

情表示钦佩，谢谢！

●—司会 次は、ハワイ大学のエリック・ハーウィット先生ですが、先生は現在、本学国際中国学研究センターの訪問教授も兼任されております。それでは、お願いします。

●—エリック・ハーウィット Thank you Professor Yamamoto. I found Professor Kagami's paper to be an excellent and thorough review of the course of research on Asia in both the United States and in Japan during the wartime and postwar period. Professor Kagami takes on an ambitious task to propose a new paradigm for researching Asia and for looking in particular at China. Overall I found the most fascinating parts of the paper to be the historical discussions of the two nations' approaches to the study of Asia. Professor Kagami puts this in the context of research streams that are either sponsored and essentially directed by the state, or those that avoid state sponsorship and therefore give the researcher more freedom of analysis. My only thought here is that Professor Kagami could make this connection somewhat more explicit, and extend the argument to consider that those researchers either in the United States or Japan who do not receive government funding, may at

least in theory, have more ability to conduct work that is independent of their nation's policy interests.

I agree with Professor Kagami's larger argument that it is possible to categorize a significant portion of the American research of the postwar era as state policy-driven in nature. I understand this is part of the basis for his advocating a new approach to the study of Asia and China. His paper also makes a striking point that, somewhat ironically, a form of Orientalism can be found in Japanese area studies of the Asian region of China. I am less familiar with the Japanese case, but I find his analysis compelling. Usually many Americans think of Orientalism as mainly western approaches to foreign studies, but Japanese also share an Asian heritage, so it seems at least to me that there should be less Orientalism here than in the United States or in Europe.

To me, it also seems there has also been a recent trend in American academia to move away from the policy oriented approaches that Professor Kagami indicates prevailed in the postwar decades in the United States. I find this to be the case in at least some parts of my own



discipline of political science, though I agree that other social sciences, as I think Professor Madsen also pointed out, such as economics and business administration, have kept more traditional methodologies, as the scholars in those fields have developed greater interest in Asia and China in recent years.

I just wanted to relate one more personal story to illustrate some of the trends in American analysis of Asian studies. A few years ago I was in Washington DC to evaluate PhD student proposals for Fulbright Foundation research grants that are supported by the US government, by the Education Department in the US government. But I found that many of the proposals that we decided to give money to had little to do with promoting American government policy. So, I think this indicates perhaps somewhat less of a link between research and government policy funding in the United States.

My main suggestion for revision of the paper, if Professor Kagami decides to make changes in this particular paper, are that the last part of the essay should go into greater depth and give a more comprehensive road map for the cobehavioralist approach. Although I should say I found the chart that he used in his powerpoint presentation today to be very useful, and I think that if he would like to include the chart in his paper that would make it very interesting for people who read the essay.

In the paper, Professor Kagami gives three main points to emphasize his new approach, and he also gives a detailed example from the case of pollution in China to illustrate the way the methodology would work in practice. However I believe it would be useful to include more

discussion of how current researchers can in a practical way change their methodologies and ways of thinking to accomplish more of this kind of work, and I think a few of the presenters today have mentioned the problem of food safety in China. I think that would also be a very interesting case to look at using Professor Kagami's methodology.

Finally, in the last paragraph, Professor Kagami cites a few more examples for a possible future cobehavioralist work, with particular reference to the Fukuchiyama railway disaster in Japan, and also nuclear power safety. And so an extended discussion on these cases, and perhaps other cases in China would be of great value to help show scholars how they can use the new approach to both revise their traditional approaches and achieve useful and notable results with Professor Kagami's cobehavioralist method. Thank you.

●—司会 時間は順調どおり進んでおりまして、ここで10分間の休憩とさせていただきます。

〈 休 憩 〉

●—司会 それでは、後半のコメントを引き続き再開したいと思います。最初に、南開大学の周立群先生、お願いします。

●—周立群 大家下午好！我一共想谈两个问题，第一个问题是关于中国问题研究与中国学这两个概念。中国问题研究是指对一个或几个重要问题多视角、多方法、多方位、多学科的研究，研究同一问题大家可以相互启发、相互比照，所作出的结论和价值不求一致，也很难得一致，因此，多异少同、求异存同是中国问题研究的一个特点。而中国学则属于一个独立的研究对象，是一个有着独立的研究对象的学