book's chapters, thus explaining very little. Nagahara's explication of globalization and the nation-state in contemporary Japan is in crucial respects beyond my comprehension: I can't understand what he's talking about.

The major strength of *Japan After Japan* is the attention paid to leading Japanese intellectuals discussing their own society. The book examines the seminal work of Katō Norihiro, as well as Miyadai Shinji, Murakami Ryū, Asada Akira, Okada Toshio, Hirai Gen, and many other interesting thinkers providing subtle if eminently contestable analyses of Japanese society at present. Anthropologists need to know about these thinkers. A number of cultural studies theorists in *Japan After Japan*, both Japanese and foreign, are directly involved in leading intellectual debates within Japan; but this is not usually true of foreign anthropologists who study Japan, who tend to be largely ignored within Japan. There are many reasons why they are ignored, but one is that foreign anthropologists tend to do fieldwork in Japan without engaging in the larger intellectual debates in the society within which their fieldwork is taking place.

BOOK REVIEWS

Although foreign anthropologists will almost certainly consult Japanese source material, and empirically-based Japanese scholarly work relating to the topic of their fieldwork, they usually do not pay heed to larger Japanese intellectual issues.

On the basis of this book, I argue that we should. There is an unwitting, unintended colonialism engaged in by many foreign anthropologists, who treat Japan as the site for fieldwork's raw material without engaging the often highly sophisticated arguments of Japanese intellectuals concerning the phenomena that foreign anthropologists may be exploring. Of course some anthropological topics are those that Japanese commentators have paid little attention to—there is a time-honored tradition of anthropologists exploring that which “the natives” simply take for granted—but many topics of recent anthropological investigation, from youth culture to textbook controversies to *anime* to issues of post-postwar identity, have aroused much discussion by Japanese commentators. Anthropologists might take up these commentators more fully, not necessarily agreeing with them but seriously arguing with them. The essays in *Japan After Japan* do take up these commentators, and this is what makes the book worth reading.

There have been a few recent anthropological debates between Japanese and foreign anthropologists of Japan, for example the fascinating exchange between Kuwayama Takami and Jan van Bremen in pages of the JAWS Newsletter a few years ago. However, this happens surprisingly little. A major reason for this is that Japanese anthropologists themselves tend to pay little attention to Japan, studying instead far-afeld societies like their European and American anthropological colleagues. Thus, to engage the Japanese intellectual world, foreign anthropologists must to some extent leave their disciplinary cocoon. But it may also be that some foreign anthropologists do not (or cannot, because of difficulties in reading Japanese) deal with Japan as a society at least as complex and multi-variegated in its ideas as the society from which they have come. I am well aware of the silly tomes that often occupy Japanese bestseller lists and the vacuous tracts that often take up space in journals; but nonetheless, there are great intellectual riches to be found as well, as the critical commentary in *Japan After Japan* reveals. The key message for anthropologists provided by *Japan After Japan* and other cultural studies analyses is simply this: we should pay greater heed to the Japanese intellectual milieu, and the arguments taking place therein. If we can do this, our own work may become better, and our contribution to Japanese society may, with serendipity, become fuller.

BOOK REVIEWS

***36 Views of Mount Fuji: On Finding Myself in Japan.* Cathy N. Davidson. New Edition. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press, 2006.**

Reviewer: David Blake Willis (Soai University, Osaka)

What do we make as anthropologists of works like "36 Views of Mount Fuji: On Finding Myself in Japan"? Recently reissued with a coda about the Hanshin Earthquake and the author's friends who were affected by that event, the book has been exceptionally popular, at least if we can believe the praise heaped on the book in trade press reviews since it was first published in 1993. A perennially recommended book for those first coming to Japan, especially to live (how many JET teachers have read this one?), the book is an account that is somewhere between fiction and non-fiction. And it tells us a lot about Japan.

One gets the impression that the author is an academic who really wanted to be a novelist. You can almost feel her champing at the bit to get her story out in that form, but of course the story hews too closely to reality for that, what with the author's own confrontation with culture shock, gender, death, family, language, and identity issues. It is actually a good compromise and makes for an entertaining read. Cathy N. Davidson, the author, is in fact a distinguished scholar of American literature at Duke University who has written widely on gender, women's literature, and even the life and death of an American factory. The question remains, however, what do we make of *36 Views* as anthropologists? We have a storied past as anthropologists of utilizing travel writers/adventurers (and this book does fall at least partly into that genre) like Isabella Bird, Richard Burton, and others in exploring new approaches to ethnographic source material. This book could well be one of those explorations, revealing not only the author and her search for identity, but a finely textured look at a certain place and a certain time, a measure of how much has or has not changed in Japan, especially in terms of the status of women, "*gaikokujin*," and what happens in the education system.

I have to admit that I initially looked at *36 Views* with some skepticism. I was first told about the book some years ago by my sister, a professor at an American university, who praised the book, saying what a good read on Japan. Following the spate of books on Japan during the Bubble in the 1980s and 1990s, some of which were well intended but limited, others thinly researched and sensationally packaged, I was right to look askance. Many of these books were by authors who had spent little time in Japan but who professed to be experts. What was the point of reading anything like that? But after I picked up this book,

BOOK REVIEWS

finally, almost furtively, I discovered an elegy on the 1980s, when the book was conceived and presumably written, some of it timeless and prescient about Japanese culture, other parts hopelessly dated. As a report of culture, yes, it works on some levels, but then it misses the point altogether on others.

As observations of Japanese society at a certain time and place, we can learn something from *36 Views*. For example, the ways in which a visiting foreign professor was received at a venerable Japanese institution in Kansai in the 1980s ("Kansai Women's University"), on the cusp of a change from an old, traditional Japan to new, post-modern approaches to this society. I must confess that, having lived in Kansai for 26 years, not a few of the characters and places mentioned in the book were more than familiar. But to represent the scenes from her time in Kansai as "Japan" and "Japanese culture," which the book seems to do, is a bit of a stretch. There is a little too much of a narrow America-Japan dichotomy at work here, especially as presented from the privileged viewpoint of an upper middle class American academic. One would hope that by now the American and European scholars who have spent time in Japan would see beyond simplistic dichotomies like Japan as Image/Reality, *Gaijin/Nihonjin*, Women/Men, and so on. There is a lot more complexity here, and shouldn't that be commented on, too? But the book is from the 1980s, so we cannot have that expectation. Why is it being reissued now? That, too, is an interesting question.

I'm sorry, but the distancing from Japanese culture and society, and then pondering its messages from afar made me long for a more nitty-gritty perspective like Ted Bestor's work on neighbourhood Tokyo and Tsukiji. A trip to Niigawa Race Track or Koshien Stadium, down the road from her college, might have opened Cathy Davidson's eyes to an entirely different Japan. Which I suppose is the other point, that, as I said earlier, the book does a very good job of presenting itself as a period piece of a certain context. In this sense, academic Japan (which many of us are of course interested in), upper middle class Japan, and the society of elite young women. It is a charming, elegant book on many levels, and the author is clearly a likeable person, but whether it works as Japanology is another question. It is a little confusing trying to ascertain how deeply the author communicated with people, for instance. At moments she appears to have fluent communication in the language, and yet later in the book she declaims her hopelessness with even the most basic phrases and expressions.

Nuances of borrowing and "practice," which almost feels like "playing house and playing culture" and at points almost *noblesse oblige* towards Japanese culture are hard to miss and found here and there in the book. This is seen in the role-playing of being "Gaijin" and justifications for not wanting to live in Japan

BOOK REVIEWS

on a longer-term basis as well as in the building a Japanese house in the hills of North Carolina. The dialogue with a visiting Japanese friend in that house is especially revealing. Their first guest in this new home, the friend insists that Davidson and her husband are indeed rich (!), much to the author's consternation.

Where the book does work is in its sensitivity to gender and academic issues, and here it is useful source material for ethnographers. I especially liked the parts about the outer islands she visited, Okinawa and the matriarchy she encountered there and the society of tough women in the Oki Islands. The flow of the writing is wonderful, and on this level we can all learn something as anthropologists. Why do we have to have such a monopoly on turgidity? It's just not necessary.

Kate Fox, in her book *Watching the English*, and in a lecture I attended that she gave at Oxford University last year, gingerly explored the contours of this issue. Clearly sensitive to the attacks she has sustained from other anthropologists for her style and approach, she does have a point when she asks the question, why do we have to write so badly? Cathy Davidson provides all of us with a model of eloquence, economy and message, not to mention charming prose, which we could all heed. The chapter titles alone bear thinking about. I wanted to note, in fairness to the author, too, some of the praise given to the book, which will give you a further idea of its effectiveness: "Luminous, nuanced and passionate; Davidson is a droll guide and a questing soul; brilliant, wise, and witty; honest and even-handed; a sensitive observer; evocative, a revealing mosaic; perceptive, frank, and personal; delightful."

English language education, how gaijins are seen and defined (and how they define themselves), and the ways society sees those who are different in Japan have all changed, though. The glaring gaps of class and schooling now appearing in the landscape of Japan have their origins in this era, yet the author barely touches on conflict or division in the society, unfortunately. The college she taught in was considered the most prestigious and most elite university for young women in Kansai in the 1980s. But it has clearly fallen on hard times today, with elite young women headed to the top of the educational pyramid instead of the college where she worked. Some reporting on the sharpness of these phenomena, both for the 1980s and for her return to Japan later, would have made for some very interesting commentary indeed.

All this being said, it is a book well worth reading. It is a memoir and a record of times gone by. And it would be an excellent take-off point for class discussion as a text, something that would entice students to read deeper reports

BOOK REVIEWS

on Japanese society such as those of John Nathan, Tom Rohlen, and John Dower, among others. The line drawings from Hokusai's prints are charming introductions to each chapter, larger fortunately in the new edition, as they should be. Perhaps one of the biggest attractions of the book is its concern with identity. Here we share common ground with the author.

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

ANTHROPOLOGY OF JAPAN IN JAPAN (AJJ)

Comments and photos about the 2007 AJJ Spring Workshop in Miyazaki can be found on the AJJ website: http://www.ajj-online.net/Site/Welcome_to_AJJ.html

Call for Papers

AJJ 10th Annual Conference

Temple University, Japan Campus, Minami-Azabu, Tokyo

Institute of Contemporary Japanese Studies (ICJS)

17-18 November 2007

Theme: 'Powers, Identities and Relationships in Contemporary Japan.'

Identities and relationships in contemporary Japan, whether personal or professional, are negotiated vis-a-vis authoritarian structures and institutions of power. Individual choices of friends, family, professions and lifestyles are constantly reshaped by changing political realities, social movements and a flux of images that shape self-perception under the gaze of global media. Changes in the concept of the self as well as new forms of societal organization reflect complexities of power and new forms of acceptable behavior that govern our modes of identity.

The most recent example can be seen in the diffusion of a new discourse regarding individuality into the Japanese ideology and the attempts to adopt the concept in a way that would fit the Japanese sense of self. Still within its formation, different conceptions of individuality are evolving, and the social/political reactions surrounding it are attempting to make sense of individual modes of identity and their relations to mediating institutions, political ideology and social control.

Power can be exercised and consciously manipulated through institutions that acquire specialized knowledge and have the ability to influence the existing discourses, according to Foucault; it can be seen as a constantly changing project of a self that is aware and self-reflexive, as Giddens understands it; or it can be a product of society that is beyond the control and awareness of the individual, according to Judith Butler. In other words, the discourses of power can be

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

accepted, resisted, challenged and even changed by the subject position and the relationships.

The 2007 AJJ conference invites papers, poster presentations and panel proposals that offer ethnographically based critical discussions of the intersections of power in the ongoing construction of identities and negotiation of relationships in contemporary Japanese culture and society.

The conference is open to papers on issues in related fields of studies, and encourages debate on different practices and performances that may be complexly located in the spaces of the past, present and future, and of the intimate, the local, and the (trans)national. Papers and discussion can be in English or in Japanese.

Proposals should be submitted to Mary Reisel: reisel@tuj.ac.jp. The deadline for submission of papers and panels is September 1st, 2007 [Editors' note: it's worth trying after this date too!]. For further details: AJJ: <http://www.ajj-online.net/>

The Institute of Contemporary Japanese Studies: <http://www.tuj.ac.jp/icjs>
Contact: icjs@tuj.ac.jp, reisel@tuj.ac.jp

GERMAN ASSOCIATION FOR SOCIAL SCIENCE RESEARCH ON JAPAN (VSJF)

Report on Annual Conference, Hamburg, 10-12 November 2006

**Social Science Matters:
Inquiries into the current state of social sciences in Japan**

Wolfram Manzenreiter

The question "What significance do social sciences bear for politics, economy, science and society in Japan?" was the main focus at the 19th annual meeting of the German Association for Social Science Research on Japan, organised by Wolfram Manzenreiter (University of Vienna) and Iris Wieczorek (GIGA Institute of Asian Studies). Fourteen guest speakers from Germany, Britain, France, Japan and Austria analysed selected aspects of the Japanese scientific systems and contributed to find answers to such questions as: What is the definition of excellence when speaking about social sciences? How can scientific

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

quality standards be established, demanded and supervised? What roles do international science networks and transnational standards play, such as the Social Science Citation Index, the practice of peer review, and the institutionalization of Centres of Excellence? Which interest groups in- and outside the scientific community influence the channelling of support for research activities? What is the relationship between science and politics, science and economics, and science and the media?

The main convention commenced with speeches given by representatives of the partner institutions, including Corinna Nienstedt and VSJF chairman Klaus Vollmer, as well as the event organisers. Wolfram Manzenreiter and Iris Wieczorek initially illustrated the topical background and called on all lecturers to comment on the specific conditions regarding the construction of social scientific knowledge in Japan. Underlining the impact of pressure on social sciences in Japan, the organisers demanded more than a mere reflection on scientific theories. They argued that owing to internal differentiation, political transition, the internationalisation of education and labour markets, the structures of supply and demand for social science knowledge have been largely changed in Japan.

Keynote speaker of the event was **Roger Goodman** of the Nissan Institute, University of Oxford. In his lecture *"The 'Big Bang' in Japanese higher education and its effects on teaching, research and administration"* he presented a dramatic image of numerous smaller, lower-level private universities and their prospects of survival. They are especially influenced by the challenges of demographic change and the growing significance of market imperatives. According to Goodman, these effects will lead to some kind of market cleansing that, in the long run, will improve the selection criteria, application procedures, the overall quality of the student body, teaching didactics and other institutional practices in the Japanese educative sector. Goodman's lecture was succeeded by six topical sections presented over the three days of the conference. The first section, *Defining the Agenda: Social Sciences Research Fields*, featured a number of presentations discussing the postwar development of sociology, economics, political sciences, and cultural studies which are some of the most important sub-disciplines within social sciences. In his lecture *"People, problems, perspectives: the development of sociology in postwar Japan"* **Sepp Linhart** (University of Vienna) raised the question of whether sociology in Japan will share a similar fate to that of the USA and in Europe, seeing as it has also lost much of its former glory. His analysis of "people, problems and perspectives" gave an overview of the development of sociology, depicting it as an anti-colonialist self-preservation

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

void of feminisation. Irrespective of the apparent lack of exceptional female sociologists as figures of public interest, Japanese sociology still benefited from the “end of history”. Unlike the discipline in the West, sociology in Japan did not face a crisis after the collapse of socialism, and created a stronger cohesive nature instead of surrendering to general disorientation. Such external influences also played crucial roles in economics and political sciences, of which the development was commented on by both **Werner Pascha** (University Duisburg-Essen) and **Katō Tetsurō** (Hitotsubashi University, Tokyo). The downfall of Marxist economic research was, in equal proportion, the result of institutional circumstances in Japan and developments of the discipline on the international level. Pascha furthermore argued that the international binding of economics contributed significantly more to the transformation of the academic field with very different outcomes, however, as far as various different actors and institutions are concerned. Due to the dominance of modelling economic traditions, Japanese economists obtained a certain respect in abstract economy rather than in applied economy, yet having said that, more practical economists have recently become increasingly involved in the political work of Japanese cabinets.

In political sciences Katō observed that American positivism has emerged as the winner from the competition between Marxist and post-modern theoretical systems. Katō linked the ideological and methodological consequences of this disciplinary shift with criticism of the business management parameters that lie behind the reform of Japan’s university system and the Internet’s growing significance for academic work.

In the last lecture of this first section, **Fabian Schäfer** (University of Leipzig) analysed the reception in Japan of cultural studies, which has become widely accepted in interdisciplinary research over the past few years. Thus, the transdisciplinary project not only initiated a new critical assessment of traditional concepts such as identity, race, gender and ethnicity, it also encouraged young researchers to employ cultural studies as a starting point for criticism of conservative currents in politics, economics and society. Practicing “re-articulation” of *karu-charu stadiizu*, these researchers also participate in fundamental debates on the Western form of thought.

The second section was entitled *Academic Markets and Networks in Japan and beyond*. Firstly, **Verena Blechinger-Talcott** (Free University Berlin) investigated the matter of how and to what extent networks in social sciences (particularly in political sciences) can exert influence on political relations between the USA and Japan. She analysed the objectives, principles and the scope of the most

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

prominent academic exchange programs in social sciences and subsequently followed the career paths of former participants. Her presentation showed that academic exchange programs in social sciences have a lasting impact on elite perception and thus on the foreign political discourse of both countries. **Arnaud Nanta** (L'Ecole Des Hautes Etudes en Sciences Sociales, Paris) focused on the circumstances which were responsible for turning the myth of homogeneity of the Japanese people into an element of hegemonic discourse in Japanese anthropology after 1945. In his presentation on "*Networks, schools and topics of Japanese postwar anthropology*", the historian related this paradigm shift back to the new order of the academic community after the collapse of the colonial empire. Supporters of the 'uniqueness' theory used key moments in Japanese anthropology to their advantage and hence were able to control the direction of the discourse.

Section three, *Social Sciences in (best) practice*, started with **Bruce White** (Dōshisha University, Kyoto). In his lecture on "*Social science at work: ethnographic notes from a sociology department*" he presented preliminary results of in-depth interviews and participatory observations carried out at a well-known private Japanese university. The main questions of his study were: which ideas, attitudes and future visions motivate professors in contemporary Japan to establish networks. The answers of the interviewees showed that personal wishes and goals are important, as well as achieving social rights like political participation: socialist ideas of how society should be, pessimistic visions of a world in which sociological knowledge will lose importance, and the idea that the definition of Japanese culture itself is in need of reconstruction were mentioned. In his presentation "*System, anti-system, and beyond: (social) scientists and politics in Japan*" **Robert Triendl** (Transnational Research, Inc., Vienna and Tokyo) portrayed the diversity of linkages between organisations and culture, and between science and policy. He argued that the interaction between sciences and politics in its entire empirical richness provides a fertile ground to historically locate the evolution of a "civil society" in Japan. In Japan, the influence social sciences have on the political discourse is merely indirect and manifests itself only after a long period of time. Nonetheless, Triendl showed that throughout the past decade even in Japan links between the administrative and the academic (social scientific) world have increased.

The fourth section, *Social Sciences and Public Knowledge*, dealt with the relationship between social sciences and public knowledge. Both lecturers on this subject aimed at examining the processes of how scientific knowledge is transferred into society and discussed their implications for the

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

conceptualization and perception of reality. **Robert Horres** (Eberhard-Karls-University Tübingen) analysed the role political sciences have within the bioethical debate and showed that in Japan research in this field can be at best described as deficient. Taking into account that developments in biotechnology jeopardise theories of fundamental democratic principles, political sciences have the responsibility – in order to establish a national and international consensus –, to join the general discussion which is at present dominated by doctors, lawyers and philosophers. The second paper in this section, by **David Chiavacci** (Free University Berlin), asked why the image of an egalitarian middle class society was widely perceived in Japan in spite of contradictory evidence from social research. It seems that the construction of models of social reality is probably more influenced by public discourses and living conditions rather than by social sciences. Hence, the present re-emersion of the definition of class differences in Japanese society is largely a result of the discrepancy between subjective expectations and an existing model of society, rather than based on empirically measurable changes.

Section five featured three presentations discussing the topic *Pursuing Excellence*. The lecture “*Centres of excellence and definitions of good science in Japan*” by **Nagano Hiroshi** (JST, Tokyo) evaluated the significance of Centres of Excellence (COE) in the field of natural sciences. RIKEN appears to be a role model for a successful COE, since the research institute has a record for having employed many of Japan’s most respected natural scientists. According to Okunishi Takashi (Kobe University), however, these centres were founded to promote excellence in natural sciences. Merely copying structures and processes would have had negative effects on social sciences. Economics, for instance, lost its original goals – to control and manage the economy – at the time when economists developed more interest in publishing articles in (American) refereed journals. As a consequence, the researchers’ individual needs are contrasting with society’s interests in research and science. The focus on specific projects suppresses the diversity of topics which have been individually developed; young scientists get only the chance for temporary employment. At the same time Okunishi made the point that there exists a massive lack of competence in research management and multidimensional evaluation procedures.

In the last presentation, **Yonezawa Akiyoshi** (NIAD-UE, Tokyo) took a closer look at the interplay of quality assessment and social sciences at Japanese universities. Like keynote speaker Roger Goodman, Yonezawa referred to the reforms in 2004 which for the first time required external, independent evaluation of research and teaching as prerequisite for accreditation procedures

CONFERENCE REPORTS AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

at universities. Yonezawa emphasized his hope for positive change that could be triggered by COE projects and good practice initiatives in education programs. Positive changes would imply greater transparency, reflection on institutional objectives, more student-centred learning styles and systematisation of research activities. Yet currently there is a high demand for social science expertise in the reform process of academia, due to inadequate instruments for measuring quality, underdeveloped evaluation catalogues and the risk of leaving the structural reform of the higher education system in Japan to market forces.

A panel discussing the question *“Do social sciences really matter?”*, and *“for whom, when and under which circumstances”* concluded the conference. The discussion referred back to the main aspects of the conference, namely research quality, relevance and conditions of knowledge production. Christian Kirchner (Humboldt University) chaired the final discussion of the panel. The panelists were Harald Conrad (DIJ Tokyo and Friedrich-Ebert Foundation), Jörn Dosch (University of Leeds), Heinrich Kreft (Planning staff of the Parliamentary Group CDU/CSU), Hiromi Sato (Japan Foundation) and Katō Tetsurō (Hitotsubashi University). Each of the five panelists gave a five minute statement in which they expressed their view about the importance of social sciences, and outlined their expectations towards other groups. In a second round the panellists commented on the results of the respective lectures. This was followed by a general discussion with the audience.

Further information on the conference, its speakers, and photos are available at the conference website at www.vsjf.net.

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

Please submit membership information in electronic form, preferably as an email attachment, using the template of the Membership Information form available on the JAWS website, to Lynne Nakano (lynnenakano@cuhk.edu.hk). Submitting electronically reduces work for the Newsletter editors considerably.

JAWS URL: www.asiainstitute.unimelb.edu.au/programs/japanese/jaws.html

NEW MEMBERS**ALISON ALEX**

Email: allison.alex@yale.edu

ERICA BAFFELLI

Email: erica.baffelli@otago.ac.nz

ALYNE E. DELANEY

Email: ad@ifm.dk

ANNE METTE FISHER-NIELSEN

Email: annemettefn@hotmail.com

REBECCA FUKUZAWA

Email: fukuzawa@k.hosei.ac.jp

JERMAINE GORDON

Email: ranma_chan4@hotmail.com

FABIO GYGI

Email: fabio_gygi@yahoo.com

ISAO HAYASHI

Email: isaki@idc.minpaku.ac.jp

ANNE IMAMURA

Email: AnneEi@aol.com

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

MIKAKO IWATAKE

Email: mikako.iwatake@helsinki.fi

SIMEON JONES

Email: yarbooo@yahoo.com

ELIZABETH KENNEY

Email: elizabethkenney@runbox.com

EINAR YOHSUKE KOSAKA

Email: Taslehoff@gmail.com

WAKAKO KUSUMOTO

Email: w_kusumoto@ybb.ne.jp

NAOMI ICHIHARA ROKKUM

Email: naomiir@gmail.com

SHIHO SATO

Email: shiho.sato@nih.no

KENSUKE SHIMIZU

Email: kenshi@utu.fi

KAZUNORI SUNAGAWA

Email: gah03406@nifty.ne.jp

DAVIDE TORSELLO

Email: davide.torsello@unibg.it

MAO WADA

Email: 149193@soas.ac.uk

GAVIN H. WHITELAW

Email: gavin.whitelaw@yale.edu, whitelaw@post.harvard.edu

Post/University : PhD candidate, Dept of Anthropology, Yale University.

Address: 17 Kescayogansett Road, Orleans, MA 02653, USA.

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

Telephone: +1-774-722-2513

Research interests/projects: contemporary Japanese society, consumption, retail.

MEMBERS

PETER CAVE

Email: peter.cave@manchester.ac.uk

Post/University : Lecturer in Japanese Studies, School of Languages, Linguistics and Cultures, University of Manchester, Humanities Lime Grove Building, Oxford Road, Manchester M13 9PL, UK

ROGER GOODMAN

Email: roger.goodman@nissan.ox.ac.uk

Post/University: Nissan Professor of Modern Japanese Studies, Univ of Oxford

Address: Univ of Oxford, 27 Winchester Rd., Oxford OX2 7RG, UK

Telephone/Fax: +44-1865-274576

Research interests/projects: Japanese higher education reform

Fieldwork: Kansai 2003-4

Recent/major publications:

Single-authored books:

2006: *Nihon no Jidouyogo: Jidouyogogaku e no Shoutai* (translated by Tsuzaki Tetsuo), Akashi Shoten, Tokyo. (A revised and abridged Japanese version of the book below)

2000: *Children of the Japanese State: The Changing Role of Child Protection Institutions in Contemporary Japan*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.

Edited books:

2007: Goodman, Roger and Harper, Sarah (eds), *Ageing in Asia: Asia's Position in the New Global Demography* (Routledge: London)

2005: Eades, Jerry, Goodman, Roger and Hada, Yumiko (eds.), *The 'Big Bang' in Japanese Higher Education: The 2004 Reforms and the Dynamics of Change* (Transpacific Press, Melbourne).

2003:

- Goodman, Roger, Peach, Ceri, Takenaka Ayumi and White, Paul (eds.), *Global Japan: The Experience of Japan's New Minorities and Overseas Communities* (RoutledgeCurzon, London).

- Iwasaki Nobuhiro, Ceri Peach, Miyajima Takashi, Roger Goodman and Yui Kiyomitsu, (eds.), *Kaigai ni okeru Nihonjin, Nihon no naka no Gaikokujin (Japanese Overseas and Foreigners in Japan)* (Shōwadō, Kyoto).

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

- Goodman, Roger and Phillips, David (eds.), *Can the Japanese Reform Their Education System?* (Oxford Studies in Comparative Education) (Oxford: Symposium Books). (Paperback)

2002: Goodman, Roger, (ed.), *Family and Social Policy in Japan: Anthropological Approaches* (Cambridge, Cambridge University Press).

Selected articles:

2007:

- 'Understanding University Reform in Japan through the Social Science Prism', in *Learning and Teaching in the Social Sciences*, Vol. 4, No. 1, 2007.

- 'The Concept of *Kokusaika* and Japanese Educational Reform', in *Globalization, Societies and Education* (special issue edited by Ka-Ho Mok and Akiyoshi Yonezawa), Vol. 5, No. 1: 71-87, March 2007.

2006:

- 'Thoughts on the relationship between anthropological theory, methods and the study of Japanese society', pp. 22-30 in Joy Hendry and Dixon Wong (eds.), *Dismantling the East-West Dichotomy: Views from Japanese Anthropology* (Routledge, London).

- 'Policing the Japanese Family' in Rebick, Mark and Takenaka, Ayumi (eds.), pp. 147-60 in *The Changing Japanese Family* (Routledge, London and New York)

2005: 'Making Majority Culture', pp. 59-72 in Jennifer Robertson (ed.), *A Companion to the Anthropology of Japan* (Blackwell Publishing Ltd.).

BRIAN McVEIGH

Email: bmcveigh@email.arizona.edu ; mcveighyuen@comcast.net

Post/University: Department of East Asian Studies, University of Arizona

Address: Learning Services Building, 1512 E. First Street, Rm 124, Tucson, AZ 85721-0105, USA

Telephone/Fax: 520-621-5476 (Office), 520-882-5958 (Home)

Research interests/projects: Emergence and history of psychology and social sciences in Japan; nationalism

Recent/major publications: *The State Bearing Gifts: Deception and Disaffection in Japanese Higher Education* (2006).

ANDREA MOLLE

Email: amolle@nanzan-u.ac.jp; andrea.molle@unimi.it

Post/University: JSPS post-doc Fellow – Nanzan Institute for Religion and Culture, Nanzan Daigaku

UPDATES TO THE REGISTER OF MEMBERS

Address: 18 Yamazato-chō, Shōwa-ku, Nagoya-shi, 466-8673, Japan

Telephone/Fax: (+81) 052 832 3110

Research interests/projects: JSPS Fellowship Research project (current project).

Spirituality as bridge-category to unite different worlds: the case of Japanese New Religions and Budō.

Recent/major publications:

- Molle, A. (2007) "Spiritualità da una galassia lontana lontana: il Jediismo come Nuovo Movimento Religioso", *Antrocom. Online Journal of Anthropology*, Vol. 3 n° 1/2007, pp. 13 – 19.
- Molle, A. (2006) "L'internazionalizzazione dei nuovi movimenti religiosi giapponesi: problemi e strategie analitiche", *Working Papers*, Department of Social and Political Sciences, University of Milan.
[http://www.sociol.unimi.it/papers/2006-05-10_Andrea%20Molle.pdf].
- Barone, C. and A. Molle (2006) "Così vicini, così lontani: i percorsi di adattamento delle tradizioni buddhiste alla religiosità italiana in Soka Gakkai e Sukyo Mahikari", in F. Squarcini & M. Sernesi (eds.) *Il buddhismo contemporaneo. Rappresentazioni, istituzioni, modernità*, pp. 163 – 186. Firenze: Società Editrice Fiorentina.
- Molle, A. (2006) "Più spirituale che religiosa. L'identità multipla nel caso di Sūkyō Mahikari", *Religioni e Società*, n° 55/2006, pp. 59 – 66.

Reviews:

- Molle, A. (2007) "Nanzan Guide to Japanese Religions", *Religioni e Società*, n° 57/2007.
- Molle, A. (2006) "Ritual Practice In Modern Japan: Ordering Place, People, And Action", *Religioni e Società*, n° 56/2006.
- Molle, A. (2006) "Practically Religious: Worldly Benefits and the Common Religion of Japan", *Religioni e Società*, n° 55/2006.

KIRSTEN REFSING

E-mail: kre@hum.ku.dk

Post/University: Dean, Faculty of Arts, University of Copenhagen

Address: Njalsgade 80, DK-2300 Copenhagen, Denmark