Editor’s Introduction

TWENTIETH ANNIVERSARY ISSUE

The Japanese Journal of American Studies celebrates its twentieth anniversary with this volume. In 1981, in the inaugural statement in the first volume of the JJAS entitled “On Starting the Japanese Journal of American Studies,” Makoto Saito (president 1980–82) stated that he “sincerely” hoped “that our new English language journal, a product of our new era, might serve as a channel of dialogue with the international community of American studies specialists and make some contribution to international American studies” (4). The early efforts of the JJAS from volume one to ten were reviewed by Eiichi Akimoto, the third editor, in his introduction to the Tenth Anniversary Issue in 1999. In the succeeding volumes from the eleventh to the eighteenth, under the leadership of Akimoto and Fumiko Nishizaki, the fourth editor, as well as Sheila Hones, the fifth editor, the mission of the journal to “serve as a channel of dialogue with the international community” was pursued by asking questions such as the following: What constitutes “Japanese” American Studies? How do we locate “national” in the “international” American Studies? How do we identify “our” community in the borderless age when cyber space and other inventions enable us to communicate easily across the world regardless of where we physically reside?

As the sixth editor of the JJAS, I hope to follow my predecessors in providing an academic public sphere which promotes international dialogue in an age when the definitions of “national” and “international” themselves are interrogated and increasingly blurred. International dialogues and exchanges, in fact, have been an integral part of the Japanese Association for American Studies. Such efforts are especially reflected in the programs of the JAAS annual meetings as well as other scholarly exchange projects. In this volume, we have started to include articles contributed by U.S. based Americanists who have participated in the JAAS international projects. Three essays in this issue, including the first article based on a Presidential Address delivered at the annual meeting, are by the delegates from the American Studies Association (ASA) to the JAAS annual meetings. We also include two articles by Japanese Americanists who currently teach at U.S. universities, where their academic careers are based.
With a newly strengthened body of Americanists within and without national borders as contributors, the Twentieth Anniversary Issue takes up “Peace” as the special theme. As for the parameters of the term “Peace,” no specific definition is given by the editorial board — whether it is Johan Galtung’s explanation on negative and positive peace, a pacifist interpretation of peace as a prime force for any human existence, an eco-oriented postmodernist understanding of permeable and imperfect peace, or an utopian pursuit of peace in stasis elsewhere. While the definition as well as the interpretation of the term varies in each article, “Peace” can be simply conceived as the antonym to modern war as in the title of Leo Tolstoy’s famous novel *War and Peace*. The contributors to this volume delve into scenes behind this dichotomy and dissect layered meanings and consequences that constitute “Peace” as well as “War.” We also include in this volume one article on the perpetual Americanist theme of the relation between the wilderness and early American literary production.

The first article “Why Latino History Matters to U.S. History” by Vicki L. Ruiz, former president of the American Studies Association, is based on her address at the annual meeting of the JAAS in 2008 at Doshisha University, Kyoto. In this article, Ruiz asks, “Why does Latino history matter?” Contrary to media depictions of Latinos as people who arrived the day before yesterday, there exists a rich layering of nationalities and generations of Latinos in U.S. history. Whether carving out a community in St. Augustine in 1565, or reflecting on colonialism and liberty during the 1890s, or fighting for civil rights in the courts in the 1940s, Spanish-speaking peoples made history within and beyond national borders. The essay identifies large themes, debates, and sources in the field. Ruiz emphasizes three historical moments pivotal to reimagining an American narrative with Latinos as significant actors: 1848 (the U.S.–Mexican War), 1898 (the Filipino-Cuban-Spanish-American War), and 1948 (the Latino G.I. Generation).

The following nine essays take up this volume’s special theme “Peace.” The first two essays deal with U.S. diplomatic history from the Eisenhower to the Johnson administrations focusing upon the close relationship between the economy and the U.S. defense policy. In “The Search for an American Way of Nuclear Peace: The Eisenhower Administration Confronts Mutual Atomic Plenty,” Toru Onozawa argues that the 1950s constituted a major turning point during which U.S. national security became predicated heavily on nuclear deterrence and that the administration of Dwight D. Eisenhower played a crucial role in establishing the American way of nuclear deterrence and the rationale behind it. Onozawa asserts that scientists’ estimates of the damage accruing from a possible nuclear war with the Soviet Union as well as the fiscal cost of achieving war-fighting capacity eventually led policymakers, including President Eisenhower, to create a rationale for a reliable deterrence. The American people, Onozawa remarks, while tacitly recognizing their vulnerable state, chose not to
confront the intractable conundrum of possible nuclear annihilation, but to enjoy a nuclear peace that could be achieved rather inexpensively. Midori Yoshii, in her article “Reducing the American Burden? U.S. Mediation between South Korea and Japan, 1961–1965,” leads us to examine the succeeding period in U.S. diplomatic history, highlighting the stark difference between the Northeast Asian policies of John F. Kennedy and those of Lyndon B. Johnson. In light of the downward trend in the U.S. balance of payments, the Kennedy administration hoped to reduce U.S. economic and military aid to Korea by encouraging normalization between South Korea and Japan. The policy’s main goal was, Yoshii maintains, to have Seoul use the Japanese reparation money for its economic development. Johnson continued to encourage normalization during his presidency, but his guarantee of aid to Korea in exchange for securing Korea’s troop support in Vietnam undermined Kennedy’s intent to reduce the U.S. economic burden in the region.

The following two essays also take up the theme of “Peace” in U.S. foreign policy, asking how the domestic debate on race and ethnicity has influenced U.S. foreign policy. In her “Architects of a Masquerade Peace: The United States and the 1936 Berlin Olympic Games,” Sayuri Gathrie-Shimizu asserts that the Berlin Olympic Games have remained one of the most controversial in the history of the modern Olympiad and reveals the backstage in the U.S. domestic scene. Her article seeks to elucidate the matrix of historical forces in which American amateur sports leaders, civic groups, diplomatic representatives, and key officials in the Franklin Delano Roosevelt administration contended with the polarizing question of U.S. participation in the Berlin games. By examining how their actions or inaction mirrored broader ideological strands in American society at the time, the article illuminates the less than sure-footed approach to “peace in our time” of the U.S. in the mid-1930s. Nikhil Pal Singh, in “Beyond the ‘Empire of Jim Crow’: Race and War in Contemporary U.S. Globalism,” also reflects on how histories of U.S. racial construction and contention traverse the domains of the foreign and the domestic, and disrupt their neat separation. Singh suggests ways in which domestic racial contexts can be used to index the articulation of U.S. foreign policy and interrogates how historically and politically distinguishable is what Condoleezza Rice calls the “empire of Jim Crow” from Thomas Jefferson’s vaunted claim that the United States was “an empire for liberty.” Singh seeks intellectual traditions and historical precedents which might inform alternative, more egalitarian ways of posing the relationship between race, justice, and power in the U.S. domestic arena and in the world at large.

The next three articles discuss the relation between “Peace” and American literature from the 19th century to today. Yoshio Takanashi’s article “Emerson and Zhu Xi: The Role of the ‘Scholar’ in Pursuing ‘Peace’” compares Ralph Waldo Emerson’s Transcendental thought with Zhu Xi’s Neo-Confucian philosophy. In spite of the many parallels between their ideas, differences also
can be recognized in their views of the role of the “scholar,” the act of naming, and the concept of peace. Identifying “integrity” as a keyword in Emerson’s view of peace, Takanashi argues that for Emerson “integrity” is a dynamic process of evolution toward a complete unity and forward realization of goodness. Zhu Xi’s yin-yang, on the other hand, is rather a principle of interchange and transformation. For Zhu, Takanashi maintains, “bringing peace throughout the world” will be finally realized by letting the state of “equilibrium and harmony” exist in perfection and letting supreme virtue manifest itself. The legacy of Chinese thought in American literature is further pursued by Naoko Sugiyama in her article entitled “From the Woman Warrior to Veterans of Peace: Maxine Hong Kingston’s Pacifist Textual Strategies.” The Woman Warrior: Memoirs of a Girlhood among Ghosts has been widely read and discussed as an autobiographical testament of a girl who gains self-esteem by identifying with a legendary Chinese woman warrior, Fa Mu Lan. Kingston, however, later commented that as a pacifist, she should not have presented a warrior as a hero. Sugiyama explores how Kingston tries to present female and male heroic characters without depending on the warrior models and extricates the writer’s alternative textual strategies toward pacifism.

Viet Thanh Nguyen in his “Remembering War, Dreaming Peace: On Cosmopolitanism, Compassion, and Literature” explores the theme of war and memory by examining some lesser-known works that have been written about the American War in Viet Nam. Instead of focusing on canonical American texts about the war by white male American writers such as Tim O’Brien, Michael Herr, or Philip Caputo, Nguyen looks at lesser-known works by women, American minorities, and Asians. These populations, Nguyen asserts, tend to produce cultural works that do not share the assumptions that characterize the work of American white men, whose points of view dominate American perspectives on the war and hence help to create a framework of memory that excludes the views of others. In works by Martin Luther King, Jr., Maxine Hong Kingston, George Mariscal, Anh Junghyo, Takeshi Kaiko, and Dang Thuy Tram, readers see a greater awareness of the complexities of how war is experienced and represented through race, class, nation and gender. Nguyen also suggests that in their works readers also find a greater sensitivity to cosmopolitanism and compassion, which provide a measure of hope in creating literatures and building social movements that are not only antiwar but also pro-peace.

The last two articles on the special theme delve into human-relational questions, both cosmological and interpersonal. In “The Cosmology of Peace and Father Thomas Berry’s ‘Great Work,’” Takeshi Kimura examines Father Berry’s idea of the Cosmology of Peace and his advocacy of “Great Work” for it in the face of the environmental problem. Drawing on Pierre Teilhard de Chardin’s thought, Berry locates the history of humanity within cosmic history. Taking up such topics as “Berry’s view of our place in history,” “the religion-
science dialogue,” and “‘Great Work’ for the Cosmology of Peace,” Kimura explores Berry’s cosmological ideas on peace between human communities and the planet. Anri Morimoto’s article “Forgiving Is Fore-giving: Reaching out for Peace in Interpersonal Relations” presents an analysis of the concept of forgiveness as it crystallizes in two legal cases from contemporary America. Despite apparent differences in the outcomes of the two cases, the two stories introduced in the article help us understand the nature of forgiveness and explore possible pathways to move from past resentment to future restoration in interpersonal relationship.

The last article in this volume, Kimiyo Ogawa’s “Fearing American Wilderness: Materialism in Charles Brockden Brown’s Edgar Huntly” explores the trans-Atlantic intellectual context in which Brown’s text emerged. Although many pioneers in the 17th and 18th century conceived of themselves as agents in facilitating the process of civilization, Ogawa maintains, Brown’s Edgar Huntly portrays men who experience regression back to a Hobbesian state of nature. Ogawa argues that Brown expresses an extreme fear of the moral degeneracy caused by placing civilized men like Edgar and Clithero in the unexplored primitive regions where no legal influence is accessible. Perhaps owing to his faith in Necessitarianism, she observes, Brown believed that man’s nature is inevitably affected by the surrounding physical universe, in which phenomena occur according to laws which are necessary. Pointing out the major influence of Benjamin Rush’s medical texts on Brown’s ideas, Ogawa discusses the author’s profound concern over the process of identity formation with special reference to contemporary medical and philosophical discourses.

The publication of the Journal is supported financially in part by a grant-in-aid for the Publication of Scientific Research Results from the Japan Society for Promotion of Science, for which we are deeply grateful. Most of the articles in the twenty volumes of the JJAS are available on the internet (http://www.jaas.gr.jp). We invite responses and criticisms from our readers and hope that the journal will continue to be an important medium for American Studies in the following decades. We also would like to extend our deep appreciation to Ms. Katy Meigs, our copyeditor in California, for her earnest support of our editorial work with many e-mail exchanges across the Pacific.

SHITSUYO MASUI
Editor
For those who wish to submit a manuscript to the *Japanese Journal of American Studies*:

1. Contributors must be dues-paying members of the JAAS.
2. Contributors are expected to observe our time schedule. They must first submit the title and abstract (about 300 words) by mid-January. We are unable to accept the manuscript without this procedure.
3. The final manuscript (maximum 8000 words including notes) is due early May. The editorial committee will inform each contributor of the result of the selection process by the end of June. If accepted, the paper will be published in June the following year.
4. The fall issue of the JAAS Newsletter will carry a “call for papers” announcement with exact deadlines and the special theme for the forthcoming issue.
5. The JAAS will accept inquiries through email: office@jaas.gr.jp