

JAPAN'S INTERNATIONAL CULTURAL RELATIONS*: Learn From the West

M. Mossadeq Bahri

Abstract

International cultural relations have become an important tool for Western advanced industrialized countries in carrying out their foreign policies. Conducting cultural programs, including educational activities abroad, has helped these countries to maintain their political and economic hegemony over cultural relations, their main aim is similar: to develop abroad positive images of their national in pursuit of international co-operation and strategic and economic benefit for the sending nation. Japan is new to its present position in the world community. It is also a relative new-comer to recognizing the benefits of extensive cultural diplomacy those Western powerful countries such as the US, Great Britain, France, and Germany have pursued for many decades. Thus, it was pursuit of Japan's national interest, not pure altruism and interest in culture that motivated Japan to follow these precedents set by Western countries with a policy on cultural diplomacy. In this study I argue that the Japanese government has pursued, and still does pursue, cultural relations with its neighbor seeking foremost political and economic benefit for Japan. Benefits for other are a secondary concern.

Keywords: cultural relations, cultural diplomacy, cultural imperialism, cultural exchange, foreign aid, economic relations, foreign relations.

Introduction

International cultural relations began to assume a prominent place in foreign relations between the major powers during the 1930s and the 1940s. The reason why international cultural relations have become an important aspect for foreign policy of major countries is a none other than because of the fact that diplomacy, as the best way to promote mutual understanding between states, has already failed in practice. According to Mitchell, official relations do not directly touch the lives of most people, not even of elites, so the "golden age of diplomacy" is already past, and beyond it lays many alternative forms of international relations (Mitchell, 1986:1).

Unlike diplomacy, which is closely aligned to official policy and national interest, Pendergast (1973:682ff.) regards cultural relation as an alternative form of international

* This paper was based on chapter 1 and chapter 2 of my Ph.D. thesis under the supervision of Dr. Md Nasruddin Md Akhir and Associate Professor Faizah Yunus, Faculty of Arts And Social Sciences, University of Malaya. I wish to thank for their valuable comments and suggestions of this paper

relations, he adds that, "cultural relations create an atmosphere that is favorable to peace. This they do by their natural emphasis on 'that which makes life worth living,' and therefore not to be destroyed, by the transfer of valuable skills and experiences, by the reduction of negative images, by revealing people to one another as they are rather than as stereotype" (Mitchell, 1978:14).

This study will describe the development of Japan's international cultural relations programs. It considers the changing demands upon Japan's foreign policy that have accompanied Japan's "rising status" as a more powerful member of the international community. Japan's international relationships have become more complex. Japan's growing economic and, these days, its political involvement in the international arena continue to be met with anticipation and misgiving in many parts of the world. Behind international cultural relations policy development is recognition of the value of developing cultural links with other countries – to minimise tensions that mount in the wake of Japan's international ascendance and to maximise the potential for future overseas co-operation with Japan as a major player in the international system of states.

Methodology

In order to examine the cultural relations between national societies, especially between developed and developing countries, this study employs an analytical framework built upon theories of imperialism. Here, imperialism is taken to refer to the relation between the 'core' countries of developed industrial North and the 'periphery' countries of the South. According to this model, the periphery countries do not have ability to control their economic (and even, arguably, their political) development as they want to. The core countries will decide and determine how far and what kind of development will be suitable for them. As pointed out by Lichtheim "What counts is the relationship of domination and subjection" (Lichtheim, 1971:9). I believe that in analyzing the way advanced industrialized countries carry out their policies of cultural relations toward developing countries through the model of imperialistic relations with an imperialistic theory of development (represented by dependency theory) is more suitable for understanding international relations than using a model derived from theories of development (e.g. as represented by modernization theory) which pretends to expand the notions of improving social welfare of underdeveloped and developing countries. Although both refer to capitalism, the discursive point of view of those who are exploited, while capitalistic understandings focus in the generosity of the donors and the stronger countries. As already been touched on above, discussions from the "native" point of view has been lacking, and so has works that looks into the other side of cultural relations, i.e. the side of imperialism as a manifestation of domination.

Analysis and Data Interpretations

The first part of this section gives an overview of the modes of Western international cultural relations and the second part focuses on Japan's international cultural relations

during the pre and post- World War periods, in particular with her activities in the Asian region.

1. International Cultural Relations: Western Modes

According to Ninkovich (1978), the notion of cultural relations as a concept in international relations can be traced from the advent of large scale institutional philanthropy in the twentieth century. Cultural relations were institutionalized and tied, however tentatively, to foreign policy objectives, particularly since the formation of the Carnegie Endowment for International Peace in 1910. Previously, cultural relations were originally spontaneous and unconstrained interactions between people within or across national boundaries.

During ancient times (2nd century BC to 4th century AD) many scholars from China, Japan, and Korea went to the ancient Indian universities to study Buddhism in the lands of its founder. Elsewhere, according to Devanesen and Abel (1865:67),

The ancient University of Alexandria was a great international university where scholars of the different Mediterranean countries carried on a very beneficial commerce in ideas. Students from all over Europe, Asia Minor and North Africa went to study in Greek schools and academies when Greece was known as the 'Mistress of the World.' Many eager students of Christian Europe flocked in search of learning to Arab schools in Muslim lands. The medieval Christian universities of Salerno, Bologna, Paris, Montpellier and Oxford attracted students from all over Europe (Devanesen and Abel, 1965:68)

These ancient cultural interchanges in the field of education were by and large unaffected by governmental intervention and control and free from political and nationalistic interests. But from history we may observe that since the advent of Western colonialism, education has been used for political purposes. In order to protect their hegemony, Devanesen and Abel (1965:68) observed that,

The colonial powers intensively introduced the western educational ideas in their colonies, to spread western culture among the natives and thereby create a class of people who would be '[native] in blood and colour, but [western] in taste, in opinion, in morals and in intellect.'

Because education has the potential to foster certain desired attitudes, e.g. to create a desired pattern of thought and behaviour in a given group of people, in the course of time many countries began to utilize education as an instrument of their foreign policies. In this way, governments promoted educational and cultural activities abroad until they become an important aspect of normal diplomacy.

With regard to cultural dimension as part of foreign policy, France, Great Britain, Federal Republic of Germany and the United States of America, and other modern nation-states,

have clear convictions and philosophical foundations upon which cultural foreign diplomacy are based. In these countries, especially after the post World War period, the extensive human exchange through cultural, educational, technological and intellectual activities continue to manifest the spiritual and philosophical motives, even though they are more strategic.

France is the pioneer in these issues. Since the 17th century until the end of 18th century, French was the common language of monarches and nobles, ambassadors and men of learning; the French governess was that age's equivalent of today's itinerant English teacher. France was the first Western nation to create an extensive program of officially organized overseas cultural relations as its influence abroad grew helped along by private organizations such as the Alliance Francaise which was established in 1883 (see Kellermann, 1978:5, 22ff; Mitchell, 1986:22-23) the influence of French culture, particularly its language, is still strong in the Middle East, Indo China, and former French colonies. The strategy of France has since then been followed by other countries.

The Federal Republic of Germany was, like other countries in the free world, concerned with the importance of cultural relations as an aspect of foreign policy. According to Mitchell (1986:126) the "cultural work is to be considered by German diplomatic missions as equally important as political and economic work" (Mitchell, 1986:126, 127). In the case of Germany, because of her experience in the last war, she gives particular attention to the safeguarding of peace and promoting international understanding as a part of her foreign policy design. According to Mitchell (1986:ibid.), the principle of Germany in order to deepen and strengthen mutual understanding, cooperation and exchange with other countries is derived from the principle that, "the value of what we give is only worth as much as our willingness to take. Thus, an open attitude towards others is a principle of our cultural policy abroad."

The Great Britain institutionalized her work in the field of cultural relations with the formation of the British Council in 1934. The establishment of this council was in order to maintain close relationship between Britain and its colonies. The shared cultural regimen between the English speaking countries was to reap rewards particularly during the Second World War, by helping to hold together the Western Alliance and securing the necessary support of the Dominions. Thus, from the experience of both France and Great Britain and their colonies, we saw inculcating a love for French and English as a means of ensuring political and economic dominance.

The United States of America, after World War II is already an advanced industrialized country outside Europe that pursued a very active cultural diplomacy based on a strategy and a national ideal. In Kellerman's view (1978:22-23), with the establishment of a Division of Cultural Relations in the Department of States in 1938, American programs took off with great enthusiasm from both government and private institutions. In spite

of that, the division was established based on two fundamental principles which are a) cultural relations activities itself, based on the idea that it would be reciprocal and that there must be no imposition of one people's culture upon another, and b) the idea that the exchange of cultural interests should involve the participation of people and institutions concerned with those interests in the respective countries, that is, the program should stem from the established centres of culture (Kellermann, loc. cit).

The value of overseas cultural activities for extending American ideological influence have had an important impact for both the US and Indonesia. By providing technical assistance to Indonesian universities in the mid 1950s, the United States of America has been successful for employing those people who received scholarship in US universities in order to safeguard US interests in Indonesia. In the First Five Year Development Plan of Indonesia, which was launched in 1967, it can be observed that most of the key positions in various ministries of the then Cabinet members were occupied by what was called the "Berkeley Mafia" (Ranson 1970; Vaughn, 1978). Regarding this situation, Gustav Papanek, a former Chief of Harvard Development Advisory Service, had this to say about his government reaction to this new cabinet,

We could not have drawn up a more ideal scenario than what happened. All of these people simply moved into the government and took over the management of economic affairs and then they asked us to continue working with them" (in Ranson, 1970:29ff.; also Vaughn, 1978:151).

Similarly, during the Cold War situation, it can be observed that the US and the USSR have deployed the notion of "national culture" as an ideological tool to create favourable images abroad, to assert their own superiority, and was used as diplomatic barometers to signal strategic intentions (Barghoorn, 1960:145).

Because Japan in contemporary history was accepted and admitted as a member of powerful and advanced industrialized countries, it was important for her to get involved and to compete with other powers in a situation wherein the rules were established by the Western industrialized countries. Therefore, as a new participant in the international community she had to learn the way to conduct cultural relations and eventually develop her own approach.

2. Japan's Modes

International exchanges in Japan were recorded to begin in the early 7th century, with the dispatch of Japanese envoys to China during the Tang dynasty (618-907 AD) and continued in some measure thereafter, but there was nothing historically to compare with the sudden burst of exchange in education, science and culture in the early *Meiji* era. Based on the *Meiji* Restoration's Slogan *Fukoku Kyohei* (Rich Nation, Strong Army), Japan opened its door welcoming of the Japanese people turned to foreign nations

(Reischauer, 1990; Halloran, 1978). In their effort to absorb European and American culture, the leaders of the Meiji Restoration enthusiastically promoted activities such as sending not only scholars, but also soldiers, students, and businessmen for study abroad (cf. Halloran 1980:34). The Japanese government also invited many foreign teachers and technicians to Japan, and the translation of foreign scientific books into Japanese. These policies in a sense could be an implementation of *Gokajo no Seimon* (Five Oaths of *Tenno*) which declared on 14 of March 1868, and these policies were still continued throughout the Meiji, Taisho, and into the middle of the Showa era, contributing greatly to the development of Japanese culture (Halloran, 1980:35ff.).

Abroad, the introduction of Japanese culture was pursued through participation in the World Expositions held in Paris in 1867 just before the Meiji Restoration, in Vienna in 1873, in Philadelphia in 1876, and again in Paris in 1878. Japan was also represented at the World Religious Conference held in conjunction with the World Exposition in Chicago in 1893. However, according to the Research and Statistic Division Minister's Secretariat Ministry of Education in international activities was negligible except for the selection of students to study abroad. In other words, from these indications it can be said that the private institutions or individuals played an important role in order to promote the Japanese culture abroad.

The Japanese government attached much importance to international cultural relations after World War II, where she began to recognize the benefits of extensive cultural diplomacy that other Western countries such as the US, Great Britain, France, and Germany had pursued for decades (Kennedy, 1988). There are several reasons for the Japanese to seek the way Western countries carry out their cultural diplomacy. On one hand, Japan's limited experience and disposition to outwardly share her cultural heritages, ideas, have restricted her socio-cultural interplay with other societies. On the other hand, the philosophical and spiritual aptitude to reach out to other people has not been part of Japanese foreign policy.

The other reason is that most of the conventions and practices in conducting international cultural relations in contemporary foreign relations were established by Western countries. Accordingly, the ideas and concepts of spreading religion, introducing political and economic systems, educational system, philosophical values, culture and human knowledge were part of the strategic and ambitious schemes to spread Western influence to other countries.

As far as cultural relations between Japan and other countries are concerned, we note that the strategy of her cultural relations was its wide-ranging geographical area coverage. However, Japan has chosen to focus on the strength of her cultural relations towards certain regions that serve her economic interests, namely, Southeast Asia, Western

Europe, North America and East Asia. This situation can readily be understood because these regions are part of the major trading partners for Japan.

To accommodate cultural relations with other countries, the need for adequate facilities was soon recognized and the Japanese government established the Japan Foundation in 1872. This institution is an operational body which undertakes various projects on its own on behalf of the Japanese government. It is a central organ for organization for Japan's international cultural exchange (Okatsu, 1977:101-102). Currently, in order to perform cultural relations abroad, Japanese government operate two Cultural Institutes in Rome and Cologne, one Cultural Centre in Jakarta, seven Liaison Offices in Paris, London, New York, Los Angeles, Sao Paulo, Bangkok, and Canberra.

In an address on foreign policy delivered at the 68th Session of the National Diet on January 29, 1972, Foreign Minister Takeo Fukuda stated:

I wish to touch on the indispensability of rapidly expanding personnel and cultural interchange. Foreign interest in Japan has grown rapidly in recent years, but in parallel with interest has come suspicion and unwarranted misunderstanding in some areas. We are criticized for orienting our overseas activities to the pursuit of economic interest and even for reviving of militarism. At this time, it is a matter of urgency for Japan diplomatically to present to foreign countries an image of Japan as a peaceful, culturally oriented nation and endeavor to eliminate mis-conceptions. Such efforts are particularly important for Japan, with its communication difficulties stemming from a unique culture tradition and linguistic barriers. Today when Japanese are active participants in various phases of the international society, they must deepen their understanding of the realities of the world. Recognizing these urgent needs, the government, intend to establish a new fund, the Japan Foundation, to work toward that end, and requests allocation of necessary fund in next year's budget ... I believe the promotion of broad mutual understanding among peoples to be one of the most important tasks facing the diplomacy of our nation (cited in Okatsu, 1977:101-102).

Since that time, the Japanese initiatives in this area have increased year by year, both from the government and private sectors.

The idea that culture is important for Japan's foreign policy can be seen from the policy statements of the Advisory Committee issued its final report describing a guide-line Japan is expected to follow in promoting her international cultural relations. Based on this guide-line, one month later, the Conference for the Promotion of International Cultural Exchange was set up in the Cabinet. As a result, in September 1989, the Council for International Cultural Exchange In the same month, the Round-Table Conference of Ministers Concerned was organized in order to discuss all kinds of problems which related to international cultural exchange (MOFA, 1990:121). The final reports of the Advisory Committee on International Cultural Exchange in May 1989 made a number of

recommendations to upgrade Japanese cultural programs activities abroad. These recommendations became the essence of the Action Program for International Cultural Exchange, which was released in September 1989. There are two important factors that can be drawn from these statements that could be useful in determining the style of Japanese Exchange Cultural Policy, i.e. the specific type of programs chosen, and the target countries or regions in which the programs are targeted (MOFA, 1989:121).

If we turn to that Action Program for International Cultural Exchange which was released in September 1989, we find that the program sets forth various objectives and ideas of Japan's international cultural exchange as follows: 1) to contribute to the construction of peaceful and stable international relations by securing mutual understanding and trust among nations and peoples; 2) to contribute the creation of a richer culture and to the development of the world's culture by promoting mutual understanding and mutual stimulation among various cultures; 3) to positively respond to the rapidly growing varied interest in Japan; and 4) to develop Japan into a country with a richer culture open to the world by increasing the opportunities of contact with different cultures and promoting Japan's overall internationalization (MOFA, 1989:121).

In regards to the types of programs, a range of measures has been outlined. The programs present basic measures to be taken into eight fields, including: cooperation in promoting Japanese language teaching and Japanese studies, enrichment of cultural exchange through the arts and strengthening of its base, enhancement of cooperation for the preservation of cultural heritage and strengthening of the basis for such cooperation, providing information through the audio visual media and promotion of intellectual exchange.

According to Action Program for International Cultural Exchange, Japanese language programs were chosen as the top priority within Japanese Cultural Exchange Policy (MOFA, 1989). This condition can be understood because language is an essential means of propagating knowledge and ideas. Earlier we noted the example of how the French and the British governments propelled their national language programs abroad through language. Similarly, Japanese language programs abroad are to be promoted to respond to the Japanese language fever abroad (MOFA, 1990:122). For this reason, specific measures were then taken. These measures include the establishment of Japanese Language Centre in Saitama Prefecture, development of materials which are appropriate for students from different countries, and educating Japanese language teachers inside and outside Japan. In fiscal year 1990, the Japanese government also established Japanese Language Centre in Sydney, Jakarta and Bangkok (MOFA, *ibid.*).

Like the Japanese language programs, the establishment of Japanese studies abroad can be considered as an important element for Japan to acquire a favourable recognition in the world community. This involves providing various materials, especially concerning the contemporary Japan, as well as encouraging the work of established Japanese studies

institutions, and providing seed money for new ones. In this respect, the government of Japan has been cooperating with major overseas institutions to establish and develop Japanese Studies (MOFA, 1990:122).

Academic exchanges, especially, were promoted to develop world-wide recognition of Japanese contributions to the advancement of learning. Specific measures involve expanding exchanges of researchers, promoting joint international researcher, and strengthening Japanese capacity to send out research information from Japan. Similarly, exchanges of knowledge were developed to improve the quality of exchanges of information with influential persons abroad. These include inviting and sending learned persons, and creating opportunities so that intellectuals outside Japan can exchange opinions with their Japanese counterparts. Also greater efforts were made to promote exchanges with persons who will be involved in political life in their home countries in the near future (JICA Annual Report, 1990; AIEJ, 1990, 1991, 1994).

The last category is concerned with making better use of the latent potential of the Japanese public to facilitate cultural exchanges. Under the label of "promoting education for international understanding," various sectors of Japanese society were to become involved; they include Japanese individuals who are living or traveling outside Japan, the Japanese studying overseas, the Japanese children who returned to school in Japan after a period abroad. Assistance is to be provided to the Japanese people studying foreign languages, and all kinds of grass roots exchanges involving Japanese people are to be encouraged (MOFA, 1990:124; also Keidanren Review, 1988, 1989). It is not an exaggeration to say that all these programs represent an opportunity for Japan to develop a cultural and financial presence abroad since the projects introduce Japanese people, their ideas and expertise into other parts of the world. This presence, then, may also provide a stimulus for developing further links in terms of socio-cultural, economic and political with Japanese interests.

Like any country, Japan also adopted a geographically specific approach to implementing its cultural exchange programs. The reason is straightforward, to devote attention to the development of bilateral relationship with key trading and security partners, especially with the United States and Southeast Asian countries. Regionally, Southeast Asia has consistently received the most funding. Asian sub-regional distinctions are specified from 1985. Hitherto, the number one priority from Japanese has always placed on the Southeast Asian region, followed by Western Europe, North America, and East Asia. At lower levels of importance are the Middle East, Eastern Europe, Oceania and Africa. Details of Japanese government expenditures on International Cultural Exchanges may be found in *Kokusai Koryu Kikin* 1988 (The Japan Foundation, 1998:108); and in *Kokusai Bunka Koryu ni Kansuru Kondankai Saishu Hokoku/Bessatsu* (Attachment to the Final Report of The Advisory Group on International Cultural Exchange) (MOFA, 1989:37).

3. One Sidedness of Japan's Cultural Relations

Based on the ideal of cultural relations, there is reason to hope that mankind may be moving in a spirit of cooperation and mutual respect among cultures toward a realization of new humanism which will be a fresh expression of the humane and the human. However, cultural relations between developed and developing countries, in this case between Japan and Southeast Asian countries are politically and economically costly. This raises some crucial questions such as; at what price, or to the detriment of whom, has the cultural relations been conducted? Who has benefited the most from such relations? And what is the prospect of such relations?

These are indeed old questions that were partly answered so eloquently many years ago by Shimizu Hayao (1989) in his engrossing article entitled *Rediscovery Asia*. It is a disclosure where he described in a melodramatic way that Japan as a member of developed countries tends to be very selfish in carrying out her relations with other countries in Asia. He went on to say, that the process of economic and technological exchange, investment and technological assistance between Japan and other Asian nations tends to run in one direction from Japan to Asian nations. Patya Saihoo (1979), writing in *Asia Pacific Community*, criticizes the one-way direction of Japanese-Southeast Asian cultural relations, pointing out that Japan is only interested in exporting Japanese goods and cultures to Southeast Asia, and not in importing Southeast Asian goods and cultures into Japan. In the same periodical, Hayashi Reisque (1979) also argues that the reasons for Japan's lack of interest in ASEAN cultures is rooted in racism. According to him, Japanese constantly distinguish between Western and Asian people; Japanese retain an inferiority complex toward Westerners while maintaining a strong superiority complex toward Third World peoples and countries. Bahri (1998) also indicates that the Japanese educational assistance was used primarily to train elite's in Japan, to promote Japanese studies in the developing countries universities, and to promote international studies in Japan universities. He went on to say that the Japanese education and technical training programs activities for students from the Third World countries was seen as a means of influencing national elite's to lead a Japanese inspired and financially supported economic and political development process.

In another study, entitled *Cultural Exchange Between Japan and Singapore*, Chan Heng Chee (1989), pointed out the one-sidedness of cultural exchange: the flow so often coming from Japan to Singapore that it soon became clear who the more aggressive partner in the exchange was. Realizing that the cultural exchange was presumably driven by Japanese desire to improve its status in the world community, she doubted that what could otherwise be done would significantly affect the responses of the weaker partner towards the stronger in the more important policies and activities of that stronger nation.

A famous Thai sociologist, Professor Prasert Yamklinfung gave warning that the unintentional and often unnoticed impact of Japanese business activities in Thailand was

causing undesirable effect upon Thai children. For example, TV series imported from Japan are being frowned upon by many concerned people as teaching unsuitable values to children, such as violence, aggressiveness, fantastic thinking and obsession with victory over rivals regardless of the means used. He argued that cultural exchange must be expanded with far-sightedness at all social levels in mutually beneficial ways. But the content of exchange must also be carefully reviewed caution must be taken not to concentrate on the presentation of only traditional Japanese culture to the Thai public since it could easily arouse their suspicion of Japan's cultural imperialism. Not merely flower arrangement, tea ceremony or review shows but authentic modern culture such as painting, drama, architecture and philosophy should be presented (1977). Another Thai scholar, Vichai (1979:82) condemns Japanese for a range of offences including refusing to mingle with the Thais, and even worse, the exclusion of Thais from Japanese-owned restaurants bars and clubs. He repeats the common accusation that the Japanese are 'economic animal' who 'know our women rather than our history or culture.' The best picture can be drawn from the experiences of Malaysian scholar, Aminuddin Mustakim (1979), he describes Japanese discrimination against himself and fellow East Asians while living in Tokyo.

In their joint paper entitled *ASEAN, Indonesia and Japan: In Search of Our "Hearts"* Professor Shibusawa Masahide and Toru Yano (1977) provide a clear explanation why the Japanese government sponsored activities in promoting knowledge of Japan in Southeast Asian countries. They strongly mock the use of propaganda which they say ultimately has little effect in developing Japan's cultural relations.

The situation can be traced from Japan's Asian attitude. The Japanese attitude has changed very little in the way it judged Asia (according to European or American standards), with Asia still being considered a poor, backward region of the world. The Japanese still compared Asia with Europe and were immediately proud of Japan's program of successfully modernizing ahead of other Asian countries without having been colonized by a Western power. One image that can most easily explain this situation is from a popular phrase during the war, *hokujin, nanbutsuron* which means literary "people, in the North; and things, in the South." There was no civilization, culture and technology in the South regions – only things or raw materials which Japan wished to exploit at any cost. Therefore, it was concluded that until Japanese people correct their view, no amount of official government for exchange between Japan and ASEAN will be successful.

Professor Mantra illustrates the nature of cultural relations between Japan and Indonesia. He points out that cultural relations between Japan and Indonesia at present is imbalanced. The different needs effect cultural relations between technologically developed and developing countries, they generally create negative effects upon members of the respective societies. Cultural relations between nations should be based on mutual trust, mutual understanding and mutual respect. Moreover, he said, that mutual understanding in

cultural exchange among nations cannot be forced. It should be fostered on the basis of the capacity of absorption and the need of the society concerned (Mantra, 1978:58-62).

Similarly, Professor Ranuwihardjo (1977), in his paper entitled *Some Notes on Japan-Indonesia Educational and Cultural Relation in Perspective*, clearly stated that there is a gap in cultural relations between Japan and Indonesia that could be resolved. He related this statement to the activities of the Japanese in Indonesia. He went on to say, that both Japanese government and private business people conduct their business in Indonesia concentrating exclusively on economic or business matters, and are not concerned with anything related to social, cultural or even educational projects. In addition, most Japanese families abroad live rather quietly without associating with too many foreign and local friends. This tends to make the intellectual world almost nil.

It can be said from the above Asian examples that the present Japanese foreign policy and influence is, as in the past, based on the expansion of Japanese nation after World War II by the use of political, economical and financial power, which is maintained through the slogans of "cultural relations," this power and influence would not have materialized through military power as was achieved before the War. Thus, even though cultural relation is one of the most important aspects for Japan in conducting her diplomacy (through Aid programs and Peace Keeping Efforts), the categories of activities from her cultural relations with other countries still remains as Nipponcentric (Mitchell, 1968:79).

Conclusion

From the history of mankind we noticed that culture as an expression of national identity has long been used as a tool of influence and power. By carrying selected information and ideas to widespread audiences overseas, carefully cultivated "cultural relations" have helped to create the structure for long term influence by one country to another. The establishment of *Pax Americana* best illustrates this case (Calleo 1988:3). Professor David P. Calleo, from John Hopkins University in Washington, at an international conference in Australia in 1988, proudly stated that, "The liberal world economy that American political class of 1945 dreamed about has, in fact, come into being. This Liberal Pax Americana is a very great historical achievement, a monument to the vision and determination of postwar leadership in America, Europe, and elsewhere around the world" (see Calleo and Allin, 1988:3).

Most developed countries, with their abundant material resources, culture, money, information, and people, attach considerable importance to active program of international cultural relations as an element of their foreign policy. Japan as a member of developed (mostly capitalist) countries is new to its present position in the postwar period. As an Asian power in a world order system that has been dominated for many years by Western nations, Japan, of course, could not deny the benefits that Western nations achieved

through their cultural relations with this region. Because of this, it is important for Japan to maintain the image of strong but benevolent nation.

Based on the above analysis, it can be concluded that since the postwar period, Japan followed the way of other Western industrialized countries that were successful in promoting their economic and political interests through the conduct and maintenance of international cultural relations. Moreover, Japan's international cultural relations, particularly in Asia and ASEAN, are mostly extended through the agency of aid programs. However, as will be seen, and as have already been criticized by Asian observers above, the ideal principles of cultural relations have not been faithfully observed, and aid as part of the whole package of Japan's (cultural) diplomacy is merely a veil for Japanese economic self-interest.

Bibliography

- Aminuddin Mustakim. 1979. 'Glimpses of Japan,' *Asia Pacific Community*, No. 5, Summer.
- Association of International Education of Japan. Booklet 1990, 1991, and 1994 (in Indonesia).
- Bahri, M. Mossadeg. Japan International Cultural Relations: An Overview, *NIPPON*, Vol. 3, No. 4, 1997.
- Barghoorn, Frederick C. 1960. *The Soviet Cultural Offensive; The Role of Cultural Diplomacy in Soviet Foreign Policy*, New Jersey, Princeton University Press.
- Calleo, David P. and Allin, Dana H. *Geostrategic Trends and the World Economy*, December 1988.
- Chan, Heng Chee. 1989. *Cultural Exchange Between Japan and Singapore*, Tokyo, JF.
- Devanesen, A. and Abel, B. 1965. *Cultural Affairs and International Understanding: Asian-American Assembly 1963*, Kuala Lumpur, The University of Malaya Press.
- Halloran, Richard. 1969. *Japan: Images and Realities*, Tokyo, Charles E. Tuttle.
- Hayashi Reisuke. 'Japanese Views Toward Foreigners,' *Asia Pacific Community*, Summer, No. 5, 1979.
- Japan International Cooperation Agency. Annual Report, 1990 (in English).
- Japan International Cooperation Agency. *Kenshu-in*, periodical for ex-JICA participants, Nos. 70, 1993 and 71, 1994.
- Keidanren Review of the Japanese Economy*. Tokyo: Keidanren, 1988 and 1989.
- Kellermann, Henry J. 1978. *Cultural Relations as an Instrument of US Foreign Policies*, Bureau of Educational and Cultural Affairs, Washington, DC, US Department of State.
- Kennedy, Paul. 1988. *The Rise and Fall of the Great Powers: Economic Change and Military Conflict from 1500 to 2000*, London, Unwin Hyman.
- Lichtheim, George. 1971. *Imperialism*, New York, Frederick Praeger.

- Mantra, I. B. 'Heart to Heart Contacts in the Context of Japanese-Indonesia Cultural Exchange,' in *Japan-Indonesia Cooperation: Problems and Prospects*, Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1978, pp. 58-61.
- Mitchell, J. M. 1986. *International Cultural Relations*, London, Allen and Unwin.
- Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Japan. *The Diplomatic Blue Book*, 1989 and 1990.
- Ninkovich, Frank A. 1981. *The Diplomacy of Ideas: US Foreign Policy and Cultural Relations, 1938-1950*, Cambridge, Cambridge University Press.
- Okatsu, Morihiko. 'The Present State of Cultural Exchange of Japan and Its Assessment,' in *Japan-Indonesia Relations in the Context of Regionalism in Asia*, Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1977, pp. 93-110.
- Patya, Saihoo. 'Problems in ASEAN-Japan Cultural Exchange,' *Asia Pacific Community*, Fall, 1978.
- Pendergast, W. R. 'The Political Use of Cultural Relations,' *Il Politico, Rivista di Scienze Politiche*, Vol. 38, No. 4, 1973, pp. 682-696.
- Ranson, David. 'The Berkeley Mafia and the Indonesian Massacre,' *Rampart*, Vol. 2, No. 4, October 1970, pp. 29-49.
- Ranuwihardjo, Sukadji. 'Some Notes on Japan-Indonesian Cultural Educational and Cultural Relation in Perspective,' in *Japan-Indonesia Relations in the Context of Regionalism in Asia*, Jakarta: Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1977, pp. 74-78).
- Reischauer, Edwin O. 1990. *Japan Past and Present*, Tokyo, Charles E. Tuttle.
- Shibusawa Masahide and Yano Toru. ASEAN, Indonesia and Japan: In Search of Our Hearts,' in *Japan-Indonesia Cooperation: Problems and Prospects*, Jakarta, Centre for Strategic and International Studies, 1978, pp. 43-57.
- Shimizu Hayao. 'Rediscovering Asia,' *Japan Echo*, Vol. VIII, No. 4, 1981, pp. 4-21.
- The Japan Foundation. *Monthly Program*, 1993-94 (in Japanese and Indonesian).
- Todhunter, Maureen. *International Cultural Exchange: A Valuable Instrument in Japan's Foreign Policy in the Late 1980s*, Unpublished Honours Dissertation, University of Queensland, 1990.
- Vaughn, Sandra Yvone Chambers. *Foreign Aid: Its Impact on Indonesian Political Development*, Ph.D. Dissertation, Howard University, 1978.
- Vichai, Suwaban. Glimpses of Japan,' *Asia Pacific Community*, Summer, No. 5, 1979.
- Yamklinfung, Prasert. 'Thailand-Japan Cultural Exchange: Past, Present and Future,' in Japan Foundation, 1977, pp. 67-82.