

International Environment for Technological and Cultural Exchanges in Asia-1983.12.13

# INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM

## Technology, Culture and Development

SESSION 6

13 DEC 1983

International Environment for  
Technological and Cultural Exchanges  
in Asia

by

Mineo Nakajima



CENTRO DI RICERCA  
E DOCUMENTAZIONE

**FEBBRAIO 74**



HONDA FOUNDATION



UNIVERSITI  
MALAYA

1. Technological and Cultural Exchanges as the Point at Issue

At a meeting on the Japanese diplomatic policy toward Southeast Asian countries which was held in Tokyo some time ago, there was a fundamental and interesting argument between two Japanese participants in connection with technological and cultural exchanges with Southeast Asian countries. One participant was a Japanese political scientist who has achieved excellent results in the field of political and social analyses of Southeast Asian countries.

On the premise that Southeast Asian countries had already passed beyond the period of political instability and are growing toward internal social development, he proposed that Japan should work out a cultural diplomacy policy toward Southeast Asian countries which was based on technological and cultural transfer. He maintained that by doing so Japan could respond to the Malaysian "Look-East Policy" and Singapore's "Learn from Japanese Experiences" Campaign.

Speaking against him was a social anthropologist who enjoys a reputation as one of the representative Japanese intellectuals. He strongly attacked the proposal made by the political scientist. He said that it was very difficult to export Japanese technology and culture to Southeast

Asian countries and that a diplomatic policy toward Southeast Asian countries which was based on Japanese culture should not be adopted. Thus, he reacted negatively to the suggestion made by the political scientist and said that the economic and technological level in Japan derives not only from the cultural tradition which grew during and after the Edo period but also from the historical heritage accumulated after the Jomon period in the prehistory era. He said, therefore, that it should not be considered an easy option to transfer Japanese technology and culture to countries devoid of such a cultural tradition. This was the reason why the social anthropologist reacted negatively to the cultural and diplomatic proposal made by the political scientist. While listening to the argument, I could not help thinking that it was similar to the difference in opinion expressed between two American scholars with respect to the success of the Japanese economy. One was Prof. Ezra F. Vogel of Harvard University who leaped suddenly to fame after he published a book entitled "Japan as No. One" and the other was Prof. Chalmers Johnson, a political scientist teaching at the University of Berkeley, California, who attracted a good deal of attention by publishing a book entitled "MITI and the Japanese Miracle". Both are scholars of medium standing who majored in East Asian

Studies, specializing on China. They are also friends of mine.(1)

Prof. Ezra F. Vogel attributed the success of Japan to "things Japanese" and "Japan's individuality", while Prof. Chalmers Johnson attributed the success to the modern industrial system and excellent bureaucracy. In short, according to Prof. Johnson's hypothesis, Japan's success is based on universal factors, and other countries will find it easy to imitate it. In contrast, Prof. Vogel stresses an individuality unique to Japan and argues that it would be difficult to transfer the Japanese recipe for success unaltered to other countries, although from what he says in "Japan as No. One" the Japanese experience may prove to be a good lesson to Americans, who are liable to think that America is No. 1 in everyting.

Thus, the problem relating to the transfer of technology and culture is an extremely important subject involving the history of civilization, and entails a great deal of controversy. Therefore, an easygoing and hasty approach to handling this problem would cause conflict in exchanges with different cultures. The problems of cultural exchanges and conflicts have just been taken up in the fields of international relations and diplomatic policies, and these are important problems which require study in the future.

Under such circumstances, I will try to concentrate my discussion on the Asian international environment, which is expected to serve as a magnetic core attracting technological and cultural exchanges.

## 2. International Environment of Interdependence

The 1970's was a decade during which men were forced to become aware of the crisis of existence due to the so-called oil crises. In the 1980's as the decade of the New Cold War(2), countries throughout the world are increasingly tending to expand their armaments as if such military expansion is inevitable in the struggle for control over energy sources, other resources and the limited living space on the earth.

Not only the advanced countries of the West but also socialist countries such as the USSR and China, which claim to stand for peaceful principles, are trying to strengthen and expand armaments on one pretext or another. The USSR and China are militaristic countries which allocate more than 10% of their GNPs to military expenditure (as against five to six percent for the USA). This kind of military expansion accelerates the massive consumption of resources and energy sources, and the military expansion option is therefore nothing but a fool's choice. Under this state of tension; however, people in general are not fully aware of this

contradiction. In a couple of centuries time, will people look back at the 20th century and laugh at the stupidity of the actions taken?

It is under these circumstances that a hot power game is being played by the USSR, USA and China. As long as it remains only a game, the final crisis can be deterred. As long as it remains basically a balance of terror the aspect that generates most fear in us is nothing less than the destruction of man caused by an erroneous pull of the trigger by these nuclear powers. For this reason, it is important for us to look at the truth behind the sensational phenomena associated with the existing international tension, to avoid the final crisis, and to search for a new hope for the modern world.

What are the important problems relating to the Asian international environment? Firstly, it is expected that the power game among the super powers will continue to intensify for the time being. A fundamental change in the Chinese domestic administration is taking place in the form of "de-Maoization" and there is an increasing probability of a thaw in relations between China and the USSR. In order to prevent China and the USSR from becoming friends again, the USA is expected to do its utmost to keep these countries apart. The impulse toward military cooperation between

China and USA must be perceived in this context. It goes without saying that the stronger the impulse, the more active the USSR's world strategy, particularly its Asian strategy.

Secondly, China has a population of one billion, or more than a quarter of the whole population of the world. The national per capita income seems to be between about \$260 and \$280, or less than one-thirty-fifth of the Japanese national per capita income. Therefore, we cannot help having some apprehensions about whether China will be able to achieve the so-called Four Modernizations. As can be seen from the resource nationalism claimed by the member countries of OPEC, the North-South problems are expected to be the problems of man as a whole. Many regard the rise of the Third World as a tidal current of hope, but I do not think that we can expect much from the "treason" of the Third World. The Third World can no longer simply accuse the advanced countries of exploitation as it did in the 1970s. A rise in oil prices will rebound against the Third World in the form of expensive imports. Besides, the development of alternative energies will make progress. It is expected, therefore, that resource nationalism will not produce a linear effect as before.

Thirdly, the most important thing to note is that international interdependence is expected to increase. It may be said that an increase in interdependence is a characteristic to which importance must be attached as it represents a new tidal current in the modern world.

At the same time, however, with the expansion of such relationships, friction and tension will be amplified and diversified. The increase in international interdependence always involves contact between different cultures and civilizations. Therefore, the problem will get complicated unless there is incessant endeavors for mutual understanding. The unhappy end of good relations between USA and Iran may be said in a way to be a failure of contact between different cultures and civilizations. This kind of risk is also latent in the relationship between the West and the "Open China".

On the other hand, an increase in international interdependence is prone to expand differences among various countries or the disadvantages of one side. One example is the trade friction among the advanced countries (such as the automobile war between Japan and USA). The rise in oil prices has produced an adverse effect upon newly industrializing countries (NICs), which had enjoyed smooth economic growth and which had followed closely behind the

advanced countries, and such an adverse effect might lead to the aggravation of inflation, increased social unrest and balance of payments deficits.. These then are the major pitfalls of the age of interdependence. Therefore, it can be argued that the term "interdependence" translates as "risk" to the Third World.

Nevertheless, when increased interdependence, as the new tidal current of the modern world, is incorporated in international politics and the world economy, it will prove to be an effective prescription which can help man to weather crises and survive.

There is already a worldwide network of interdependence and countries and regions of the world can sensitively respond to one another. Therefore, free, open and pluralistic international relationships must be established through exchanges in the fields of politics, the economy, culture and so forth.

In particular, open interdependence in the economic field assumes free trade and the liberalization of capital transfers. In view of this, there should be an approach which is capable of avoiding exclusive nationalism and sectionalism. At the same time, a system for international cooperation must be ensured. From these points of view, bilateral and multilateral cooperation must be accelerated.

It goes without saying that international interdependence is most conspicuous in the field of economics. It must be noted, however, that interdependence is widely maintained in the international relationships of today's "New Cold War Era". This kind of interdependence is not the exclusive property of the West or the USSR and East Europe. It is maintained outside political systems in international trade, international finance, multinational enterprises, etc. Interdependence can be observed even in various fields of international culture, and in the export and supply of weapons. There is even interdependence between the US and USSR which are the principal players in today's "New Cold War". It must be noted that trade and transportation between China and USSR have not been terminated, even though the relationship between these countries was extremely serious. Faced with the "New Cold War Era", we must coolly grasp a modern world characterized by interdependence and search for the ways and means to overcome any immediate crisis which may arise in the midst of today's international tension.

### 3. New Possibilities in the Asian and Pacific Regions

In the midst of the severe international environment in the "New Cold War Era", there has appeared a wishful new concept of international solidarity in the Asian and Pacific regions. It is referred to either as the Pacific Community or Pacific Cooperation. The Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept<sup>(3)</sup> is in a way something like a "follow-on" to the age of interdependence. The Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept itself is not necessarily a new concept. The idea was often proposed, albeit with a slightly different nuance. It is ironic that the person who said that, while Europe was falling down, the Asian and Pacific region was full of possibilities in the coming century, was Mary MacLane, deputy editor of London Economist, published in England, which is suffering from the British disease.<sup>(4)</sup>

It is natural that a concept such as the one mentioned above should have various implications. But many people unanimously agree that the 1980s, 1990s and 20th century will be the age of the Asian and Pacific region. The circum-pan Pacific region is full of possibilities. Industrial countries such as the USA, Canada and Japan and newly industrializing countries such as South Korea, Taiwan, Hongkong, Singapore, Brazil and Mexico are located in this

region. The fact that Australia and New Zealand are claiming new identities as "Asian and Pacific" nations has an important historical meaning. ASEAN countries are aiming at unification in terms of industrialization and nation building. In addition, the islands of the South Pacific are becoming independent countries one after another.

Such being the case, the Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept is fascinating as well as exciting. At the same time, however, there are a number of barriers and problems in this region. The Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere which Japan advocated during the war was nothing but a nightmare to many Asian and Pacific nations. An anti-hegemonic alliance of the US, Japan and China may go as far as to become an Eastern version of NATO. Thus, the Asian and Pacific region no longer permits the pursuit of political romanticism and is a region of complex diversity.

Under such circumstances, it is not possible for Japan to advocate Pacific Basin Cooperation for its own sake. Today, when people are required to coexist and co-prosper, the fact that the Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept has received renewed attention must be rated highly.

This is because the concept implies that the system of interdependence provides a very important network for

international peace despite the competition between the super powers. For this reason, it must be reconfirmed that the Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept is a long-term vision intended for the prosperity and stability of the Asian and Pacific region. Accordingly, if the Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept is considered to be a universal remedy with an immediate effect, a gap will soon be evident between the ideal and reality. The countries concerned should recognize this concept as reflecting a movement in the direction of prosperity and stability in the Asian and Pacific region and as the ideal to look to while struggling with realities.

Before considering the ideal of future modernization, it must be remembered that there are a great number of problems that remain unsolved in the Asian and Pacific region. In order to challenge such difficulties, there is no choice but to solve problems on a step by step basis while keeping a long-term vision of the future.

It is impossible to systematically wrap up the Asian and Pacific region into a neat package. In the Asian and Pacific region today, there are countries whose top priority is political independence rather than economic cooperation and interdependence, while there are still other countries whose pressing need is the achievement of economic

development and economic independence. If advanced countries come up with economy-oriented solidarity without considering political problems, they would be evading the real problems which await solutions and there would be the possibility of the promotion of regional cooperation lapsing into an "economic club" consisting only of advanced countries.

In order to mutually control closed nationalism, national or group egoism and the underlying strategic and tactical motives called national interests, the long-term and concrete vision discussed above is a vital ingredient. The vision must be the supreme principle for man's coexistence and co-prosperity, and which denies political romanticism.

#### 4. Asian International Environment and the "Shadow of China"

There still are various social and political problems to be resolved in Asia today. In some cases, such problems may lead to war because of hatred and grudges, to international instability, and to increased tension. Against this international environment, a number Asian countries have suffered and wavered. For this reason, the "Shadow of China" is very long in Southeast Asia. With this knowledge, the People's Republic of China has executed its own strategy.

In view of the above, it may be said that Asian countries are keeping a sharp eye on China. When Japan, which is an economic superpower, began to form close relations with the PRC after the US approach to China, not only the countries of the Indo-China peninsula but also ASEAN countries reacted strongly against the formation of a Tokyo-Beijing axis.

Under such circumstances, it will be useful to discuss the "Shadow of China" in Asia today. I have visited Southeast Asia often and one of the impressions I obtained is that the predominant image of China is quite different from the image of China which we have in Japan. To the Japanese people, China is, so to speak their cultural home and the Japanese people tend to have a naive feeling of intimacy with China and feel a kind of "purity" and "sacredness" in connection with China.

On the other hand, other Asians view China from a different perspective. Although a new China was built on the basis of revolutionary purity, China today is a powerful authoritarian state. Therefore, other Asian countries seem to see the ugliness of China which has both strength and authority. It may be said, therefore, that the more the prestige of China rises and the more conspicuous the Chinese role in the international stage, the more clearly they seem

to see an aspect of China, or even the threat of a powerful China which endlessly pursues national prestige and interests. This image of China is the "Shadow of China" brought about by the increase in Chinese international prestige and influence.

Secondly, the "Shadow of China" which covers Asia and which causes pressing problems is brought about by the wide dispersion of ethnic Chinese throughout the region. As everyone who visits Southeast Asia discovers, a great number of Chinese live in the area. These overseas Chinese have a firm grip on economic activities, and cherish Chinese culture and customs. The China with which these peoples are familiar differs greatly from the image of China represented by external phenomena such as the Chinese admission to the United Nations and the American diplomatic approach to China. The third "Shadow of China" was attributable to the Maoist revolutionary "threat", as symbolized by the "export of revolution" and "revolutionary

diplomacy". This problem was more keenly perceived by the fact that most of the Asian revolutionary groups are led by Chinese and closely connected with the Chinese Communist Party.

In view of the above, Asian countries are considering measures to respond to the "Shadow of China" with these matters taken into consideration.

For example, it is well known that Malaysia has adopted the Malaysian-oriented "Bumiputra" policy (which was completed by a new economic policy formulated in 1971). This particular policy represents the characteristics of Malaysia, which is a pluralistic state suffering under the "Shadow of China". It must be noted that the "Look East policy", which Prime Minister Mahateel advocates, aims at Japan and South Korea and not China or Taiwan. Asian countries are struggling with the "Shadow of China" and are promoting their national identities and economic development as common themes. It is; therefore, necessary for us to fully understand the realities of Asia.

5. Exchanges of Technology and Culture and the Role of Japan

When the complex and fluid international environment in Asia is carefully examined, it is clear that Japan must endeavor to solve basic problems relating to Japan's cultural and technological exchanges with Asian countries. Measures and institutional and organizational reforms to facilitate smooth international exchanges and mutual understanding, problems relating to the acceptance of students from Asian countries, the employment of foreign teachers, mutual access to library information and academic information, and the breaking of the closed nature of research institutes are important diplomatic themes to be studied. It follows naturally that "area studies" must be accelerated to promote mutual understanding in the Asian and Pacific region.

The importance of "area studies" has been recognized to a considerable extent in Japan. Some universities and research institutes have begun to accept students from Asian countries. It can be argued then that "area studies" are important not only to facilitate exchanges of different cultures but also to clear the barrier of culture differences. Edward T. Hall, a cultural anthropologist, said(5) that unless one studies and understands foreign cultures, they will always appear tyrannical and tend

to dazzle the viewer. Therefore, it is necessary for us to acquire the ability to filter the impact and fascination of foreign cultures and to coolly look at the thus refined foreign cultures through "area studies".

On this basis, cooperation relating to training, technical cooperation, trade cooperation and expansion, industrial adjustment, cooperation in the development of resources (energy development, oceanic development and cooperation in agriculture, forestry and fisheries), the smooth flow of funds (liberalization of financial and capital market), the expansion and improvement of transportation and communication systems (improvement of transportation systems, expansion of communication networks and improvement of emigration and immigration procedures), occupational training and job creation for the development of Asian countries will take-off. The next step will be the liberalization of the trade in agricultural products and joint development of energy intended for the benefit of developing countries.

Only by pursuing these problems on a long-term basis can technological transfer and cultural exchanges in the Asian and Pacific region make steady progress. While technological transfer and cultural imports are given full play to maximize their input effect, harmony between such

technology and culture and local history and tradition will be made possible, with the result that the sum of these will contribute to the wealth and development of the Asian and Pacific region.

In the new international environment of the 1980s in Asia, the appraisal and image of Japan has been improved and Asian countries' trust in Japan has been greatly heightened.(6) As is well known, Japan, which became an economic super-power thanks to the high economic growth in the 1960s made inroads into Southeast Asia at the beginning of the 1970s and was frowned upon and severely criticized by the Asian people because of its aggressive approach to international contact.

The anti-Japanese criticism has gradually faded away now and the situation has changed a great deal. Today, Asian nations expect Japan to play its international role to the full. Japan should never again fail to meet the expectations of the Asian people.

Japan should not adopt the way of thinking that it is sufficient to reconsider its own share in a give-and-take approach and neither is it allowed to satisfy itself by being devoted to an ideal vision without regard to the

complicated reality and deep rooted stagnation in Asia. It will not be possible for Japan to obtain anything productive from the self-punishment caused by its own assailant-awareness or from the old fashioned Asian challenge to advanced urban civilization.

It will be important to emerge from a stereotyped view of Asia, to accept the mixture of muddy reality and carefree frankness unique to societies in the South Sea and to acquire a sense of realism in our recognition of Asia.

## Footnotes

- (1) Ezra F. Vogel, Japan as Number One: Lessons for America (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1979).  
Chalmers Johnson, MITI and the Japanese Miracle: The Growth of Industrial Policy, 1925 - 1975 (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1982).
- (2) With respect to the reason why the 1980s are the age of a "New Cold War", see Mineo Nakajima, Era of the New Cold War (Shin Reisen No Jidai) (Tokyo: TBS Britanica, 1980) PP. 5 - 16.
- (3) The author himself was one of the members of the policy research group. For his views on the Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept advocated by the Ohira Cabinet, see Mineo Nakajima, Pacific Basin Cooperation Concept and Japan's Options, Asia Pacific Community, No. 9, Summer 1980.
- (4) Norman Macrae, Pacific Century, 1975 - 2075, The Economist, January 4, 1975.
- (5) See Esward T. Hall, Beyond Culture (New York: Anchor Press/Doubleday, 1976), Chap. II, Chap. XII.
- (6) See "Public Opinion Poll on Japan in ASEAN", Public Information and Cultural Affairs Bureau, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japanese Government (November 2, 1983).