

Introduction: Globalization, Localization, and Japanese Studies in the Asia-Pacific Region

Volume 1

James C. BAXTER

The essays in this volume grapple with the phenomena that have been labeled globalization and localization. Written by scholars who specialize in various fields of research on Japan, they reflect, directly or indirectly, how the experience of the events and forces emblemized by the terms globalization and localization has affected Japan and the Asia-Pacific region (where our authors live and work). They also offer clues for understanding how this experience has influenced the way Japanese studies are conducted and perceived in the region.

The term “globalization” came into widespread use in the 1990s, although it can be found in the literature of marketing as early as 1983,¹ and it has antecedents in the notion of “globalism,” which has been in circulation much longer. It denotes a protean concept, “a process, a condition, a system, a force, and an age,” as Manfred B. Steger has put it.² In contemporary parlance, Jan Aart Scholte has observed, globalization is used to convey four general conceptions that overlap and complement each other, namely internationalization, liberalization, universalization, and planetarization.³ Economic historian Jeffrey G. Williamson identifies two important features of the late twentieth century as characteristic of (economic) globalization: high-volume flow of capital and labor across national frontiers and booming commodity trade, and he observes that these were accompanied by “an impressive convergence in living standards, at least within most of what we would now call the OECD club.”⁴ Definitions of globalization describe it as the diffusion of people, capital, goods, information, and ideas across regions and continents, a process accompanied by an increasing degree of interdependence and integration between economies. Frequently globalization is understood to imply the flow of information and patterns from the West to the rest of the world—to be a synonym for Westernization or Americanization. Historical sociologist Sonoda Hidehiro warned us to be aware the hegemony of the point of view of the northern hemisphere in much of the discourse about globalization, remarking that this discourse primarily takes place in and involves participants from the northern hemisphere; he suspected that insufficiently examined assumptions about the economic and cultural “leadership” of advanced Western nations get

1 Theodore Levitt, “The Globalization of Markets,” *Harvard Business Review*, May–June 1983. Levitt, a professor at the Harvard Business School, is sometimes credited with coining the term “globalization,” but earlier occurrences (as early as 1945) have been identified. A recognized authority on marketing and for some years editor of the *Harvard Business Review*, Levitt may have been responsible for popularization of the term in business circles.

2 Manfred B. Steger, *Globalization: A Very Short Introduction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2003).

3 Jan Aart Scholte, “Globalization,” in *Encyclopedia of Globalization*, ed. Roland Robertson and Jan Aart Scholte, vol. 2 (New York and London: Routledge, 2007), p. 527.

4 Jeffrey G. Williamson, “Globalization, Convergence, and History,” *Journal of Economic History* 56:2 (1996), p. 277. Williamson observes that these two features characterized the late nineteenth century as well.

in the way of analytical understanding of the phenomenon.⁵ Regional experience suggests that while many modern societies seem to be trending in the same direction, toward convergence on patterns of existence that some observers believe are “universal,” at the same time differences rooted in local cultural particularities cause significant variation in the pace and degree of convergence. This variation has been labeled “glocalization,” although this term has not been as widely accepted by academic writers as “globalization” (nor has it been legitimized by inclusion in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*).⁶ Roland Robertson used the word “glocalization” in several articles in the mid-1990s to denote the local adaptation of material and cultural products that come from outside, which is one common and important aspect of globalization.⁷ Robertson, a sociologist, remarks that he drew on a Japanese marketing term in formulating his understanding of glocalization; the word *dochakuka* (to indigenize) “draws attention to the simple proposition that every idea coming from outside into a context has to be adaptable to that context.”⁸ Glocalization—this process of adaptation to particular circumstances—transforms globalization, he argues, compromising ideas and products that were “previously thought of as homogenizingly triumphant and standardizing.”⁹

In these pages, for the most part, the authors do not explicitly engage the theoretical discussion about globalization and localization, but rather they deal with concrete examples of interactions between cultures (or simply between Japan and other societies and/or nations in the Asia-Pacific region). Awareness of the notions of globalization and localization, however, informs the authors’ thinking at many points.

The first three essays in these pages offer broad reflections on the concepts of globalization, regional identity and interest, and nationalism, particularly cultural nationalism. In his chapter, Roy Starrs, a specialist on modern Japanese literature, observes the emergence of a “nostalgic cultural nationalism” in Japan in the 1990s and early twenty-first century, in the years since the collapse of the economic bubble. Does this cultural nationalism, which prides itself on what others have called Japan’s “soft power,” represent the wave of the future, Starrs asks, or is it “the last gasp of a dying old-world order”? Rien Segers, whose own research ranges from comparative literature to comparative politics, proposes that the contemporaneous advance of globalization and localization is a kind of paradox, and that while that paradox is visible in many countries, the quantity and quality of its representation are “much more manifest in Japan than anywhere else.” This has

5 Sonoda Hidehiro, “A View from the North,” keynote address (“kickoff speech”) 10 November 2003 at the symposium “Globalization, Localization, and Japanese Studies in the Asia-Pacific Region: Past, Present, and Future” co-organized by the International Research Center for Japanese Studies and the School of European, Asian and Middle Eastern Languages and Studies of the University of Sydney, at the Union Conference Center, University of Sydney.

6 There are several articles on globalism and globalization in the *International Encyclopedia of the Social and Behavioral Sciences*, ed. Neil J. Smelser and Paul B. Baltes (Amsterdam and New York: Elsevier, 2001), 26 vols., but there is no entry for “glocalization.”

7 Roland Robertson, “Globalisation or Glocalisation?,” in *Journal of International Communication* 1:1 (1994), pp. 33–52, and Robertson, “Glocalization: Time-Space and Homogeneity-Heterogeneity,” in *Global Modernities*, ed. Mike Featherstone, et al. (London: Sage, 1995), pp. 25–44.

8 Roland Robertson, “Glocalization,” in *Encyclopedia of Globalization*, ed. Roland Robertson and Jan Aart Scholte, vol. 2 (New York and London: Routledge, 2007), p. 546.

9 *Ibid.*, p. 547.

given rise to a quest for cultural identity, and different visions of cultural identity, within Japan. Outside Japan, he maintains, “common perspectives” for interpreting and evaluating Japan are “inadequate.” Suzuki Sadami 鈴木貞美, a scholar of modern Japanese literature and intellectual history, remarks that recently new theories have been advanced regarding the relations among multiculturalism, nation-state building, and literature. With respect to Japan, many of these theories are confused, he argues, largely because they fail to account for particular features of Japanese cultural history. As a corrective, he offers new guidelines for inclusion of concepts of culture, political thought, concepts of and writing about history, and deep and wide consideration of literature.

The next seven essays in this book provide historical perspectives on the phenomena of globalization and localization. Six of those deal with the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, but the first, by Edwina Palmer, looks at relations among cultures and societies in the Asia-Pacific region in prehistoric times, giving us an instance of what we might regard as premodern localization. A specialist in early Japanese literature and mythology, she brings together evidence from archaeology and mythology to support the theory of northward migration and influence on Jōmon culture of people from Sundaland—a continent in the area that today is Southeast Asia that was largely submerged as the sea level rose at the end of the last Ice Age. Her interpretation is stimulated by the work of Stephen Oppenheimer (*Out of Eden*) as well as Sasaki Kōmei 佐々木高明 and other Japanese scholars.

Pankaj Mohan, whose specialization is Korean literature but who originally comes from India, reevaluates the effort of the Nobel Prize-winning Indian poet and philosopher Rabindranath Tagore to mediate cultural and philosophical exchange between India and Japan. Early in the twentieth century, Tagore collaborated with Okakura Tenshin 岡倉天心 and Noguchi Yonejirō 野口米次郎. After World War I, with Okakura gone (he died in 1913) and Noguchi identifying more and more with nationalist trends in Japan, Tagore felt “severe strain” in his relations with Japan. Mohan describes him as feeling that Japan was disillusioned with its Buddhist past and accommodating of “modernity in the image of the imperial West.” Tagore might be representative of a cultural leader who resisted the globalizing forces of his day.

The years between the World Wars are the subject of the essay by Ken McNeil, a historian of Japan-New Zealand relations. McNeil assesses the impact of visits to Australasia by Japanese Imperial Navy training ships. Not merely exercises in seamanship and naval discipline, training voyages became “temporary embassies” in the port cities where they called. Precisely because there was little contact between Japan and the Australasia region in this period, the Japanese naval officers’ calls in regional ports were of great importance in forming national perceptions of each other. As Japan’s imperial expansion raised worries among Westerners in the region, the visiting naval officers found themselves in the position of having to compete against “threatening representations” of their homeland.

Another scholar who focuses on regional relationships and stresses the importance of the early phase of what we now call globalization is anthropologist and folklorist Komatsu Kazuhiko 小松和彦. Here he reevaluates Japan’s encounter with the Nan’yō (South Seas) through an examination of the life of Mori Koben 森小弁. After observing that it was not until about 1877 that Japanese began to view the Nan’yō as real—as not belonging wholly

to the realm of imagination—Komatsu illustrates the image of Japanese formed by people of Palau, on the one hand, and images of the Nan'yō formed by Japanese, on the other. His review takes in the activities of “swashbuckler” adventurers, Japanese government circles, and a small Japanese trading company in Micronesia; it traces the entry into Truk society as a merchant by one key figure (Mori), and chronicles his change of attitude and marriage with a local woman of Truk.

Japan's social welfare policies in the interwar years are historian Elise Tipton's topic in this volume. She frames her analysis in terms of the globalization and localization that are our common theme. Noting that the aim of central government and subnational entities in Japan in the 1920s was “to introduce ‘modern’ social policies that were in keeping with trends in the West, yet would remain essentially Japanese,” she makes clear that Japanese were aware of global trends and felt challenged to improve standards to keep up, but deliberately chose to stress what they perceived to be distinctively Japanese.

Beatrice Trefalt, another specialist in modern (especially postwar) Japanese history, has probed deeply into the repatriation of more than six million Japanese who were overseas at the end of World War II. This too is a regional story—an example of regionalism in the context of developing globalism. Assimilating and integrating these former soldiers and civilians, men and women, many of whom had planned to remain overseas as emigrants, posed many problems for Japan. In Western writing up to now, however, this story has been largely overlooked, in contrast to U.S.-Japanese relations, which have gotten much attention. Trefalt argues that understanding the experience of life overseas and repatriation is important to gaining an appreciation of Japan's early postwar relationships with its neighbors.

The final eight essays in this book fit under the rubric of cultural dynamics. Chihiro Kinoshita Thomson is involved in teaching the Japanese language in Australia, and here she discusses the contribution Australia has made to global Japanese language education—a contribution that might be regarded as accidental, or almost unintentional. What she draws attention to is that more and more students have come to Australia from abroad, especially from other Asian countries, in recent years, and many of them have taken advantage of good programs of instruction in Japanese. She argues that Australian education is capable of challenging the monolithic view of Japanese language and culture that prevails in many Japanese classrooms.

In her chapter, Nanette Gottlieb, who has written extensively on developments in Japanese language in the modern era and also thought carefully about language education, considers the impact of the Internet, a globalizing medium, on the globalization of the Japanese language. She wonders what would make it possible for the Japanese language to become “a player in global terms” on the Internet, given that it has been a strictly local language.

Christopher Pokarier notes that recent writing about Japan's “gross national cool” and “soft power” and the globalization of Japanese cultural products have stimulated new interest in Japanese studies. Much of this writing is, however, methodologically weak, in his opinion. Pokarier, a student of marketing, proposes a research agenda for reevaluating soft power. He suggests that the methods of the study of microeconomics and marketing

be applied as they have been in some investigations of national media businesses.

Alison Tokita, whose research ranges across the fields of premodern literature and musicology, reflects in these pages on the past and future of the Australia-Japan relationship in the context of a rapidly globalizing Asia. She identifies a couple of troubling circumstances: a “residual mistrust towards Japan” among Australians, and an absence of interest in Australia on the part of Japanese. Given similarities in these two established democracies, and given that Australia has developed Japanese language education more than any other Western nation, it is somewhat puzzling that relationships between the two countries are not closer. It is a reality in the world of universities in the post-Cold War era that area studies come to be regarded as irrelevant, and this, unfortunately, affects the status of Japanese studies in Australia.

Emphasizing localized distinctiveness rather than globalized convergence, anthropologist Matthew Allen examines issues of cultural identity in Hawaii and the implications of Okinawan immigrants’ resistance to being categorized as “Asian American.” Although most of the forty-thousand people of Okinawan descent who live in Hawaii do not speak *uchinaguchi* (Okinawa dialect), nevertheless they have maintained a strong sense of distinctiveness, not only from other Asians but also from “Japanese” residents. Among young people a hybridized Hawaiian Okinawan identity is emerging.

Linguist Osada Toshiki 長田俊樹 reports on the change of name an academic association and offers his interpretation of the meaning of the change. Globalization and regional sensitivities in the context of globalization, he makes clear, were highly salient factors. In January 2003, the society of scholars specializing in Japanese linguistics that had been known as the “Kokugo Gakkai” voted by a 2-to-1 margin to rename itself the “Nihongo Gakkai,” with the change to take effect in 2004, the sixtieth anniversary of the society. To a significant extent, the decision represented a reaction to external pressure. Many foreign students, mainly from Asian countries, have enrolled at Japanese universities since the 1990s, and have pointed out that to them the term “Kokugo” means, for example, the Korean language or the Chinese language. Insistence on identification of “Kokugo” with the Japanese language came to be seen as ultraconservative, even imperialist, in a globalized society. The association’s name-change parallels that of many Japanese universities, which have changed department names containing the word “Kokugo” to names that include “Nihongo.”

The next essay marks a shift of attention from academic culture to popular culture. I Ketut Surajaya wrote his doctoral dissertation at Hitotsubashi University on Yoshino Sakuzō 吉野作造, but in recent years he has been investigating the reception of Japanese popular culture in his home country, Indonesia. He reports here on his field research in six major cities, in which he surveyed Indonesian students on their reading of Japanese manga and assessed the impact of that act of consumption on their awareness of Japanese popular culture. He is interested also in how Japanese popular culture has influenced the students. Many respondents reported that their reading of manga had inspired them to choose Japanese language as their major field of university study. Surajaya’s research illuminates the dynamic of reception of outside (globalizing) patterns and localization of those patterns.

Gender issues are widely regarded as urgent in globalizing societies, and they are of great interest to scholars who wish to grasp the significance of globalization and localization. In his chapter, musicologist Hugh de Ferranti explores an aspect of Japanese cultural history and queries its implications for theorization of gender issues in other performance traditions. He examines music performed by females and discusses the role of these women in musical life in Japan. In medieval and early modern times, only males were permitted to perform the *Heike* narrative tales (*katarimono*) that constituted the core repertoire of the *biwa*—a repertoire that was privileged by official recognition of guilds for *biwa* musicians. Those guilds were exclusively for men. No direct documentary evidence of women performing *katarimono* to *biwa* accompaniment exists, but there is indirect evidence. Music and performance were acceptable professions for women, de Ferranti observes, but carried with them low status and marginality. Yet at the same time, for women of high birth or rank—non-professionals—skilled performance on string instruments was highly valued as a pastime.