

86

Mid-term
SIS 348 April 26, 2009

1) According to Iwabuchi what is wrong with the term "cultural imperialism"? Why does it misrepresent the contemporary realities of globalization?

why? Iwabuchi sees cultural imperialism as an outdated term that no longer correctly illustrates the movement of culture. It is a mistake he says to try and understand the impact of society through the paradigm of cultural imperialism. He creates his theory that a new phase of cultural logic is emerging based on the question; why hasn't the Japanese cultural impact been equal to its economic weight? Based on the ideas of cultural imperialism, Japanese culture should seem as overbearing in the 21st century as American cultural was seen during Westernization. It is not however, because the new reality of Globalization is forcing a new theory to be developed.

22 Cultural imperialism is defined as the practice of promoting or artificially injecting the culture or language of one culture into another. The contemporary ideas of globalization are that any country with the biggest economy and or military should have this same effect, be it with hard power such as colonization or the soft power of political or economic influence. That is why it would make sense that in the 21st century Japanese cultural should be having as big of an impact on the world as Westernization has had in the last couple centuries. Westernization impacted the world's industry, technology, law, politics, economics, lifestyle, diet, language, alphabet, religion, and values. Although the Japanese economy has been growing steadily and is years ahead of the West in technology its culture has not had as big of an impact as expected. Iwabuchi's response to why this has not occurred is that our way of conceptualizing globalization must be wrong and that reality is changing. Iwabuchi explains the Japanese lack of influence on what he calls a new course. This new framework refers to the theory of localization, Transculturalation, and a challenging of the core periphery.

Localization is the adaptation of a product, application or document content to meet the language, cultural and other requirements of a specific targeted market. He says the global capital market is no longer trying to dominate local culture it is adapting to it. For example McDonald's fast food chain was an American idea that has been brought into countries all over the world. If you were to look at the menus of the different chains you would notice that they are slightly changed. A menu in the United States would consist of burgers and fries while in Asia the company has been localized to include rice on the menu. The only reason McDonalds has done this is because in order to Americanize the country and integrate its fast food into the culture it cannot rely merely on the theory that people believe in order to modernize they had to emulate the West. McDonalds must localize in order to appeal to the foreign consumers and for its company to successfully earn a profit in this new environment.

Instead of the previous idea of cultural imperialism homogenizing, the new framework suggests that this dispersing of culture is "producing a new cultural diversity". The previous theory of Cultural imperialism was a passive theory that fails to reflect how an audience actively absorbs and criticizes a new cultural perspective; this is the new reality that leads to the

development of a new theory. His name for this theory of globalization is Transculturalation. Transculturalation is the process of various cultures encountering and creating a "new style". Its effect can be seen in the world media and with fashion as well.

Another part of the new framework is the challenging of the core periphery. The shift from a center-periphery model to the diffusion of culture suggests the declining influence of the United States. Iwabuchi refers to Smart who believes that instead of the United States, Japan is becoming the model for Post modernity. Japan's takeover of Hollywood is an example of this. The Japanese influence in Hollywood was not a plan to take over American culture it was a strategic business move.

Iwabuchi's new framework is a new way of thinking in terms of cultural expansion. He believes that the World has outgrown the idea of Cultural Imperialism. To him this is clearly shown in the difference of Japanese influence in the 21st century compared to Westernization. The motives behind the expansion of culture had shifted from a 19th century view of bettering the world by injecting Western culture to the mind set of global capitalism with the goal to make the biggest profit.

Transnational cultural flow

2) What were the central tenets of colonial modernities in the Philippines as outlined by Rafael? How was the census complicit with this project?

The central beliefs behind colonial modernities were paralleled by the census. The American government was able to frame their involvement with the Philippines as one of moral obligation. They presented the Filipinos as inadequate to govern themselves. The census' role was to re-enforce these ideas of American supremacy.

Americans were there to assist the Philippians to govern themselves at least that was the overlying idea. They thought that their superior modern way of colonizing would be able to bring the Philippians in the right direction. The Americans had a very linear view of modernity. They saw themselves as at the front and the Philippines as very far behind and they wanted to help elevate them to the Western level.

The Filipinos had been through many waves of colonization and America compared their different colonization to the Spanish that had colonized there years before and left the Country even more backwards. The US unlike the Spanish was non-oppressive and planed on bringing democracy into the Country (It was imperative for the Americans to be there) and free these people from "themselves and their Spanish past". The US had a very maternal way of viewing the Filipinos.

A way of separating themselves from previous colonizers was to actually create modern institutions. The census was considered a bureaucratic tool. This was a very modern turn from the previous ways of colonizing, continuing to parallel the idea of the US supremacy in modernity and colonization. The Americans did a very good job of hiding the consequences of the census and how it really did not adequately separate them from previous colonizers only mask their true intentions. The census created a ranking with in the Philippines re-establishing previous racial and ethnic classifications from the previous Spanish colonization. It placed the colonizers as the pinnacle of the hierarchy and ranked the Filipinos based on how civilized they were.

The census' public goal was to create a colonial order that was parallel to the representation of the Filipino people. It was going to create a representative institution once the Filipinos were ready. According to General Taft the census was designed for the Filipinos in order to build character and prepare them for self governing. The census was a test to measure their capacity to rule themselves, of course because the Americans thought of them unable to do so the census re-established the idea that the Americans were still needed. The true role of the census was to legitimize why the Americans still had to remain in the Philippines.

The census re-established the ideas of colonial modernities within the Philippines. It was able to convince the American public and the Filipinos that the American intentions were in line with their diction. The main idea that the Americans were superior to the Filipinos and the previous colonizers were reinforced by the creation of the modern bureaucratic census. The census and its results also justified the other ideas that the Philippines were in need of the Americans and that their intentions were completely noble.

3) What is one example of a "modern tradition" as detailed in Mirror of Modernity, and what is the significance of this concept?

An example of "modern tradition" that Vlastos bring up in Mirror of Modernity is *yocozuna*. The respect given to a *yocozuna* wrestler is still as high or higher today than it was when the tradition began. This example is significant to Vlastos' argument in that it still commands respect even after the original tradition has been modified and changed to fit the modern world.

Yocozuna, or sumo wrestling, has been a time honored tradition since 1789. It has evolved since the 20th century to adapt to what Vlastos calls the modern tournament champion system. This modification has put more pressure on the wrestler to uphold an almost impossible quality of performance. Today the quality of performance expected from a wrestler hardly resembles that of the original tradition.

Although new rules and rituals have been added to the sport it still retains its prestige within society. As modernized as it has become Japanese still see it as an important tradition that links them to the past and allows them to hold on to their culture. The *yocozuna* are seen as embodying all that is Japanese, they are the very essence of what is seen to be Japanese. So much so that when an American became a *yocozuna* it outraged the Japanese society. The criteria for becoming a *yocozuna* was changed in order for that to not happen again, part of the criteria now is the wrestler must look how the original *yocozuna* are imagined by society.

The significance of this example is to answer the puzzle posed by modern traditions. The idea that if at the heart of every tradition are time honored practices and beliefs, then why have the modern tailoring and embellishing not taken away from the authority of the traditions? The amount of respect that the Japanese have for their culture and tradition should have made them turn away from anything modern trying to infiltrate their customs. They would be surprised by the recent origins of these age old traditions. The reason why they don't see this is because they have this understanding of tradition that is disconnected from the reality of what is really going on.

Vlastos includes Chakrabarty's argument as a critical reminder that the sensory dimension of cultural practices has a lot to do with reinforcing tradition tries to make sense of the *yocozuna* example and answer the puzzle of modern traditions as much as possible. His argument says that the *yocozuna* tradition has continued to be prevalent and as time honored because it continues to present a "convincing sensory spectacle" that repeatedly convinces society of how ancient the tradition is. He argues that the past is embodied through living it not just remembering it and these displays are responsible for convincing people to see through their logic.

The example of *yocozuna* tradition is used by Vlastos to answer, as best as possible, the puzzle of modern tradition without the deeper understanding of tradition that is needed. The fact that sumo wrestling is still considered a vital part of Japanese tradition is due to the fact that sensory has been used to establish its ancient origins. *Yocozuna* may continue to modernize with the world but its view as a tradition will continue to be re-established as long as there is that gap between the understanding of tradition and the reality of it.

4) Why does Woodside title his book *Lost Modernities*? What do these "lost modernities" suggest about the conventional genealogy of modernity?

in that it over looks aspects constructed as a view of the past.

Woodside suggests that the term modernity is too narrow and that it puts constraints on our thoughts. He titles his book *Lost Modernities*, because that is exactly what he believes has happened. He believes that the modern aspects of the Mandarin society have been lost when explaining the theory of modernity. hist.

Modernity refers to the modern era starting in the 18th century. It is a term used to explain a point in history when the ideals of the world, mainly the West were changing. Prior to the 18th century, scholars claim that nothing modern existed yet there was the Mandarin system. The system embodied a lot of what we consider modern today. ~~modernity~~

The Mandarin society in 605 C.E. incorporates a lot of what is considered to be modern, challenging the genealogy of modernity. Mandarins ran into the problems of modernity far before Europe. Unlike other societies of its time the Mandarin society was no longer a feudalist. They saw the need for the separation of church and state long before the creation of the United States constitution in the West. They had eliminated inheritance and replaced it with a merit based system. The evaluations used to determine worthiness of a job were the pinnacle of what is modern. ~~modernity~~

The Meritocracy used by Mandarins was the closest system to a modern democracy of its time. No other society would realize the benefit of a merit based system until the modern era. This really upsets the idea of modernity beginning in the 18th century. Exams were used to test people on what they knew about the Mandarin system, this determined if you were worthy of your job. People would study for years in preparation of these exams. ~~the open mindedness~~

Another aspect of their culture that made them modern was their realistic view towards the problems of the day by the government, including the willingness to not idealize the present, ~~the~~

was the gov's open mindedness when it came to the present social problems

20
created a welfare state

and
to state things as they were, not as they should be. The government saw problems such as poverty as the fault of the government. If people were impoverished then there must be something that the government is doing wrong and needs to fix.

Develop! → The ideas on poverty in Europe at this time were that if you were poor then it was your fault either because you were lazy or there was a moral issue. Therefore, there is nothing the government would or needed to do about it. The welfare system that the Mandarins created became a model for the modern world. They were providing basic social needs for their people long before Capitalism emerged. The conventional genealogy of modernity suggests that the Welfare state could only follow and develop in a Capitalist society. They even went so far as to create affirmative action. Their form of affirmative action pushed for more peasants and minority ethnic groups to be able to take the exams, it even made exceptions for a lot of them in order to have minorities represented in the bureaucracy.

Yes, what else? → The qualities of the Mandarin government had many qualities of what scholars define as modern after the 18th century. The purpose of Woodside's book is to bring to light these modernities of this society that have been "lost" in the theory of modernity. He believes that these modernities have been ignored because they question the very genealogy of modernity. What was thought to have begun in the West was seen in the mandarin society year prior and all of this was done without a Capitalist government.

Anthony
Giddison

mod. w/ Capitalism

look at examples of neatly
connected w/ cap.

history
Marxism
cap engine of change
of social formations
lead to socialism

Taylor
strong
tendency
material
explanations

neo classical theorists
eco drive social
formations