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東アジアのブランドスケープ、クールジャパン、生産フェティシズム。

大山 眞司
（立命館大学国際関係学部准教授）

報告では日本のポピュラー文化商品などの輸出振興策として語られている「クールジャパン」を取り上げ、批判的に考察した。はじめにクールジャパンが言説としては、ポピュラー文化の商業化・商品化・無難化、そして西洋的他者の眼差しを通じた自己表現というセルフオリエンタリズムの特徴を持っていること。さらには現代の文化生産における国際分業体制を後景化する性格を持つことを指摘した。さらに経済政策としては、アメリカ、さらに最近の韓国的事例を下敷きにし、ポピュラー文化輸出が原産国イメージの向上という形で主に消費財輸出の振興につながるという効果を前提にしていることを確認した。その上で文化消費を「日本らしさ」への同化や共感という「ナショナルな枠組み」で考える有効性を、日本発のファッションを事例として考察した。

ファッションはクールジャパンの中でも、特に成長市場アジアへの有望な輸出産業として取り上げられている。東アジアのファッションを検討する前提として、ブランドが知的所有権としてグローバルに取り引きされていることを確認した。また東アジアには70年代以降テレビ、雑誌、音楽をはじめとする日本のポピュラー文化が大量に流通しており、それがファッションの生産と流通、消費に多大な影響を与えていることを説明した。その上で日本ファッションのアジア進出の幾つかの形態を紹介した。1つめはファーストリテイリングのように日本企業が所有する日本ブランド（ユニクロ）を、日本原産のイメージを明白に訴求して展開するという形である。まさにクールジャパンが想定する形だが、こうした形での成功例は極めて限られている。次に日本企業が欧米ファッションブランドを取得あるいはライセンス契約を通じてアジア市場に持ち込む事例である。伊藤忠をはじめとする商社やアパレル企業に最近増えてきた形である。

3番目はアジア企業が日本のファッション企業やブランドを買収してアジアに展開するという展開、例えば中国企業によるレナウンの買収、さらには香港企業による、日本の裏原宿文化を代表するストリートブランドであるA Bathing Apeなどはその代表例である。

この報告ではファッションを含めたグローバル化する文化生産をナショナルな枠組みで捉えるクールジャパンをある種の生産フェティシズムであると位置づけ、こうした観点は、国境を越えた資金、メディア、人、技術の流れを見えなくするものだと主張した。さらに脱中心化し、乖離的傾向を強めるグローバル文化経済の研究においては、またこうした複雑さに対応した理論、方法論が必要とされており、文化とメディアの重要性が増していることを結論として述べた。
Knowledge dissemination from wartime Manchuria to postwar Japan
Postwar job experiences of South Manchuria Railway company (SMR) repatriates
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One of the important questions in history is how technology and knowledge have spread and allowed participants in an economy to increase their human capital. This paper goes back to imperial Japan to analyze one possible channel of human capital development – in-house vocational training by one of the largest wartime public corporations, the South Manchuria Railway (SMR) Company.

As of September 1944, the total number of its employees was approximately 400,000, which included 140,000 Japanese and 260,000 staff members of other nationalities, mostly Chinese and Russians. Contrary to prevailing notions, the majority of the Japanese were elementary school graduates who had been recruited in Japan and sent to Manchuria. They worked, for example, as railway operation staff members, factory workers, construction staff members and station staff members, and received extensive on-the-job training. After 1945, many SMR repatriates entered the postwar Japanese labour market with their skills acquired at the SMR. This research confirms that SMR repatriates found employment in various places, including the Japan National Railways, the public sector and industry and were engaged in construction, electrical engineering, steel production, railway operations and power plant construction, among others. This paper argues that the SMR, as well as other wartime public and private corporations and possibly the Japanese Navy, offered training opportunities to under-educated young individuals who brought their skills and knowledge to postwar Japan. After the war, the Japanese economy seems to have been able to have new skilled entrants as one of the sources of human capital, which also became a foundation of the postwar growth.
Globalization has resulted not only in massive flows of people, goods and information across the globe, but also in an ever increasing trend toward internationalization of higher education. Besides long-standing hubs of educational exchange such as Europe and the US, new clusters are developing across Asia. While these developments are pushed by governments in a bid to attract international paying students, increase international competitiveness of their own graduates and raise their country profile, implementation has its challenges. Based on a survey (n=23) conducted among faculty members of one internationalized college at a large-scale private university in Japan, some benefits and challenges of the process of internationalization were identified.

While faculty were overall positive about internationalization, both Japanese and international members agreed that actual implementation could be improved. Language and intercultural competence were considered essential and bilingual staff, emails and meetings were mentioned as features supporting an internationalized college. At the same time, culturally based expectations were not always met and an increased effort in community building as well as language support in Japanese for international faculty and more inclusivity for languages other than English were raised as necessary building blocks. Gender was another serendipitous finding with regard to the different gender expectations between the host culture and representatives of international cultures. Teaching, research and administrative work were similarly affected by the processes of internationalization. The diversity of students was highlighted as a natural base for promoting intercultural understanding and tolerance, whereas a certain increase in the workload was mentioned as a side effect. Regarding research, the majority of respondents coincided in the additional opportunities available due to internationalization, whereas a few mentioned added competition or pressure or no change at all. As far as administrative work is concerned, an increased work load and the perceived unequal distribution of the latter was cause for concern among both Japanese and international faculty members, which points to the need for structural reform in the process of internationalization. Language is an issue here but contributing based on the complementary strengths of different groups was mentioned as a way to overcome this hurdle. While faculty generally considered themselves as proactive in the face of internationalization, opinions on the appropriate steps to take in case of misunderstandings were less clear cut. Based on the findings described above, this college is following a trajectory of multi-cultural organizational development (Jackson & Hardiman, 1994; Jackson, 2006) from the
monocultural via the non-discriminatory toward the multi-cultural with different individuals being in different stages of the transition. In order to create a community of practice (Lave & Wenger, 1991; Wenger, 1998), members have to share their practices within a domain through social engagement, from the periphery to the center or via multidirectional networks (Kunschak, 2015). If participants from different cultures of practice intersect, overlap and sometimes collide, a third place (Kramsch, 1993; 2009) needs to be created where individuals can form a new understanding of what it means to be a multilingual multicultural community of practice in a globalized world.


