



琉球大学学術リポジトリ

University of the Ryukyus Repository

Title	Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai'i: Twice Born; Suggestions for Further Research
Author(s)	Huey , Robert N.
Citation	International journal of Okinawan studies, 4(2): 65-77
Issue Date	2013-12-30
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/20.500.12000/43626
Rights	

Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai‘i: Twice Born; Suggestions for Further Research

Robert N. Huey*

One of the projects I pursued as Director of the Center for Japanese Studies (2003–2012) at the University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa (UH) was the development of Okinawan Studies. It became clear around 2005 that critical mass existed in terms of the intellectual climate at UH, the political climate in the state, and interest in the local Okinawan community as well as scholars from Okinawa, to make it possible to consider establishing a Center for Okinawan Studies as an independent center, joining seven other “area” centers in the School for Pacific and Asian Studies. (I place “area” in quotation marks for reasons that will become clearer below.)

I was vaguely mindful that there had been an earlier push for Okinawan studies at UH, but I focused primarily on the task at hand, and with the support of many people, we were able to establish a Center for Okinawan Studies at UH in 2008. It was then that I became interested in what my predecessors had done. However, little remained in the institution from their earlier efforts. Most of the courses were no longer on the books; the professors themselves had all passed away. One exception was the Sakamaki-Hawley Collection in the library, which became a key element in our attempt to revive interest in Okinawan studies.

It was with the hope, then, of making our current effort more sustainable that I decided to learn more about that earlier attempt to see what structural, institutional elements may have resulted in its demise. What I found, however, was that not only did the institutional details differ but the entire political and intellectual framework of that earlier effort was markedly different from that of 2008. The endeavor is far outside my normal academic field (classical Japanese literature!), but I approached it as an administrator, looking for guidance in building a new center. In fact, the intellectual issues that my inquiry raised, however, suggested that there is fruitful area for further research in looking at the relationship between intellectual trends, larger political frames, and international university administrative politics.

Thus I am offering this article as a way to stimulate further research into how not just Okinawan studies but any “field of study” gets impetus, thrives, or fails within an aca-

* Professor, University of Hawai‘i at Mānoa ハワイ大学マノア校教授

demic institution.

Scope and Methods of This Study:

Since World War II, there have been two waves of institutional interest in Okinawan/Ryukyuan Studies at UH. I believe the wave metaphor is apt in that as one wave recedes the next one breaks, and they share more than is immediately apparent. Still, my contention is that these two waves were born out of very different historical contexts, which I would like to briefly review here.

My method is straightforward. For the first wave, I reviewed the University of Hawai'i archives to find evidence of how Okinawan Studies was "sold" to administrators in order to obtain institutional support, and I revisited the publications of such University of Hawai'i-connected scholars as Shunzo Sakamaki, George Kerr, William Lebra, Richard Pearson and Thomas Maretzki — especially the introductions, acknowledgments, study designs, and funding sources-to see how they characterized their own endeavors within a scholarly context.

For the second wave, I interviewed current university administrators from several levels and one person from the larger Okinawan community outside UH who strongly supported the establishment of the Center for Okinawan Studies (COS) in its current iteration. My interviews followed a question template approved by the Human Studies Program at UH (CHS #19898). I explored questions related to identity, to Okinawan language, to the perceived impact (if any) of the Hawaiian Renaissance and indigenous studies in general. (To preserve confidentiality, I have assigned each interviewee a set of randomly-selected initials for the purposes of citation.)

I also drew on my own interactions and experiences as one of the key participants in the Okinawan studies "revival" at UH. My tentative conclusion is that the two waves differ not only in the way they appealed for support (funding) but also in their intellectual frameworks. Not surprisingly, the difference reflects the different historical circumstances as well as a general shift in American academia that has been occurring since the late 1960s.

Briefly stated, the first wave of Ryukyuan/Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai'i was born of post-war occupation exigencies, which later gave way to overlapping Cold War concerns. Okinawa was seen in the context of "democracy as immunization" — initially as immunization against the excesses of feudal, militaristic Japan, and later as immunization (and a bulwark) against communism. The intellectual framework reflected a structuralist, universalist approach that mirrored "modernization theory," which was so important in Japanese studies at this time. The key tenet of "modernization theory" was that developing countries could be studied and evaluated against a universalist model based primarily on American capitalism.¹⁾

On the other hand, the second wave comes out of a brew of identity politics, liberal U.S. race politics, ethnic studies, and, more recently, indigenous studies. As I will discuss,

people involved in the second wave do not necessarily share the same agenda with each other, as is evidenced by the tension between those who see revitalization of the Okinawan language as a key and those who argue that “Okinawan-ness” is not necessarily tied to language. To be fair, the first wave scholars were not monolithic, either, as I will show.

The First Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Shunzo Sakamaki

The first wave of Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai‘i is indelibly tied to Shunzo Sakamaki, whose impact on the university was such as to get a building named after him.²⁾ Race was always a key issue for Sakamaki, who might be described as “hyper-patriotic” before and during World War II. In 1940, he was very active in promoting an expatriation petition that sought to allow Japanese citizens long resident in the U.S. to legally renounce their Japanese citizenship. Also in that same year, he suggested that authorities keep a list of names of those in the community, particularly people connected with Shinto institutions, whom he thought would bear watching if war broke out with Japan (Gusukuma, 1999, pp. 60–69). Somewhere along the line, Sakamaki developed an interest in Ryukyuan studies. I have yet to find clear evidence in his own words as to why, though I am inclined to think connections of his in the military may have encouraged it. (It should be noted that Hawai‘i is nearly as militarized as Okinawa.) In a *Hawaii Hochi* article from early 1964, the reporter who interviewed Sakamaki writes that Okinawan studies was originally a “side interest” for Sakamaki but grew in importance to him because as he (Sakamaki) says, “Any people, for their history, should be studied” (Toishigawa, 1964). Before one reads Sakamaki as an early advocate of “indigenous studies,” however, consider that the Japanese version of the article says that Sakamaki began to keenly feel the need to expand the field of Okinawan studies immediately after World War II, and presumably in response to it. In other words, his attention was not necessarily drawn to Okinawa, *per se*, but to Okinawa as a recently acquired U.S. territory.

Sakamaki’s earlier publications on Japan-U.S. relations (including his *Japan and the U.S.*, 1939) and his 1953 textbook *Asia* (with John White), treat Okinawa peripherally, if at all. In the former, the only references to the Ryukyus are as a way-station for U.S. ships repatriating shipwrecked Japanese sailors. The “Sketch Map of Japan” that accompanies the monograph (Sakamaki, 1939, p. ix) depicts nothing south of Okinawa Island. In fact, it is difficult to tell whether Sakamaki sees the Ryukyus as a more or less independent entity or as an essentially meaningless margin of Japan.

In the 1953 textbook, the Ryukyus/Okinawa is not even mentioned in the section on the U.S. Occupation of Japan, though the authors do state that the 1951 Peace Treaty with Japan “placed the Ryukyu Islands and certain other islands under United Nations trusteeship and United States administration” (Sakamaki & White, 1953, p. 495). There is also the intriguing comment that Perry had “recommended that the Bonin or Ryukyu Islands near Japan be taken over to serve as a coaling station” (Sakamaki & White, 1953, p. 229).

Here, Sakamaki's decoupling of the Ryukyus from Japan may stem from a growing notion that it was by then a part of the U.S. and, in his mind, should stay that way.

Thus, in his early career, the Ryukyus/Okinawa did not figure much in his work. However, once he grew interested in the region — for whatever reason — he made impressive strides in building Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai'i: he brought several scholars (including William Lebra) to the University of Hawai'i directly, and later through the new East West Center, which itself was to play a role in U.S. Cold War politics.³⁾ He purchased the Hawley Collection, with support from both the state and the local Okinawan community, which was an enormous coup (Siebert, 1961). Yet, after his retirement in 1972, Ryukyuan Studies gradually faded away; after Lebra's death in 1986, only Mitsugu Sakihara remained, and his transfer to Summer Sessions, which administered the university's summer course offerings, meant that the Okinawan history course was taught only sporadically. Sakihara's death in 2001 marked the end of the wave, and yet it was the dictionary manuscript he left behind, like a receding wave, that we at the Center for Japanese Studies picked up and published as the *Okinawan-English Wordbook* (Sakihara, 2006), which gave the second wave its initial push.

What motivated Sakamaki? He himself gives the following as the factors that make Okinawan Studies intrinsically important, as outlined in his 1963 *Ryukyu: A Bibliographic Guide to Okinawan Studies*:

The ethno-linguistic ties between the early inhabitants of the Ryukyu Islands and the early inhabitants of the Japanese islands; the diverse cultural and economic influences of China upon Ryukyu since the fourteenth century; the tremendous maritime activity of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries that saw Ryukyuan ships engross the trade lanes from Northeast to Southeast Asia; the impact of Satsuma hegemony and Japanese culture on Ryukyu after 1609; the role of Ryukyuan scholars in the transmission of Chinese knowledge to Japan; the writing of Chinese scholar-envoys and their influence on Japanese and Western conceptions of the Ryukyus; the manifold problems that attended Japanese governance of the islands as a prefecture after the 1870s; the important studies produced by Japanese, Ryukyuan, and Chinese scholars in modern times; the current major question of "Reversion to Japan," from the standpoint of Ryukyuan and Japanese. (Sakamaki, 1963, p. v)

All of these issues still occupy scholars and demonstrate, I think, that Sakamaki was serious in his interest. However, I cannot help feeling that the final problem he poses — reversion — carries much weight with him. In other words, the patriotic Sakamaki's focus on Okinawa seemed to stem from what he saw as America's interest there. (We will see something similar with Kerr below.)

The First Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — William Lebra, George Kerr, and Thomas Maretzki

For William Lebra, too, "reversion" looms large. In his paper "The Ryukyu Islands," part of the Rice University conference "The Study of Japan in the Behavioral Sciences"

(published in 1970), he argues that “. . . a process of Japanization is rapidly accelerating and will in all likelihood totally efface Ryukyuan culture in several decades” (Lebra, 1970, p. 285). Here one sees the shadow of Margaret Mead and the notion that one of the anthropologist’s roles is to record marginal, and often dying, cultures.

A fascinating document for understanding the Ryukyuanists of this first wave is the 1955 Scientific Investigations in the Ryukyu Islands (SIRI) study called *Post-War Okinawa*, by Pitts, Lebra, and Suttles. Funded by the U.S. Army, its unabashed purpose was to better understand Okinawa so as to more effectively govern it. As such, it calls to mind Ruth Benedict’s earlier *The Chrysanthemum and the Sword*.

In the Introduction, the authors claim the purpose of the project was “. . . to advise and assist the administrative authorities of the Ryukyu Islands in problems of rehabilitation relating to the health and economy of the Ryukyu Islands.” The project outline was developed by the Pacific Science Board and called for “a description and assessment of the impact of the United States military occupation on Okinawan culture.” The “authors’ primary aim has been to inform those actively concerned with Okinawan-American relations” (Pitts, Lebra, & Suttle, 1955, p. i).

An interesting feature of this study is the last four pages, in which the three scholars gave their recommendations to the Army. Reversion hovered in the background. The three authors themselves saw it as inevitable, though probably some of their readers did not. In any case, the recommendations included such things as land reform; a call for birth control (even legalizing abortion if necessary) to curb a population growth that the authors did not believe Okinawa’s economy could sustain; public health education and upgrading of medical care; upgrading and rationalizing education; discouraging the teaching of English below the high-school level as “a waste of time;” and a plea to the USCAR to “abandon its attempts to identify reversionism with communism” (Pitts, et al., 1953, pp. 217–221). This oblique reference to lingering MacCarthyism reminds us that these scholars, even as they cooperated with U.S. military Occupation officials, must have felt considerable constraint.

This long document deserves a lot of serious attention, for its content, which is quite detailed, as well as for its recommendations, but it is outside the parameters of this paper except insofar as eventual UH faculty member William Lebra was one of the co-authors. The research trip he made to write his contribution to the book laid the foundation for his famous work on Okinawan religion.

In fact, most if not all of the academic research during this period — Lebra’s study of Okinawan religion, George Kerr’s history of Okinawa, etc. — was funded by the U.S. Army. Before we draw too many conclusions from that, I offer a caveat: as universities that have tapped U.S. government Title VI International Studies funding know, the goals of the funders (in the case of Title VI, these would include national interest, making the U.S. competitive in global markets, language for security purposes) do not always play out in the actual research and teaching. For example, I myself used Title VI-funded National Defense Foreign Language (now called Foreign Language and Area Studies —

FLAS) grants to study classical Japanese in graduate school, something far removed from “national defense” in the 1970s. Thus we should not read too much into funding sources alone. That being said, the Pitts, et al., volume offers a rather striking example of academics stepping into policy-making. The Vietnam War seems to mark the point at which many academics — at least those in the humanities and social sciences — began to feel reluctant about cooperating so closely with the U.S. military.

Kerr himself leaves no doubt as to funding and motivations for his work. In the introduction to his *Okinawa: The History of an Island People* (Tuttle, 1958; rev. 2000), he notes that his history text was initially commissioned by the Pacific Science Board of the National Research Council in 1951, authorized by the Department of the Army, and subsidized by Government and Relief in Occupied Areas (GARIOA) funds (for the relief and rehabilitation of occupied areas). Subsequently, then Civil Administrator for the Ryukyu Islands Brigadier General James M. Lewis asked Kerr for more in 1952 (Kerr, 1958/2000, p. xiii). Kerr states: “The original text has been enlarged and recast to bring forward the story of European and American interest in the Ryukyu Islands in the 19th century, and to note (by way of introduction) the manner in which the United States government established a legal basis for the present [as of 1958] occupation” (Kerr, 1958/2000, p. xv).

Like Pitts, et al., Kerr is also concerned that the U.S. policymakers understand the reversion movement and not simply dismiss it as “communist.” In a symposium at the Hoover Institute at Stanford University in early 1953, he asserts that, “With few exceptions they [supporters of reversion] stress their desire to cooperate with the United States in maintaining a barrier to Communism . . .” (Kerr, 1953, p. 1, Section I). Kerr further warns that unless the U.S. agrees to reversion, all sorts of people will exploit the situation, including communists, the ultra-right in Japan, and both Chinas (Kerr, 1953, p. 1, Section II). In all, further study of the relationship between Kerr (at the East West Center), the Pacific Science Board, and USCAR would likely reveal a great deal about these complex Cold War inter-connections.⁴⁾

Thomas Marezki made his clearest mark as an Okinawanist in a 1966 project called the Six Cultures Series, which looked at child-rearing techniques in various societies (Marezki & Marezki, 1966). This study was sponsored by the Ford Foundation and also had U.S. Army funding. In the series introduction, Beatrice B. Whiting says, “Although the original design of the study called for a sample of societies whose culture had already been studied by ethnologists, the temperament and motivations of the young anthropologists were such that they tended to choose groups who are relatively unknown and who, often for some personal reason, appealed to their interest” (Whiting, 1966, p. vii). Two pages earlier, she had already cited Margaret Mead and Ruth Benedict as inspirations for these young scholars.

Marezki reveals his own approach more clearly in a paper he delivered at the 10th Pacific Science Congress in Honolulu in 1961 (published by the University of Hawaii Press in 1964 as Alan H. Smith, ed., *Ryukyuan Culture and Society*): “The theoretical orientation [of this paper] emphasizes effects of universal psychological processes in a

specific cultural setting . . .” (Maretzki, 1964, p. 100).

This betrays an approach, buttressed by structuralism, that, as noted above, parallels “modernization theory.” It posits universal norms and compares Okinawa against them. Maretzki also remarked “One reason for concentrating on Okinawa — other than adding another society for whom a culture-psychological analysis may provide new insights — is that it offers a laboratory setting which, in further research, could be put to good use” (Maretzki, 1964, p. 99). Notice the scientific discourse mode as well as the notion that the point of studying various cultures is to help generate universal principles. Note, too, Okinawa-as-Object (“. . . adding another society . . .”). Cold War issues aside, here we also see a profound methodological and theoretical difference from today’s scholarship.

The First Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Contrasting Voices

One exception to this drumbeat of democracy and reversion is the work of archeologist Richard Pearson, whose 1969 *Archaeology of the Ryukyu Islands* was recently published in an updated, revised edition. Archeologists, like historical linguists, are (or can be) unfettered by notions about modern nation states and tend to view things as a broad continuum. Pearson writes: “The Ryukyus constitute an important but poorly known link in the island chain flanking East Asia, and their culture history is of interest to scholars concerned with Taiwan, China, and Southeast Asia, as well as Japan” (Pearson, 1989, p. 3). He positions Okinawa in a much broader cultural and historical context, making no mention of current geopolitical issues.

Another UH scholar with a different agenda was Mitsugu Sakihara, who fought in the Battle of Okinawa and struggled with identity issues during and after the American Occupation. These struggles clearly informed his scholarship. In the introduction to his *A Brief History of Okinawa Based on the Omoro Sōshi*, he writes: “I felt compelled to recreate the Okinawa of the time of the *Omoro Sōshi*, when the nameless people living in these islands came to be Okinawans” (Sakihara, 1987, p. vii).

The First Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Summation

These two scholars notwithstanding, many documents in the University of Hawai‘i archives show how the University of Hawai‘i was trying to position itself as a “player” in the Cold War Asia-Pacific. For example, the papers in Gregg Sinclair’s archives (Sinclair was the University of Hawai‘i president from 1942–55) include a number of exchanges with people connected to the International Christian University (ICU), whose motto was “Democracy through Christian Education in Japan” (University of Hawai‘i President’s Office, 1971). In addition, Willard Wilson, in a talk before the Second Annual Meeting of the Members of the University of Hawai‘i Foundation, Oct. 3, 1957, in George Hall, speaks of UH’s “manifest destiny as a bridge between East and West,” and envisions UH as “a center of scientific and cultural leadership — particularly in Pacific and Asian

affairs” (Wilson, 1957).

In the end, of course, although the backdrop was identifiably Cold War, the first wave was not monolithic, ranging from Sakamaki’s hyper-patriotism to Sakihara’s passionate desire to share his own culture, to Pearson’s regional vision (more like today’s). In addition, there was an intense rivalry between Sakamaki and Kerr. Sakamaki faulted Kerr for not knowing any of the East Asian languages, and Kerr saw Sakamaki as an academic empire builder of light intellectual weight. Kerr also distrusted the University of Hawai‘i in general, especially the library, which is probably one reason why he ended up donating his papers to the Okinawa Prefectural Archives.⁵⁾ Likewise, the motivations of the second wave are diverse to the point of being contradictory.

The Second Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Background

The mission of the 2008 iteration of COS is remarkably unlike the other area studies centers at the University of Hawai‘i in that it clearly embraces the study of the Okinawan diaspora and the natural sciences. In contrast, the Center for Japanese Studies, for example, received \$1,000,000 in 1972 from the Japanese government through the Japan Foundation. Two basic conditions of this funding: (1) that it go toward the study of “Japan and its heritage,” and (2) that it not be used for the natural sciences. These conditions work against cross-area and cross-disciplinary approaches to research. How the broader focus of COS will play out in the activities of the Center remains to be seen, but it certainly reflects the interests of the Center’s early core faculty and administrative and community supporters.

As background, let me briefly share the “pitch(es)” we used to obtain support from various sources for the establishment of the COS. For administrative support within our own university, we stressed the parallels with Hawaiian studies, the influence of the local Okinawan community, and the fact that the University of Hawai‘i is tied to specific community constituencies through other area centers such as Hawaiian Studies, Pacific Islands Studies, and Philippine Studies. For state funding from local politicians (in this case, American politicians of Okinawan ancestry), we stressed heritage pride (the role of the center in teaching people about Okinawa — “academics show they value something by studying it,” as Center for Japanese Studies Associate Director Gay Satsuma said to one state senator). For support from the Japan Foundation, we stressed the role the Ryukyu Kingdom played in a broader East Asian region (north-south rather than east-west orientation), the fact that looking at Ryukyu forced us to re-think what we believed about the so-called *sakoku* period — yet we also understood that the Japan Foundation’s interest was in casting light on “the base issue,” so we included a project related to that question. This approach to pursuing funding might be seen as mercenary, yet the breadth of the mission invited a broad range of appeals.

The Second Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Ethnic Studies, Indigenous Studies

As might be expected given the multi-pronged approach to funding, supporters of COS are by no means of one mind when it comes to why they support Okinawan Studies or what they want the Center to accomplish. Broadly speaking, several of the non-Okinawan informants were, like me, college students during the Vietnam War and tended to see Okinawa in terms of “ethnic studies” as it grew out of the mushrooming of Black Studies and Women’s Studies programs in American universities in the late 1960s. Sensitized by the civil rights movement of the 1950s and ’60s, these “second wave” COS supporters viewed Okinawans as “underdogs,” both in Okinawa and overseas (especially in Hawai‘i, vis-à-vis the rest of the Japanese-American community). For them a Center for Okinawan Studies was a way to “right a wrong.”

But being in Hawai‘i also impacted this group. Those informants who were originally from the mainland talked about how being in Hawai‘i made them more aware of indigenous issues. The diversity one informant, a high-level administrator, found in Hawai‘i sensitized her, and she realized that the Japan she had experienced as a researcher in the 1990s had made no mention of Okinawa. In Hawai‘i, she learned of diversity in Japan as well as in the Japanese-American community. As she said, “I would never have understood this in Wisconsin” (G.V., personal communication, 3/8/2012).

Even those born in Hawai‘i did not always know the story. One informant, a lower-level administrator, was pushed toward supporting Okinawan studies when she learned about the “shocking discrimination that Okinawans experienced in Hawai‘i” while she was doing research for a paper on ethnic identity in Hawai‘i (J.G., personal communication, 2/28/2012).

The Second Wave of Okinawan Studies at UH — Language Revitalization; the Hawaiian Renaissance

One area where my informants disagreed was on the issue of Okinawan language. The University of Hawai‘i people as a group strongly supported the revival of Okinawan languages, pointing to how important the Hawaiian language revival has been to Hawaiians. In fact, they put it at, or close to, the top of their list of things they thought the COS and the University of Hawai‘i should be involved in. As one informant said, “culture, language — when these are lost, people lose pride” (G.V. personal communication, 3/8/2012). Another was even more fervent: “but once the language is dead it’s as if the people are dead” (J.G., personal communication, 2/28/2012). Indeed, as a language and literature scholar myself, I always considered the issue of Okinawan languages to be crucial, which is why the Sakihara *Wordbook* was so important to us as a first project.

Yet at least one community informant, who has worked in the private sector as well as for the state government, was less concerned. He insisted he was not any less Okinawan

just because he doesn’t speak Okinawan. He did not minimize the importance of an understanding of culture and history; he just did not tie it to language. Not surprisingly, he did not place as much importance on the Hawaiian Renaissance as most of my other informants did. “Okinawan” to him meant a community, a network with global ties. As his top two goals for the University of Hawai‘i and COS, he chose “teaching local people (both Okinawans and non-Okinawans) more about Okinawans overseas” and “helping to instill a sense of pride among Okinawans” (M.B., personal communication, 2/29/2012).

Regarding the Hawaiian Renaissance, while all my informants agreed (with different levels of enthusiasm) that it provided a good model for Okinawa — proof that it can be done — one informant expressed concern about the infighting that still characterizes some elements of the Hawaiian community (J.G., personal communication, 2/28/2012), and another, a mid-level administrator close to Hawaiian studies as well as Pacific and Asian studies, warned against being “too strident” (K.N., personal communication, 2/29/2012).

On the other hand, another informant astutely noted that one reason to study Okinawa was to see not just the parallels with how Hawaiians handled being colonized and nearly overwhelmed but also what Okinawans have done differently in the face of similar pressures, not just in Okinawa but in their diasporic communities. She saw the trauma of the Battle of Okinawa to be virtually incomprehensible, yet she recognized the current anger at the U.S. military presence and wondered several times during the interview which side, Japan or the United States, Okinawa “hated more” (her words!). She felt studying Okinawa could help us answer the question “How do people learn from adversity; not necessarily overcome it, but cope with it?” (G.V., personal communication, 3/8/2012).

Much of what we see in the second wave of Okinawan Studies at the University of Hawai‘i reflects the general change in academia since the late 1960s, that is, a shift away from the attempt to “be objective,” away from a universalist approach, away from a “scientific” discourse that collects cultures like specimens, toward approaches that focus on “subjectivity” both of researcher and researched.

Finally, one informant commented on the degree of help and support the University of Hawai‘i got from professors in Okinawa, especially at the University of the Ryukyus, or Ryudai (J.G., personal communication, 2/28/2012). From my standpoint as CJS Director, the Okinawan side seemed delighted that people at the University of Hawai‘i were working to revive interest in Okinawan studies, and their support was very valuable to our success. Unlike the first wave, when the University of Hawai‘i and EWC “imported” Okinawanists, this time, we are building collaborations between peer universities. At the same time, our success became a tool that the Okinawa side could use to generate support from their own administration, so the relationship has been mutually beneficial.

Conclusion

What can we learn from the first wave at the University of Hawai‘i to ensure that the second wave becomes more sustainable? Clearly, just collecting scholars and faculty is

not enough. The University of Hawai‘i had an embarrassment of riches (Sakamaki, Lebra, Maretzki, Robert Sakai) on its faculty in the 1960s and 1970s, as well as the support of EWC scholars like Kerr, Matsuda, Nakahara, and so on. The “exceptional individuals” view of history is currently out of favor, yet once Sakamaki was gone, the above-mentioned scholars failed to remain a cohesive “Okinawan Studies” presence. One of my interviewees was doing graduate work in Japanese history in the 1980s at the University of Hawai‘i, and though Sakai and Sakihara were still there (as was Lebra, for that matter, and Kerr at EWC), my informant’s advisers never mentioned to her the possibility of adding Okinawa to her field of study (J.G., personal communication, 2/28/2012).

Having an impressive library collection is also not enough. To date, the Sakamaki-Hawley Collection is still not completely catalogued, though the University of Hawai‘i and the University of the Ryukyus are now working jointly to digitize a large portion of it and make it more widely available.

The lesson is that we need to weave Okinawa tightly into the East Asia region (not just Japan) so that students can no longer ignore it or treat it as peripheral. This might be done by lobbying professors to add Okinawan components to their existing courses. For example, a survey of Japanese (or even Chinese) history ought to include significant coverage of the Ryukyu Kingdom and its relations with Japan, China, and Southeast Asia. Students across disciplines can be encouraged to include Okinawa, where relevant, in their work. For instance, a recent Asian Studies MA student with a Japanese literature focus explored a novella by an Okinawan writer that dealt with the Okinawan presence in the Philippines before and during the war and its continued consequences.

More broadly speaking, another lesson the UH experience teaches is that a narrow, traditional area studies approach to Okinawan studies is not sufficient to sustain the field. We still need “Okinawanists,” but we also need more historians who understand the importance of the Ryukyu Kingdom and political scientists who are aware of the complexities of contemporary Okinawa, entangled in a web of global politics. In his discussant comments on an earlier version of this paper, delivered at the Okinawan Studies Conference at Waseda (“Remembering 40 Years Since Reversion”) in March of 2012, Masahide Ishihara astutely noted that Okinawan studies will benefit from a more transnational view that places Ryukyu/Okinawa in a broader regional and global context. The Center for Okinawan Studies at UH has set a mission that supports such an approach. Further research on the ways in which intellectual and political trends play out in administrative units within a university may help guide endeavors like this. If we are mindful of the historically contingent nature of this most recent “Okinawan Studies” iteration at UH, it should better prepare us to make sure the Center is responsive to changing academic needs and interests.

Notes

- 1) A particularly pithy example of modernization theory can be found in John W. Bennett, “Japanese Economic Growth: Background for Social Change” in R. P. Dore, ed., *Aspects of Social Change in Mod-*

ern Japan (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1967), pp. 411–453. See also Ezra Vogel's *Japan's New Middle Class* (UC Berkeley, 1963, 1971).

- 2) For more information on Sakamaki, see Gusukuma (1999).
- 3) In Chapter Three and elsewhere in her Ph.D. dissertation, *A History of the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center between 1960 and 1966*, Margaret Smedley (perhaps inadvertently) documents the progression of Cold War-related policy and budget decisions made from 1948 onward that pointed the way to the founding of the East West Center. A quote from her interview of Senator Daniel Inouye is most telling: "It has been further estimated that if only 20 out of every 2000 [East West Center] grantees return home convinced of United States sincerity for peace and understanding, this project in cultural relations will have been a success" (Smedley, 1970, p. 179).
- 4) The Okinawa Prefectural Archives (OPA) holds the bulk of George Kerr's papers and in 2011 published a detailed catalogue of them in English. A large number of these papers are connected to Kerr's interactions with USCAR.
- 5) Folder GHK1N01016 in the George H. Kerr papers bristles with animus. In addition to numerous letters and marginal comments from Kerr disparaging Sakimaki, the folder includes a letter from Sakamaki to a mutual acquaintance questioning Kerr's scholarly qualifications, which the acquaintance then forwarded to Kerr to warn him. Kerr's mistrust of the U.H. Library comes across in several places in Folders GHK1N01016, GHK1N01017, and GHK1N01019. Many parts of these folders are marked "confidential" by the OPA but may be viewed with permission and restrictions.

References

- Gusukuma, C. (1999). *Nisei daimyo: The life of Shunzo Sakamaki*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Hawai'i, Honolulu.
- Kerr, G. (1958; rev. 2000). *Okinawa: The history of an island people*. Tokyo, Japan: Tuttle.
- Kerr, G. (February 19, 1953). *The U.S., the Ryukyus and the reversionist movement* (Background paper prepared by GHK). Folder GHK1M01004. The G. H. Kerr Papers. Okinawa Prefectural Archives. Haebaru, Okinawa.
- Lebra, W. (1970). The Ryukyu Islands. In E. Norbeck, & S. Parman (Eds.), *The study of Japan in the behavioral sciences* (pp. 283–293). Houston, TX: Rice University.
- Maretzki, T. (1964). Personality in rural Okinawa. In A. H. Smith, *Ryukyuan culture and society* (pp. 99–111). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.
- Maretzki, T., & Maretzki, H. (1966). *Taira: An Okinawan village (Six Cultures Series, v. 7)*. New York, NY: J. Wiley.
- Okinawa Prefectural Archives (2011), (Eds.). *A catalogue of the G. H. Kerr papers*, Okinawa-ken Haebaru-chō: Okinawa Prefectural Archives.
- Pearson, R. (1969). *Archaeology of the Ryukyu Islands*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Pitts, F., Lebra, W., & Suttles, W. (1955). *Post-war Okinawa*. Washington, D.C.: Pacific Science Board, National Research Council, Scientific Investigations in the Ryukyu Islands (SIRI), Report #8.
- Sakamaki, S. (1939). *Japan and the United States*. Tokyo, Japan: Asiatic Society of Japan.
- Sakamaki, S. (1963). *Ryukyu: A bibliographic guide to Okinawan studies*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Sakamaki, S., & White, J. (1953). *Asia*. St. Louis, MO: Webster Publishing Company.
- Sakihara, M. (1987). *A Brief history of Okinawa based on the Omoro Sōshi*. Tokyo, Japan: Honpo Shoseki Press.
- Sakihara, M. (2006). *Okinawan-English wordbook*. Honolulu, HI: University of Hawai'i Press.
- Siebert, M. (1961, April 30). University acquires Ryukyu treasures. *Honolulu Star-Bulletin*, p. 8.
- Smedley, M. A. (1970). *A History of the East-West Cultural and Technical Interchange Center between 1960 and 1966*. PhD dissertation, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D.C.
- Toishigawa, L. (1964, January 1). University is leading center for Okinawan studies. *Hawaii Houchi*, p. 1.
- University of Hawai'i President's Office. (1971). A: 1971:002, Box 5, Folder 5, "Japan 1936–1950," folder

- label “Sakamaki, Shunzo and George.” Honolulu, Hawai‘i, USA: University of Hawai‘i Archives.
- Whiting, J. E. (1966). *Field guide for a study of socialization (Six Cultures Series, v. 1)*. New York, NY: J. Wiley.
- Wilson, W. (1957). *Speech delivered to UH Foundation members on October 3, 1957, at George Hall*. Sakamaki Papers, Box 1, University of Hawai‘i Foundation Folder. Honolulu, Hawai‘i, USA: University of Hawai‘i Archives.
-

ハワイ大学における沖縄研究の再興と将来的課題への提言

ロバート・ヒューイ

2008年、日本国外で唯一となる「沖縄研究センター」がハワイ大学に設置された。しかし、ハワイ大学でのこの「沖縄研究ブーム」は、初めての動きではない。1960年代、ハワイ大学および東西センターには、坂巻俊三教授をはじめとする琉球学を専門とする研究者たちが集い、ハワイ大学の図書館にはホーレー文庫 (Hawley Collection) が創設された。しかし、坂巻氏の死後、ハワイ大学での沖縄研究関連の活動は衰えていった。本稿では、沖縄研究ブームが、政治的、文化的、または歴史的にどのような過程を経て、第二波ともいふべき再興へ至ったのかについて考察する。第一波の沖縄研究には戦後占領と冷戦の時代的背景、第二波には冷戦後の民族研究 (ethnic studies)、そして先住民の主権回復および独立運動の影響があることを明らかにしながら、第一波と第二波の二度にわたる沖縄研究ブームに関わった人々の動機や動きについて述べ、最後に、ハワイ大学で沖縄研究を持続するうえで考慮すべき問題に触れる。
