

Compact-Disc No. 3

Lecture 9

Prof. Sharon TRAWEEK

”Margaret Mead and Ethnological Approaches to War and Peace”

Prof. Deguchi: Shall we move on to the next presenter? Dr. Sharon Traweek, who is from UCLA, will make a presentation on Margaret Mead. Please notice the quotation written on the board.

Prof. Traweek: Thank you very much.

Anthropological Knowledge about War:

Margaret Mead, Gregory Bateson, and Emiko Onuki-Tierney

I. Knowledge Making in Anthropology

A. Assumptions and Context

First, I want to make a few remarks about knowledge making in anthropology. Perhaps it is obvious, but it needs stating again, that the context of our research matters. There are many dangers in any kind of research when we do not identify our own assumptions. All of us doing research on peace and war must think very carefully about our assumptions, our own beliefs (personally, culturally, socially) about human nature, violence, peace, and

war. As researchers we need to think about our personal assumptions, clarify them, specify them, and discuss whether or not they are going to be a part of our research. One of the biggest mistakes in social science research is not doing this first step. Of course, it also is a danger when we search only for what we want to find, or we develop research methods to find what we want to find, or we analyze data for what we want to find, or we receive research funding for what our society wants to find. Actually, many of us are passionate about our research, and we care deeply about what we are studying, and we do want to find something. That is normal. Most of us, because we are participating in this group meeting at Sokendai, have shown that we know how to get funding or support for the kind of research that we do. Our society is sponsoring institutions like *Sokendai* and our access to them. I am not saying that we can or should avoid these resources, but we must be conscious of how these resources might affect our research. This is true for all researchers, but when we are working on ideas about society, it is especially important. We always must examine our cultural and social assumptions.

Every society has ideas about "common sense" and "human nature" that we are taught from the time we are babies. Clifford Geertz, an American cultural anthropologist, said that we can identify common sense by "the maddening air of certainty which it is always uttered." For example, my mother still tells me how to behave, and she has that "maddening air of certainty" about what she thinks is proper for women. That is an example of "common sense." As social science researchers studying various forms of social action, we must think about what is common sense in our societies. We also must think about how we ourselves understand, enact, and perform automatically these ideas of common sense and human nature. Then we must conduct research to investigate that "common sense" knowledge.

Some interesting research has been done in Finland and the United States examining undergraduate students' assumptions about human nature. Students were asked if they thought violence were a part of human nature. According to the researchers, if the students agreed with that statement, they also did not want to work for peace. The researchers found a very strong correlation. It is an example of how assumptions about human nature can sharply affect our ideas and our willingness to act on certain ideas. It was very interesting finding what the students from higher social class

backgrounds attending very good liberal arts colleges in the United States were more likely to believe that violence was part of human nature. The students at more working class colleges were less likely to believe that violence was part of human nature.

There is another aspect to the context of research, especially in anthropology. As a research field anthropology emerged historically along with colonialism. That fact is introduced as part of graduate education in anthropology. When I was graduate school during the 1970's, I learned the history of anthropology as a part of colonialism. We examined studies in anthropology to see how the colonial context had shaped findings in anthropology. We have to realize so much of the anthropology has conducted not only in colonial situations but also in imperial and military situations.

British and European studies of Africa by anthropologists were funded very clearly in colonial settings with funding from colonial administrators wanting to know how to intervene effectively in the local cultures. They wanted to know how to administer the local cultures effectively, whom to speak with to gain effective action with the local cultures. The studies of Africa were done mostly by European anthropologists, most studies of Latin America were done by anthropologists from the United States, most studies of India were done by anthropologists from England, and most studies of Southeast Asia and Oceania were done by from anthropologists from all over Europe and North America. That is, most anthropological researches would not have been conducted without colonialism, imperialism, and various military activities. We have to be conscious of that fact; to be unconscious of it or to ignore it is intellectually silly. We must think about how of those conditions might have affected research.

We also have to think about internal colonialism. Today we also were hearing about how nation states do not always protect their citizens, and how nation states sometimes even attack their own citizens in various ways. They can attack people physically or attack people's cultures. Many national governments have undermined the cultures of indigenous peoples, including the Aborigines in Australia, Native Americans in the United States, and Ainu in Japan. Such government actions were often drastic.

We must think about government research during wartime, too. The Office

backgrounds attending very good liberal arts colleges in the United States were more likely to believe that violence was part of human nature. The students at more working class colleges were less likely to believe that violence was part of human nature.

There is another aspect to the context of research, especially in anthropology. As a research field anthropology emerged historically along with colonialism. That fact is introduced as part of graduate education in anthropology. When I was graduate school during the 1970's, I learned the history of anthropology as a part of colonialism. We examined studies in anthropology to see how the colonial context had shaped findings in anthropology. We have to realize so much of the anthropology has conducted not only in colonial situations but also in imperial and military situations.

British and European studies of Africa by anthropologists were funded very clearly in colonial settings with funding from colonial administrators wanting to know how to intervene effectively in the local cultures. They wanted to know how to administer the local cultures effectively, whom to speak with to gain effective action with the local cultures. The studies of Africa were done mostly by European anthropologists, most studies of Latin America were done by anthropologists from the United States, most studies of India were done by anthropologists from England, and most studies of Southeast Asia and Oceania were done by from anthropologists from all over Europe and North America. That is, most anthropological researches would not have been conducted without colonialism, imperialism, and various military activities. We have to be conscious of that fact; to be unconscious of it or to ignore it is intellectually silly. We must think about how of those conditions might have affected research.

We also have to think about internal colonialism. Today we also were hearing about how nation states do not always protect their citizens, and how nation states sometimes even attack their own citizens in various ways. They can attack people physically or attack people's cultures. Many national governments have undermined the cultures of indigenous peoples, including the Aborigines in Australia, Native Americans in the United States, and Ainu in Japan. Such government actions were often drastic.

We must think about government research during wartime, too. The Office

of Strategic Services [OSS], formed during World War II, became the CIA after the War. The OSS had many intellectuals and academics working in the intelligence service, including anthropologists such as Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson (my own teacher). We have to think about how that kind of service affected their research. The idea of "just war" that Deguchi-san has presented is very important for understanding their motivation. Most of the U.S. intellectuals participating in the OSS during the war at the time thought that they were in a just war and they were not only allowed, but also morally required to use their knowledge to help defeat the enemies and use their knowledge in anyway possible. There also were many American social scientists working in Japan during the allied occupation, and a great deal of knowledge was gained through that practice. There are large moral issues in knowledge-making about society and the application of that knowledge.

I mentioned that because this book called War now being circulated in the room was written by anthropologists based upon a workshop held during the Vietnam war. Many of the workshop participants had done research for the military during World War II, believing it was a just war. Many researchers asked to work on the Vietnam War had serious conflicts about whether that was a just war. There were many anthropologists working on Southeast Asia trying to help both sides decide which of the hill tribes in Southeast Asia could be induced to work for which side in that conflict. Just before I started graduate school there was a large debate about this within the field of anthropology.

There is another part of my research I am not going to discuss today but briefly I want to mention it. Before World War II American universities were not strong. "The best and the brightest" American undergraduates wanted to go to Europe to graduate school, and hopefully to get a permanent job there. After World War II American universities start to become strong. The universities do not become strong in the traditional forms of knowledge. American universities start developing new forms of knowledge that first emerged during the war and during the occupation period. The returning researchers enter into the universities and start new fields of inquiries and new departments. Now those people are mostly in 80's and some of them have died, of course. They launched whole new fields of inquiry, whole new approaches, and they have helped to build the American info-

structure for knowledge making when it had been weak. These knowledge makers during the World War II had a huge influence on the subsequent 50 years of American universities. We are just beginning to write the histories of this period. We do know that the history of knowledge making in the twentieth century, including social science, was profoundly shaped by knowledge making during World War II.

We also must include the "Cold War" in this discussion. One of my colleagues, David Kaiser has studied the physics department at the University of California at Berkeley during the cold war. At that time there was a huge pressure to increase the production nationwide of physicists and that led to pressure to reduce the time in graduate school to five years. Even the theoretical physicists who would not assign problems solvable within five years were not being promoted. They were being discouraged from staying in the university. They were being fired. These faculty, even those doing basic research, not applied research, had to be identifying so-called "do-able" problems. There was a tremendous focus on pragmatic studies during this period in the American academy.

B. Range of Anthropological Studies

During the last 75 years anthropology has become a very complex array of activities. Now anthropology is composed of 4 to 6 subfields: physical anthropology, archeology, biological anthropology, linguistic anthropology, and socio-cultural anthropology. The first three are rather well known to the people in this room, from the study of human origins and human biology to the study of artifacts once used by humans. You may know that linguistic anthropologists, along with linguistic sociologists, study the practice of communication in everyday life, including topics such as trade languages. For example, "international English" is now a kind of trade language for exchanging ideas; more people now speak international English as a second language than native speakers of English.

Here I want to mention some differences between social and cultural anthropology because it affects Japanese and American research on the anthropology of war and violence. Generally speaking, social anthropology is practiced primarily in Japan, the United Kingdom, and its Commonwealth countries. The focus is on studies of kinship, social structure, division of

labor, decision-making, and dispute resolution. That kind of information is very useful for governments, including colonial administrations. Not surprisingly, historically, social anthropology develops first, and remains very strong. Cultural anthropology then develops in the United States during the 1920s; Margaret Mead is among the founders of the field. In cultural anthropology the focus is on so called symbolic communication. How we understand and make meaning together. This includes the strategies we use to motivate each other, our discursive strategies, our belief systems, our knowledge systems, as well as how all these are related to each other. It also includes our beliefs about the stages of life. Every culture includes beliefs about the normal stages of life; people come to believe in and enact these stages. These beliefs and practices also change over time. For example, we can study the invention of childhood and the invention of adolescence. These beliefs and practices concerning certain stages of life definitely came into existence at a certain historical moments in certain places. We also study how knowledge is transmitted during every stage of life.

How do we transmit knowledge including the transmission of the knowledge about ordinary activities like teaching graduate students, participating in a workshop, or giving a talk at a workshop, and so forth. Does a university teach the next president how to be president? If not, how does the next president learn? The transmission or lack of it is a very important issue in every culture. Those American researchers entering universities after World War II, starting new fields of inquiry, were not taught by other people. They learned and developed the knowledge but they did not inherit anything. They created whole new infrastructures for knowledge making and whole new disciplines. Eventually, it became very difficult for them to pass their resources onto the next generation because they did not inherit. Sometimes innovators do not know how to transmit knowledge.

These are the topics studied by cultural anthropologists. This very brief introduction to anthropology provides a context for understanding what Margaret Mead and other cultural anthropologists such as Gregory Bateson and Emiko Onuki-Tierney have had to say about war and violence since World War II.

II. Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson on War

A. Margaret Mead on the invention of war

Margaret Mead developed an interdisciplinary research collaboration to advise the U.S. government during World War II. Getting an interdisciplinary team together to work on policy matters was something that she very much wanted to after the war. The workshop on war she organized is one example. Mead is known developing many aspects of anthropology; one is this idea "applied" anthropology. She also became what we call now a public intellectual through all her public and applied anthropology activities. She became extremely well known in the United States and perhaps the best known anthropologist in the world. She felt it was her responsibility to try to create peace. She wanted to explain to the public, first of all, about the diversity of cultures. Our own way of doing things, our own common sense, and our own views of human nature are just that, ours; all other groups have theirs, too. She emphasized that this cultural diversity is actually a human resource. Our understanding of this is the beginning of learning how to get along with each other. That was the message she wanted to teach through her public activities as an anthropologist.

Deguchi-san said that I would present a definition of war from Margaret Mead, and I wrote it on the board: "Groups engage in purposeful, organized, and socially sanctioned combat involved in killing each other." In that book she explains why she generates this definition. She wants to include wars socially sanctioned by nation states, but also violence by groups that might be engaging in terrorism for example, or even gangs trying to kill other gang's members. Her emphasis is on socially sanctioned violence, sanctioned by their group, not by the group being attacked. She wants to use this definition because then she wants to make two very important points. First, the capacity for violence is not the same as the capacity for war. Secondly, war is invented at specific time and specific cultures, and it is far from being universal.

Some societies that do practice war at certain time stop practicing war, and vice versa. Some societies that never engage in war and some do. This is finding has been confirmed many times over. In her career as a public intellectual she worked to distribute this fact as widely as possible. She

said that if war is an invention, then we as intelligent creatures can figure out how to invent the alternative. She did not even want to say peace because she said peace presupposes the idea of war. She very carefully said that we need to create processes of dispute resolution. Kurokawa-san spoke earlier to our group about various models of dispute resolution and Deguchi-san discussed the emergence of trans-national civil society (non-governmental organizations and intergovernmental organizations). Both explored how we can resolve disputes, how we make decisions together, and how we can resolve disputes without violence, especially that kind of violence called war.

During World War II Mead's research group at Columbia University studied both allies and enemies. They studied Japan, Germany, England, France, the U.S., and so on. They wanted to continue this research after the War, and they thought the regional focus was very important. This research was funded as a part of legislation called the National Defense Education Act (NDEA). Interdisciplinary "area studies" groups emerged at American universities all through the 50's and become very powerful centers for research and graduate education, especially in African, Latin American, South Asian, Southeastern Asian, Northeast Asian, Eastern European, and Soviet studies. Graduate students in those area studies fields got NDEA funding for their graduate education, including language studies. (Excellent language programs were developed with NDEA funding.) However, during the Vietnam war many students began to refuse that funding. Alternative funding did not emerge in its place. To study or conduct research on any other culture in the world besides the United States without NDEA funding was very difficult. I, myself, was in such a "double bind."

The Institute for Intercultural Studies (IIS) was established by Margaret Mead during World War II. (At their webpage you can get many of the articles by Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, her husband.) This organization is now headed by Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson's daughter, Mary Katherine Bateson, also an anthropologist. William Beeman, an anthropologist at Brown University and a specialist on Iranian culture, has been writing introductions to Mead's works being republished by IIS. He argues that Mead's work is crucial for understanding our current situation in the United States. He also claims that Mead is very important for how we can teach anthropology and how we conduct research in anthropology

now.

B. Gregory Bateson on positive feedback loops and war

Margaret Mead's third husband was Gregory Bateson; after they divorced, they remained friends and continued collaborating throughout their lives. Bateson's father, William Bateson, was a founder in the field of modern genetics, and he re-discovered Gregor Mendel's studies. Gregory Bateson's early education was in biology, and eventually he became a very active contributor to the development of cybernetics and systems theory with Norbert Wiener and Warren MacCulloch. Bateson was very interested in the idea of steady states (including positive and negative feedback loops) in cultures, and in developing the concept of ethos for cultural studies. Cultural anthropology is usually taught through a small set of excellent ethnographies; even 75 years after *Naven* was first written, Bateson's ethnography of a group in highland New Guinea is still on that list. He also made fundamental theoretical and methodological innovations in pathological psychology, including addiction, schizophrenia, and group therapy. He also made major contributions to the study of animal behavior, communication, and play, as well as the use of film in studies of social interactions. Bateson had an unusual career and it was quite exciting to study with him.

What did Bateson have to say about war? He thought that war was a kind of positive feedback loop in which each side was escalating what the other side was doing. He was very interested in how to intervene in that kind of feedback loop or positive re-enforcement. He also described physical addictions as positive feedback loops and he analyzed pathological interactions in families as positive feedback loops. In such loops there is nothing that deescalates or stabilizes the situation. He described a certain set of cultural practices in highland New Guinea in the same terms. When he went with Margaret Mead to do collaborative research he identified Bali as having a steady state culture. He then argued that there are all kinds of ways to intervene in the escalation of some process. He became very interested in how some societies have many strategies for deescalating some kind of positive feedback loop, but some societies seem to have none, except war or partition. Bateson and Mead then tried to identify these processes to achieve steady state or deescalate or defuse an escalating situation. Bateson thought that systems theory provided some good ideas about this.

Now, those of you familiar with systems theory can say that this is a failed promise of systems theory. Nonetheless, it gives us some interesting ideas about how to think about violence and war, as positive feedback loops without any stabilizing or deescalating features.

III. Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney on war: manipulating cultural symbols

To give you an idea of how cultural anthropologists look at war now I want to discuss the work of Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney. (I am circulating a copy of her book on the *Tokkotai* - the World War II "kamikaze" pilots.) In all her work she has examined symbolic communication; in particular, she studies various symbols from Japanese culture. First of all, she conducts a cultural history of that symbol and how it acquired a central place in Japanese cultural aesthetics (the sense of beauty and form). Most cultural anthropologists argue that every society has key symbols. We might say that in the U.S. automobiles are key symbols; in Japan certainly cherry blossoms are key symbols. In her earlier work Ohnuki-Tierney has also looked at the image of monkeys in Japanese culture, as well as various images of illness and wellness. In her recent work she is looking at cherry blossoms. She examines how this image mutates and takes on another form during the period of authoritarian government in Japan. That government manipulated the symbol of cherry blossoms and used that to recruit the sensibilities of young people for war.

Emiko Ohnuki-Tierney has studied of the diaries of *Tokkotai*. These young men were almost all from universities, some of them the best universities in Japan. They were very widely read, multi-lingual, and intellectually sophisticated. In their diaries they were explaining their ideas, their hopes, their dreams, and why they are becoming *Tokkotai*. Ohnuki-Tierney studied their language and found that a new idea about cherry blossom had become a central metaphor for them to explain to themselves and to each other why they were becoming *Tokkotai*. This is not book about how the government creates propaganda; this is a study of how an idea goes into the hearts and in minds of the best young people and how these ideas change their minds. Ohnuki-Tierney has provided a very interesting account of extraordinarily intelligent and sensitive young people through their many diaries.

Ohnuki-Tierney analyzes a poem by Saijo Yasu that became a popular song during the 1930s; she shows that the language changed to a much masculine kind of Japanese. The beginning of the poem was "*kimi to boku wa*," but in the popular song it becomes "*kisama to ore*." It is much gutsier talk. Ohnuki-Tierney gives many examples like that.

She argues that there is an important distinction between nationalism and patriotism. She connects patriotism to the idea of protection: protecting friends, family, ideas; she associates nationalism with the protection of a specific leadership group. These young people believe that they are protecting their families and protecting their country. Listening to Armed Forces Radio in Japan I heard the words protect and protection over and over again. That is how young American soldiers are talking now. Clearly, these young American soldiers believe they are protecting freedom, liberty, democracy, their families, and America.

When we feel the urge to protect and care for others (called altruism in the study of human/animal behavior), there are psychological or physiological forces at work. Interestingly, altruism is part of this language of participation in war for both *Tokkotai* and contemporary American soldiers. Perhaps these ideas are important for terrorists and gang members, too. I have been quite intrigued and startled by this aspect of Ohnuki-Tierney's work.

In cultural anthropology and cultural history we study "subjectivity": how does the subject, the person, come to feel and want to do what is valued in the society, or to participate in what is valued in society. Ohnuki-Tierney's work on the *Tokkotai* is getting much attention in anthropology around the world right now in part because she is developing the cultural study of subjectivity in new and important ways.

Her work also is receiving much attention from many kinds of readers because we all want to understand why so many scientists, engineers, and other highly educated people seem to be participating in terrorism. How can we understand their idealism, and how their idealism invoked in terrorism?

When we think about motivations for war and terrorism, we usually think about violence motivating people. However, if we think the motivation is idealism and the desire to protect, we would engage in a very different kind of analysis. Like Margaret Mead and Gregory Bateson, Ohnuki-Tierney also wants to know how we can disengage the part of the social system that supports war and terrorism. She asserts that we need to understand powerful cultural symbols and how they get transformed and exploited during certain kinds of regimes.

IV. Conclusions

There are several ways in which cultural anthropology can contribute to our understanding of war, terrorism, and violence. In addition to the lines of inquired I discussed in my talk, I want to mention five more themes in current anthropological research that could be useful for this collaboration:

1. Studies on decision making and dispute resolution.
2. Studies on meaning and expressive culture in during war, occupation, revolution.
3. Studies of what is being called "everyday violence": not some kind of eventful violence, in the form of what we might call war.
4. Studies exploring Bateson's and Roy Rappaport's early work on ecology and meaning: the ways we simultaneously alter our environment and make meanings.
5. Following Bateson's and other's pioneering work on animal behavior, we should study Craig Packer's work on cooperation, Anne Pusey's work on social roles among primates and lions, Richard Wrangham's work on nutrition, and Adrian Zihlman's effort to look at anatomy and behavior. Consider too the anthropology of science study on brain research by Joseph Dumit. I think some of their contributions might be useful to the deliberations of this group.

During my talk I have circulated an outline of this talk, a bibliography, and a list of related URLs. Unfortunately, these lists, as well as those I discussed more fully in my talk, is very American centered. I can only offer this excuse: that is where I come from. I think that it would be very useful to have anthropologists from other parts of the world also speak to this

issue. That would be another way to enlarge the collaboration. I thank you.

V. Discussion

Dr. Sugawara: I have one question to ask. I've been visiting Hawaii for long time and in 1960's, whenever I go to the beach, I used to watch lots of Samoans spending all the days dancing, beating drums, do nothing other than these, and I ... people, but apparently, after Margaret Mead studies, I heard that those people are not exactly peaceful people. You mentioned there are 30 communities which stopped practicing war or even communities would never experienced war. Can you gave us some examples?

Prof. Traweek: Well, that book edited by Margaret Mead and called "War" is filled with all these examples. I think one of the most immediate examples of countries choosing not to participate in war is Japan. Obviously during the Tokugawa period in Japan, some parts of Japanese society were perfectly aware of all kinds of military technologies that they chose not to use, including guns. Some would say that the Tokugawa government enforced their monopoly on violence. By monopolizing violence, they also could control the armament race. They could even choose to completely suppress certain forms of weapons, such as guns. So I think Tokugawa is a very interesting case.

To return to the Samoan case; Mead used the Samoans often as an example of a non- violent society. During the early 80's, a book was published by the Harvard University Press by Derek Freeman in which he wrote for the public audience. Freeman said that Margaret Mead's findings on Samoa were wrong, and that, indeed, there was violence between young men and young women in Samoa. This was not news to the anthropological research community.

Mead had done her research on Samoa in the 30's and over the subsequent 50 years, all kinds of modifications and revisions of her work had been done. Derek Freeman made a big case of this in his book, suggesting that these revisions were new, which they were not. Why did he do this? He was not addressing anthropologists because we all knew about the revisions. Free-

man was addressing the public audience that Margaret Mead has created. In my talk I mentioned that she had, especially in the second half of her life, focused very much on being a public intellectual in order to transmit some ideas about war and peace; she achieved a huge audience. Derek Freeman, an Australian, was rather unknown, both as an anthropologist and as a public intellectual. He was able to achieve an amazing notoriety for himself very quickly by publishing the book attacking Mead.

What did he accomplish by this in addition to enhancing his own notoriety? During the late 70's, early 80's there was a lot of public discussion about gender roles in the U.K., Australia, Canada, the United States. With the publication of his book on Mead Freeman gained himself a position in that public debate. Why did Harvard University Press publish the book? At the end of the Vietnam war, many, many university presses in the United States lost their funding from the universities. So-called subventions to support academic research declined rapidly and Harvard's press was one of the first to become a more commercial press. It began to depend on a public audience; it very deliberately sought books that would generate a large audience in order to support the rest of the press. So, there are many forces at work in Freeman's effort to repudiate Mead's work on violence and gender.

What lasted in Mead's work was the idea of studying cultural variation in the stages of life. She developed the study of what are considered culturally significant stages of life, the meaning of physical maturity in different cultures, and how people enact, perform, engage, with "coming of age." That part of her work and designing studies to address questions like that has been a huge legacy of Mead's.

Audience member: Thank you for your talk. Early in your presentation, you mentioned that ...

Prof. Traweek: To answer second question first, cultural anthropology starts during the 1920's at Columbia University and Yale University with a specific set of interests in psychology, literary language, and the stages of life.

As for the second question concerning area studies: As I mentioned in

my talk people returning from World War II moved into US universities to create all kinds of inquiry. Those engaged in the occupation of Japan established area studies for Japanese studies. Others launched Chinese studies and Korean studies. These three areas become models for many kinds of area studies in the U.S. especially as the Korean War escalates. Some continued the kind of research that Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict had designed during World War II, during the Korean War the study of "culture at a distance" to investigate China and North Korea during the Cold War.

Those who had been part of the occupation forces in Japan did not only establish area studies; they also moved into studies of comparative government in political science and legal studies of constitution-building and democracy-building. You might be aware that lot of people trying to design democratic practices in Iraq after the war were explicitly using the model of the occupation of Japan, turning to that research on Japan. From the occupation of Japan there is a great deal of work in government studies, gender studies, studies of local government, and again, civil society. For example, unions are reactivated during the occupation. The occupation forces try to establish certain forms of civil society. So exactly, how all that was done then becomes a part of schools of public administration, political science, (and) international relations in the U.S.

Prof. Yukawa: One thing. I thought that an important in researching study peace and war is as you said, it gets dangerous in any kind of research. Among this, I thought another important thing is that how we open the result with public. Sometimes, this kind of research if you associate with public directly, then people may make the opinion to understand other way or wrong way, so it is important, I think, to ...

Prof. Traweek: So true. I think we also have to think about secret research that never gets disseminated. Especially in my country, we estimate that for 50 years between 1943 and the end of the Cold War, perhaps 50% of the research and the 50% of the funding and the 50% of the researchers were engaged in the secret research. That is very, very serious.

Concerning public audiences misunderstanding our work: Richard Wrangham's book published in 1996 (?) with the words "demonic males" (?) in the title got a huge amount of attention in the worldwide press. The

counter arguments did not get that kind of attention. So, what do we do about that as researchers? As we communicate with public what kind of responsibility do we have for transmitting our knowledge? Very catchy language captures imagination, but maybe it is misleading. This is one piece of a complex debate.

Ms. Davis: Thank you for your talk though. I always think it's very inspiring.

Prof. Traweek: She is a student I work with, so she has to say things like that.

Ms. Davis: ... I am wondering if you could address what is happening education now, I have an impression that government has been taking money away from area studies and perhaps different types of knowledge formation were being born or supported by the U.S. government, perhaps when competing groups that were funding research today, in for that matter, who might be funding these studies are in decision making and dispute resolution?

Prof. Traweek: That's a very good point. In the early 90's at the end of the Cold War the so-called "peace dividend" was discussed in the U.S. The US Social Science Research Council (an analog of the US National Science Foundation) is the primary distributor of area studies funding in the U.S. Some of us hoped that the area studies funding from the SSRC would get redistributed into different pathways, but, of course, many university-based researchers were very worried about that. A lot of workshops and conferences were held in the middle 1990s on this subject. First, I would say cynically that a lot of programs continue after having been renamed, which is, of course, a very old strategy in institutions of any kind. Institutions tend to want to survive and administrators and participants and staffs want to continue what they have been doing. During this transition in the administration in Japanese universities, too, there's a tremendous comfort level in just continuing.

An interesting force in American research, that, I think, is not so powerful yet in Japan, is the role of these private foundations. Deguchi-san was mentioning Ford Foundation earlier. Ford Foundation, Carnegie Founda-

tion, Sage Foundation, and many others have actually had a major role in funding research in the United States for much of the 20th centuries. They often fund research that is not yet routinized, not yet standardized. They usually fund research in the first generation of its design and establishment. Rockefeller Foundation was very active for example, in funding molecular biology during the 1930 ' s before it started being funded by the U.S. government. Once routine lines of inquiries are established, it can be easily evaluated. The government takes over that kind of research, but the first generation of innovative research in the U.S. is mostly financed by these private foundations. We see that happening again in the U.S. with what I would call new ways of studying the world.

In the U.S. part of this research is going under these names: world history, world studies, global studies, global-local studies, transnational, and trans-local studies. I tend not to like the word transnational because it presumes nations. Back to some of the points that Kurokawa-san was making, we want to study people and the way groups are organized without assuming nation states. That is similar to the point I made during my talk about the effect of assumptions in our research. So much of our social science research assumes nation states. I am not saying we should ignore them but we should not assume them. We should investigate why this form of organization emerged rather than others. That is also why the study of civil society, NGOs, and IGOs are so important right now. I think the formation of these new kinds of studies will causes us to think whole new kinds of questions if we do not define the research areas in terms of nation states. For example, do not study the United States alone; study certain practices that circulate through, beyond, and into the U.S., or Japan, and so forth. How do these practices circulate around the world? There's a man in my history department where I work at UCLA who studies the history of colonialism in the Philippines. His work is considered a bit strange because in history departments the specialties are named after nation states. Is my colleague a specialist in the Philippines, is he a specialist in the U.S., or is he a specialist in Spain? He actually studies the process that circulates through what we currently call the Philippines. Studying the ways important practices, like colonialism or science, circulate around the world is a better way to organize our research than by either area studies or national studies.