Discussion Paper No. 129

Global Area Studies and Fieldwork

By

Narifumi Maeda Tachimoto*

December   2004

Global Area Studies and Fieldwork

Contents

Area Studies: Sharing a Place

From Multidisciplinary to Integration

Area studies originated from multidisciplinary joint studies. Researchers of various disciplines gathered to study comprehensively a certain area as a unit by covering all the phenomena of the area, both natural and human. Such initiatives were aimed at the integration of individual achievements in each discipline, but such an effort is comparable only to a joint compilation of the topography of the area, and could not be developed into more than merely an encyclopedia on the area.

From such parallel collaborations, area studies evolved. A key figure may organize a multidisciplinary, joint research team to achieve a comprehensive outcome. Naturally, some disciplines play major roles while others have only supporting roles. The results were primarily the development of the leading disciplines.

Then, further advancement was made to realize a system wherein all the participants, leading and supporting, can equally enjoy the fruits of synergetic collaboration, making the studies more productive. Such efforts developed into the idea of area studies as an integrated science aimed at a trans-disciplinary panoramic integration while receiving multidisciplinary inputs when necessary, instead of an exhaustive coverage of all phenomena by one individual. The integration is not exhaustive but focused. In other words, each researcher is expected to draw his original image of the area.

The Framework for Integration

As the name implies, "Area Studies" can never be free from "an area." What defines an area unit, and what does it contain? There are a variety of defined area units ranging from geographical demarcation such as a community (or a local society), a state or province, a country, and larger regions ranging from areas such as East Asia, to regional unions such as the EU, to continents, and the Earth. As I have long been in an institution specializing in Southeast Asia, this represents my working definition of an area unit, and I believe there are about 15 other such areas on the globe. I also believe that global peace can be achieved if areas of this size organize themselves politically and economically while minimizing the functions of nations. (See *Kyouseino sisutemuwo*

motomete [*Towards the System of Coexistence*] by Narifumi Tachimoto.)

Nevertheless, the size of areas studied is not fixed. Spatiality or the size of an area is demarcated in many ways by a researcher according to his research objectives. A major need in area studies is to identify the most appropriate area size from a strategic point of view. No matter how important it may be to have a global perspective, a researcher cannot remove the framework of an area. Again, area studies can never be free from "an area."

After demarcating an area, a researcher needs to see the area comprehensively. I use a framework called socio-cultural ecodynamics which breaks down and comprehensively views phenomena of an area into three aspects: the ecological domain, the social domain, and the cultural domain. (See Figure 1) It is important to have a panoramic and focused view on these aspects rather than a wide and flat view. A panoramic and focused view is similar to that of a mandala, the map of Buddhist training. Figure 2 shows some of the possibilities of the mandala viewpoint. Of course, anything can be at the center, be it economy or politics, as long as it is in line with the research subject. As some Buddhist trainers achieve enlightenment by observing the mandala, a researcher may be able to achieve a trans-disciplinary outcome by examining an area with the help of the models shown.

From Chaos to Complex Order

There can be a variety of interdisciplinary methodologies. In particular, methodologies of integration need to be developed in area studies where the research subjects are already identified. I would like to advocate three methods: "burying oneself in," "roaming around," and "flying around," and would also like to recommend the KJ method developed by Mr. Jiro Kawakita for data organization. To put it simply, "study deep inside and wide outside."

When a researcher goes to an area for fieldwork, the first and foremost thing he has to do is to learn the skill of burying himself in the life of the area, to assimilate himself into the environment, as a *ninja* blends into his surroundings unseen. While doing so, the researcher deals with the field as a whole, and it is important for him to use a methodology that can expose the broad range of its background while still monitoring his focus. This method of "burying oneself in" may seem to have nothing to do with interdisciplinary research. Yet, the success or failure of interdisciplinary research

depends on researchers who can immediately bury themselves in any environment they are placed.

In "roaming around," a researcher strolls about, making comparisons. While an anthropologist makes a fixed-point observation, an ecologist must have a broader range of observation. In area studies, a researcher mixes these two approaches and travels around for site visits. Without the background of community research, he would not be able to appreciate the phenomena he observes no matter how widely he may travel. While it is important to ask local people about these phenomena, a fieldworker, who has expertise and is familiar with the local situation, is indispensable for a more correct understanding. If his research covers a wide area, the researcher needs to use a car. The group of people who adopted this style was once identified as "the Car Window School" of research. This style can be very effective if community and other researchers work together in combination.

In "flying around," a researcher makes a panoramic integration. But this cannot be achieved by only going up in the air and looking over the area from the sky. He will still need to "bury himself in" and "roam around." He needs the ability to know by analogy what life on the land is like even without seeing it fully with his naked eye.

In a rule-of-thumb discipline like area studies, it is important to think out how to sort the data. Each researcher could apply techniques used in his discipline, but I believe that the technique of sorting, classifying, and organizing knowledge and information according to the KJ method is most appropriate for area studies. (See *Hassouhou* [*How to get the idea*] by Jiro Kawakita)

From the Integration of the Humanities and Sciences to Panoramic Integrated Science

In order to create a new field of an integrated science, it is important to create a common ground for joint research. It is indispensable that researchers share experiences by working and living together and resonating with each other, face to face, in the location of their fieldwork. Sharing a place is the key to interdisciplinary research.

It is not the team but rather each individual member of the team that integrates the results generated in a place. A miscellany is often published as an achievement of interdisciplinary research, but such achievement should develop into a single piece of work as a design to show to show a totality by an individual member. The type of work

may be a map of an ecosystem, a geographical map, a theoretical model, a novel or a piece of music. The pieces of work produced by an individual member/members of the team are the achievement of integrated research that goes beyond multidisciplinary and comprehensive research.

Acknowledgement:

Global Area Studies

1. Why Area Studies?

Area studies is the study of a place identified as an area. We can claim ourselves "area" specialists only because an area-framing is recognized. While area studies is the study of an area, it is at the same time the act of watching the world from within and outside the area. Historically speaking, all disciplines can be considered to have originated to some extent from a kind of area studies in a broader sense.

Area studies in the modern age were generally started or conceived as foreign studies. Disciplines at home are guidelines for such foreign studies. Researchers comparatively observed foreign things from their own parochial perspectives. Exotic subject matters induced dilettantism and exoticism, leading to what is called orientalism. This stage of area studies showed humanistic orientations toward language, literature or history. Historically speaking, all disciplines can be considered to have originated to some extent from a kind of area studies or what may otherwise be called history/geography. As Bryce Wood said in 1968, "It may even be contended that political science and perhaps other social sciences were until very recently little more than parochial studies of an area limited to Western Europe and the United States, masquerading under a universal rubric." [Wood 1968:401]

After World II, especially in the United States, area studies developed as a kind of strategic study of foreign countries, involving collaboration and group research by scholars with various disciplinary backgrounds. It should be noted that the target area was a nation-state, often a state antagonistic or enigmatic to the USA. These may be called multidisciplinary area studies. At that time, social scientists engaging in area studies felt acutely the confrontation between other disciplines and area specialization, since they were considered inferior to general theorists. One solution was to find a compromise position such as that of Lucian Pye [1975]. Yet this position was tenuous and did not give much help to area specialists because disciplinary generalizations eventually won over area specialization in the framework of disciplines. The lack of funds to support area programs in the United States also invited the stagnation of area studies. It should be pointed out, however, that the blurring of disciplines has subsequently become an academic fashion or trend not necessarily in area studies but

also in cultural studies, gender studies, environmental studies, and so on.

A revival of area studies in the United States appears to be gaining momentum recently, concentrating again on language, history or culture, but emphasizing crossing boundaries [Ford Foundation]. In this connection, we should take note of this aspect of area studies as a part of a colonial or hegemonic endeavor which poses an ethical issue. US anthropologists are aware of the proposed changes to Title VI Funding for area studies.

In contrast to the United States, the promotion of area studies in Japan as a trans-disciplinary project has emerged in Southeast Asian studies, at first spearheaded by the Center for Southeast Asian Studies of Kyoto University.

Trans-disciplinary area studies is trying to develop its own field of study as one which cannot be covered by established disciplines. Against the fragmentation of sciences, trans-disciplinary area studies tackles problematics requiring an inter-disciplinary approach and attempts to overcome the inadequacies of the nation-state. In Japan, this trans-disciplinary area studies has been institutionalized as a higher degree course in area studies, i.e., a major in a specific area, a minor in a discipline. This type of area studies gravitates toward an integrated study, taking a holistic approach towards an area as a unit.

2. Issues on Methodologies

a. Spatial unit

Next, the problem becomes what kind of an area unit is conceivable, whether relevant to or inherent in integrated area studies. In other words, it is a boundary problem. The term *area* is commonly used as the most inclusive generic term for a portion of the earth's surface. It is conceived of as any arbitrarily, or even randomly, chosen segment of the earth's surface, in contrast to "place," "region," or "space," with no specified character other than internal continuity and contiguity among its sub-areas. But in "area studies," the term implies in practice a certain part of the world, often one country or state, where interdisciplinary programs of training or research have been established. Although an area presumably has some degree of internal cultural, economic, or political homogeneity, or institutional identity, the term "region" has not been widely used in place of "area," partly because a regional concept denotes a special way of thinking about area that often evolves its own "regionalism" [Ginsburg 1968:399].

In claiming that we engage in area studies not as disciplinary specialists but as area specialists per se, we assert the validity of "area" as a meaningful framework for analysis. Otherwise we need not call our endeavors "area studies." It is apparent that the term "area" is situated between "space," as a boundless three-dimensional expanse, and "region," which has a distinctive homology or identity like a typical nation-state. The concept of area can be conceived as one of an unbounded but distinctive entity. It is not purely an ontological entity, nor a physical space, but an epistemological or relational entity. Boundaries are produced out of relationships or family-resemblances. It is " a communication community based on new kinds of belonging" [Gerald Delanty 2003]. In order to ascertain a new meaning for the concept of area, we propose to call this areal unit a "unit-world.""World" implies the universe or all that exists. Its connotation is wholeness, completeness, everythingness, however relativistic or protean it may be. The English word "world" derives from a Germanic root meaning "age of man." The Chinese *shì-jìe* (   ), which Japanese has also adopted, has the same components of time and the state of human existence. It is not simply a physical, spatial concept, but a spatial entity with histories, i.e., temporally sedimented memories. We do not suppose any clear-cut boundary, whatever the area unit is. Like the configuration of cultural forms, the "area" could be conceived as fractally sloped and polythetically overlapping in its coverage of terrestrial space [cf. Appadurai 1996:46].

The concept of areal unit or unit area has always been a hotbed of controversy without yielding any concrete definition. The spatial entity is an areal unit with a relativistic wholeness, which, in actuality, man has to demarcate out of the chains of beings. Whose demarcation should be regarded as authentic? Perhaps we can strategically define the unit as seen from an institutional identity, self-identity and external identity as proposed by the Slavic studies group[Hokkaido COE project on the Slavic world].

An areal unit can be constituted as one of several concentric layers of a circle or class: a domicile place, a community, a region, a state, a geographical area, a continent, or the globe itself. (See Fig. 3.)

Classification, except by genealogy or descent, could involve either uni-dimensional, clear-cut division by index or typological division by family-resemblance. So applying a certain denominator for division, for example, geographic and ecological features or cultural traits can demarcate it. The unit-world is not itself a space: an ideal-typical

model applicable to the total phenomena in the area demarcates it. It is a structure in the sense of Fernand Braudel, a process in the sense of Anthony Giddens' structuration and an artificial frame at the same time. As such, it can be described as a theoretical or utopian frame based on its structure and formation process.

Let's take the area concept of Southeast Asia as an example. (See Fig. 4, Fig. 5, Fig. 6 and Fig. 7)

The boundary of the Southeast Asian unit-world is protean [<Proteus], but its prototype can be found in the maritime world, which is a dominant and particular ecological feature of Southeast Asia. In this world, tropical rainforests and the sea restrain socio-cultural eco-dynamics. These restraints affect the selection of habitat, subsistence, occupation, and way of life in general, so that a certain type of habitus emerges. As a forest-edge animal, man selected the seashore or strand area as his proto-habitat or ecological niche, relying heavily on fishing, hunting, gathering, shifting cultivation, or exchange and trade.

Social relations consist of radical pairing or dyadic equilibrium [Maeda 1975], emphasizing a pair relationship in every activity to cope with the harsh environment for man and forming not a rigid group with strict membership but rather a fuzzy, flexible circle of people. The limits and restricted locations of resources forced people always to move around to seek resources in gathering, hunting, and fishing and to barter and trade forest or marine products for necessities. Even agricultural activities required shifting systems of cultivation; thus we can call them mobile polybians [Kerney 1996]. Dispersion of people was normative and commoditization for exchange was a necessity.

In these circumstances, it was difficult for systemic domination over a large territory to appear, and, if it did, it was ephemeral. Instead of long-endured domination, short-lived charismatic leadership fitted the diasporic situation with ample supplies of water, mobile population, and resources.

Thus, the prototype of maritime Southeast Asia can be summarized as consisting of the diasporic type of settlement, commoditization or commercialization, and with flexible networking type of social relations which bonded together aggregations of people mostly by means of charismatic leadership. This could be the legacy of the proto-Austronesian maritime culture [cf. the Nusantao hypothesis of Wilhem G. Solheim II].

Within this category of the unit-world or "Space Nusantara," we can include insular

Southeast Asia as well as riverine, deltaic and coastal regions of continental Southeast Asia. The core or prototype of the maritime world is the Malay world, not in an ethnic sense but in a wider linguistic sense comprising the Malayo-Polynesian family, as well as in the sense of coastal people, including Myanmars, Thais, Khmers, Chams, Kins and others who live in the deltaic plains of the Eurasian continent.

It is true that Southeast Asia as a whole does not have systemic integrity like China. In that sense it may be termed as a networking society or an aggregation of networking societies. But we would argue that Southeast Asia is also a unit-world deriving its uniqueness based on eco-identity, especially maritime Southeast Asia and its periphery. This is not to claim that there is an integral force in Southeast Asia. It is not a centric kind of unit-world like China. Implicit organizing principles link together various sub-units by the analogy of family-resemblance, and as a whole they can be treated as a unit. Several recent endeavors to demarcate boundaries of historical maritime networks include those of James Warren [1981], Denys Lombard [1990] and Yajima [1993]. (See Fig. 8, Fig. 9, and Fig. 10.)

ASEAN is an example of an artificial framework, with the potential to become a regional system, and a hope to become a security community [cf. Acharya 2001; Alagappa 2003].

b. The contents/objects of studies

Area studies would be a multidisciplinary endeavor as topics of area studies often fall in domains where the conceptual and methodological apparatus of particular disciplines are least relevant [Lambert 1991:191]. Lambert assumes that "the core of area studies in the social sciences lies in the nontechnical, frequently nondisciplinary end of the discipline" [ibid.: 192]. We would disagree with him in that whatever area studies may be, it is free from, or transcends, the limits of any discipline. Thus, we propose socio-cultural eco-dynamics as an example of a holistic approach. (See Fig. 1)

The unit-world consists of three domains: ecological, social, and cultural. The ecological domain is studies by the "ecology" of the environment, nature, artifacts, population or behavior. The social domain is studies by "sociology" of power, institution, polity, market or agency. The cultural domain involves studies on the "symbology" of logic, meaning, information, language, arts, etc. Eco-identity is a unifying theme overarching the three domains.

The unit-world is primordially definable in terms of ecological environment, with socio-cultural forces modifying it. The ecological environment is composed of not only physical environments (i.e., habitat, landscape), but also technological products and human agency. Human nature is part of the ecological environment and one of its agents, not the sole agent, in the environment that works on the unit-world as a system.

As indicators for the social domain, we look at social institutions for the allocation of power, which are encoded in role and collectivity. Socialization institutions, such as family, community, education systems, or even social welfare for delinquents, indoctrinate members to adapt to social forces. Remote-control institutions are called political and economic systems, but the emphasis is on indirect appropriation and manipulation. Since urban problems and colonialism are crucial in considering Southeast Asian situations, parasite institutions are distinguished from remote-control institutions. The *communitas* is usually regarded as an anti-structure, and thus not a social institution. But the communitas, structured differently from a normative structure, should be taken into consideration in the analysis of the social domain.

The cultural domain is often called a system of meaning. Here we take up symbols as vehicles of meaning in order to concretize analysis [Geertz 1973]. This domain, like the other domains, can be conceived in various ways. Here we may divide it into three: symbols or mediums used in exchange or for communication, such as language, signs or money; marshaling symbols, which command people's perception, such as world view, ideology and science; and symbols for expression and representation, as in the various arts.

Our thinking is quite eclectic, but more ecological in its broadest sense. We are interested in the interactions, selection, and succession of the three domains within a unit-world. And these require dynamics or eco-dynamics to explain them. There is a hierarchy of contexts within contexts. At the core there is the habitus defined by body, mind, and language. Then comes the interrelationship of culture, social relations, and habitus restrained in the ecological environment. In the broader context, descent through modification may transform the unit-world through the uncoupling of "system" and "life-world" in the sense of Jurgen Habermas, differentiation and hypertrophy of some parts of the domains, reception of other civilizations, globalization, and so on. Based on the socio-cultural eco-dynamics, an historical structure emerges out of the local history of a unit-world.

The socio-cultural eco-dynamics can also take a system-environment approach à la Niklas Luhmann.

In short, our target of area studies is to draw a mandala of the unit-world, using available holistic approaches.

c. Discipline/training/ethics

Area studies naturally need, together with data collection and data analysis, the process of synthesizing obtained results. Methodologies of existing fields of science, or combinations of them, may work to a certain extent for data collection and data analysis. It is often noted that area studies in its incipient stage had only emphasized the acquisition of needed languages, comprehensive understanding of the history and culture of target areas, and collection of materials through fieldwork, rather than proposing methodologies specific to it. Each researcher was left to adopt a methodology according to the discipline in which she/he was trained. As a result, the view that area studies was not an independent field of science, and that it only provides a forum or arena for joint studies, was not deniable. But the development of area studies on its own, with the accumulation of achievement which is not attributable to a specific discipline, now requires us to build reflectively on the specific methodologies cultivated, without being evaluated, in actual fieldwork situations.

We, in this sense, should take a "grounded" theory as the basic strategy for area studies [Glaser and Straus 1967]. Also, a critical (disciplined configurative) analysis as proposed by Chalmers Johnson [in Pye 1975:93] would be essential. We could start by applying or borrowing appropriate disciplinary methods. But the following methods should have central parts in chorographic but theory-producing endeavors: fieldwork, case study, network analysis, and system analysis, which consist of analyses of budget, context and content. A landscape approach is needed to grasp a unit ecologically and integrally, but this would require an essentially intuitive, perspectival ability to construct images based on chorographic and descriptive techniques. Another technique of fieldwork is to read the phenomena or landscapes as a text. The text can be interpreted through content analysis, context analysis and budget analysis.

We recommend to you "village-intensive observations together with area-extensive surveys" under the slogan, "think relationally, act uniquely." Thinking relationally requires seeking for connections, and acting uniquely could be based upon seeing

first-hand with your own eyes [cf. Gingerrich & Fox 2002].

In the final analysis, area studies is a design science based upon an on-the-spot technique and a synthetic perspective:

        (1) on the spot technique: "grounded" theory

        (2) an area-framing in the context of contemporary world architecture/design

        (3) synthetic science: *global ecosophy*

d. Inter-areal comparison

Globalization calls for global area studies in the double sense. Globality has two meanings: one is "relating to the whole world, or worldwide;" another is "relating to or including the whole of something" [The New Pocket Oxford Dictionary]. Global area studies in the latter sense is a socio-cultural eco-dynamics of unit-areas. Global area studies in the former sense requires study of an area in the context of the whole world or a study of world-area relations, necessarily demanding comparative studies of unit-areas. By admitting various styles of comparative studies, area studies provides a holocultural comparison between regions/areas based on lifelines, core institutions, history or transformation.

It is arguable what kind of society would be ideal in the coming world of modern global societies. Appadurai [2002] proposed an elementary framework of five dimensions to explore global cultural flow in the disjunctive order of today's global interaction: ethnoscapes, mediascapes, technoscapes, financescapes, and ideoscapes. The common suffix, -scape, is used to indicate first of all that these are not objectively-given relations which look the same from every angle of vision, but rather that they are deeply perspectival constructs, inflected very much by the historical, linguistic and political settings or situatedness of different sorts of actors. This reasoning for the use of "-scape" seems convincing: these landscapes can offer only an analytical tool, but they may not be enough to constitute an "imagined world," so they become an appropriate agency in place of ethnos, nation-state, or regionalism.

The concept of Southeast Asia as a unit-world could be a u-topia, a false construction in a verbal vacuum, or an a-topia, bereft of concrete space, leaving only the social vacuum [Elden et al. 2003]. Still we need this concept just like the idea of community as an ideology or utopia.

Our argument is that a centric society with a strong center and a periphery like China

could be reevaluated in terms of a network society with predicative logic in its constitution. In this sense, the prototype of the Space Nusantara or the maritime Malay world as a unit-world could offer an alternative paradigm for the global world.

A critical point is the coexistence of strong, centric unit-worlds and a weak, vinculum unit-world. The earth should not be covered by hegemonic globalization, but rather we need a network or heterarchical globalization. Following Gerald Delanty, who argues that contemporary community is essentially a communication community based on new kinds of belonging, I would argue that the new kind of belonging should be eco-identity or, more sociologically speaking, a situational identity of those who belong to multiple communities, recognizing and accepting various cultural identities based on religion, ethnicity, lifestyle and gender. We hope that we can utilize the concepts of unit-world and global area studies to bring this coexistence to reality in the twenty-first century.

References

Acharya, Amitav. 2001. *Constructing a Security Community in Southeast Asia: ASEAN and the Problem of Regional Order*. London: Routledge.

Alagappa, Muthiah, ed. 2003. *Asian Security Order: Instrumental and Normative Features.* Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Anderson, Benedict. 1991. *Imagined Communities*. Rev. ed. London: Verso.

Appadurai, Arjun. 1996. *Modernity at Large: Cultural Dimensions of Globalization*. Minneapolis: University of Minesota Press.

Boulding, Kenneth E. 1979. *The World as a Total System.* London: Sage.

Braudel, Ferdinand. 1992 (1966). *The Mediterranean and the Mediterranean World in the Age of*

Philip . London: Harper-Collins.

Delanty, Gerard. 2003. *Community.* London: Routledge.

Elden, Suart, Lebas, Elizabeth, and Kofman, Elenore, eds. 2003. *Henri Lefebvre: Key Writings.* New York: Continuum.

Fiske, Alan Page. 1991. *Structures of Social Life: The Four Elementary Forms of Human Relations.* New York: Free Press.

Ford Foundation. 1999. *Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies*. New Yorlk: Ford Foundation.

Geertz, Clifford. 1973. *The Interpretation of Cultures*. New York: Basic Books.

Giddens, Anthony. 1984. *The Constitution of Society: Outline of the Theory of Structuration.* Cambridge: Polity Press.

Gingrich, Andre and Fox, Richard G., eds. 2002. *Anthropology, by Comparison*. London: Routledge.

Glaser, B. and Strauss, A. 1967. *The Discovery of Grounded Theory.* Chicago: Aldine.

Habermas, Jurgen. 1984 (1981). *The Theory of Communicative Action*. Boston: Galilee.

Hamashita, Takeshi.

Inglis, Fred. 2000. *Clifford Geertz: Culture, Custom and Ethics*. Cambridge: Polity Press.

Johnson, Chalmers in Pye 1975.

Kearney, Michael. 1984. *World View*. Novato: Chandlere & Sharp Publications.

Lambert, Joel L. 1991. Blurring the Disciplinary Boundaries: Area Studies in the United States. In *Divided Knowledge: Across Cultures*, edited by D. Easton and C. S. Chelling, pp. 171-194. London: Sage.

Lefebvre, Henri. 2000 (1986)*. La Production de l'espace*. 4th ed. Paris: Anthropos.

Lombard, Denys. 1990. *Le Carrefour javanais: essai d'histoire globale.* Paris: EHESS.

Luhman, Nikolas. 1995 (1984). *Social Systems*. Stanford: Stanford University Press.

Maeda [Tachimoto], Narifumi. 1975. Family Circle, Community and Nation in Malaysia. *Current Anthropology* 16(1):163-166.

Maeda [Tachimoto], Narifumi. 1989. *Tonan Ajia no Soshiki Genri* [Organizing Principles in Southeast Asia]. Tokyo: Keiso Shobou. (In Japanese)

Ortner, Sherry B., ed. 1999. *The Fate of "Culture": Geertz and Beyond*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Parsons, Talcott. 1966. *Societies: Evolutionary and Comparative Perspectives*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Pye, Lucian W., ed. 1975. *Political Science and Area Studies: Rivals or Partners?* Bloomington: Indiana University Press.

Ragin, Charles C. and Becker, Howard S. 1992. *What is a Case?: Exploring the Foundations of Social Inquiry.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Smith, Mick. 2001. *An Ethics of Place: Radical Ecology, Postmodernity, and Social Theory.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Solheim, Wilhelm G. 1988. The Nusantao Hypothesis: The Origin and Spread of Austronesian Speakers. *Asian Perspectives* 26 (1): 77-88.

Tachimoto, Narifumi Maeda. 2000. *Chiiki Kennkyu uno Monnda ito Hoho* [Methodologies of Area Studies]. Kyoto: Academic Press of Kyoto University. (In Japanese)

Warren, James Francis. 1998. *The Sulu Zone: The World Capitalist Economy and the Historical Imagination.* Amsterdam: VU University Press.

Wood, Bryce. 1968. Area Studies. In *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, ed. by David L. Sills. Vol. 1. pp. 401-407. New York: Macmillan & Free Press.

Yajima, Hikoichi. 1993. *Umi ga Tsukuru Bunmei* [The Civilization Created out of the Sea: A History of the Maritime World in the Indian Ocean] Tokyo: Asahi Shinbunsha. (In Japanese)

Fieldwork

1. Introduction

While area studies is the study of an area, it is, by the same token, the act of watching the world from the area as well as in the area. Then, what methodology should we adopt to make this possible? To be honest, area studies, while claiming themselves "studies," has only emphasized the acquisition of needed languages, comprehensive understanding of the history and culture of target areas, and the collection of materials through fieldwork, rather than proposing methodologies specific to it. Each researcher was left to adopt a methodology according to the discipline in which he was trained. As a result, the view that area studies was not an independent field of science, and that it only provided a forum for a joint study, was undeniable. But the development of area studies on its own, with the accumulation of achievements attributable to other disciplines, now requires us to build reflectively on the specific methodologies cultivated, without being evaluated, in fieldwork situations.

Together with data collection and data analysis, area studies naturally needs the process of synthesizing obtained results. Methodologies from existing fields of science, or combinations of them, may work to a certain extent for data collection and data analysis. A researcher may only need to gather data provided by people in various disciplines, and glean the knowledge and information that are not covered by those people. But is the accumulation of joint studies enough as an approach for the synthesis of obtained results? Although joint studies are critically important for area studies, they alone may not bring about the synthesis which evolves into area studies. Shouldn't area studies eventually become a study that can be done by an individual integration not by a collective collaboration? The Center for Southeast Asian Studies, Kyoto University, the first institute that specializes in Southeast Asian studies in Japan, along with other institutions, has proposed several approaches such as integrated ecology, landscapology and socio-cultural ecodynamics. But as was already discussed, only through fieldwork can a researcher illustrate the methodology he has adopted to synthesize and to identify the whole picture, the image, the endemism and the characteristic property of an area. Nonetheless, while exploring such methodologies, more and more people share the understanding that fieldwork in a broad sense is an indispensable approach that forms

20

the backbone of the methodology of area studies. Emphasis is put on its significance as the momentum for synthesis, not only as a means of data collection. In this chapter I try to view fieldwork as *rinchi-kenkyu* (on-the-spot research) and examine how it should be performed. Readers may have the impression that I have focused on the techniques of fieldwork, but by doing so, I rather try to clarify the essence of fieldwork.

2. Fieldwork and *Rinchi-kenkyu*

The hyphenated "field-work" is found in the *Shorter Oxford English Dictionary* and, according to the dictionary, it first appeared in 1777. At that time, the word meant "work done in the field, or in the fields." In 1819, the word started to be used to imply "a temporary bulwark thrown up by armed forces involved in a open battle."

Under the heading of fieldwork in the *Oxford English Dictionary*, Supplement Volume 1 (1972), there is a postscript that the word had been used to imply survey work since 1761. It is only recent that fieldwork started to be used since 1761 as "a general term to indicate practical aspect of studies in archaeology, linguistics and sociology conducted in target and related areas, distinguished from theoretical and laboratory research." A passage from *Argonauts of the Western Pacific* by the famous B. Malinowski published in 1922 is used in the dictionary as an example of this usage. Malinowski conducted research in the Trobriand Islands for about three years, and proved that fieldwork can develop a perspective for a new theory. There had been a tradition of fieldwork before him, but around this time, the continuous research of collecting exhaustive data about every aspect of people's life by staying in a community for a long period of time was accepted as a methodology in social sciences. Readers can refer to introductory books on anthropology to know more about this development of the concept of fieldwork. There are many books that deal with fieldwork alone. Nowadays, new books are published one after another to review the issues related to epistemology in fieldwork. Fundamental questions are being posed to determine the validity of ethnography as data, and criticisms are made regarding the process of making ethnography. Fieldwork is indeed basic and fundamental to anthropology.

This anthropological fieldwork has developed beyond anthropology, and has been gaining importance in other humane studies and social sciences such as sociology, linguistics and psychology. Fieldwork has not only developed as a valuable approach to understand different cultures. It is now recognized as an effective approach across

disciplinary boundaries in studying areas of investigation in general which need to understand phenomena as a whole. Fieldwork is also used in order to review the whole picture of a subject that has been subdivided and studied analytically.

As fieldwork has developed and established itself as an academic approach, other terms such as "field research" and "field study" have come to be used interchangeably in some disciplines. We have to examine not only the compound word "fieldwork" but the word "field" as well. The word "field" is often used to indicate the natural state (environment) in contrast to laboratories, study rooms and offices, and not to mean only outdoor fields.

In Japan, "fieldwork" was translated into such terms as "*genchi-chosa* (on-site investigation)," *jicchi-kenkyu* (hands-on research)," "*yagai-chosa* (out-of-door investigation)" and "*yagai-sagyou* (out-of-door work)." Fieldwork in the sense expressed by the words above had existed even before the word "fieldwork" was imported without being translated. For example, the measurement survey by Tadataka Ino for map-making is an admirable example of fieldwork. But neither these translated terms nor the English word of "fieldwork" conveys its depth of nuance as a scientific methodology. These words are associated with the discriminatory nuance that fieldwork is the "work" of data collection, and that real study is possible only when a researcher is back in his laboratory or office with data gathered for examination. Because of the limitation of these words, it was quite remarkable that Mantaro Hashimoto came up with the term "*rinchi-kenkyu* (being-on-the-spot or facing-the-place research)" for translation of "field-study." Aping his method, I would like to call fieldwork "*rinchi-kenkyu*". But the term *rinchi-kenkyu* walks on its own, projecting its own shadow regardless of its being a translated term. In this chapter, I will use the term *rinchi-kenkyu* not only as a translation but as a technical term with its own meaning. Another word "*rinsho*" which means "clinical" gives a positive effect to the nuance of *rinchi*. *Rinchi-kenkyu* as a study technique for area studies can be called "*rinchi-kenkyu* methodology." The specific and more concrete approach to *rinchi-kenkyu* methodology is landscapology. Its theoretical framework should be identified in a way that can be called socio-cultural ecodynamics. This chapter only discusses basic issues in *rinchi-kenkyu* methodology.

"Field," used in the original term *rinchi-kenkyu* refers to a given "place." Conducting investigation and research while putting oneself in a given place is called

rinchi-kenkyu. A space, a location where something is happening or being done, or a circumstance or atmosphere or ambience in which something is being done, is a place. At the same time it is a fundamental place where an intuition is formed. In a sense, every human being lives in a place. Fieldwork starts to form itself into a meaningful method and *für sich* only when a researcher questions the place where he has lived as a given. One of the ways to pursue this question is to put oneself in a place different from your used place or home. Strolling and traveling are two of the ways of putting yourself within a different place. Doing fieldwork means seeking a change of place. Standing in and lying deep in a different place to do research is exactly *rinchi-kenkyu*. A researcher needs to maintain this attitude even when doing fieldwork for the purpose of testing a hypothesis. Because the essential part of area studies is to select an area as a place, and make a study by looking at the world through that area, it is quite logical that they should be *rinchi-kenkyu*.

Of course, it is also necessary to leave a place and wander about, and from time to time, to get off the ground and fly around to look over the horizon rather than remaining in just one place. But we must first make an effort to make ourselves the master in the study of an area, and then, keep coming back to that place. In simpler terms, this means that an anthropologist needs to make an effort to have "his own village" about which he definitely refuses other researchers' interpretations different from his. It does not have to be a real village or a community. What I mean is that he needs to have a "place" that works as the starting position or stance for his study and perception in one way or another,

3. Encounter

A field as a place is the world of people's daily lives. But when a researcher moves from one place to another, naturally a new encounter takes place. He meets new circumstances where what was taken for granted in his own world may not work. When a researcher goes abroad after identifying the subject or direction of his research, he gathers knowledge from information heard from those who have been there and by reading books about that country.

Whether or not to have a specific subject of study in mind, what research methods to choose as appropriate to the selected subject, and how to collect data are key indicators to predict success or failure of *rinchi-kenkyu* methodology. But what is most important

is the understanding that the knowledge *für sich* is not enough when doing research because it has its own limitations. That is why we do *rinchi-kenkyu*. This means that the first step to *rinchi-kenkyu* is to establish within us the perspective of viewing things in a relative, open-minded way, i.e., the view that the knowledge and information we have is only one of the possible perspectives, let's shelve the truths of science for the time being. Collecting data with disregard for the place in order to verify a preconceived theory or hypothesis is different from what I call *rinchi-kenkyu* here. Rather, *rinchi-kenkyu* is an attitude of "discovery."

When one person meets another, the first thing they do is greet one another. Japanese bow. Americans shake right hands firmly. Muslims shake right hands and move their right hands back to their chests or foreheads. In certain circumstances, one may be expected not to greet. Should one insist on his own culture, respect the others, or follow international norms? The battle of cultures starts from here.

A student of area studies ought to know the common practices of the target country, and to supposedly conform to it–as the saying goes, "Do in Rome as the Romans do." But knowing common practice is only tentative knowledge. There are a variety of levels in common practice. In almost any country, there are ethnos with different cultures, and it is not appropriate to insist on the practice of an ethnic culture you are only sightly familiar with. This is especially true in countries such as Malaysia where Malaysian Chinese and Malays are not on friendly terms. A visitor from abroad, who greets a Malaysian Chinese in the Muslim way as Malays do, would not only look strange but would arouse suspicion about his political intentions. Furthermore, a similar way of greeting has different meanings between urban and rural areas, and upper class and ordinary people also have different ways of greeting.

In this instance, it would be most innocuous to shake hands following the "cosmopolitan practice." (This is the gesture that most people who travel abroad use as a greeting.) Greeting the local way with only limited knowledge may cause an unexpected misunderstanding because of subtle differences. The handshake may be a better choice if you don't have to develop further encounters in the future. But if you are to associate further with the local people, you have to master their customs sooner or later regardless of whether you always use them or not.

Then, is "my village style" never acceptable? Not necessarily. If you know nothing about the local people, or if the environment is not cosmopolitan, a cordial greeting in

your own way may be effective. Greeting in your own way sometimes breaks the ice. But one should not force the local people to do the same regardless of whether the greeting is the urban, upper-class way or cosmopolitan way. How to greet is cultural, and no way is in reality better than another. However, while keeping in mind that an encounter is the initiation of an association comfortable to both you and the local people, try to adjust your behavior by holding a relative view of the culture in which you were raised and an open mind to accommodate the cultural difference. The same holds true of associations as a whole, not only of encounters, and one must keep in mind that oftentimes the impression made at the time of a first encounter lasts long due to an initial hesitation on both sides.

Of course, an encounter needs more than just a pantomime. Greeting is followed by conversation. Never forget that the selection of the language used is determined by a social power relationship. An unconscious selection of a language is tacit approval of an unequal relationship from the beginning. People from a suzerain speak their native language rather than the local language. A person who travels from Jakarta to Ujung Pandang would speak Indonesian, the country's national language. In a formal setting, Indonesian is the norm. People imply by speaking that language, that Indonesian-speaking people are superior to dialect speakers. But one should speak in Bugis or Makassar, the standard languages in Ujung Pandang, when giving instructions to a *becak* driver whether the driver is Bugis or Makassar. This selection of a language, as a means of communication, is certainly based on the practical consideration that *becak* drivers can never understand Indonesian. But at the same time, it openly demonstrates the existing power relationship. Because a researcher has only a limited selection of languages to use, it is impossible for him to use different languages depending on any situation. But being aware that the selection of a language is not just for the convenience of communication can cause a world of difference.

A language has its own framework of thoughts. The fastest and surest way to know another's culture is to learn their language. Without using their language, it is indeed very difficult to get inside the mind of others. However, communications beyond language in an ordinary sense are used often in dialogues with animals, plants and landscapes.

In reality, it is very hard to learn another's language. If there is more than one language to learn such as the standard language, local languages and dialects, we could

only halfway learn because of limited time and capability. The minimum requirement for a researcher is to master the most frequently-used language. But it is not advisable to stick to other languages and forget your own. Communication is impossible without conveying your own heart. When neither side knows the other's language, they may have to depend on a common language. It is not impossible to become comfortable with each other by sharing a common language. Yet, a researcher is expected as soon as possible to find those key terms in the other language that cannot be translated, and then use them for communication.

4. Rapport

1) Association with People

Although observation seems to be the most reliable tool in studying a "place, " and even if a researcher claims that his observation is objective and bias-free, he inevitably watches and perceives things in the framework taken for granted in his own culture. He cannot escape the cobweb of the culture in which he was born and raised. If a spider cuts its cobweb, it will fall. There may not be a major difference between cultures in perceiving the shapes of stones and colors of soil, but different cultures have subtly different ways of categorizing colors and viewing shapes. If you perceive them in a universal way with no regard for the subtle differences, you would loose the ability to infer what people are thinking. When it comes to relationships between people and nature, and between people, the same behavioral pattern may have different meanings depending on the culture of those who use that behavior. Therefore, in order to understand a "place" from within it, be face-to-face with those who have lived there, and listen to them. Similar landscapes are not necessarily filled with similar dynamics.

No researcher can avoid associating with the local people. For students of humane studies and social sciences, encountering, associating and interacting with people are the important objectives of fieldwork. How wide, close and long the associations are depends partly on the personality of the researcher, and is generally determined by the objectives of the research. Besides, these types of association are subject to situations in the target country and the position of the researcher. Nevertheless, I will try to make a generalization. This generalization refers to general etiquette in understanding unique things and special phenomena.

The essence of *rinchi-kenkyu* is to become comfortable with the air in a place and

inhale it. It is absolutely absurd to limit from the outset the people to associate with to a certain group. But in reality, a researcher most frequently associates with those whom he meets because of his position, such as a research assistant he may hire for implementing the research, and local informants and experts who would provide information. If you are to do sociological research of a village in Indonesia, for example, it is advisable to talk in advance to the central and local governments officials, and the headman and people of importance of the village in order to obtain agreement to conduct your research. Indeed, it would be very effective to stay at the headman's house and collect information from him and other important people of the village using them as informants. Even if you struggle to find other informants in order to avoid one-sided information, oftentimes you may not be able to escape beyond the close associates of the headman. This is an extreme case, but interviewing experts to get information often ends up in a similar trap. After making a great effort to find, interview and collect information from informants outside the influence of the headman and important people of the village, you may find an informant who is not a native of the village, and is marginalized there. Such a person tends to have an objective viewpoint and will often convey it to foreigners. On the other hand, if you want to know the content of a privately-shared esoterica, no matter how many people you may interview, no informant is better than an expert insider who knows everything.

Dealing with and treating local people as "informants" may be wrong in the first place. At least, you should recognize that they are joint participants in your research, rather than mere informants who would provide the information you need. After getting to know each other better, the same village headman may show you a completely different perspective. Connecting with, blending in and bonding with local people rather than just meeting them may be the best way to form associations. However, while you may believe that you have become close to local people, they may think they are only doing their duty. Such a case helps us realize that it is not only in fieldwork where associating with others can be complicated.

When a researcher is doing research, in order to overcome difficult situations, he tends to think that he can easily leave after enduring hardships during a period of research. It is not only sad that such associations continue only as far as there is face-to-face contact, but this kind of association creates no feeling of warm interaction. There can be no association between a researcher and local people without the

assumption that the association is long-term, regardless of the period of the research. Actually, both the researcher and the local people are fully aware that the researcher will not live in the place for the rest of his life, and that his stay is only temporary. How can you make the association seem long-term in spite of the brevity of your stay? Association is not necessarily a function of time. Your top priority should be to establish an association with the local people. It is important to confirm first the fact that you have a real relationship with the local people, rather than prematurely categorizing things or applying pre-existing concepts to them in order to understand them.

How does a researcher truly grasp the situation when he puts himself in a place different from his? Grasping the situation is a premise of observation and research, and a must in order not to commit a major mistake. As was already discussed, a human being, when encountering the unknown, draws an analogy from the unknown to the known in order to deal with the unknown. He makes the utmost use of the knowledge he has, and then makes a guess by using the knowledge that is most similar to the unknown. Research is a process of verifying if this analogy is correct or not. But what is most important is the starting point of the analogy. For example, if you make a wrong guess about whether a picture is a caricature or a landscape, you make a fatal misinterpretation. Further analogy would take you nowhere if your starting point is wrong. This is similar to the situation of a person who is very good at reading maps but has made a mistake in knowing where he is now.

In *rinchi-kenkyu* you will encounter many situations where this cognitive pattern of drawing an analogy from the known to the unknown does not work. In such a situation, it is crucial not to resort to the cognitive pattern of the known. However, it would be quite difficult, then, to do research within a discipline, because any academic discipline is premised on the existence of universal cognition. Generally speaking, researchers do fieldwork because there is an issue to be verified in an academic discipline. The issue is conceptualized using the terms of the discipline. Survey items relevant to the issue are chosen in advance. Whatever methodology a researcher may use, be it an interview survey or a questionnaire, the framework of questioning is designed by the researcher so that it will work for him. However strictly scientific the methodology may appear, the method of categorization adopted to serve the researcher will influence the survey results.

It would be desirable if a researcher could see things completely free from existing

stereotypes. But as long as his thoughts are formed in his language, he can never break the spell of that language. He can devise the methodologies to use in order to avoid, as much as possible, the possibility of pushing his own framework directly onto respondents, as is often seen in questionnaire methods. There can be no perfect methodology, but readers can use for reference the methodology of focusing on the categorization of folk customs in anthropology and ethnomethodology in sociology.

However, not all researchers can become completely unbiased nor invisible. I would rather say it is impossible for a researcher to do so. Besides, becoming unbiased and invisible is not always best from the strategic point of view. It is sometimes an advantage for a researcher to maintain his own point of view. For example, there is an advantage in being Japanese. There may be certain things that a Japanese researcher can see because he is Japanese. There are certain things that those who live in a place cannot see, but "a researcher--an outsider" can. One of the purposes of doing research is to get past what has been taken for granted in order to obtain a correct understanding of the real world of everyday life. In this context, we have to keep in mind that sitting in someone else's chair is not equal to becoming that person. Interacting with local people means being deeply involved with them while respecting each other's differences. It requires the act of becoming objective and awaking to oneself.

In sociology, research methodology includes surveys, participant observations, interviews, the questionnaire method, repeating surveys and sampling. Other existing academic disciplines have their own methodologies as well. It is impossible to avoid all of them. Unless a completely new methodology is invented, we have to resort to data collection based on the existing methodologies of research and analysis. The second choice may be eclectic methodology. *Rinchi-kenkyu* will probably be built on and beyond the combination of these.

There is another way of classifying research methodologies based on how a researcher relates to his subjects: research by observing and while walking (strolling), research by listening, research by living in, and long-term fixed point research. During research, a researcher should be very careful even in doing his usual activities such as making drawings, taking notes and taking pictures. We might better go to *rinchi-kenkyu* without choosing beforehand which research methodology to use. What matters more is the positive attitude to explore and find new ways of organizing knowledge, and to create a new research methodology. What is most important then, is to keep in mind that

to investigate means to be investigated. A researcher is not in the ethereal realm of divine that transcends human knowledge. Rather, local people also observe and investigate the researcher as he does them. If you forget this, and see yourself as a hero with an objective observation for the sake of noble science, you will never have any meaningful interaction whatsoever with local people. There is no creative research without interaction.

However, interaction is not possible with only the attitude of a researcher. Local people are there. What if local people refuse to interact with you? In that case, you have to blame yourself for being refused because interaction has much to do with fundamental interpersonal relationships. You can also take it that you are still incapable of stepping into the realm of interaction because you have not acquired enough understanding of the local people. This method of interpretation is absolutely necessary in one sense. However, it is not advisable to force local people to interact with you in the name of research. Only a man of all virtues can interact with everyone. Among ordinary people, some are better at interacting than others. The latter might as well leave things as they are. It must be impossible to interact indiscriminately with everybody because of research. Each case of interaction matters. This means that a researcher needs to take the position of an initiator and get comfortable together with local people, borrowing from Keiji Iwata's words "jump in among others, approach them, sit in others' positions and get comfortable together."

If a researcher thinks about the local people, their rights and freedom become an issue. No research can be done that disregards the will of the local people. No matter how difficult it may be to know their will, those who go to research have to acculturate and adhere to the principle that interaction with local people should happen within the customs of the local people. In this sense, we had better maintain a relative point of view of each interaction. There could be many ways of interacting.

The issue of the freedom of doing research vs. the right to refuse, and protection of privacy vs. non-violation of privacy can also been seen in the context of the etiquette of interaction. Even if a researcher is aware that he had better not ask or look into what his respondent does not want to talk about, he often fails to notice that he is forcing the respondent to answer when he forgets the power imbalance between a respondent and a researcher (or when he takes advantage of a respondent's kindness). We should go back to the basics of interaction rather than talking in abstract words such as privacy, freedom

and rights. The first step to research and a study is to know what is considered private and what is public, and what are the rights of people in a community. To put it plainly, sit in the other's chair. After that, you need to do research in the framework of social and cultural context of the local people while respecting their wishes. You may have to break that framework of necessity from time to time, but breaking the framework while being aware of it is completely different from acting as you wish out of ignorance.

2) Interaction with a Place
So far, I have focused on interaction between people. There can be interaction between a person and an object and between a person and a place. We must say that such interaction exists in a culture where people use such terms as "drawings that strike one's heart," and "landscapes that would draw one's soul" even though it may be an imagination on the part of a human being. Doesn't a person's living in a certain place mean his interaction with that place in the first place? Now, let me discuss interaction with a place.

There is an ecological approach, for example, of questioning what a place means. It would be quite desirable if a researcher knows the structure of a place when interacting with it. But the knowledge about the structure does not easily bring him to an interaction with the place. A long association may finally do so.   Let me name such an association as "feeling the energy (or Qi   in the Oriental concept) of a place." This means touching the Qi drifting around the universe of the place. I named this style the "socio-cultural ecodynamics approach." This approach is to seek not only the structure of ecology but the whole dynamics (general tendency of movement and the equilibrium of force) including phenomena involving human beings, and what human beings have produced and modified. It is not to "read" the land using a certain framework or a view of the world. It is to create a code to read. Needless to say, this approach is a paraphrase, from the viewpoint of a place, of landscapology that was previously discussed.

The etiquette of interacting with a place should be further elaborated as socio-cultural ecodynamics, but for the time being, I would like to point out three conceivable elements: (1) to observe and think, (2) to form links, and (3) to stand in an imagined world. The last one, an imagined world, is of particular importance. A researcher can interact with a place by standing in an imagined world without distinguishing the subjective and the objective. An imagined world is not the subjective vis-à-vis the

objective. To stretch a point, I would paradoxically call it the subjective objective. It is the world of conceptual power where the dynamics of a place and a researcher's imagination blend together.

Another issue we have to keep in mind in thinking about interaction with a place is "expansion of a place." While a researcher's choice of a certain place as foreign from his own should remain open to question, choosing a place means demarcating it, and setting limits and boundaries to it. A place without boundaries as a subject of research is a contradiction given the original meaning of fieldwork. In doing fieldwork, a researcher has to think about the boundaries of a place. For example, when a researcher suggests a general trend based on his observation, the question is how general it is, and how far it applies. To answer this question, extensive strolling and landscapological rough research based on observation are needed. It is true that what I discussed about encounter, association and interaction is based to a large degree on the model of anthropological community studies. The boundaries of a community in this sense can be drawn clearly as such. But anthropological fieldwork in a community is merely a small part of *rinchi-kenkyu*. A place that I am talking about here can be the place a researcher is standing on right now, a space much smaller than a community or a place that may expand into an "area." There can be a variety of boundaries to determine a place. The boundaries do not always have to be absolute ones. The structure is like an endless lineage of parts nested in a whole.

5. Parting

Some anthropologists have buried themselves into the society they went to for research and never returned to the society of their origin. The content of their research ends up unpublished. Depending on the circumstances, such a way may be the ultimate way of *rinchi-kenkyu* and interaction. But most researchers come back to the world of their origin. Yet, no one can say that the latter way is not genuine *rinchi-kenkyu* or interaction. Parting leads to distinguishing, and may lead to a real understanding of each other. What should be questioned instead is how to part from a place. As a cliché goes, "It is a foolish bird that defiles its own nest." A researcher should not leave troubles behind. But don't fly away forever. It is also essential to maintain long-tem contacts.

Having said that, any research is limited by the funding and time that is available. In some cases, the effort may not yield expected results, and rapport with local people may

not be built in a limited time. However, in these cases, the manner of parting and the aftercare becomes more important. In smooth and successful research, a researcher does not have to be quite so careful about the way of parting. Contact afterward naturally follows. A researcher had better use his brain in parting if the research process had been a rough ride. It is definitely necessary to stay open and maintain the possibility of having future contacts.

What matters are not only the people and the place that have become the subjects of the research, but the researcher himself after the research matters. What has he understood and what hasn't he, and why? Then, he is challenged to examine himself. This selfreview means grasping the selves before and during research, comparing them with the selves after research, and finally integrating them into the one who is separated both from the target place and the home. More generally speaking, *rinchi-kenkyu* is an initiation. Initiation is a process where a person changes from being something to another. Initiation leads to reincarnation. A researcher's not changing at all may mean that he has a too strongly established ego to change, or the research has failed. Maybe, we do not have to go out of our way to change ourselves. Experiencing no change is still definitely an experience. It would be ideal, however, if there were a situation in which a researcher can create his new self. Besides, it would be a waste not to take advantage of such an agent of change.

Secondly, parting is followed by the act of going back to the society where a person is from to share his experience. A researcher would perform this act by fulfilling his duty of reporting, and this act takes the form of writing. He undertakes writings during fieldwork. These writings are called field notes. Field notes as they are rarely become a final piece of work. He needs to sort out and reorganize his field notes to produce a final report. A researcher would be very lucky if he knew from the beginning the general outline of what to write, the research results supported what he had in mind, and he could publish what he wrote just as they happened. Again, all researchers, including such lucky ones, must ask themselves, "when, where, in which language, what, for what purposes and for whom" to write. For example, a local person, as a result of interaction with a researcher, may reveal to the researcher something very personal that the person does not want to be made public, or the researcher may come to know esoterica that local people keep strictly undisclosed. It would trouble him a lot whether to make the information public or not, and in what way to do so if he does. Whatever the case may

be, the "advance of learning" cannot be a justification, and he needs to take particular care to give the highest priority to the privacy of informants (joint participants in the research).

Thirdly, at this stage, a researcher would have obsessive thoughts again that he has been predetermined, since before *rinchi-kenkyu* started, to write, and what to write may also have been determined "a priori." This thought is a form of self-examination regarding why he did the research. The prerequisite for writing is to stay objective by seeing three things: his research subjects, his own bios, and the invisible censorship of the society which he is in. The last one is quite trying to deal with, and we would need to come up with a new classification system in order to avoid it completely. The boundary, limit or definition would become an issue again. The issue is deeply related to classification, and at the same time, touches upon the deep origin of area studies. Some pieces of work will be produced as a result of a compromise. Even in such works, the question of "when, where, in which language, what, for what purposes and for whom" discussed above should not be forgotten as the etiquette in interaction. A written "work" such as the final product of research does not exist independent from *rinchi-kenkyu*. Instead, it is a part of *rinchi-kenkyu*.

6. Conclusion

Are area studies an effort to apply emotion to what cannot be dealt with by reason? Whether they are or not will be discussed continuously as a future issue. In any case, I would say that it is more fruitful to let emotion take the initiative and have reason play second fiddle as far as the *rinchi-kenkyu* method is concerned. Feelings for people and feeling a place are the first thing to do in *rinchi-kenkyu*. Only if there can be emotion supported by reason, should such emotion take the lead. Mere emotion sometimes reveals aspects that are very much culturally bound as both history and our daily experiences show. And, in general, we are expected to use reason and logic to convey to others (people who use the same language as ours, people who use different languages, and people in the research area) what we have acquired through emotion. There could be an argument that reason and logic (and even intelligence) alone are incapable of conveying in a real sense what we felt. However, once we say that they are incapable of doing so, we abandon the place called area studies. Such kinds of communication should be considered as act of human beings transcending learning and research.

What is acquired with emotion tends to become a stereotype. In this sense, we need to keep our emotion clear. One of the objectives of area studies is to define the image of an area, the overall picture surrounding it, and the uniqueness and regionality of the area. Such integration often depends on the power of conceptualization. Regardless of whether there can be such an overall picture, and whether it is definable scientifically speaking, a picture once defined tends to become stereotyped and become an ideology insensitive to change. That is why the kinetics and dynamism of an area and a place are emphasized. We have to keep it in mind that this tendency is often overlooked in area studies, as researchers tend to stick around their contemporary perspectives.

Area studies is the study of a place called area. They can claim themselves "area" studies only because the framework as an area is recognized. If this framework is denied, researchers in multidisciplinary endeavors are mere curiosity seekers, and what an area specialist achieved is impossible as an academic discipline. All of these would be an extension of existing disciplines. In order to avoid this, there should be further development of area studies sticking to regionality with a tension being maintained between discipline-oriented researchers and area specialists. If I were now asked for a concrete methodology of area studies that advocates regionality, integration and modernity, I would have to say that without the *rinchi-kenkyu* method, nothing else can be the building block of area studies as the study of a place. Interaction, the pillar of the *rinchi-kenkyu* method, is indeed the framework of area studies. I find it exciting that "interaction" entails the risk or the joy of guiding one to a path completely different from established-disciplinary research.

On Fieldwork

Booth, Wayne C., Colomb, Gregory G. and Williams, Joseph M. 1995. *The Craft of Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Burgess, Robert G. ed. 1982. *Field Research: A Sourcebook and Field Manual*. London: Allen & Unwin.

Burgess, Robert G. 1984. *In the Field: An Introduction to Field Research*. London: Routledge.

Casagrande, Joseph. Ed. 1960. *In the Company of Man: Twenty Portraits of Anthropological Informants.* New York: Harper & Row.

Devereux, Stephen and Hoddinott, John. ed. 1993. *Fieldwork in Developing Countries*. Boulder: Lynne Rienner.

Emerson, Robert M. 1983. *Contemporary Field Research: A Collection of Readings*. Prospect Heights: Waveland.

Emerson, Robert M., Fretz, Rachel I. and Shaw, Linda L. 1995. *Writing Ethnographic Fieldnotes*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, George M., Scudder, Thayer, Colson, Elizabeth and Kemper, Robert V. eds. 1979. *Long-Term Field Research in Social Anthropology.* New York: Academic Press.

Glaser, Barney G. 1992. *Basics of Grounded Theory Analysis*. Mill Valley: Sociology Press.

Gubrium, Jaber F. and Silverman, David. ed. 1989. *The Politics of Field Research: Sociology beyond Enlightment.* London: Sage.

Hammersley, Martyn. 1990. *Reading Ethnographic Research: A Critical Guide.* London: Longman.

Jackson, Bruce. 1987. *Fieldwork*. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

Junker, Buford H. 1960. *Field Work: An Introduction to the Social Sciences.* Introduction by Everett C. Hughes. London: University of Chicago Press.

Maanes, John Van. 1988. *Tales of the Field: On Writing Ethnography*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Manning, Peter K. 1987. *Semiotics and Fieldwork*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Peacock, James L. 1986. *The Anthropological Lens: Harsh Light, Soft Focus.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

> In the physics of photography, the brighter the light, the smaller the aperture of the lens; with more light, a smaller hole is sufficient to transmit the image to the film. And the smaller the aperture, the larger is the depth of field. That is, the photographer can include in focus the background and foreground of the object itself. (p. xi)

Punch, Maurice. 1986. *The Politics and Ethics of Fieldwork*. Newbury Park: Sage.

Sanjek, Roger. Ed. 1990. *Fieldnotes: The Makings of Anthropology*. Ithaca: Cornell

University Press.

Schatzman, Leonard and Strauss, Anselm. 1973. *Field Research: Strategies for a Natural Sociology*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall.

Wax, Rosalie. 1971. *Doing Fieldwork: Warnings and Advice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

1967

1992

Ethnicity and Community in Eastern Asia Reconsidered

The Concept of Eastern Asia

In the first International Forum of East Asian Studies held in Beijing, I proposed to develop the concept of Eastern Asia, consisting of East Asia, Northeast Asia and Southeast Asia. In the 3rd Conference of the IFEAS held in Bangkok, I would like to insist again on the importance of Eastern Asia instead of East Asia or Southeast Asia proper.

The concept of Eastern Asia as a mezzo-area unit is proposed to cope with several problems.

The first is to acknowledge the ecological unity of the maritime world along the Asian green belt, which is an ecologically binding prerequisite to define a such area. (See Fig. 4)

The second is to revive the proto-historical interaction along sea routes between North and South in terms of racial mixtures or chains of trade routes. (See Fig. 10)

The third is the strategic need to incorporate the recent political development of regional cooperation against the hegemony of global powers, especially the United States or the European Union.

The fourth is the methodological reshuffle of area studies introducing the order of area units against one country-area studies. Especially since the boundaries of Southeast Asian countries have been arbitrarily demarcated by the colonial powers, we should reconsider the limits of the nation-state.

Usually we delineate levels of area as domestic, communal/local, national, regional, and global. Here, I would like to propose a different general area-framing for area studies.

A referential area unit, conventionally much used in area studies, is a country, state, nation-state or a political entity. A basic area unit in area studies, however, should be a geographical region sometimes composed of several countries or a region within a large state, regardless of the conventional political boundaries, because an area can not be

defined only by one scale, like polity. Examples are Southeast Asia or West China. The region Southeast Asia cannot be lumped together with East Asia and South Asia as a determinant of overall affairs, as its races and cultures are diverse, its geography archipelagic, insular, and peninsular, and its forms of governance are varied.

A mezzo area is a grouping of basic area units, like Eastern Asia.

A mega area could be Asia, including India and China, but excluding West Asia or Central Asia.

And the maximum area is the Globe.

A mini area within a referential area could be added to analytical frameworks like anthropologist's fields, sites, or places.

An area, however its scale may differ, is composed of core institutions, marshaling symbols or values, and a set of eco-systems. You may say that it has a structure at one point in time. But the area is always structured or restructured by internal dynamics as well as external impacts from other areas. Although it may be an "imagined community" as a whole, it is, at the same time, a reality in everyday life experience and actual negotiations on the ground. My argument is that it is important to realize how the area-framing works in area studies. (See the first chapter in this collection.) This is a call for theory of middle range or a mid-range generalization in a certain sense.

Why Antagonism?

It is a current global trend that conflicts, based on antagonism, hostility, opposition, hate, or disagreement, are surfacing more and more. Even in Southeast Asia, where comparatively placid dispositions and so called "loosely structured" societies enabled harmonious coexistence to some extent, it is not an exception.

In Southeast Asia at present, there appear four types of ethnic conflicts or disputes: an indigenous minority problem, separatist movements, ethno-religious antagonism, and the immigrant problem.

The indigenous minority problem became a global issue because of the political movement of indigenous peoples around the world. Separatist movements of detached peoples were rampant in borders in Thailand, the Philippines and other regions. Ethno-religious antagonism has been accelerated by the wars in the Middle East in which hegemonic powers intervened to secure energy resources. The movement of people is somewhat tolerated because of the development of transportation and the

introduction of liberalism. But the human rights movement raises the serious issue of immigrant status in a nation-state.

The four types of ethnic problems stem from different perspectives but show the same trend: The stereotyping by ethnic categories and labels and then applying their exaggerated generalizations to everything related to those labels. For example, the claim that everything can be explained by the label Islam can not be supported—how can you understand 1.3 billion Muslims by saying that they are one and the same Muslims. It is apparent that Muslims do not necessarily follow the same putative behavioral patterns. We can take prejudiced examples from China or Yugoslavia where Muslims are officially treated as the 'ethnic' category.

Underlying these labeling problems is the politics of primordialism or essentialism. It is said that the introduction of essentialism in the discussion of ethnicity or race is a recent one, especially propagated by the nation-state. The concepts of tribe, family, or region emphasize the primordial perspective on ethnicity to mobilize the public. It is not ethnicity, religion, nor culture that matters. They are manipulated as a reality to cope with daily-life political or economic conflicts.

We need deeper and more compassionate, yet flexible understanding towards other ethnic groups against misconceptions based on ethnic/racial essentialism or primordialism. Hegemonic globalization does not provide any such mechanism to avoid ethnic primordialism, but rather stimulates antagonism, ironically caused by a so-called universal principle such as the human rights concept. Instead, we have to promote a well-being based on coexistence of pluralism and equity. In this sense, I think we can tolerate coexistence with inequality if trade-off between tax and protection is properly guaranteed as was done under the Ottoman Empire. We cannot simply follow a policy of internal equality of assimilation with arbitral external exclusion as in Europe.

Ethnic Minorities, Immigrants and the Poor: The Politics of Identity

Ethnic minorities could be one of the four types mentioned above. They are often categorically regarded as the economically oppressed. However, ethnic problems are the politics of cultural or collective identity for human security, freedom and equity rather than economic discriminations.

In generally speaking, the ethnic minority means those indigenous peoples who had already established their own communities when the nation-state started. They are

discriminated by the habitat (e.g., hill tribes, sea nomads), religious differences (e.g., animism), linguistic peculiarity (e.g., the endangered language group), or customs/ways of life (e.g., tribalism).

They live in an enclave, geographical or social, with the spirit of traditional resilience against assimilation by a larger nation. Their rights are often neglected in comparison with more a vociferous community such as immigrants from more developed countries. Their determination to cope with the intrusion of outside influences often leads them to an essentialistic view of their culture, perhaps to cope with the vulnerability in the development policy. Sadly the outside people, especially the government, reproduce this essentialist view, or, rather, the government coerces them and outsiders to uphold the stereotyped image of ethnic minorities. For them ethnicity is the tradition or continuity from the past with those of the same descent, i.e., blood, tradition, and continuity which matters. Their ancestry, however, seems less rigid or formal, sometimes only emphasizing founding fathers/mothers. The reason they subscribe to the essentialist concept of ethnicity is that they have to construct a tradition against the other cultures or civilizations.

Another ethnic minority is a part of a major ethnic group detached or separated from a neighboring nation-state, such as the Malays in Southern Thailand or the Moros in the Southern Philipines. Separatist movements are also caused by ethno-nationalism within a nation-state like in North Sumatera, Maluku or Irian Jaya. In a sense they are indigenous peoples but they cannot content with their minority status.

Immigrants are in a different situation than indigenous minorities. They often form diaspora, such as ghettoes, China towns, Little Indias, or new villages in the host countries. They are often racialized, biologized, even minoritized guests, given the government policy towards immigrants. In immigrant society in the USA, Jennifer Lee and Frank D. Bean argue that the concept of ethnicity/race is generally accepted as a "consciousness of status and identity based on ancestry and color." We can use this definition in Southeast Asian contexts with a slight modification as in Malaysia, i.e., a consciousness of privilege and identity based on descent and religion. The explicit addition of religion is quite important to explain the different treatments of Chinese migrants in Southeast Asia.

The immigrant problem is how to protect their freedom of movement and human rights against the interests of the nation-state. Especially if the majority only comprises

a part of the national peoples as in Malaysia or the Philippines, then the problems become more delicate, empowering both immigrants and indigenous peoples. For example ethnic education will be a very controversial issue.

The government or people in the mainstream often apply inconsistent exclusion indexes from the mainstream to protect their wealth and 'human rights' from the intruders who are resented as obtrusive and vexing. Some theories inveigh that it is not ethnic differences but class stratification that matters. It is apparent that immigrants belong to diverse economic classes. All Chinese are not rich. All Malays are not poor. So we have to consider the poverty problem without implying close connections with ethnic divisions. Yet, economic development is a crucial target of the nation-state, and development projects often relate to ethnic problems, not just minorities or immigrants. Admitting that economic inequality is a necessary component of society, we have to try not to fix such an inequality as hereditary. We need a mechanism to allow equal chances to everybody.

The Resurgence of Eco-identity and the Communication Community

In order to cope with the problems mentioned above, I would argue that, however difficult to achieve, we have to introduce new concepts of ethnicity/culture and community/polity to overcome the trilemma of human conditions: freedom, security, and equity. We should, I would argue, find out or salvage such a concept from peripheral cases of Asian ethnic groups in the modern age. My experience in Malaysia and Indonesia definitely confirms me in this conviction.

The first step toward conflict-solving is to return to ecological identity or eco-identity to encompass multiple identities. Eco-identity is a mooring identity that is relational, contextual, and situational; it is an open and multiple membership, not nationalism, ethno-nationalism, nor tribalism. I would argue that a cosmopolitan port-polity in the Southeast Asian past is a good case in point to reconsider the eco-identity. There were a little partitions between insiders and outsiders as far as they were there together. The eco-identity coincides with ethnicity at large of hybridity or Creole or communitas à la Victor Turner. Or you can say it is a meta-identity, without negating ethnic identity or cultural identity, as well as a corporeal identity based on the daily situations. It is a syntagmatic integration of identity, while other identities are a paradigmatic choice of available identities. The latter are a matter of choice and

resolution. The former is the integrity of those choices. Anyway, I have to hastily add, what we can make our identities, we cannot do so exactly as we please.

As a macro device to achieve harmony, I propose a communication community of mezzo-scale area, i.e., Eastern Asia to transcend "ethnicity" or "nation." Scholars and bureaucrats variously use the concept of community. Ethnic community, linguistic community, civil community, societal community, borderless community, academic community, or even hippie community. I think we need to introduce the various levels of order of community similar to the "area" discussed earlier in the first section. As an example of mega community, we are familiar with the European Union. While this usage of community could be figurative, I think we should include this kind of figurative usage. In the Conference several papers have discussed the mezzo community of the Northeast Asian Community, the Peace Community, and the East Asian Regional Community.

Although there are many arguments about community from Tënnies or McIver to Zygmunt Bauman, the community, I would argue, should be a communicable network/circle or communication community as discussed by Gerald Delanty. Communicability is guaranteed through eco-identity. Chains of circles make up a larger circle in turn. Crossing the borders of the nation-states, we can engage in trade or value pluralism in a wider context, protecting en masse against the hegemonic globalization.

A bowl of salad needs a proper dressing. The marshaling symbols are the rational consensus itself as to plurality of values, equilibrium, equal opportunity or fulfillment of capability. The core institutions have to be developed, but at least we need a mechanism to guarantee justice and rights with appropriate power, physical or moral. We secure this ecological symbiosis in a set of ecological niches, where coexistence, cohabitation or conviviality is horizontal, contemporary, consociational, and existential.

I am by no means confident that this argument is water-tight. But I am confident that we have to endeavor to design a new world order of society to save the globe from the standpoint of Asia as soon as possible. Even a schematic design, such as set forth in this paper, may help in the effort to achieve our common aim.

of East Asian Studies, held at Chulalongkorn University, Bangkok, December, 2004. The theme of the Conference is the "Ethnic Groups in Asia: Harmony and Conflict."

The concept of "mezzo area" was borrowed from the COE project of Hokkaido University on Slavic area studies.

References

Bauman, Zygmunt. 2001. *Community: Seeking Safety in an Insecure World*, London: Polity.

Delanty, Gerald. 2003. *Community*. London: Routledge.

Ford Foundation. 1999. *Crossing Borders: Revitalizing Area Studies*. New York: Ford Foundation.

Lee, Jennifer and Bean, Frank D. 2004. "America's Changing Color Lines: Immigration, Race/Ethnicity, and Multiracial Identitification." *Annual Review of Sociology*, vol. 30, pp. 221-242

Turner, Victor. 1969. *The Ritual Process: Structure and Anti-structure*. Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company.